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I. INTRODUCTION

These findings and statement of overriding consideration have been prepared for the Old Town San Diego State Historic Park-Building Demolition and Immediate Public Use Facilities Project (Proposed Project). The California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) is the Lead Agency for this project. This document accompanies the Environmental Impact Report, which addresses the potential environmental impacts associated with providing visitors to Old Town San Diego State Historic Park (OTSDSHP) with a new interim public use park space. These Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations have been prepared to comply with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Location

The recent land acquisition of Block 409, previously owned by the California Department of Transportation, is a significant addition to OTSDSHP. The acquisition is 2.47 acres in area and is located at 2829 Juan Street within the community of Old Town in the City of San Diego. The acquisition is bound to the northwest by Taylor Street, northeast by Juan St., southwest by Calhoun St. and southeast by Wallace St. The former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex (Office Complex) contains a total of 115,735 square feet of office space. OTSDSHP is located approximately 3.5 miles northwest of downtown San Diego, near the junction of Interstates 5 and 8.

B. General Project Characteristics

The proposed project will consist of the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex and construction of new immediate public use facilities as a part of OTSDSHP.

C. Project Objectives

The primary objectives of the Proposed Project are:

1. To interpret Block 409 including the sites of several buildings from OTDSHP’s interpretive period and their associated landscapes. Other interpretive opportunities include presentation of the history and culture of the Kumeyaay who lived within and surrounding OTSDSHP both prior to and during Old Town San Diego’s historic period and the interpretation of the community’s relationship with the San Diego River.

2. To provide parking to assist in accommodating existing and additional visitation to OTSDSHP. This is especially necessary during when events are held at OTSDSHP and on weekends when concessions are especially busy.

3. To provide circulation of pedestrians throughout Block 409 compliant with CDPR’s Accessibility Guidelines.

4. To create an inviting and historically accurate landscape for visitors to OTSDSHP including a new entrance utilizing appropriate signage. The nearby San Diego River shall be interpreted utilizing topographic changes to simulate the river valley which was historically adjacent to the Proposed Project site.
D. Required Permits and Approvals

Implementation of the Project requires several approvals and permits. CDPR anticipates that the agencies responsible for issuing these permits will rely upon the Final EIR for purposes of evaluating the project's potential environmental effects. Required approvals and permits are identified below.

As lead agency, CDPR has relied on the Final EIR for purposes of its decision to approve the project.

Other Federal, State and local agencies with non-discretionary permitting authority over some aspect of the project, or with consultation responsibilities, include:

Local Agencies
San Diego County Air Pollution Control District
   Asbestos Removal Notification

State of California
California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA)
   Demolition Permit
   Asbestos Worker Notification

California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control
   Asbestos Abatement Notification

State Historic Preservation Office - PRC 5024.5
   Consultation Comments

State Fire Marshal
   Plan Approval

California Environmental Protection Agency
   Lead Based Paint Notification

Regional Water Quality Control Board
   National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit

Federal

Environmental Protection Agency
   Notification for Hazardous Materials and Lead Based Paint
III. BACKGROUND

As planning proceeds for the Immediate Public Use of the former Caltrans District Office Complex, two vital missions shall be met to meet the goals of CDPR as well as the Cultural Resources Division. Cultural resources make up the majority resources that exist on the new acquisition and are critical to the success of OTSDSHP.

The California State Parks mission states:

To provide for the health, inspiration and education of the people of California by helping to preserve the state's extraordinary biological diversity, protecting its most valued natural and cultural resources, and creating opportunities for high-quality outdoor recreation.

The Cultural Resources Division Mission Statement states:

To provide inspiration and leadership in acquiring, conserving, and managing cultural resources that represent California’s rich history and diverse population, and, to foster an appreciation of the extraordinary value of California’s cultural heritage for the enjoyment of present and future generations through access, education, service, and stewardship.

The mission of OTSDSHP is to present the opportunity to experience the history of early San Diego by providing a connection to the past to better understand the origins of today’s greater community. Located at the site of the centuries-old Native American settlement of Cosoy, and the initial European settlement of Alta California, Old Town reflects the long-standing, diverse and internationally significant cultural heritage.

As a State Historic Park, OTSDSHP strives to re-create Old Town San Diego’s historic period from 1821 to 1872 in order to provide a historically accurate environment in which the people, lifeways and significant events of this era can be interpreted for the people of California. OTSDSHP interprets and presents this history through various mediums including preserved and re-constructed historic structures and landscape elements, interpretive programs (e.g. tours, educational and living history programs, exhibits), special events and human resources that include park employees, concessionaires and volunteers.

OTSDSHP is a core contributor to the Old Town San Diego National Register District (OTSDNRD). It owns and preserves seven original contributing historic buildings along with numerous archaeological sites and resources. It also has reconstructed over a dozen historic era buildings and maintains re-created historic landscape features and elements in order to provide visitors to enhance the historic integrity of the OTSDNRD.

In order to support and enhance this purpose, the 1977 OTSDSHP General Development Plan recommends CDPR acquire nearby properties that also have historical resources and sites associated with the OTSDNRD for the “purposes of preservation, restoration, reconstruction and interpretation” and to “provide a complete picture of [historic] Old Town San Diego.” Subsequent OTSDSHP planning documents including the 1991 Interpretation Plan (Helmich 1991) identified the historic Block 409 (Caltrans Property) as the location of several potential historic era property sites. The 2000 OTSDSHP Action Plan directly noted the goal to “consider acquisition of the adjacent Caltrans property.”
Over the ensuing decades CDPR management and local historic preservation organizations, community members, park stakeholders and local agencies supported adding this parcel into OTSDSHP. In 2006 Caltrans opened their replacement District 11 Office Complex across the street at 4050 Taylor Street and closed its former Office Complex. When Caltrans proposed selling off the then surplus state property in 2011, local stakeholders lobbied state legislators to authorize the 2013 property transfer to CDPR. The property was officially acquired by CDPR on November 6, 2013.

In order to facilitate the addition of the property into OTSDSHP, CDPR prepared a Budget Package to provide for the abatement, demolition and removal of the Office Complex and the construction of IPU facilities. CDPR received budget approval to proceed with the planning and construction of the Proposed Project.

IV. FINDINGS/STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATION REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects." The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." Section 21002 goes on to state that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).) For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions.

1. "Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1).)

2. "Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(2).)

3. "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(3).) Public Resources Code section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors." CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (See also Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565.)
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With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened either through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternative, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043, subd. (b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (b).)

V. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the Project and has been adopted concurrently with these Findings. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6, subd. (a)(1).) CDPR will use the MMRP to track compliance with Project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period.

VI. SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS, FINDINGS, MITIGATION MEASURES

The Final EIR identified several significant environmental effects (or "impacts") that the Project will cause. Some of these significant effects can be fully avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures.

Impact to historic resources cannot be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives; however, the beneficial effects provided by the Proposed Project are outweighed by overriding considerations set forth in § VIII below. This Section presents CDPR's findings with respect to the environmental effects of the Proposed Project.

A. Historic Resources

DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE:

For the purposes of this EIR, the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment if the project would:

1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA § 15064.5.

A cultural resource is considered "historically significant" under CEQA if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register). The California Register was designed to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify existing historical resources within the state and to indicate which of those resources should be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change. The following criteria have been established for the California Register (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 5024.1 ; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 4852).

A. is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage; or

B. is associated with the lives of persons important in our past; or
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C. embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic values; or

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

Additionally, any California site eligible for the National Register is considered eligible for the California Register. When considering a resource for listing on the California Register, the resource must be old enough so that sufficient time has passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource that is more than 50 years old meets this specific criterion, but more recent resources may not without justification of outstanding significance.

In March of 2011, the California State Historic Preservation Officer [CASHPO] partially concurred with a Caltrans-produced report that the Former District Office was eligible for placement on the National Register of Historic Places under eligibility Criterion C as a “scarce and important example of a mid-twentieth century government/corporate Modernist office building in the greater San Diego region” and added it to the State’s Master List of Historical Resources. (DEIR, § 4.5.3.)

FINDINGS:

According to CEQA § 15091, due to CDPR’s determination of significant unmitigable impact to a historic resource due to its complete demolition, a finding has been made that “Specific economic, social, technological and/or other considerations” make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

Economic considerations make implementation of a project alternative to maintain a portion of the Office Complex cost prohibitive. This alternative is also in conflict with the project objective of CDPR to provide Immediate Public Use of the Proposed Project site. The prohibitive costs to implement maintaining a portion of the Office Complex would include both the planning necessary to provide a new use for the building as well as the construction costs to bring up the building to sufficient building health and safety standards. These standards would include remediating hazardous materials within the building, providing sufficient access and complying with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Adaptive Reuse of a Historic Resource.

The project objective to interpret OTSDSHP’s interpretive period (1821-1872) will be hampered considerably by retaining portion of the Office Complex. Visitors will best experience OTSDSHP by removal of the Office Complex, which did not operate during OTSDSHP’s interpretive period or would be eligible as a contributor to the existing Old Town San Diego National Register District. Interpretation of the San Diego River within Block 409 wouldn’t be possible with the retention of any portion of the Office Complex. The San Diego River’s interpretation has been identified as an important element to the historic context of Old Town San Diego that should be interpreted as it was a vital resource in the development of Old Town during its interpretive period. Additionally, the historic buildings being considered for reconstruction on Block 409 would be overshadowed by the Office Complex should some or all of it remain. This would result in a Historic District that would not reflect its historic period and result in an inaccurate historic landscape hampering the historic location and setting, and subsequently the historic integrity of the National Register District.
MITIGATION MEASURES:

Mitigation measures that shall be implemented to lessen historic resource impacts include the following:

**Hist-1:** Prior to demolition, Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II documentation of the Complex.

Measured drawings produced at a precise scale from dimensions recorded in the field. Drawings may be produced either by hand or with computer-aided drafting (CAD).

Large-format photographs are produced as contact prints from 4x5, 5x7, and 8x10 black-and-white negatives and color transparencies. This format allows for maximum enlargement with minimal loss of detail and clarity, and the black-and-white processing allows for archival stability.

Written histories shall be completed in order to place the site or structure within the appropriate context, addressing both the historical and the architectural or engineering aspects of its significance.

Field records, though not formal documentation, include notes, sketches, 35 mm or digital photographs, field measurements and historical views used to in preparing formal documentation. They are the primary source of HABS/HAER/HALS measured drawings and can reveal aspects of a structure or site not emphasized in the formal documentation. They shall be retained as an important record of the documentation process, and often provide the greatest detail.

**Hist-2:** Interpretive elements at a publically accessible site within or near the Project site, such as at the Caltrans District 11 Transportation Museum, which would provide a narrative of the historic significance of the building and include photographs of the building as it would have been viewed from key vantage points to display the building’s significance.

**Hist-3:** An Open House where invited architectural students and interested parties from local or regional institutions and organizations such as the School of New Architecture and Modern San Diego, SOHO’S Modernism Committee, Docomomo Southern California Chapter, the media and the public can walk about the building to learn, study, and photograph the Office Complex and its character defining features. CDPR shall provide interpretation of the building during the Open House by one or more architectural historians or historians familiar with the building’s history, and/or experts in Modernism.

RESOURCE IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION:

The Proposed Project would result in a significant impact to a potentially National/California Register-eligible property due to its full demolition. Mitigation proposed would not lower impact to a less-than-significant level.
VII. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following effects and resources have been evaluated within the EIR and determined to result in impacts that are less-than-significant with or without the implementation of mitigation measures. Refer to the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) for mitigation measures (EIR § 7.11) that shall be implemented to ensure impacts remain less-than-significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource/Effect</th>
<th>Finding of Effect</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry Resources</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Resources</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>No mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services and Utilities</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>No mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Less-than-significant</td>
<td>Mitigation incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth in the preceding sections, the project will result in a significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources:

The Proposed Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.5.

The Proposed Project would demolish a National/California Register-eligible resource, the 1953-1959 Department of Transportation, District 11 Office Complex.

Despite this impact, CDPR has chosen to approve the Proposed Project. To do so, CDPR must adopt a Statement of Overriding Consideration as defined by CEQA Guidelines, § 15093 and Public Resources Code, § 21081(b).

CDPR finds that the Proposed Project would have the following economic, social, technological or other benefits.

First, the Proposed Project would allow CDPR to meet the goals of OTSDSHP by removing a structure which is not associated with OTSDSHP’s historic period (1821-1872).

Second, this allows OTSDSHP the ability to interpret the San Diego River, the bank of which ran adjacent to the Proposed Project site and was a vital resource in the development of Old Town San Diego.

Third, the demolition and removal of the Office allows for the disposal of a variety of types of hazardous waste with public health danger that would no longer pose a risk to occupants of the Office Complex or the public surrounding it.

Fourth, the inclusion of the Proposed Project site into OTSDSHP would allow for the creation of a new entrance into OTSDSHP and create an inviting space for visitors to begin their visit to OTSDSHP.

Fifth, the Proposed Project would provide the public access to the site by constructing pathways, open space and landscaping as opposed to an unoccupied building with no public access.

Sixth, views from outside of the site into OTSDSHP shall be improved with the removal of a building which has dominated the viewshed, creating an improved visitor experience.

Seventh, additional opportunities shall be created for interpretation of the historic use of the Proposed Project site including Native American culture and early commerce and lifeways.

Eighth, additional parking onsite would facilitate additional visitors to OTSDSHP and support businesses both within and surrounding OTSDSHP.

For these reasons, CDPR shall approve the Proposed Project despite its significant adverse impacts to a historic resource.
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Response Letters to Notice of Preparation
To: Mr. Luke Serna  
Environmental Coordinator  
California Department of Parks and Recreation  
2797 Truxtun Road  
San Diego, California 92106

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report  
Immediate Public Use of the Former Caltrans District Office Complex

Dear Mr. Serna:

Thank you for the Notice of Preparation for the subject project, received by this Society last month.

As is necessary for the demolition of some or all of the structures in this complex, historic and prehistoric cultural resources are to be addressed. SDCAS would therefore request to be included in the public review of the DEIR, including its technical appendices.

We note that HABS recordation (level to be disclosed in the DEIR) of the Mid-Century Modern structure designed by noted architect C.J. Paderewski will not completely mitigate the impacts of its demolition, so overriding findings will be required. These need to be justified in the DEIR.

SDCAS appreciates being included in the City's environmental review process for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson  
Environmental Review Committee

cc: SDCAS President  
File
May 9, 2014

State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation
Mr. Luke Serna, Environmental Coordinator
2797 Truxton Road
San Diego, CA 92106

Subject: CITY OF SAN DIEGO COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION FOR THE IMMEDIATE PUBLIC USE (IPU) OF THE FORMER CALTRANS DISTRICT OFFICE COMPLEX

The City of San Diego (“City”) has received and reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the above project and appreciates this opportunity to provide comments to the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR). In response to the NOP on this project, prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City identified potential environmental issues that may result in a significant impact to the environment. Continued coordinated planning between the City, the CDRP, and other local, regional, state, and federal agencies will be essential in order to implement this project.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT:
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS SECTION:
MYRA HERRMANN, SENIOR PLANNER, mherrmann@sandiego.gov

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Please note that any work proposed within the City’s Public Right-of-Way (PROW) will require permitting in accordance with the Municipal Code. Please refer to the Development Services Department (DSD) website at http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/ for guidance on submittal requirements. Staff within DSD will be able to assist the CDPR with any future permitting and/or discretionary actions associated with any work in the PROW.

PUBLIC UTILITIES

Any work within the City’s Public Right-of-Way requires review for conformance with the City’s Storm Water Regulations (within the Land Development Code) and should be referenced in the environmental document.

The environmental document should address how existing and proposed utilities within the project footprint will be dealt with as a result of the proposed improvements.
Sewer and water mains serving one entity/ownership should be private or they will be converted to private. All proposed private sewer facilities located within a single lot are to be designed to meet the requirements of the California Uniform Plumbing Code and will be reviewed as part of the building permit plan check.

No trees or shrubs exceeding three feet in height at maturity shall be installed within ten feet of any sewer facilities.

**HISTORICAL RESOURCES – BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

The project site contains a designated historical resource which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Demolition of this resource would result in an adverse affect which cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance. The environmental document should consider alternatives to the project (demolition) such as adaptive reuse which would avoid direct impacts to the historically significant building.

**HISTORICAL RESOURCES – ARCHAEOLOGY**

The project site contains a designated historical resource which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The site is also known to contain the remains of potentially significant historic archaeological resources as well as possible Native American human remains. Demolition has the potential to result in an adverse affect on unknown buried archaeological resources. As noted in the NOP, archaeological monitoring would be required for any construction-related work at this site. The City of San Diego concurs with this requirement, but highly recommends that the environmental document and associated mitigation measures include a requirement for monitoring by representatives of the Native American and Old Town Descendant community.

**TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT SECTION:**

KAMRAN KHALIGH - TRAFFIC, (619) 446-5294, kkhaligh@sandiego.gov

1. The scope of the project should be clearly defined in order to evaluate its impact on the transportation system. If appropriate, a transportation impact analysis should be conducted as part of the EIR to evaluate project impacts, and to identify any required project mitigations. The excerpts of this study should be included and discussed in the EIR. The transportation impact analysis should be conducted based on the guidelines of the City of San Diego Traffic Impact Study Manual, and it should also include sections discussing the adequacy of parking and circulation in the area.

2. The project should also strive to improve and increase pedestrian, bicycle, and transit use within the area.

**ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

LISA WOOD, SENIOR PLANNER (858)-573-1236, lwood@sandiego.gov
The proposed project will involve demolition of up to 115,735 square feet of building area. This will generate significant quantities of waste. A waste management plan should be developed to minimize impacts associated with handling and disposal of this waste.

**TRANSPORTATION AND STORM WATER DEPARTMENT - STORM WATER DIVISION**

MARK G. STEPHENS, AICP, ASSOCIATE PLANNER (858) 541-4361
mgstephens@sandiego.gov

The City of San Diego Storm Water Division within the Transportation & Storm Water Department is responsible for protecting and improving water quality and reducing flood risk through efficient storm water management.

The Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit (MS4 Permit) issued by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requires all development and redevelopment projects to implement storm water source control and site design practices to minimize the generation of pollutants. The Permit requires new development and significant redevelopment projects that exceed certain size thresholds (referred to as Priority Development Projects) to implement Structural Storm Water Best Management Practices (Structural BMPs) to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff and control runoff volume.

The MS4 Permit is re-issued every five years, typically imposing more stringent requirements on a wider range of development. These requirements are adopted in the City of San Diego Land Development Manual/Storm Water Standards Manual and apply to both private development and public improvements.

There is increased reliance on Low Impact Development (LID) strategies to meet the MS4 Permit requirements and other storm water regulations such as Total Maximum Daily Loads. Examples of LID techniques are bioretention cells, green roofs, porous pavement, infiltration basins, and biofiltration planters. The project description indicates that the project will incorporate sustainable technology and materials such as bioswales and permeable parking surface materials to allow run-off percolation, which should assist in addressing potential hydrology and water quality impacts and mitigation in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.
Please contact the appropriate above-named individual(s) if you have any questions on the submitted comments. The City respectfully requests that you please address the above comments in the Final EA and provide CD copies of the document for distribution to the commenting department(s). If you have any additional questions regarding the City’s review of the Draft EIR please contact me at 619-446-5372 or via email at mherrmann@sandiego.gov.

Sincerely,

Myra Herrmann
Senior Environmental Planner
Development Services Department

cc: Reviewing Departments (via email)
Review and Comment online file
June 19, 2014

Luke Serna
California Department of Parks and Recreation
2797 Truxtun Road
San Diego, California 92106

Re: SCH 2014041044 CDPR Caltrans Building Demolition and Immediate Public Use Plan, NOP

Dear Luke:

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) has jurisdiction over the safety of highway-rail crossings (crossings) in California. The California Public Utilities Code requires the Commission approval for construction or alteration of crossings and grants the Commission exclusive power on design, alteration, and/or closure of crossings in California. The Commission’s Rail Crossings Engineering Section (RCES) has received a copy of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed Caltrans Building Demolition and Immediate Public Use Plan Project from the State Clearinghouse. The California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) is the lead agency.

According to the NOP, the project proposes to establish immediate public use of the former California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 11 office complex of 2.47 acres, located at 2829 Juan Street in the community of Old Town, San Diego. The Taylor Street crossing is nearby.

The project should consider the safety of the railroad crossing at Taylor Street in regard to temporary traffic control and any construction-related traffic. The project should not result in narrowing of northbound Taylor Street. If such narrowing is required during the project, additional measures should be considered to avoid congestion that may result in additional vehicles stopping on the tracks, or traffic unable to move off of the tracks during the approach of a train. To the extent feasible, construction traffic should be routed away from the tracks. Please refer to 2012 CA MUTCD Figure 6H-46 regarding work in the vicinity of a grade crossing.

If you have any questions in this matter, please contact Ken Chiang at (213) 576-7076, ykc@cpuc.ca.gov, or Kevin Schumacher at (415) 310-9807, kevin.schumacher@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Ken Chiang, P.E.
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings Engineering Section
Safety and Enforcement Division

C: State Clearinghouse
April 11, 2014

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: CalTrans Building Demolition and Immediate Public Use Plan

SCH# 2014041044

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the CalTrans Building Demolition and Immediate Public Use Plan draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Luke Serna
California Department of Parks and Recreation
2797 Truxtun Road
San Diego, CA 92106

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.
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Historical Background and Significance

1953-2006, Caltrans District 11 Office Complex
1950-1953, (Caltrans-owned Property), Under Development
1915-1950, Old Mission Packing Corporation Plant
1910-1914, Vacant
1893-1910, Murtha Property
1853-c.1859, Lyon’s Bowling Saloon
1850-1856, Strauss Dry Goods Store and Residence
1848-c.1874 or 1893, Fitch Store, Residence, and Corral

SUMMARY

Only the former Caltrans District II Office Complex’ original 1953-built main office complex facing Taylor Street is potentially eligible for listing on the California and National registers. One of the best surviving examples of a mid-20th Century International style government/corporate office building in San Diego, it is also a rare representational example of the work of noted local master architect Clarence J. Paderewski. Although the building’s 1953-1958 historic period is outside OTSDSHP’s 1821-1872 historic interpretive period, it is still worthy of preservation and adaptive reuse. The Complex’ two additional 1959 and 1964-built office wings are not historically significant. Neither represents the work of a master architect, nor do they represent exemplary local examples of the early postwar International style.

California Department of Parks and Recreation [CDPR] should consider preserving the main 1953-built office building, and remove the two office wing additions. The removal of the non-historic wings, along with the accurate reconstruction of the main office building to its 1953 to 1958 restoration period, is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for the Restoration of Historic Properties. Once completed, CDPR could rehabilitate the interior spaces according to the Secretary’s Standards and Guidelines with minimum impacts to their character-defining space and features. CDPR should consider relocating the San Diego Coast District’s administrative, operational, interpretive, and other Parks-related functions into the building. It should then consider renting and/or leasing surplus interior spaces for revenue-generating purposes.

The removal of the non-contributing 1959 and 1964 additions would also allow CDPR an opportunity to investigate sub-surface areas of the southeastern half of Block 409 for potentially significant archaeological resources associated with Old Town San Diego’s Transitional Period, when it evolved from a Mexican pueblo to an American town. These include the Fitch and Strauss stores and residences, as well as the Lyons Bowling Saloon. Archaeological investigations might also locate the sites of an important historic period water well, and the San Diego River embankment. Besides offering excellent interpretive opportunities to interpret San Diego’s transitional American economic and cultural history, their locations could allow CDPR the opportunity to expand the boundaries of the park’s National Register-listed Historic District and California Landmark into Block 409.
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INTRODUCTION

Constructed between 1953 and 1964 on all of Block 409, the current multi-story office complex located at 2829 Juan Street served as the California Department of Transportation [Caltrans] District 11 Office Complex from 1953 to 2006. However, as early as 1990, Caltrans felt that the complex had outgrown its ability to serve the District’s needs. Indeed, the rising and continuing costs associated with its operation had become an area of concern. Caltrans also regarded the estimated $17.1 million cost to rehabilitate and seismically retrofit the aging building was highly prohibitive. In addition, if it chose to rehabilitate the complex, Caltrans would have to disperse its District 11 employees to off-site facilities at additional cost. Also, a rehabilitated/seismically retrofitted complex would not solve the District’s need for more office space. As a result, Caltrans chose to erect a new, larger office complex across Taylor Street from the original. In 2006, after Caltrans transferred its district operations into the new office complex, it sought to dispose the now vacant former District 11 Office Complex.1

In 1991 Caltrans approached California State Parks (CDPR) and asked if it would be interested in acquiring all of Block 409 and annexing it to Old Town San Diego State Historic Park (OTSDSHP). However, negotiations were at a standstill until 2008, when Caltrans and CDPR reached a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which outlined the property’s future sale to CDPR. However, the MOU expired in October 2010 before the two parties could agree on a workable mitigation program. In addition, both the California Highway Patrol and the San Diego Association of Governments, which were interested in acquiring the complex, decided against it due to the estimated high costs attached to the building’s rehabilitation and seismic retrofitting.2

Two years later, Caltrans’ Environmental Analysis Branch B in Sacramento prepared and submitted an archaeological, historical, and architectural survey report on the District Office Complex. Although the report suggested there might be culturally significant subsurface resources under the complex, because the buildings were less than 45 years old at the time, and did not represent a property that had achieved significance within that time, the analysts dismissed it as non-eligible for consideration for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.3

However, eighteen years later, again in preparation for the property’s possible sale or transfer, the Caltrans Environmental Resource Studies Branch prepared a second historical resource evaluation report. Completed in January 2011, the report concluded that the now 47-58-year old office complex was potentially eligible for listing on the National Register. According to the report, the complex was eligible under Criterion A at the state and local level of significance for its association with a pivotal period of Caltrans’ mission to innovate, improve, enhance, and maintain the State highway system. The complex was also eligible under Criterion C at the local and regional level of significance as “a scarce and important example of a mid-twentieth century

---

1 State of California, Department of Transportation [Caltrans], Disposal of the Former California Department of Transportation District Office Complex, San Diego County, California District 11- SD - 0R0002(P# 1100000072) Final Environmental Impact Report (December 2011), 2.

2 Caltrans, Disposal of the Former District Office Complex, 2011, 6.

government/corporate ‘Modernist’ office building in the greater San Diego area.” The report concluded that, for the purposes of Governor’s Order W-26-92 and the California Environmental Act (CEQA), pursuant to the California Public Resources Code (PRC) §15064.5(a), §5024.1, and §5024(b) and (c), the complex is a historical and architectural resource that meets California Register of Historic Places eligibility Criteria 1 and 3.4

In fulfillment of §PRC 5024(b), in April 2011 Caltrans requested that the California State Historic Preservation Officer [SHPO] review the January 2001 historic evaluation report.5 On March 7, 2011, the SHPO concurred that the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex was eligible for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. However, the SHPO concluded that it only met eligibility Criterion C as “a good example of a ‘Modernist’ office building in the local San Diego area and appears the best designed district office complex built during the period from 1947 through 1967. The SHPO’s letter of concurrence also stated that the resource’s Period of Historic Significance was 1953-1958,” not 1953 to 1964 as the 2011 Caltrans report stated. Regardless, the SHPO recommended that the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex be placed on the State's Master List of Historical Resources.6

As of result of the SHPO’s placement of the office complex on the State’s Master List, Caltrans decided that it was “neither prudent nor feasible to sell the Complex.” It argued that having to preserve the building’s numerous character-defining interior features in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards “would limit the list of potential buyers.”7

CDPR, however, was willing to purchase the complex as is, which it did as of November 6, 2013.8 Thirteen days later, CDPR evaluated whether proposed alterations to the complex’s two parking lots to facilitate temporary safe on-site visitor parking would have an adverse effect on any historic resources. The reviewing historian’s findings reiterated the SHPO’s March 7, 2011 partial concurrence with Caltrans’s January 2011 Final Environmental Impact Report stating that the complex was eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion C. However, the reviewer disagreed with the report’s statement that the entire complex was eligible. Based on a re-analysis of the historic reports and primary sources, the reviewer concluded that only the original 1953-built main office building, not the 1959 and 1964-built office wings, was significant under National Register Criterion C, as well as California Register of Historic Places eligibility Criterion 3. The reviewer also concluded that the project’s Area of Potential Effect

---

4 Dana E. Supernowicz and Janice Calpo, Historical Resources Evaluation Report for the State of California, Department of Transportation, Former Caltrans District II Office Complex APN 442-463-01, San Diego, San Diego County, California, EA 110000072 (Sacramento: California Department of Transportation, January 2011), i-ii, 3, 39-40. Note: PRC 5024.1 criteria for historic eligibility are nearly identical to the National Register criteria.
7 Caltrans, Disposal of the Former District Office Complex, 2011, 6.
8 State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation [CDPR], San Diego Coast District/Southern Service Center, Project Evaluation (PEF) ID No. 14884P, Building Demolition and Immediate Public Use [at] Old Town San Diego SHP (July 15, 2015), 8.
(APE) along Wallace Street, between Juan and Calhoun Streets, may contain below-grade foundations and other features associated with Old Town San Diego’s Transitional Period, when it evolved from a Mexican Pueblo into an American town.9

On July 15, 2015, CDPR initiated efforts to provide an Immediate Public Use (IPU) of all of Block 409. Although the proposed project would provide public use of the site, it would result in the demolition and removal of all above-ground improvements.10 After reviewing the proposed project, the reviewing historian made the following positive findings:

- The Proposed Project would meet CDPR’s Cultural Resource Management Directives and OTSDSHP’s General Development Plans’ goals to remove modern era structures that are not compatible with OTSDSHP’s historic interpretive period.
- The Project would also allow consideration to extend OTSDSHP’s National Register-listed Historic District and California Landmark boundaries beyond Wallace and Calhoun streets to Taylor and Juan streets.11

However, again basing his findings on the 1993 and 2011 Caltrans-prepared historical and architectural investigational reports, the SSC historian project could not approve the project for the following reasons:

The Proposed Project, as described, shall result in a significant adverse effect on a potential National/California Register-eligible property: the Caltrans District 11 Office Complex. Such an action does not comply with the California Department of Parks & Recreation’s authority to assure that no significant historic resource is unnecessarily destroyed or lost. This action also does not comply with the Department’s Cultural Resource Management directives to preserve and restore, as required, existing historic features outside a park unit’s primary historic interpretive period. In addition, the proposed project concept for the site’s Immediate Public Use would give an unrealistic interpretation of OTSDSHP’s sparse historic setting. This action is not in compliance with the Park Unit’s Resource Management and General Development plans, Interpretive Program Site Recommendations, or a recent Cultural Landscape Treatment Report’s recommendations for the re-creation of OTSDSHP’s cultural landscape as it appeared during its 1821-1872 interpretive period.12

Because the project would result in un-mitigable significant impacts to a historic resource, CDPR is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The EIR will utilize the information contained within the information contained in this report to evaluate alternatives that would avoid or lessen impacts to Block 409’s historic resources.

---

10 San Diego Coast District, Building Demolition and Immediate Public Use, 2015, 8.
12 Ibid., 5 and 9-10.
HISTORICAL LAND USE of BLOCK 409

CALTRANS DISTRICT 11 OFFICE COMPLEX

In 1950, Caltrans sought to relocate its ever-growing number of administrative, design, engineering, and support staff out from a small, inadequate downtown San Diego office into a larger, more-modern building in the Old Town San Diego Community. The site of the new office building would be located at the mouth of Mission Valley, at the nexus of two major freeways—the I-5 and I-8—then under construction linking downtown San Diego to Los Angeles, Mexico, and the East Coast. The new District 11 Office Complex, in conjunction with Caltrans’ older shop complex across Taylor Street, would meet the local challenges Caltrans faced during the immediate post-World War II interstate and suburban highway expansion program. The building was also supposed to “revitalize” the Old Town San Diego community by providing an influx of professionals who would contribute to the local economy.13

Completed in 1953, the building’s International style design, layout, and materials were a collaborated effort between the California Department of Public Works, the Division of Highways and the noted architectural firm of Paderewski, Mitchell, Dean, and Wilson. Completed in 1953, the District 11 Office building was an early contributor to San Diego’s “vernacular” Modernist postwar cityscape, designed by one of the leaders of the style in San Diego.14

Despite a scattering of Modernistic-influenced public buildings, San Diego’s pre-war architectural landscape consisted primarily of Spanish, Mediterranean, Tudor and other Period Revival styles reflecting past architectural traditions. Except for Defense-worker housing, most non-military related design/construction work ceased during World War II. As San Diego’s postwar economy improved, there was an exponential demand for increased civic, commercial, and residential development, particularly in the expanding suburban areas. In this climate of unbridled optimism, civic leaders, urban planners, and designers promoted an architecture that looked forward into the future, rather than back towards the past. Following a national trend, they agreed that everything, from design, materials, and landscaping, should favor of a “rational, clean, uncluttered” modern and forward-looking design that was “universal: an International architectural style” that transcended any national or regional individuality.15

---


Although it originated in Western Europe during the 1920s and 1930s, the International style quickly spread to the United States as its key proponents, Ludwig Mies Van der Rohe, Rudolph Schindler, Richard Neutra, and other progressive Jewish architects, fled Nazi-occupied Europe prior to WWII. Settling in Los Angeles, Schindler and Neutra were instrumental in popularizing the International style in Southern California, including San Diego.\textsuperscript{16}

Another factor that helped expand the International style’s influence in postwar San Diego was the 1945 Case Study House Program. The Los Angeles-based Arts & Architecture Magazine had sponsored the program in 1945 to entice nationally recognized architects like Sumner Spaulding, Richard Neutra, and Eero Saarien, to design eight “Contemporary-style” houses that offered “good living conditions” within Southern California’s unique terrain and climate that could be constructed within a specific budget. The aspect that arguably had the most influence was the requirement that the Case Study Houses’ architecture be “contemporary,” with simple, economical construction using modern materials. Their floor plans had to exhibit a free-flowing openness, with the liberal use of glass blurring the transition from indoor to outdoor living spaces that included large patio areas surrounded by low-maintenance landscaping. The resulting Case Study Houses were noted for their honest expression of structure and the rejection of unnecessary details or historicism in order to honestly embrace the principles of utilizing modern materials and the functionality of the building with its site.\textsuperscript{17}

The Case Study House Program, which continued into the mid-1960s, inspired numerous postwar architects, especially in San Diego. Among these was Lloyd Ruocco, who had already introduced the International style of American architecture to San Diego in 1937. As a result of the Case Study House Program, Ruocco’s postwar work was architecturally less complex modular shapes. Utilizing standardized modern building materials, glass, wood, steel, and concrete building materials, they were also relatively less expensive to build. In addition, through his writings, lectures and encouragement, he played a key role in popularizing the style among the city’s financial and civic leaders and planners, as well as a new generation of young San Diego architects, one of which was C. J. Paderewski.\textsuperscript{18}

A 1932 graduate of UC Berkeley’s School of Architecture, Clarence Joseph (C. J.) Paderewski, FAIA, moved from his native Los Angeles to San Diego in 1939 where he taught drafting, architecture, and related subjects for the San Diego Unified School District until 1957. During his tenure, and in private practice as the founder and lead architect at Paderewski, Mitchell and Dean in 1944, Paderewski was more than a teacher or architect. As an architect, he believed that he had a moral responsibility to make his community a better place in which to live for himself


\textsuperscript{17} City of San Diego, \textit{San Diego Modernism}, 35; and “Towards a Definition of San Diego Modernism.”

and his neighbors. By producing what he referred to as “good architecture,” he could provide an environment that will enlighten both adults and children. Finally, as a teacher, he believed it was his responsibility to “preach the gospel of good architecture at every opportunity.” The result would be “an ever-increasing percentage of [the] people will appreciate and demand good architecture.”

Referred to later in life as San Diego’s “Mr. Architecture,” Paderewski sought to promote good architecture through several means. First, as president of the San Diego chapter of the American Institute of Architects [AIA] in 1948 and 1949, and as a board member of the State Board of Architectural Examiners from 1949 to 1957, he worked to strengthen the State Architects Act to prohibit non-licensed architects or engineers from designing large-scale, multi-story projects. Second, as a member of California Institute of Architects’ school house planning committee, he was responsible for several innovative local “firsts” that improved elementary school environments: the “interesting use” of exterior and interior colors; the incorporation of radiant heat via hot water pipes under floors; and the use of pre-fabricated plywood wall and roof panel systems to lower costs and shorten construction times.

Between 1958 and 1970, Paderewski, in collaboration with his junior partners, Delmar Stewart Mitchell, Louis Abbott Dean, and Adrian Wilson, established himself as a master of the postwar International as well as the more forward-looking Abstract Modernistic style. The latter can still be seen in his firm’s design of the Palomar Community College campus geodesic-domed gymnasium, the Mexico-U.S. Border Station, and the San Diego International Airport’s East Terminal. Paderewski’s firm was also responsible for designing the world’s first all-glass hydraulic elevator on downtown San Diego’s El Cortez Hotel’s south façade on June 11, 1957 (Unfortunately, it is no longer extant). In a later interview just before his death, Paderewski stated that, along with the glass elevator and the Palomar College dome, the Caltrans District 11 office building was meant to be a highly visible “cornerstone project” representing to the public his firm’s dedication to quality design within the San Diego region.

The influence of both Lloyd Ruocco and the Case Study House Program’s early postwar International style design elements influence can be seen in C. J. Paderewski and Associates 1952-design of the original Caltrans District 11 office building on Taylor Street. Most notable is

---

19 City of San Diego, San Diego Modernism, 102-103; Sim Bruce Richards, Chapter President of the San Diego Chapter of the American Institute of Architects [AIA], quoted in same, 103; and Kinsman, “C. J. ‘Pat’ Paderewski, 2007.
the asymmetrical L-shaped 2-3-story building’s massing of simple square and rectangular flat-roofed forms. Cantilevered overhangs and protruding window surrounds outline and shade horizontal bands of multi-light steel sash casement and fixed windows set in stacked-bond brick veneer or stuccoed reinforced concrete walls. Also typical of the style, the window bands and exterior walls surfaces meet at squared corners. Except for the use of fired clay brick set in a checker board weave pattern above the original Taylor Street main entry, and the patterns of wooden board and plywood forms impressed in concrete, the building’s façades are devoid of any extraneous decoration.25

A pre-war International style *piloti* or stout Le Corbusier-influenced freestanding terrazzo-covered column at the Taylor Street entrance’s northeast corner allows the overhanging checkerboard-pattern brick block to appear to “float” above the recessed terrazzo-covered entrance. Other postwar International style features include a floor-to-ceiling metal-framed plate glass entry doorway set perpendicular to flanking brick-faced walls at the former entry blur the transition from outdoor to indoor spaces. Inside the front entry is a built-in counter where a receptionist would greet visitors, who were directed to sit on an L-shaped sofa built into the lobby’s walls. Built-in half-wall planters with narrow columns soften the transition between the lobby waiting area and the first-floor hallway, which leads to a central stairwell or offset west and east corridors. Instead of load-bearing exterior masonry walls, internal steel skeletal post-and-beam framing result in an open floor plan that provides greater interior spatial freedom that also allowed for easy transitions between office spaces, floors, and a centralized exterior garden patio area. Other International style character-defining features along the 1st and 2nd floor corridors include the retention of original interior wood panel wall partitions, as well as half-wood or metal-panel doors topped by either clear or frosted glass panels, or plain wood or metal slab doors leading into separate offices.26

The 2007 *San Diego Modernism Historic Context* states that “examples of true International style architecture [in San Diego] are rare” and that “with no great concentrations [of examples of the style] occurring in any one area . . . , [the] retention of good examples is important.” The report continues to state that the majority of San Diego’s International style resources are commercial or institutional properties. It should be noted that the report used a contemporary photograph of the Paderewski and Associates-designed Caltrans District 11 Office Building as a representative local example of the International style.27

The City’s report also regards an International style institutional property’s setting as a particularly relevant contributing character-defining feature.28 However, a case could be made that the California Division of Architecture’s design and construction of two additional 2-story office wings in 1959 and 1964, respectively, resulted in impacts to the setting’s historic integrity. A careful look at the wings’ historical development, construction, and use will reveal that their impacts are negligible, as well as reversible.

---


28 Ibid., 59.
With an ever-increasing number of highway and freeway projects on its schedule, Caltrans District 11 was again faced with having to expand its work force. Choosing not to build and relocate to a larger structure, in 1958 the district decided to add a 2-story office wing to the five-year-old office building on Block 409. Instead of hiring a private architectural firm, the State of California Department of Public Works assigned the project to its Division of Architecture’s Los Angeles branch office. The proposed $2 million structure, which extended off the existing building’s southeast corner along Juan Street, would provide additional legal offices and drafting rooms for the District 11’s design and engineering staff.

Prior to the office wing’s 1959 construction, demolition crews removed several structures and hardscape features associated with the 1953 building’s setting. These include a poured-in-place concrete pad, a Canteen/Laboratory building, a covered walkway leading from the latter to the original office building’s west wing, retaining walls, and a centrally located parking area. They converted the latter, which featured a concrete-curbed island with shade trees and shrubs, from a parking area into a pedestrian courtyard. Overall, these improvements had a less than significant impact on the original 1953-built office building facing Taylor Street.

Four years later, Caltrans commissioned the Division of Architecture to design an additional 2-story office wing that would extend off the 1953-built building’s southeast-facing corner along Juan Street. Completed in 1964, the structure is nearly identical to the Calhoun Street addition, with a squared box roofline, flat scored concrete exterior walls, and horizontal ribbons of large single-pane aluminum-framed windows along both floors. However, unlike the 1953 and 1959-built structures, which rest on a steel framework set on over 200 individual tapered concrete and steel piles imbedded between 30-40 feet in the sandy soil beneath them, the Juan Street addition rests on a 10-foot-deep basement with an 8”-thick concrete floor slab. Stretching in a southeasterly direction along Juan Street, the new addition extended towards the property line at Wallace Street. Two raised concrete planter boxes set the wing’s southeast façade some five feet from the property line. Planter boxes were also laid out along the wing’s southwest corner. Additional landscape improvements dating from the 1964 addition included a concrete walk along half of the northeast façade facing Juan Street, and an existing palm tree-shaded garden between the wing’s southeast façade and the corner of Juan and Wallace Streets. Several of the palm trees were removed along Juan Street to facilitate a landscaped area used to display a section of the historic wooden “Plank Road” that once allowed automobiles to drive over the Imperial Valley desert sands, an “El Camino Real” bell, and interpretive signage. A plate glass walled double door entrance at the 1964 Addition’s north corner provided access into the wing from the Juan Street parking area. The 1964 Addition’s construction also resulted in the removal

---

31 CDPW, Office Building Addition, Demolition Plan, 1958, sheet C-1 of 2; and “Area Contractors Submit Low Bids,” 1959, B-8.
32 CDPW, Division of Architecture, Los Angeles Branch, Addition to Office Building, Division of Highways, District XI, Title Sheet, File No. 26-C-44 (June 21, 1963), sheet 1 of 13.
of an original loading dock off the 1953 building’s southeast elevation.³³ Overall, the two wing additions had little effect on the 1953 building’s historic character.

In retrospect, the Division of Architecture had designed them to be compatible with, yet not mimic the 1953 building’s architectural character. Not only are they visually separate, they are also physically separate. They are both stand-alone structures that abut the 1953 building’s exterior walls. Separated by expansion joints, the latter’s exterior concrete and brick-veneer exterior walls were kept in place. The only alterations were the reframing or relocation of existing doorways to connect the additions to pre-existing corridors or stairwells in the 1953 building. In addition, several original windows at these junction points were removed; their voids filled with concrete and plastered over to match the original exterior and interior wall surfaces.³⁴

Returning to the City of San Diego’s Modernism Contextual Statement, “some impact or loss to character-defining features may be acceptable when comparative analysis demonstrates that the resource is a rare example of a type [of a recognized American architectural style]. Taking this in consideration, On March 7, 2011, the California State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with a Caltrans-produced report that the Former District Office was eligible for placement on the National Register of Historic Places under eligibility Criterion C as a “scarce and important example of a mid-twentieth century government/corporate Modernist office building in the greater San Diego region.” In addition the Historic Preservation Officer concurred that the building’s period of historic significance was between 1953 and 1964 and added it to the State’s Master List of Historical Resources.³⁵

However, one could argue that, while the original 1953-constructed section of the former Caltrans office building is architecturally significant, the 1958 and 1964-built wing additions are not. Unlike the 1953 section, the two wings do not represent the work of a master architect, nor are they exemplary local examples of the early postwar International style. If need be, they could be removed without any major effect to the 1953 building’s historic integrity. Surviving copies of the latter’s original plans could serve as guidelines for accurate restoration of those sections of the building modified in 1959 and 1964 to allow passage to and from the wings. The removal of features from other periods of the building’s history, along with the accurate reconstruction of missing features from its 1953 to 1958 restoration period, would have minimal impacts on the 1953-built building’s location, setting, design, materials, or workmanship, which is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for the Restoration of Historic

³⁴ CDPW, District XI Office Building, First floor Alteration Plan of Existing Building, 1958, sheet 4 of 7; Ibid., Addition to Office Building, Partial First Floor Plan, 1963, sheet 2 and 3 of 13; Ibid., Addition to Office Building, Second Floor Plan of New South Wing, 1958, sheet 3 of 7; and Ibid., Addition to Office Building, Second Floor Alteration Plan of Existing Building & Second Floor Plan of New Legal Offices, 1963, sheet 5 of 7.
Properties. Once completed, the building’s interior could be rehabilitated and adapted according to the Secretary’s Standards and Guidelines with minimum impacts to character-defining interior spaces and features for possible use by CDPR for office space. CDPR could also rent or lease surplus office and/or storage space for revenue-generating purposes.36

The removal of the non-contributing 1959 and 1964-built office wings would allow CDPR an opportunity to investigate sub-surface areas of the southeastern half of Block 409. Possible historic archaeological resources may include the foundations, features, and artifacts associated with a number of important commercial buildings and other historic sites dating back to Old Town San Diego’s Transitional Period when it evolved from a Mexican pueblo into an American town. That being said, archaeological investigations may reveal evidence of a relatively more recent significant commercial operation that post-dates Old Town San Diego’s 1821-1872 interpretive period.37

OLD MISSION PACKING CORPORATION PLANT SITE

After Caltrans purchased all of Block 409 to erect its new District 11 office building, it initiated the demolition of the former Old Mission Packing Corporation’s olive and pimento processing plant, which had been in almost continuous operation on the site since 1914. Edward W. Akerman and Robert L. Tuffley, who bought the property from Francis D. and Winifred Murtha on September 8, 1910, had relocated their original plant in the former Casa de Bandini/Cosmopolitan Hotel [2660 Calhoun Street] to the new location to expand their operations.38 The new plant, located at 4090 Wallace Street, consisted of two major buildings. The first was a factory/warehouse used to clean, process, can, store and supply cured olives and olive oil to wholesale and retail markets under the Old Mission Brand Olive and Olive Oil Supply Company. The 200 square foot 2-story California Mission Revival style building rested on four rows of upright wood posts along an east/west axis from Juan to Calhoun Streets. Along the building’s southeastern elevation, set back some 60 feet along Wallace Street, were loading docks and a parking area for the company’s delivery trucks. A small 1-story detached automobile garage stood near the corner of Calhoun and Wallace Streets.39

38 Clement and Van Bueren, Historic Reports, 1993, 30; William E. Smythe, History of San Diego (San Diego: The History Company, 1908), 133; and San Diego City and County Business Directories (1900), 23 and (1915), 167. The one-time U.S. Postmaster for “North San Diego” [the name was often interchangeable with “Old Town San Diego” during the early 1900s], Edward W. Akerman and his wife Ysabel also lived in the former Casa de Bandini/Cosmopolitan Hotel during the new plant’s construction and early operation.
39 “San Diego Product Shipped to U.S. Commissary,” San Diego Union (July 6, 1914), 7 and (July 12, 1914), 12; CDPR, SSC, Digital Photograph Collection: Old Town San Diego State Historic Park, Photograph No. C-29, Old Mission Brand Olive Plant, (c. 1915); San Diego City and County Business Directories (1900), 23, and (1915), 167.
The second building was a 3-walled semi-open-walled shed used to cook and can pimentos. The 1-story saw tooth-roofed Pimento Factory, which also rested on wood posts, extended approximately 250 feet from Taylor Street southeast along Calhoun Street. A series of attached structures extended off the shed’s northeastern façade. Two smaller detached structures off the shed’s northern corner contained “roasters;” while an approximately 20-foot long x 15-foot wide brine house stood off the Pimento Factory’s southern façade. In between the two structures was a worker’s locker room and restroom.40

Additional ancillary structures that supported the plant’s operations included an approximately 280 square foot boiler room located mid-block northwest of the olive factory/warehouse building. Roughly 25 feet northeast of the latter was a 2,500 gallon underground fuel oil tank. The only other detached structure on record is an approximately 200 square foot 2-story barrel storage shed and adjacent storage shed for paints, oils, and repair parts. The former also featured a 10-foot wide 1-story overhanging L-shaped automobile shelter. The remainder of the block between Taylor Street and the olive factory/warehouse toward Juan Street contained brine-filled wooden barrels used to cure olives.41

The olive and pimento processing plant and storage yard on Block 409 remained in operation under various owners until Caltrans purchased the property in 1950. Although salvages had already dismantled and removed the former olive processing buildings, olive crushers, and canning machinery, negotiations between the San Diego Harbor Department and Caltrans over the sale of the former’s downtown building held up construction.42 It wasn’t until 1953 that the local San Diego firm of M. M. Golden began to prepare the site for the new 2-story Caltrans office building, which would occupy the majority of Block 409’s northwestern half. Part of the site preparation involved the removal of concrete slabs once associated with the olive processing plant, the surviving underground fuel storage tank, and mature eucalyptus and pepper trees along Calhoun Street.43

Golden, however, did not remove all of Block 409’s then-existing plant material and buildings. The Caltrans office building’s original 1951 plot plan called for the retention and protection of “existing landscaping,” including “trees and shrubs” in two approximately 5,740 square foot sections located on the block’s southeastern corner at Wallace and Calhoun Streets. The plot plan also indicates the existence of an “exist[ing] walk & steps” that divided the two sections between

---

40 CDPR, Photograph No. C-29, c. 1915; Sanborn Map Company, Insurance Maps of San Diego, California, vol. 4 (New York: Author, 1940), sheet 403; and Clement and Van Bueren, 1993, Figure 17.
41 Sanborn Map Company, Insurance Maps of San Diego, 1940, sheet 403; and Clement and Van Bueren, 1993, Figure 17.
Calhoun Street and another concrete slab associated with the site of the former olive factory/warehouse.  

CALIFORNIA PEPPER TREE

Although the plot plan didn’t specifically call out for its preservation, it indicated an “existing pepper tree” in the same location as the present one encroaching upon Wallace Street.  

While a c. 1915 photograph of the Old Mission Brand olive and pimento processing plant indicates a relatively new fenced-in garden area in that location, it does show a relatively tall tree with an irregular-shaped spreading crown typical of a mature California pepper (Schinus molle), encroaching onto a widened Wallace Street. This would suggest that the existing tree may be well over 100 years old. The California State Department of Architecture thought the tree important enough to save that it left it in place during its planning of the Complex’ 1964 office wing. The City of San Diego likely felt the same when it redirected the paving of Wallace Street around the tree’s base, which extends halfway into Wallace Street’s northwest lane.

The California pepper tree, which appears likely to predate the olive factory, may be associated with the property’s previous owners, Francis D. and Winifred Murtha, who reportedly owned all of Block 409 from around 1899 to 1910. The November 1993 Clement and Van Bueren historical survey of the project area reported that “by 1893 . . . a wood-frame residence with extensive gardens occupied the northwest lot on block 409.” However, the pepper tree is located between the nexus of lots 3 and 4, which would place it near the southeastern corner of Block 409. San Diego city directories, newspaper accounts, and property records indicate that the Murthas’ Old Town residence was at 2820 San Diego Avenue. That would place in on Block 408, not 409. Mrs. Winnifred Kearney Murtha’s late husband, Sheriff James McCoy, had erected the 2-story wood-frame residence in September 1869. The McCoys lived in the house for 26 years up until James McCoy’s death in 1895. The Murthas lived in the house for an additional 21 years.

A well-respected member of San Diego’s business, political, and religious communities, Francis Murtha, as a result of his marriage, shared ownership with the widow McCoy’s real estate holdings. By the time they sold Block 409 to Akerman and Tuffley in 1910, the Murthas
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45 Ibid.
46 CDPR, Photograph No. C-29, c. 1915.
47 CDPW, Division of Architecture, Los Angeles Branch, Addition to Office Building, Division of Highways, District XI, Grading and Paving Plan, File No. 26-C-44 (June 21, 1963), sheet C-1 or 1.
48 Clement and Van Bueren, 30.
49 Ibid., 30.
51 “Pioneer Merchant Succumbs to Cold,” San Diego Union (July 29, 1919), 5.
reportedly owned and had sold hundreds of thousands of dollars’ worth of local real estate.\textsuperscript{53} Their sale of Block 409 was a means by which they could support themselves financially after Francis Murtha’s 1909 dissolution of his partnership in the Schiller & Murtha retail clothing store in downtown San Diego.\textsuperscript{54}

Whether or not the pepper tree is a legacy of their Old Town estate is still subject to conjecture. California Pepper trees are known to be long-lived. The tree growing in the courtyard of Mission San Luis Rey near Oceanside, for example, is reportedly over 184 years old.\textsuperscript{55} However, core testing of the tree’s growth rings is the only way to determine its true age. If indeed it predates the McCoy/Murtha ownership period, it may be one of the oldest trees in San Diego.

**FITCH STORE/ADOBE SITE**

Situated on the southern corner of Wallace and Calhoun streets (Lot 4), is the site of the first recorded building erected on Block 409. Sometime in 1848, local businessman Henry Delano Fitch erected a 2-story adobe building on the site. A former ship’s captain, Fitch had acquired all of Block 409 in 1846 as part of his wife, Josepha Carrillo de Fitch’s dowry.\textsuperscript{56} While Fitch operated a mercantile store on the ground floor, the remaining seven rooms served as the Fitchs’ principal residence. One of the first Americans to settle in San Diego during its Mexican Period, as Captain of the Mexican brig *María Ester*, Fitch had shipped and traded goods along the Pacific Coast during the 1830s. After his “scandalous” elopement with Josepha Carrillo in 1829 to Peru, Fitch returned to San Diego in 1833, converted to Roman Catholicism, and became a naturalized Mexican citizen. In 1841 and 1845, respectively, Fitch established general merchandise stores in the former Ylario Poinciano adobe (the current Light-Freemans’ San Diego House) on San Diego Avenue, and in two rooms he rented in the Juan Osuna adobe next to the *Casa de Carrillo* on Calhoun Street. After they moved into the new adobe, the Fitches continued to operate the Calhoun Street store. Reportedly Old Town San Diego’s first building built specifically to house a general mercantile store, the Fitch Store accepted cow hides and sea otter furs in trade for basic goods. Besides being a well-respected businessman, Henry D. Fitch was also involved in early San Diego’s civil administration, serving subsequent terms as a *syndico proctor* (town attorney), *alcalde* (mayor), and *Juez de Paz* (Justice of the Peace) from 1835 until his death in 1849. After which, his widow continued to operate the Wallace Street store until 1854. During this time, she could have sold food and supplies to wave of prospective Argonauts coming into San Diego via the Gila Trail during the California Gold Rush. Records


\textsuperscript{54} “Collumb Takes over Management of Estate,” *San Diego Union* (June 6, 1917), 9.


\textsuperscript{56} Raymond Brandes, PhD., *Historical Research Report, Old Town San Diego, California: for the Years 1821 to 1874* [unpublished report] (May 1974), 488; During this time period, Block 409 was originally mapped as “Block 45” and both Wallace and Calhoun Streets were known as “Washington,” and “Fitch,” respectively. To avoid confusion, this report will refer to the block and streets by their current names and number. See: Charles H. Poole, *Map of the H. D. Fitch Property for Geo. Lyons, Esq.* (March 12, 1854), in Clement and Van Bueren, 1993, Figure 9.
indicate that a series of meat markets and variety stores continued to operate from the building well into the late 1850s. The Fitches two sons sold the property to John H. Grant in 1868. The building was demolished sometime between 1874 and 1893.\textsuperscript{57}

Period maps, paintings, and contemporary descriptions indicate that the Fitch store/residence was “painted barn red” instead of whitewashed. Erected in two phases, the first consisted of a 2-story wood-shingle-covered end-gable roofed building. A full-length Classical-influenced rectangular porch provided shade along the main Wallace Street elevation. A cannon, anchored muzzle-down in the earth in front of the store, reportedly once stood as a hitching post. Sometime before 1854, Fitch added a south-to-north 2\textsuperscript{nd}-story gable-end wing, with a chimney protruding through the roof’s northeast corner. The property also featured a walled or fenced-in corral, which could have been used to contain beef cattle prior to slaughter, and several ancillary structures. According to Judge Benjamin Hayes, the property also contained “a fine garden prized by Doña Josefa, his wife.”\textsuperscript{58}

The OTSDSHP’s 1992 Interpretive Program recommended that, if the Caltrans Property became available, CDPR should acquire it and reconstruct the Fitch adobe on its historic site and adapt it as a house museum. The ground-floor store would be mercantile establishment “at the outset of the Gold Rush, ready to outfit eager immigrants and miners.” The remainder of the building would contain “exhibits on the building and its history, and the Fitch/Carrillo extended family.”\textsuperscript{59}

**STRAUSS STORE/ADOBE SITE**

The site of the next combination commercial/residential building on Wallace Street was located on the eastern corner with Juan Street. Completed around 1853, the 2-story rectangular-shaped gable-roofed adobe building is associated with pioneer Jewish-American merchant Louis Strauss. Strauss, who reportedly acquired the property from James W. Robinson around 1851, operated a dry goods store in it with his business partner Charles Gerson from 1856 to around 1867. Historic drawings indicate that the building sat slightly back from Wallace Street on a roughly southwest-to-northeast axis, with an attached porch extending out toward the lot’s southeastern boundary along Wallace Street. The drawings also indicate that the building was at least as tall as the Fitch Store/Residence on the opposite corner, and contained a residential annex.\textsuperscript{60}


The 1992 OTSDSHP Interpretive Program also recommended that CDPR should reconstruct the Strauss’ store and have a concessionaire operate it as a dry goods enterprise. Interpreters could use contemporary advertisements from the 1850s San Diego Herald newspaper to create a list of actual items for sale at L. Strauss & Co. A reconstructed adobe house museum next to the store would give the park the opportunity to interpret the life of one of San Diego’s Jewish “Men of Enterprise.” Like Louis Rose, Joseph Mannassee, Marcus Schiller and the Franklin brothers, Strauss was a pioneer Jewish-European immigrant who made his mark on San Diego’s early development after 1850. Indeed, the Strauss store and residence were located across the street from “Calle Judeo” (Jew’s Street) or “Mannassee Street,” an alley paralleling Juan and Calhoun Streets along which were a number of Jewish-owned stores.61

LYONS BOWLING SALOON/ADOBE SITE
The final historic site on Wallace Street is the location of the Lyons Bowling Saloon. Another Irish immigrant, George Lyons had been a ship’s carpenter on board a Northwest coast whaling ship before arriving in San Diego in 1847. In 1850 Lyons married Bernarda Billar, the daughter of a former San Diego presidial commander. Lyons erected an adobe on the southeast junction of Lots 3 and 4 of Block 409 in 1853 for his wife and their growing family of seven sons and three daughters. To this he attached an elongated gable-roofed wooden framed wing extending in a northeasterly direction toward Juan Street. Lyons reportedly operated a single-lane bowling alley (one of two operating in Old Town at the time) in the attached wing, and a saloon in the adobe, which the May 29, 1855 San Diego Herald noted had “a large stock of liquors, bar fixtures, and furniture.”

According to the May 29, 1855 San Diego Herald, “The entire wooden portion of the building was destroyed [in a fire], together with a large stock of liquors, bar fixtures, furniture and some valuable books and papers.” However, Lyons stated in the newspaper that he “would rebuild it in adobe.” This would imply that the unburned portion was made of adobe. Besides operating the store, Lyons served as a city trustee and postmaster from 1853 to 1854. He also served as San Diego County sheriff for two terms until 1862, when fellow Irishman James McCoy succeeded him. The length of Lyons’ association with the saloon/bowling alley is unknown.63

The OTSDSHP’s 1992 Interpretive Program Site Recommendations also recommended that, if the Caltrans Property became available, CDPR should acquire it and reconstruct the Lyon’s Bowling Saloon and adapt it as a house museum “to demonstrate a popular leisure activity of the period.”64


63 Helmich, et al, Site Recommendations, 1991, GDP#52A and 52B: Lyon’s Bowling Saloon; Clement and Van Bueren, 29-31; and Smythe, 1908, 277-278.

The future reconstruction of all three enterprises would help restore the northern section of Old Town San Diego’s historic commercial core, as well as return Wallace Street to its former character as a busy pedestrian and vehicular artery.

FITCH WELL SITE

In a 1969 *Journal of San Diego History* article, local historian Orion M. Zink indicated on a map the location of the “Old Town Well” in Block 409. Zink placed the well in the northwest corner of Lot 4 near Calhoun Street. This would place its approximate location under the 1959 Caltrans’ office wing’s southeastern section. Zink’s informants, Old Town residents Peter Llucia and Simon Mannassee, told him that the well was one of two [the other was in front of the American Hotel] that Johnny and Mike O’Neill utilized to “peddle” water to residents in Old Town, La Playa, and New Town San Diego. Based on New Town’s short abortive existence, the well would have been in operation between 1850 and 1862.65

Historic maps indicate that the well site would have been situated several feet south of a 15-foot high sandy embankment that once bisected Block 409 in a northeasterly to southwesterly direction. Prior to the grading of Taylor Street, the embankment gradually sloped down toward the bottom of a backwater dead end slough linked to the San Diego River near where the Old Town Transit Center’s Bus Access Road exits onto Congress Street.66 An image on an 1856 panoramic watercolor of Old Town San Diego suggests the existence of what appears to be a well house near the middle of Block 409.67

Deed records and maps indicate that the well site would have been situated just west of the Fitch Store/Adobe. Because the Fitches owned the entire block from 1846 to 1868, the well should be referred to as the “Fitch Well Site.”68

The Fitch Well would be one of twelve known historic well sites located within the Old Town San Diego State Historic District. The following list of wells would have been critical for supplying the needs of Old Town San Diego’s pioneer residents during its 1821 to 1872 interpretive period:

- Old Town Plaza69
- American Hotel, Block 31/42770
- Machado/Silvas Adobe, Block 31/42771

---

66 CDPR, SSC Digital Map Collection, Lt. Cave J. Couts, *Map of the Town and Beach of the Port of San Diego* (1849); Lt. George Derby, *Survey of San Diego River and its Vicinity* (1853); and Poole *Map*, 1854.
69 Ibid., 69 and 70.
70 Ibid., 130, 144-145 and 200.
Historical Background and Significance

- Juan Cota Adobe, Block 29/453
- Casa de Estudillo, Block 40/452
- Robinson-Rose Building, Block 46/408
- Osuna Adobe, Block 46/408
- Juan María Marron Adobe, Block 44/426
- Casa de Bandini/Seeley Stables [two wells], Block 41/451
- Ruiz/Soto Adobe [two wells], 56/410

If evidence of a historic well does exist in Block 409, it, along with the sites of the Fitch, Strauss, and Lyons buildings, would be potential historic archaeological sites that should be added to an expanded Old Town San Diego historic district.

SAN DIEGO RIVER EMBANKMENT SITE

As mentioned above, historic maps indicate the existence of a sandy embankment that dropped off along the northwestern perimeter of lots 3 and 4 in Block 409. In addition to historic topographic survey and property maps, and a 1950 Log of Borings included in the 1959 office wing’s design plans indicate that the below-grade soil profile at this point consisted of five layers of deposition ranging from medium sand under an asphalt and rubble surface, to a bottom layer of medium to coarse clayey sand at about 40 feet. At no place in the six borings was there evidence of loose cobble, hardpan, or bedrock. This would indicate that the embankment and river estuary consisted of alluvial soil alternately deposited and eroded by the San Diego River.

Photographs taken between 1869 and 1875 reveal that the area along the San Diego River’s drainage between the mouth of Mission Valley and Old Town San Diego’s northwestern perimeter was practically devoid of trees or shrubs. This might have been caused in part by seasonal flooding of the San Diego River every 10-15 years, which scoured the river banks. Indeed, when U. S. Army Topographical Engineer Lt. George Derby came to San Diego to redirect the river’s waters into False (Mission) Bay instead of San Diego Bay in January 1853, he reported that, during the “rainy season,” the lowlands along Old Town’s northern to southwestern perimeters were completely inundated.

---

71 Ibid., 271 and 431.
72 Ibid., 437.
73 Ibid., 442.
74 Ibid., 456.
75 Ibid., 473.
76 Ibid., 494.
77 Ibid., 544, 545 and 546.
78 Ibid., 559.
79 Couts, Map, 1849; Derby, Survey, 1853; Poole Map, 1854; and CDPW, “Log of Borings,” in Miscellaneous Details, 1958, S-8 of 11.
80 CDPR, SSC: Digital Photograph Collection, Photograph No. F-3 (2), Calhoun Street, Looking Northwest (c. 1875).
81 Derby, Survey, 1853; and Davis, Old Town Light Rail Transit Extension, 1992, 6. Note: Davis lists six recorded flood events that impacted San Diego in 1821, 1825, 1839-40, 1855, 1857, 1862, and 1877.
82 Ibid., 6.
Even after Lt. Derby’s completion of an earthen levee to contain the river’s widened channel into False Bay, floodwaters breaching the levee threatened the town on two occasions. For example, during the “Great Flood of 1862,” “houses were swept out to sea and gardens and orchards were washed away.” Eleven years later, during the winter of 1873-1874, floodwaters carried away the huerta or subsistence garden behind the Smith adobe southwest of the McCoy House. The same flood also threatened to undermine the latter’s foundations.\(^{83}\)

It is not known if flooding events between 1855 and 1877 impacted the three historic commercial enterprises/residences along Wallace Street. However, the threat of seasonal flooding hindered any development westward toward Taylor Street until at least 1914, when it and the Mission Olive Company were on relatively level ground.\(^{84}\)

Likewise, if evidence of the river bank exists under the 1959 and 1964 office wings, it, along the other historic sites associated with OTSDSHP’s historic interpretive period, should be added to an expanded Old Town San Diego historic district.

**CONCLUSION**

Only the former Caltrans District II Office Complex’ original 1953-built main office complex facing Taylor Street is potentially eligible for listing on the California and National registers. One of the best surviving examples of a mid-20th Century International style government/corporate office building in San Diego, it is also a rare representational example of the work of noted local master architect Clarence J. Paderewski. Although the building’s 1953-1958 historic period is outside OTSDSHP’s 1821-1872 historic interpretive period, it is still worthy of preservation and adaptive reuse.

California Department of Parks and Recreation [CDPR] should consider preserving the main 1953-built office building, and remove the two office wing additions. The removal of the non-historic wings, along with the accurate reconstruction of the main office building to its 1953 to 1958 restoration period, is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for the Restoration of Historic Properties. Once completed, CDPR could rehabilitate the interior spaces according to the Secretary’s Standards and Guidelines with minimum impacts to their character-defining space and features. CDPR should consider relocating the San Diego Coast District’s administrative, operational, interpretive, and other Parks-related functions into the building. It should then consider renting and/or leasing surplus interior spaces for revenue-generating purposes.

The removal of the two non-historic office wings would also allow CDPR an opportunity to investigate sub-surface areas of the southeastern half of Block 409 for archaeological resources associated with Old Town San Diego’s historical development. These include the Fitch and Strauss stores and residences, as well as the Lyons Bowling Saloon. Archaeological investigations might also locate the sites of the elusive Fitch Well and the San Diego River Embankment. Besides offering excellent interpretive opportunities to interpret San Diego’s

---

\(^{83}\) Ibid., 4-8.

\(^{84}\) CDPR, Photograph No. C-29, c. 1915.
transitional American economic and cultural history, their locations could allow CDPR the opportunity to expand the boundaries of the park’s National Register-listed Historic District and California Landmark into Block 409.

Alexander D. Bevil, Historian II
Southern Service Center
September 4, 2014
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) proposes to add the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex property to the Old Town San Diego State Historic Park (OTSDSHP or Old Town) in accordance with the OTSDSHP General Development Plan, approved 1977, which recommends the acquisition of nearby properties when the opportunity presents itself (Project). OTSDSHP occupies approximately 29 acres within the city of San Diego, California. The former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex is located adjacent to the OTSDSHP. The Project area consists of an entire developed block, historically referred to as Block 45, Block 409, and/or Block 4550. The project area is bounded by Taylor Street to the northwest, Juan Street to the northeast, Wallace Street (historically Old Beach Road or Washington Street) to the southeast, and Calhoun Street (historically Fitch/Calhoun Street) to the southwest (Figures 1 and 2).

1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1.1 Project Description and Objectives

The proposed Project will establish Immediate Public Use (IPU) of the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex. The Project would begin with the demolition of the Office Complex. The Project includes several elements to be accomplished to meet the objectives of the requirements of IPU. These four elements include:

1.1.2 Interpretive Elements

Interpretive elements have the potential to take a variety of forms. The requirement to meet IPU for the newly acquired park space creates a limit to the level of development that can occur onsite. Due to the substantial historical use of the site, interpreting the site’s history during OTSDSHP’s interpretive period (1821-1872) will be of prime importance.

The southeast side of the site, adjacent to Wallace Street contained several buildings that did exist during OTSDSHP’s interpretive period. These include: the Fitch Store, which operated as a mercantile store and residence; the Strauss Store, a dry goods store that also functioned as a residence; and the Lyons Bowling Saloon, which operated as a single-lane bowling alley and saloon. Reconstruction of these buildings will not be considered as part of the Proposed IPU Project, however, their potential for future reconstruction will be protected by limiting the development on these sites.

1.1.3 Basic Landscaping

Landscaping within the new acquisition shall provide several functions to visitors within the new park space. It should create a welcoming environment and act as a gateway for visitors to begin their exploration of OTSDSHP. Landscaping should provide a means of exiting the urban feel of the surrounding environment and entering an environment that contains elements of Old Town San Diego as it existed during the interpretive period of 1821-1872. It should be noted that the interpretive period contained very minimal vegetation. Despite this, shade trees may be present to provide respite from direct sunlight, so that visitors may be inclined to spend time within the park space. Gentle changes in topography shall be included to provide a sense of being adjacent to a river valley. Gardens and/or orchards may be considered to supplement the landscaping due to the minimalist landscaping that existed when the area served as residence and/or business space for those who lived and worked during the interpretive period. An open space with turf, though not indicative of the interpretive period, shall serve to provide a space for interpretive activities and for visitors to gather. A stage is also possible to allow for presentation to visitor groups.
Figure 1. Vicinity map of project area.
Figure 2. Location of project area.
1.1.4 Pedestrian Circulation

The ability of visitors to experience the new acquisition will be made possible by the pathways that are provided within the space. A combination of concrete and decomposed granite pathways will be used. These shall be made suitable for accessibility by a range of visitors with different mobility abilities. A balance shall be struck between a circulation system that allows moving throughout the space, while maintaining some space that is provided strictly for viewing.

1.1.5 Parking

While parking is a commodity that could be expanded, the limited space that the acquisition is providing should be made available for visitors to use in a way that enhances the experience within OTSDSHP. To meet the parking needs of visitors to OTSDSHP as well as provide usable park space, the development will include multi-purpose space that can be used for both visitors use and parking. The incorporation of landscaping into the site shall minimize the feel of being within a traditional parking lot.

1.2 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The consideration of alternatives to the proposed project is required by CEQA §15126.6. Because an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, alternatives which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project should be considered [CEQA §15126.6(b)]. This would include the significant adverse impact caused by the demolition of the portion of the Office Complex, which is potentially eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources and/or National Register of Historic Places. As such, several alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen this significant impact were considered. These alternatives and their feasibility are presented below.

The analysis of the proposed Project and alternatives shall be used to initiate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in compliance with the provisions of the CDPR’s Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Public Resources Code Section 5024.5.

1.2.1 Alternative 1: Retention of the Paderewski Designed (1953) Section

Project Description

In order to consider an alternative that would avoid the significant adverse impact caused with the demolition of the entire Caltrans District Office Complex, this alternative was considered to allow for the reuse of the original 1953 constructed portion of the Office Complex, designed by noted architect, C.J. Paderewski. The 1953 built section established the International architectural style and historic character of the Office Complex. This alternative would demolish the contributing 1959 addition and the non-contributing 1964 addition and allow for their sites to be redeveloped. Demolition of the contributing 1959 addition would constitute an adverse effect. Limited exploration of use of the 1953 built section of the Office Complex took place due to its retention resulting in difficulty in meeting the Project’s IPU objectives.

This alternative would meet some of the IPU objectives. The removal of the non-contributing 1958 and 1964-built office wings would allow CDPR an opportunity to more fully investigate sub-surface areas of the southeastern half of Block 409. Removal of the two additions would still allow for investigation of historic archaeological resources such as foundations, features, and artifacts associated with important commercial buildings and other historic sites that would be likely contributors to the Old Town San Diego National Register District.
Interpretation elements would be considered under this alternative and could take place within the retained 1953 construction portion. This alternative would reserve specific areas of the Project site for historic structure reconstruction as is recommended in the proposed Project.

Landscaping would include the use of limited new plantings and could utilize existing plantings and infrastructure already present surrounding the Office Complex to reduce the resources necessary to prepare the site for public use. An extensive amount of mature non-historic plantings already exist within the site including various groundcover, shrubs and trees. Keeping mature trees would minimize the time necessary to grow new plantings and would provide shaded space for visitors upon opening the site for public use. However, existing landscaped plantings are not compatible with those which would have historically been present when the site was part of the San Diego River watershed. Circulation of visitors throughout the site will be possible under this alternative and would include new accessible routes.

To accommodate additional parking onsite, the reuse of existing parking onsite would be preferable with the potential for some additional parking spaces. The site would be designed to be flexible in order to accommodate further space for automobile parking when special events are being held at OTSDSHP.

**Resource Significance**

CDPR determined that this alternative would retain enough of the Office Complex to avoid overriding significant impacts to the historic resource, with mitigation to address the loss of the contributing 1959 addition.

CDPR contends that removal of the two additions would therefore not result in the complete loss of a historic resource and still retain its most character-defining International Style elements designed by original architect Paderewski. As such, the most character-defining portion of the Complex would be retained and avoid the complete loss of the potentially eligible historic property.

**Determination Not to Carry Forward**

However, maintaining the 1953 built section of the Office Complex would eliminate the ability to construct a historically accurate interpretation of the San Diego riverbank, as its location is the same as the 1953 built section of the Office Complex. Interpretation could take place within the 1953 building as a potential space to expand visitor services.

Several considerations make retaining any portion of the Office Complex infeasible or challenging. Maintaining the building in an unoccupied state the length of time necessary to plan for its reuse would place financial hardship on CDPR due to the recurring costs of securing and maintaining the Office Complex. It is currently unable to be occupied due to the presence of hazardous materials that pose substantial adverse health risk. Additionally, the Office Complex is not compatible either physically or contextually with the other buildings present within OTSDSHP. The retention of the 1953 built section would result in difficulty creating a new entrance gateway into OTSDSHP by blocking views from Taylor Street into OTSDSHP and not add to the OTSDNRD.

### 1.2.2 Alternative 2: Demolition and Minimal Improvement to Project Site

This alternative would demolish the entire Office Complex. Implementation would then proceed to meet the objectives of IPU described within the Budget Package. This would allow for Immediate Public Use of the site with limited development and limited financial commitment.

---

1 Bevil, Alexander, California State Parks, Southern Service Center, *Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex-Historical Background and Significance*, 2014, p. 22
1.0 Introduction

This alternative would result in an adverse significant impact to a National/California Register-eligible historic resource due to its full demolition. In the event that the demolition and hazardous waste remediation of the Complex consumes a large portion of the Project’s total budget, this alternative may be preferable due to the limited amount of development that it proposes to the Project site. Additional substantial costs could also be incurred from the necessary archaeological monitoring and recordation of the Project site.

Interpretation elements would be considered under this alternative, but may be further limited in their scope if demolition and remediation are substantial efforts. This alternative would reserve specific areas of the Project site for historic structure reconstruction as is recommended in the proposed Project.

Landscaping would include the use of limited new plantings and would utilize existing plantings and infrastructure already present surrounding the Office Complex to minimize the cost of preparing the site for public use. An extensive amount of mature plantings already exist within the site including various groundcover, shrubs and trees. Keeping mature trees would minimize the effort in developing an entirely new landscape and would provide shaded space for visitors immediately upon opening the site for public use. Grading of the site would be minimal and would utilize the existing topography.

Circulation of visitors would likely take the form of less defined pathways throughout the Project site in order to lessen financial resource needs. However, circulation throughout the site will still meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility guidelines.

To accommodate additional parking onsite, reuse of existing parking shall be considered along with a modest increase in new parking spaces. The space would be flexible to accommodate additional parking when special events are held at OTSDSHP.

1.2.3 Alternative 3: No Project Alternative

By not carrying out any demolition or improvements to the site, no public use would be provided. CDPR would continue to be responsible for maintaining the building and ensuring it remains secure. None of the objectives outlined within the Budget Package would be implemented. CDPR, as the land owner, would continue to incur the cost of maintaining the building and securing it. The mission of CDPR and goals for OTSDSHP would not be met.

1.3 REPORT STRUCTURE

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) has prepared this Historic Context, Archaeological Research Design, and Mitigation, Monitoring, and Discovery Plan (Archaeological Research Design) to guide archaeological monitoring of the demolition and removal of the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex. It provides a compilation and synthesis of information from historical sources, maps, and previous archaeological studies, as well as research questions with which to identify and evaluate the significance of any discoveries identified during archaeological monitoring. For the preparation of the Archaeological Research Design, ASM complied information from historical and archaeological primary and secondary sources from the San Diego History Center, OTSDSHP, San Diego Museum of Man, South Coastal Information Center, and San Diego State University Collections Department. The Research Design first reviews the prehistory and history of the region and then provides a land use history of the Project area (Chapter 2). Next the record searches are summarized and a review of previous archaeological work within the vicinity of the Project area is given (Chapter 3). Finally, a research design is provided, which includes a theoretical background, research themes and data requirements for the Project area, archaeological monitoring strategies, treatment of human remains, eligibility evaluation procedures, significance testing and data recovery excavation methods, laboratory methods, and future report preparation requirements (Chapters 4 and 5).
1.4 PERSONNEL

The creation of the Archaeological Research Design was managed by Sinéad Ní Ghabhláin, Ph.D., RPA. Sarah Stringer-Bowsher, M.A., RPH and Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA performed the historical research and record searches, prepared the land use history, the record search summaries, and review of previous archaeological work. Sinéad Ní Ghabhláin, Ph.D., RPA. wrote the research design. Don Laylander, M.A., RPA edited the Archaeological Research Design and Zee Malas prepared the graphics.
2.0  HISTORICAL CONTEXT

2.1  SETTING

The Project area is located within the natural flood plain of the San Diego River. Historically and prehistorically, portions of the Project area have been located within the San Diego River’s bed, depending on the path the river followed to the Pacific Ocean. After the San Diego River was channelized in 1877, the Project area was classified as urban land (United States Department of Agriculture 2014). The effect the San Diego River has had on the Project area is discussed in more detail in Section 2.3.2, below. The Project area is located on recent alluvium, which overlies a Pleistocene marine terrace deposit (Clement and Van Bueren 1993).

Barbour and Major (1977) report that prior to development of the Project area, it held open grassland and coastal sage scrub vegetation communities on the southeastern side, and estuary and marine habitat on the northwestern side. The Project area is currently fully developed and contains the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex.

2.2  PREHISTORIC PERIOD

Archaeological fieldwork along the southern California coast has documented a diverse range of human occupation extending from the early Holocene into the Ethnohistoric period (Erlandson and Colten 1991; Jones 1992; Moratto 1984). Several different regional chronologies, often with overlapping terminology, are used in coastal southern California, and they vary from region to region (Moratto 1984: Figures 4.5 and 4.17). Today, the prehistory of San Diego County is generally divided into three major periods: Paleoindian, Archaic, and Late Prehistoric. These time periods are characterized by patterns in material culture that are thought to represent distinct regional trends in the economic and social organization of prehistoric groups. In addition, some scholars, referring to specific areas, utilize a number of cultural terms synonymously with these temporal labels: San Dieguito for Paleoindian, La Jolla for Archaic, and Yuman for Late Prehistoric (Moriarty 1966; Rogers 1939, 1945; Wallace 1978; Warren 1964).

2.2.1  Paleoindian Period

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

As in most of North America, the earliest recognized period of California prehistory is termed Paleo-Indian. In southern California, this period is usually considered to date from at least 10,000 B.P. until 8500 to 7200 B.P. (Moratto 1984; Warren et al. 2008), and is represented by what is known as the San Dieguito complex (Rogers 1966). Within the local classificatory system, San Dieguito assemblages are composed almost entirely of flaked stone tools, including scrapers, choppers, and large projectile points (Warren 1987; Warren et al. 2008). Until recently, the near absence of milling tools in San Dieguito sites was viewed as the major difference between Paleo-Indian economies and the lifeways that characterized the subsequent Archaic period, in which milling tools have been abundantly identified in the archaeological record.
Based upon rather scant evidence from a small number of sites throughout San Diego County, it has been hypothesized that the people linked to the San Dieguito complex lived within a generalized hunter-gatherer society with band-level organization. This portrayal is essentially an extension to the inland and coastal areas of San Diego County of what has long been considered a continent-wide Paleo-Indian tradition. This immediate post-Pleistocene adaptation occurred within a climatic period of somewhat cooler and moister conditions than exist presently. The range of possible economic adaptations of San Dieguito bands to this environment is poorly understood at present, but it is typically assumed that these groups followed lifeways similar to other Paleo-Indian groups in North America.

This interpretation of the San Dieguito complex as the local extension of a post-Clovis big game hunting tradition is based primarily on materials from the C. W. Harris Site (Ezell 1987; Warren 1966, 1967). An unusually high percentage of large bifaces in the Harris assemblage seems indicative of a retooling station, a pattern not found at any other purported San Dieguito sites. Still, there does appear to be some evidence that large biface technology was typical of the earliest occupations of San Diego County, and that this pattern is shared by other complexes in the greater Southwest. What is less clear is how large a role these objects played in the day-to-day subsistence activities of their creators.

### 2.2.2 Archaic Period

The Archaic period (also referred to as the Early Milling period) extended back at least 7,200 years, possibly to as early as 9000 B.P. (Moratto 1984; Rogers 1966; Warren et al. 2008). Archaic subsistence is generally considered to have differed from Paleo-Indian subsistence in two major ways. First, gathering activities were emphasized over hunting, with shellfish and seed collecting of particular importance. Second, milling technology, frequently employing portable ground stone slabs, was developed. The shift to littoral exploitation from a land-based focus is traditionally held to mark the transition from the Paleo-Indian period to the Archaic period. In reality, the implications of this transition are poorly understood from both an economic and a cultural standpoint (see Warren et al. 2008).

Early Archaic occupations in San Diego County are most apparent along the coast and the major drainage systems that extend inland from the coastal plains (Moratto 1984). Coastal Archaic sites are characterized by cobble tools, basin milling stones, hand stones, discoids (disk-shaped grinding stones), a small number of “Pinto” and “Elko” series dart points, and flexed burials. Together, these elements typify what is termed the La Jolla complex in San Diego County, which appears as the early coastal manifestation of a more diversified way of life.

For many years, the common model has included something that D. L. True (1958) termed the Pauma complex, an archaeological construct based upon a number of inland Archaic-period sites in northern San Diego County that appeared to exhibit assemblage attributes different from coastal Archaic sites. Pauma complex sites were typically located on small saddles and hills overlooking stream drainages, and were characterized by artifact scatters of basin and slab milling stones, hand stones, some scraper planes, debitage, and occasional ground stone discoids. Further analysis suggests that the Pauma complex is simply an inland counterpart to the coastal La Jolla complex (Cardenas and Van Wormer 1984; Gallegos 1987; True and Beemer 1982). Given that the distance between the two environments (coastal and inland) is relatively small, and that sites attributed to each complex appear to be contemporaneous, it seems more appropriate to consider the differences in materials as seasonal manifestations of a mobile residence strategy using both coastal and inland resources. When similar environmental variability exists within Archaic complexes in other regions, such sites are usually considered to represent different aspects of the annual positioning strategies of a single hunter-gatherer culture complex (Bayham and Morris 1986; Sayles 1983; Sayles and Antevs 1941).
In recent years, local archaeologists have questioned the traditional definition of the Paleo-Indian San Dieguito complex as consisting solely of flaked lithic tools and lacking milling technology. There is speculation that differences between artifact assemblages of “San Dieguito” and “La Jolla” sites may reflect functional differences rather than temporal or cultural variability (Bull 1987; Gallegos 1987; Wade 1986). Gallegos (1987) has proposed that the San Dieguito, La Jolla, and Pauma complexes are manifestations of the same culture, that is, different site types are the result of differences in site locations and resources exploitation (Gallegos 1987:30). This hypothesis, however, has been strongly challenged by Warren et al. (2008). In short, our understanding of the interplay between human land use, social organization, and material culture for the first several millennia of San Diego prehistory is poorly developed, although some progress has been made. Recent data collection has accelerated in the areas of paleoenvironmental analysis, paleoethnobotany, faunal analysis, and lithic technology studies. More importantly, efforts are being made to reexamine the assumptions surrounding existing artifact typologies and climatic reconstructions that form the basis of the standard systematics.

2.2.3 Late Prehistoric Period

In his overview of San Diego prehistory, Malcolm Rogers (1945) hypothesized that Yuman-speaking people from the Colorado River region migrated into southern California. This hypothesis was based primarily on patterns of material culture in archaeological contexts and his reading of linguistics. This “Yuman invasion” is still commonly cited in the literature, but some later linguistic studies suggest that the movement may have actually been northward from Baja California.

Assemblages derived from Late Prehistoric sites in San Diego County differ in many ways from those in the Archaic tradition. The occurrence of small, pressure-flaked projectile points, the replacement of flexed inhumations with cremations, the introduction of ceramics, and an emphasis on the collection, processing, and storage of inland plant foods (especially acorns) are a few of the cultural patterns that were well established by the second millennium A.D. The centralized and seasonally permanent residential patterns that had begun to emerge during the Archaic period became well established in most areas. Inland semisedentary villages appeared along major watercourses in the foothills and in montane valleys where seasonal exploitation of acorns and piñon nuts was common, resulting in permanent milling stations on bedrock outcrops. Mortars for acorn processing increased in frequency relative to seed-grinding basins.

The Late Prehistoric period is represented in the northern part of San Diego County by the San Luis Rey complex (Meighan 1954; True et al. 1974), and by the Cuyamaca complex in the southern portion of the county (True 1970). The San Luis Rey complex is the archaeological manifestation of the Uto-Aztecan (Takic) predecessors of the ethnohistoric Luiseno, while the Cuyamaca complex reflects the material culture of the Yuman ancestors of the Kumeyaay (also known as Diegueño or Ipai and Tipai).

According to True et al. (1974), the Cuyamaca complex, while similar to the San Luis Rey complex, is differentiated by its greater frequencies of side-notched points, flaked stone tools, ceramics, and milling stone implements, a wider range of ceramic forms, a steatite industry, and cremations placed in urns. Assigning significance to these patterns should be done with caution, however, since it is obvious that seasonal camps in upland areas would reflect a different economic focus and would involve a slightly different set of trade relations than would be expected for populations on the coast. Thus a good deal of the variation in artifact form might be attributable to functional differences or point of origin. In regards to site structure, we might also expect occupational spans to differ between coastal and inland camps, given the shorter summers at higher elevations.
2.2.4 Ethnohistoric Period

In general, the term Kumeyaay has come into common usage to identify the Yuman-speaking people living in the central and southern part of San Diego County at the time of Spanish contact. The Kumeyaay are also referred to as Diegueño, which they were called by the Spanish because of their association with the mission at San Diego, or as the Ipai and Tipai. The Ipai were the dialect group north of the San Diego River and the Tipai south of the river and into Baja California (Hedges 1975; Langdon 1975). The following short synopsis is derived from various ethnographic and historic documents and publications. More detailed accounts of the aboriginal cultures of the Kumeyaay are found in a range of early historic sources (Boscana 2005; Fages 1937; Geiger and Meighan 1976; Laylander 2000) and ethnographic accounts (Drucker 1937, 1941; Gifford 1918, 1931; Hicks 1963; Hohenthal 2001; Kroeger 1925; Laylander 2004; Luomala 1978; Sparkman 1908; Spier 1923; Waterman 1910; White 1963). However, ethnographic research directly applicable to the Project area has been minimal; as the native community had been decimated or displaced by the time trained ethnographers began their studies.

The Kumeyaay inhabited a diverse environment including marine, foothill, mountain, and desert resource zones. The region inhabited by the Kumeyaay probably extended from Agua Hedionda Lagoon eastward into the Imperial Valley and southward through much of northern Baja California (Almstedt 1982; Gifford 1931; Hedges 1975; Luomala 1978; Shipek 1982; Spier 1923).

There seems to have been considerable variability in the level of social organization and settlement patterns among the Kumeyaay. The Kumeyaay possessed a patrilocal type of band organization with patrilineage exogamy and virilocal marital residence (the married couple integrates into the male’s band). The band is often considered as synonymous with a village or ranchería, which was a political entity. Kumeyaay bands claimed prescribed territories and patrilineages claimed specific ownership of certain resources such as, some minor plants and eagle aeries (Luomala 1978; Spier 1923). Some of the bands occupied procurement ranges that required considerable residential mobility, such as those in the desert (Hicks 1963). In the mountains, some of the larger bands occupied a few large residential bases that were inhabited for half of the year, such as those inhabited in Cuyamaca in the summer and fall, and in Guatay or Descanso during the rest of the year (Almstedt 1982; Rensch 1975). According to Spier (1923), many desert and mountain Kumeyaay spent the period from spring to autumn in larger residential bases in the upland procurement ranges, and wintered in mixed groups in residential bases along the eastern foothills on the edge of the desert (e.g., Jacumba and Mountain Springs). This variability in settlement mobility and organization reflects the great range of environments within Kumeyaay territory.

The Kumeyaay are typically considered to be a hunting-gathering society. While a large variety of terrestrial and marine food sources were exploited, emphasis was placed on acorn procurement. Acorns were the most important single food source utilized by the Kumeyaay. Kumeyaay villages were usually located near water, which was necessary for leaching acorn meal. A wide range of other mineral, plant, and animal resources were exploited, including coastal fish and shellfish (Hedges 1986; Shipek 1991; Wilken 2012). Seeds from grasses, manzanita, sage, sunflowers, lemonade berry, chia, and other plants were also used along with various wild greens and fruits. Deer, rabbits, birds and other small game were hunted.

Hunting implements consisted of the bow and arrow, curved throwing sticks, nets, and snares. Bone and shell hooks, as well as nets, were used for fishing. Lithic resources of quartz and metavolcanics were commonly available throughout much of the Kumeyaay territory. Other raw materials, such as obsidian, chert, chalcedony, and steatite, occur in more localized areas. These raw materials were acquired through direct procurement or exchange. Projectile point types included the Cottonwood Triangular, as well as the Desert Side-notched, both commonly produced. The material culture also included ceramic cooking vessels, basketry, flaked stone tools, milling implements, arrow shaft straighteners, and bone, shell, and stone ornaments.
Houses were arranged in villages without apparent patterns. Houses in primary villages were conical structures covered with tule bundles, having excavated floors and central hearths. Houses constructed at mountain bases generally lacked any excavation, probably due to the summer occupation. Other structures included sweathouses, ceremonial enclosures, ramadas, and acorn granaries. Many households would constitute a village or ranchería, which occupied a larger territory. As Spier (1923:307) noted, the entire territory was not occupied at one time, but rather the communities moved between resources in such a manner that in the course of a year all of the recognized settlements may have been occupied.

Most of Kumeyaay mythology was quite similar to the Quechan and Mohave of the Colorado River, as well as other Yuman groups in the Southwest (Gifford 1931; Hicks 1963; Luomala 1978; Spier 1923; Waterman 1910).

**Village of Cosoy**

Ethnohistoric documentation places the Kumeyaay village of Cosoy (Kosoi) within or near the Project area, along the banks of the San Diego River (Carrico 2008, Gross and Robbins-Wade 2008, Ezell and Ezell 1987, and La Rose 2009). Cosoy was the first Native American settlement contacted in Alta California by the 1769 Spanish expedition to establish the mission and presidio. Little is known about the village, and several locations for the village have been hypothesized around the mouth of the San Diego River (Gross and Robbins-Wade 2008). The village was probably relocated or dispersed after the arrival of the Spanish (Carrico 2008). Carrico described the village as follows:

Cosoy, sometimes spelled Kosoi, was the name of the primary native settlement associated with the San Diego Presidio. It is mentioned frequently in late 1700s Spanish literature. Cosoy was apparently a large village that may have been relocated or at least dispersed during the early Contact period. Ezell and Ezell (1987:119-134) suggested that the village extended southwest from the north side of Interstate 8 in Mission Valley, on the south side of the San Diego River, into an area just below Presidio Hill. Only minimal archaeological documentation of this settlement has occurred because highway construction, commercial development, and river channeling took place without benefit of archaeological study. Ironically, much of the fill soil used to cap the Presidio San Diego ruins in the 1930s was derived from midden deposits at the Cosoy site in front of Presidio Hill, and it could provide some information about the settlement (Carrico 2008).

Other studies believe to have identified the village of Cosoy at SDI-4675, also referred to as the Brown site, approximately 1 mi. east on the north side of Mission Valley (Ezell and Ezell 1987 and La Rose 2009). They believe that SDI-4675 contained the major habitation area of the village, however the entire San Diego River flood plain, including the Project area, was part of the resource procurement area for the village. Gross and Robbins-Wade believe that Cosoy was a series of temporary camps around the mouth of the San Diego River (2008). They found that the best radiocarbon dates suggest an occupation of Cosoy, along the banks of the San Diego river around 350 B.P. from the Heron Site, SDI-14152 (Gross and Robbins-Wade 2008). Excavation of SDI-14152, located approximately 900 m north east of the Project area, along the northern bank of the San Diego River, found that the settlements along the mouth of the San Diego River were seasonally occupied and the inhabitants focused both on marine and terrestrial resources. During the rainy winter months when the water level in the river was higher the habitation and activity areas shifted to the upper terraces surrounding the river (Gross and Robbins-Wade 2008). Additional W-291 (SDI-12469 and SDI-38) has been hypothesized as a possible location of Cosoy, however due to the early recordation of W-291 little information was recorded (Ezell 1968, Carrico and Clevenger 1991).
2.3 HISTORIC PERIOD

2.3.1 A Brief History of Old Town San Diego

In 1769, Spanish colonization of Alta California began in San Diego with construction of the first presidio and mission on the hilltop overlooking San Diego River bottomlands. Over the next forty or so years, life revolved around the presidio and mission, which had been relocated in 1784 a short distance inland. With only a handful of soldiers and a few priests, the Spaniards relied upon Indian neophytes (Catholic converts) at the mission for their labor force. Mission San Diego de Alcalá supplied the fledgling community with Indian-raised food, Indian-made clothing, and even Indian-rented labor. By the early 1800s, it had over 55,000 acres and 1,500 Indian converts living nearby. Its monopoly of land and labor stifled colonization and private development.

The present-day plaza was laid out in the early 1820s, after Mexico won its independence from Spain. Older soldiers received small land parcels from the presidio’s comandante as compensation for long years of service. On the flatlands below Presidio Hill, they built houses out of sun-dried adobe brick since wood was scarce. By the mid-1820s, a cluster of adobes, corrals and gardens formed a rough but orderly street pattern around the treeless plaza. Two of the finest buildings, built between 1829-1831 and still standing, belonged to José Antonio Estudillo and his brother-in-law, Juan Bandini.

With the exception of these two townhouses, the adobe homes reflected the frontier conditions of the day. None had indoor fireplaces or glass windows, and floors were made of packed earth. They were used only for sleeping. All other activities, including cooking and eating, occurred outside, usually in an enclosed corridor or patio. Farm animals were butchered in nearby yards. Bedbugs and fleas from the horses and cows were a constant nuisance. And the San Diego River’s ever-changing course could wash away structures and gardens in a sudden, terrifying moment.

The Spanish missionaries laid the foundation of California’s economy during Mexican rule with the importation of cattle. After the breakup of the missions in the early 1830s, cowhides, known as “California Banknotes,” and tallow (or cow fat) became the chief exports of the Old Town community. Foreign vessels anchored in San Diego’s calm bay to trade manufactured goods and luxury items from all over the world for hides and tallow.

Development of this global trade caused the province’s governors to dole out immense land grants to family members, relatives and political cronies. Soon large ranchos dotted the outlying sage-scrub landscape. Often called “Dons,” the ranchers were the new landed elite.

The “Rancho Period,” as it is called, opened California up to outside influences. It changed the habits of consumer-deprived Californios, who craved the latest in fashion and wares. It altered methods of work and perceptions about the future. And it perked U.S. interest in California’s potential, which set the stage for diplomatic and later military intervention.

San Diego’s Mexican era ended abruptly in 1846, when the United States declared war on Mexico. Although the war was fought primarily in Mexico, it fueled tensions within Old Town, dividing families and friends against one another. Californio forces loyal to Mexico lay siege to the town in October, but retreated with the arrival of U.S. reinforcements under Commodore Robert F. Stockton. Battles were fought in nearby San Pasqual Valley and Los Angeles.

---

2 This is an excerpt from a history written by Victor Walsh, California State Parks Historian II, in 2006. It was provided to ASM Affiliates, Inc. by the California State Parks, Southern Service Center.
The war between the U.S. and Mexico ended in 1848 with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Two years later California was admitted into the Union as the 31st state, and the pueblo of Old Town was incorporated as the town of San Diego.

The discovery of gold at Coloma in January 1848 lured adventurers to distant California from around the world. San Diego became an important stopover for thousands of miners sailing around the Horn en route to the central Sierra goldfields. “The emigrants are pouring in from all directions,...Our gorgeous little harbor is now seen riding four, five and six of the ocean’s pride daily, and not infrequently two steamboats,” wrote Lieutenant Cave Johnson Couts in 1849.

In 1850, the town built its first jail at a whooping price tag of $5,000 only to have its first prisoner, Roy Bean, a roystering young blade and brother of the Mayor, escape! A year later, the first newspaper, the Herald, began as a sober, small-town Democratic weekly. While the owner was away in San Francisco, a phantom editor, called “Phoenix,” transformed it into a riotous conglomeration of wit, burlesque and satire, devoted to the opposing Whig Party.

The sudden influx of Americans and Europeans transformed Old Town. Those who stayed brought new practices about law, trade, government, education, and health. Adobes were remodeled and converted into commercial enterprises. Prefabricated wood-frame buildings, brought by ship from the East around the Horn, were reassembled in San Diego.

The boom proved short-lived. Once the Gold Rush ended, the town languished. Businesses closed, people left, and nature wreaked havoc. Storms in 1861-62 raised the river’s tides and flooded the west end of town. In May 1862 a severe earthquake struck to be followed by a smallpox epidemic. Several years of drought devastated the ranchos and livestock industry.

In 1867 San Franciscan Alonzo Horton arrived in San Diego to begin developing nearby New Town three miles to the south on the bay. A fierce rivalry ensued, reaching a climax in 1870 when the Board of Supervisors ordered all county records to be removed from the Whaley House in Old Town to New San Diego. Government and professional offices moved downtown. In the spring of 1872, fire destroyed seven buildings in Old Town, including the old courthouse.

New Town’s development as the commercial and civic seat sparked an exodus among Old Town’s most prominent businessmen and professionals. In the decades that followed, Old Town languished in its past. In 1888, the writer Harriet Harper described the forgotten village in these words. “All around us, forming a great square, were the crumbling dwellings of the old Mexican residents....Today Old Town...remains a monument to the past, a finger pointing out the endless changes of time and tide....”

The town’s recovery, however, was its history. Renewed interest in San Diego’s Spanish heritage sparked Old Town’s revival in the early twentieth century, and led to the restoration of several old adobes, including the Casa de Estudillo. Advertised as “Ramona’s Wedding Place,” it became the site of hundreds of weddings during the inter-war years.

The opening of Presidio Park in 1929 on the hill overlooking Old Town heralded a new era. Its development under civic leader George Marston spurred efforts over the next decade to revitalize the decaying community as a historic tourist spot. Over the next few years, Cave Couts, Jr. restored the former casa of his grandfather Juan Bandini (in Old Town SHP); photographer Lewis John Geddes and wife Frances opened a studio in the refurbished Casa de Machado (in Old Town SHP); and the Works Progress Administration restored the historic Chapel of the Immaculate Conception (just outside the future Old Town San Diego State Historic Park). In 1939 a Spanish Revival white stucco colonnaded building, called the Pio Pico Motor Hotel and designed by the noted architect Richard Requa, opened.
2.0 Historical Context

After the war, in 1946, the city of San Diego introduced a plan to set aside Old Town as a historic site. The plan envisioned transforming the plaza and surrounding neighborhood into a “living museum.” It proposed reconstructing buildings in the “style of early California” and developing crafts and cottage industries of that period. Its goal was not historic restoration per se—a profession still in its infancy—but rather to transform the historic community into an attractive tourist site.

During the following decade, the campaign to create a historic tourist site gained momentum with support from descendants of the early families and civic organizations. In 1964, Assemblyman Jim Mills of San Diego introduced legislation to make Old Town a state historic park. Three years later, the State Public Works Board approved the release of $2.5 million in State Bond funds to purchase 6.5 blocks of the original Mexican pueblo around the plaza. In 1968, this area officially became a state historic park, and efforts to rediscover and preserve the historic town and its rightful legacy began anew.³

2.3.2 Land Use History within the Project Area

The Project area is bounded by Taylor Street to the northwest, Juan Street to the northeast, Wallace Street (historically Old Beach Road or Washington Street) to the southeast, and Calhoun Street (historically Fitch/Calhoun Street) to the southwest. The Project area encompasses all of the block historically referred to as Block 45, Block 409, and Block 4550. The block was subdivided into lots 1, 2, 3, and 4. Lot 1 is in the northwest corner, Lot 2 is in the northeast corner, Lot 3 is the southeast corner, and Lot 4 is in the southwest corner of Block 409 (Figure 3). Table 1 outlines the changes in development within the Project area over time.

## 2.0 Historical Context

### Table 1. Guide to the Land Use History of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Location within Block 409</th>
<th>Structure Description</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Associated Individuals, Families, and/or Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitch Residence and Store</td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>Two story adobe building, corral, and gardens</td>
<td>1848 - c. 1850</td>
<td>Henry Delano Fitch Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1850-1854</td>
<td>Unknown – possibly still the Fitch Family heirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Werth and Krist – meat and vegetable market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1854 – 1858</td>
<td>Solomon Goldman – unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>J.A. Meier – Universal Variety Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1858 – c. 1893</td>
<td>Unknown residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well reported by Zink</td>
<td>Lot 4, Near Fitch/Calhoun Street, behind the Fitch Residence</td>
<td>Well house structure</td>
<td>c. 1850 - c. 1862</td>
<td>Reported to Zink by local residents in 1969, presumably used by the Fitch Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well identified on the 1856 panoramic, and 1874 and 1898 photographs</td>
<td>Lot 4, Centrally located within the Block</td>
<td>Well covered with a roofed structure</td>
<td>Prior to 1856 – after 1898</td>
<td>Reported by Judge Benjamin Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strauss Residence</td>
<td>Part of Lot 3</td>
<td>Store and residential building, a warehouse, and potentially other ancillary buildings</td>
<td>c. 1850 - 1852</td>
<td>James W. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1852 - 1867</td>
<td>Louis Strauss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1867 - 1868</td>
<td>Henry and John Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1868 – c. 1893</td>
<td>Unknown residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon’s Bowling Saloon</td>
<td>Part of Lot 3 and 4</td>
<td>Bowling Saloon, one-story adobe building used as the saloon and an attached one-lane bowling alley, both of which burned in 1855. An adobe building was rebuilt in the same footprint</td>
<td>c. 1853 - c. 1874-1893</td>
<td>George Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Lots 1 and 4</td>
<td>Wood-framed residence and extensive gardens</td>
<td>c. 1874-1893 – c. 1910</td>
<td>Unknown residents, property changed hands amongst: James McCoy, Ephraim Morse, Thomas Whaley, R.H. Dalton, Mary Davies, and Winifred McCoy/Murtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Factory and Packing House</td>
<td>Entire Block</td>
<td>Concrete warehouse with a tower, packing facility, elongated wooden shed, worker’s locker room, brine house, bathroom, boiler room, underground tank and open area for barrel storage</td>
<td>1910-1919</td>
<td>E. W. Akerman and Tuffley, Old Mission Brand California Olives and Olive Oil Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919-1920</td>
<td>Old Mission Packing Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of the Boiler room and underground tanks, addition of a garden area, and a large addition to the back of the factory, a new storage building, and a residence</td>
<td>1920-1950</td>
<td>Old Mission Packing Corporation / Old Mission Products Company, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Entire Block</td>
<td>Caltrans acquires the property</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Caltrans District 11 Office Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of prior buildings and structures and construction of the Caltrans District 11 Office Complex begins</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Caltrans District 11 Office Complex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 Historical Context

San Diego River Prior to 1877 Channelization

The project area was within the floodplain of the San Diego River as it flowed to the Pacific Ocean into Mission Bay, historically known as False Bay, or at various times into San Diego Bay (Davis 1953). Prior to 1811, the San Diego River flowed northwest into False Bay. From 1811 until 1825 it slightly changed course and flowed west into False Bay. After 1825, it flowed south into San Diego Bay (Handbury 1872). The river’s outlet at Mission Bay silted up periodically, causing the river to change course (Davis 1953). Episodic flooding in 1811, 1821, 1825, 1839-1840, 1855, 1857, 1862, 4 and 1873-1874 and resultant silt build-up at San Diego Bay hindered the potential growth of New Town (Clement and Van Bueren 1993:3; Elliot 1883:110-111; Pourade 1964:143). It also limited the development in the Project area.

Surveys of the San Diego River during the outset of the American period show the changing course over time and the effect the river had on the Project area. The earliest map of the San Diego River (Figure 4) shows it flowed roughly down Taylor Street and through the northwestern half of Block 45, Lots 1 and 2 (Couts 1849). An 1851 United States Coast Survey map completed also shows the channelization of the river and the many paths it took to reach the Pacific Ocean (Figure 5). A map prepared that same year shows the river at a slightly more southwestern angle, bisecting a greater part of Lot 1 (Clayton and Hesse 1851, Clement and Van Bueren 1993).

The incorporation of the city of San Diego in 1850 moved the focus of development, including water resources, toward the recently platted New Town San Diego. At this time, the flow of the San Diego River into San Diego Bay was causing severe siltation in the bay. In order to stimulate the growth of the port, city leaders determined that the San Diego River needed to be channelized into False Bay to prevent ships from running aground within San Diego Bay (Brodie 2013). A channelization attempt, known as the Derby Dike, was made in 1853, when a levee was built to channel the river into False Bay; however, the levee failed in 1855, and the river flowed back into San Diego Bay (Pourade 1964:143). The 1853 channelization of the river is shown in Figures 6-7. The sketch map and completed works map show the Project area, with the Fitch and Strauss buildings, discussed below, present in the southwest corner of the block. The sketch map indicates the general boundaries of the Fitch property. The maps also show the San Diego River flowing west, outside of the Project area. They demonstrate the meandering and multiple paths of the river as it led to the Pacific Ocean and of the road from La Playa to Old Town (Derby 1853; Derby and Poole 1853). The two maps map clearly show that Old Town is located within the alluvial plain of the San Diego River, as the river at its largest single extent curved around Presidio Hill and then took many divergent paths to the ocean.

By 1854, the Poole map clearly showed the San Diego River flowing through Taylor Street and along the western half of the block, as well as the attempt to safeguard Old Town properties with an embankment (Figure 8) (Poole 1854, Clement and Van Bueren 1993). An 1857 map illustrates the changing river course between 1853 and 1857 (Figure 9) (United States Coast Survey 1857). The 1872 sketch map (Figure 10) shows the San Diego River flowing to the west of the Project area and well outside of Old Town (Handbury 1872). This map also shows the different courses the river took to reach the Pacific Ocean, the canal and embankment known as the Derby Dike (1853), and the proposed channelization of the river to False Bay.

---

4 The runoff from the 1862 flood destroyed older adobe walls and corrals (Brandes 1974:322N, 322P, 322Q).
Figure 4. Surveyed and drawn for the Ayuntamiento or Town Council by Cave J. Couts in 1849. Henry Clayton, C.E. copied that original map for this January 1850 version. Courtesy of San Diego History Center.
Figure 5. 1851 Map of San Diego Bay from Point Loma to New Town.
*Drawn by the United States Coast Survey. Courtesy of United States Coast Survey.*
Figure 6. 1853 sketch survey map by Topographical Engineer George H. Derby. Courtesy of the San Diego History Center.
Figure 7. 1853 survey map by Topographical Engineers George H. Derby and Charles H. Poole. 
*Courtesy of the San Diego History Center.*
Figure 8. 1854 map of Block 45 surveyed by Charles H. Poole on March 12. Courtesy of records retained by the California State Parks, Southern Service Center.
Figure 9. 1857 Map of San Diego Bay, California. 
Drawn by the Survey of the Coast of the United States. Courtesy of the San Diego History Center.
Figure 10. 1872 Sketch map drawn by H. Handbury. Courtesy of the San Diego History Center.
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The importance of freeing San Diego Bay from silt and opening the port to expanded trade is illustrated by the 1875 Congressional appropriation of $80,000 for rechanneling the river to avoid silting at San Diego Bay, with the output to be directed instead to False Bay. The United States Army Corps of Engineers designed and constructed a 7,735-ft.-long levee with the labor of 75 Euro-American and 75 Chinese laborers, and it was completed in 1877 (Pourade 1964:143). Whaley’s 1877 map (Figure 11) shows the new route of the San Diego River as flowing southwest through Blocks 57 and 48 (across Taylor Street from the Project area) and then along Taylor Street south of the Project area (Whaley 1877). An 1899 map shows Old Town and the blocks that existed northwest of the project area between Block 409 and the channelized river (Figure 12) (Aray 1899). Seasonal flooding of the San Diego River, and consequently of the Project area, occasionally occurred afterwards during flooding events in 1884, 1895, 1916, 1927, and 1938 (Clement and Van Bueren 1993:3; Elliot 1883:110-111).

Land Use of Block 409 from 1848 to 1872

The first structures known to have been constructed within Block 409 during the Transitional/American period up to the 1872 fire were constructed between 1848 and 1853 (Figures 13-17; see also Figures 4, 6, and 8). The first buildings constructed on the block were the Fitch residence and store, the Strauss residence and store, and the Lyon’s bowling saloon (Figure 18; see Figure 17). These three building developments had residential, merchant, or leisure uses, and all three fronted on Wallace Street. The San Diego River still breached the block until the 1877 channelization, making development in Lots 1 and 2 less likely. During the 1850s, 1860s, and 1870s, portions of the Project area were sold or leased to various Old Town residents and businesses. A significant data gap of information on ownership and leases exists from when John A. Grant acquired Block 409 from John B. and Joseph Fitch in 1868 to 1876 when William Evans had acquired the Block 409 and sold it to James McCoy.

First Development in Block 409: Fitch Residence and Store

The Project area was first developed in 1848, when a two-story adobe building, housing a store and residence, was constructed by Henry Delano Fitch on the corner of Wallace and Calhoun Streets (fronting on present-day Wallace Street), within Lot 4 of Block 409 (Bevil 2014:17-18; Clement and Van Bueren 1993:29; Smythe 1908:130). Fitch was first associated with the property on June 6, 1846, when his father-in-law, Joaquín Victor Carrillo granted the property to Henry Delano Fitch’s wife, Josepha Carrillo de Fitch (Brandes 1975:270). Joaquin Victor Carrillo was the cousin of Francisco Ruiz, Commandant of the San Diego Presidio.

Henry Delano Fitch

In 1829, Josepha Carrillo and American sea captain Henry Fitch notoriously eloped (Pourade 1963:11). Fitch had been baptized in the Catholic Church that same year as Enrique Domingo Fitch, and in 1833 he became a naturalized Mexican citizen (Smythe 1908:159-160, 274). Prior to his marriage, he was a merchant sailing along the Mexican California coast from 1825 to 1829. During his extensive travels, he exchanged local and European goods for hides, tallow, and other California products. In 1830, he, his wife, and his child returned to San Diego where his wife and child remained while he sailed cargo vessels along the California coast and as far south as San Blas, from 1830 to 1834. In 1835-1840, he conducted trade up and down the California coast by employing the vessels of other captains and stayed in San Diego (Ogden 1981). Fitch is remembered as the first American to permanently settle in San Diego (Pourade 1963:18; Smythe 1908:293).
Figure 11. 1877 Map of Old San Diego.
Drawn by Thomas Whaley. The base map is Cave Couts’ survey in 1849 and includes Charles H. Poole’s 1856 survey. Courtesy of the San Diego History Center.
Figure 12. 1899 Map of the City of San Diego, California, showing all subdivisions filed for Record. Originally drawn by Louis M. Aray in 1897 and corrected and revised in April 1899.
Figure 13. 1850 lithograph of Old Town San Diego, sketch by H.M.T. Powell.

Figure 14. 1850 Sketch of San Diego by H.M.T Powell in 1850 (at left) and 1850 lithograph (at right). Sketch adapted from Clement and Van Bueren (1993). Lithograph adapted from H.M.T. Powell 1850 lithograph.
Figure 15. 1850 San Diego map. Surveyed and drawn for the Ayuntamiento or Town Council by Cave J. Couts in 1849. Henry Clayton, C.E. copied that original map for this January 1850 version. Courtesy of San Diego History Center.
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Figure 16. Painting ca. 1852 by A. Sauerwein’s painting of “Old San Diego.” Adapted from an unnumbered fold out insert in Pourade’s The Silver Dons.

Figure 17. 1854 Town and Port of San Diego, California, map. United States Coast Survey, Charles H. Poole. Courtesy of San Diego History Center.
Fitch was the first merchant in San Diego, and was the only one for several years (Smythe 1908:105). He bought and sold hides, tallow, and furs, outfitted otter hunters, and made trading voyages along the coast. Fitch’s store was the place to sell valuable otter skins in 1845. Over the years, he intermittently partnered with the well-known merchants of Stearns, McKinley, Temple, and Paty (Smythe 1908:105, 274). He served in various civic capacities as well, such as first syndico in 1835 and as one of the town’s two first alcaldes. He also drew the first survey map of the pueblo lands (Smythe 1908:229, 274). Fitch also served terms as town attorney and Justice of the Peace from 1835 to 1849 (Bevil 2014:17).

During the early 1840s, Fitch owned and ran several stores in Old Town prior to his business on Block 409. Two of the stores operated out of the former Ylario Poinciano adobe (now the Light-Freeman House on San Diego Avenue) and rented rooms in the Juan Osuna house next to the Carrillo house in neighboring Block 46 that fronted on Fitch/Calhoun Street. With Abel Stearns’s business support, Fitch operated a store on the bottom floor of the building, and the Fitch family occupied the second floor (Bevil 2014:17-18; Ogden 1981).
Historical Context

After Henry Delano Fitch died on January 13, 1849, his family left San Diego sometime between 1850 and 1852, and moved to their land grant Sotoyome Rancho near Healdsburg in Sonoma County. Henry had acquired that land grant in 1841 and had begun developing it. Henry’s sons John B. and Joseph Fitch were absentee owners of the Project area from the early 1850s until they sold the property in February 1868 to John A. Grant for $250 (California Census 1852; Junior League of San Diego 1968:41; San Diego Deed Book 1868: 3/56; Smythe 1908: 274; United States Census 1850). However, Block 409 became known as the Fitch Property because the sons had consolidated ownership of Block 409, lots 1-4 prior to selling it (San Diego Deed Book 1868). Several businesses operated out of the building through the 1850s. Werth and Krist ran a meat and vegetable market in the Fitch building in the fall of 1854. Solomon Goldman occupied the building for a time, and J. A. Meier used the building for operating his Universal Variety Store in 1858 (Clement and Van Bueren 1993:29; Helmich and Clark 1991:GDP 52).

Physical Description of Building and Property

According to Bevil (2014), available historic maps, paintings, and historic accounts indicate that the Fitch building was constructed in two phases (Bevil 2014:18). The two phases, completed between 1848 and 1855, created an L-shaped, two-story structure at the corner of Fitch/Calhoun Street and Washington/Wallace Street. The first phase was constructed in 1848 as a two-story, 38-x-36-ft. adobe building. The main floor was used as the store, and the Fitch family of 13 made the second floor their principal home, comprised of five rooms and an attic (Brandes 1975:254-255; Helmich and Clark 1991:GDP 52; Junior League of San Diego 1968:41; Smythe 1908:274). The structure was valued at $5,000 (Brandes 1975:254-255).

By 1850, the roof was wood shingle with end gables, as shown in Figures 8 and 13-17. A classical-style rectangular porch that stretched the entire length of the building was added by 1852. A two-story addition extended northwest from the corner of Fitch/Calhoun Street and Washington/Wallace Street. It also had a gabled roof and a chimney. A walled or fenced corral encompassed the building, and several ancillary buildings existed within the fenced corral (Bevil 2014:18; Clayton 1850; Hayes 1929:302; Miller 1856; Poole 1854; Sauerwein 1852). According to the Junior League of San Diego (1968), the “windows were long and narrow, the doors were paneled, and the porch was suggestive of the Greek Revival then popular on the Atlantic Seaboard. The exterior of the building was not finished in the traditional whitewash, but was painted a ‘barn red.’ Only the wooden trim on the building glistened in white paint” (Junior League of San Diego 1968:41). Judge Benjamin Hayes remembered that the two-story building was dark red (Hayes 1929:302). According to Lillian Whaley, the cannon on the plaza was used as a hitching post for Fitch store patrons (Helmich and Clark 1991:GDP 52; Junior League of San Diego 1968:41). Locals praised the garden that Josepha Carrillo de Fitch had cultivated on this property close to the San Diego River (Hayes 1929:302).

As previously mentioned, the Fitch family moved to northern California sometime between 1850 and 1852 and became absentee owners until they sold Lots 1-4 to John A. Grant in 1868. Improvements made to the Fitch property over time are shown in Figures 4, 6, 8, 11, and 13-18.

---

6 It is important to note that Brandes inadvertently assigned the 38-x-36-ft. adobe building to Block 46/408, but other historical evidence proves that the building was located in Block 45/409.

7 According to Smythe (1908), there were 11 children.
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Wells on Block 409
During the period of Fitch ownership of Block 409, Lot 4 (see Table 1), an “Old Town Water Supply” well may have been in use. A well was reported to Historian Orion M. Zink by local residents in 1969. Zink reports that the well was located near Fitch/Calhoun Street behind the Fitch house/store and was used between 1850 and 1862 (Zink 1969). It may have been one of only two wells in the area (Bevil 2014:20). Judge Benjamin Hayes also located a well in Old Town at the river bed that provided drinking water to an unidentified location five miles away. Bevil reports that, if Zink’s account is correct, the well was located “several feet south of a 15-foot high sandy embankment that once bisected Block 409 in a northeasterly to southwesterly direction” (Bevil 2014:20). Bevil also reports that the location of the well is supported by an 1856 panoramic water color of Old Town (Miller 1856, see Figure 18), which shows a possible well house within Block 409 (Bevil 2014:20). A structure is evident behind the Fitch house/store as early as 1850 and another structure existed just outside the Fitch fenceline (see Figure 14). By 1854, a structure existed on Block 409 in a more central location (see Figure 8), which is also shown in the 1856 panoramic water color of Old Town (see Figure 18). A roofed structure, possibly a covered well, is evident in a similar central location in an 1874 photograph (Figure 19). It is also identified in the same location in 1898.

![Figure 19. 1874 photograph showing the location of the earliest known structures.](Courtesy of the San Diego History Center.)

---

8 This is approximately the same location as the “catch basin” identified on the 1958 Plot Plan (P1 of 4) drawing of the addition to the District XI Office Building. Prepared by the Department of Public Works, Architecture Division. December 12, 1958.
Second Development in Block 409: Strauss Store and Residence

The second structures constructed on the block are shown at the corner of Washington/Wallace Street and Juan Street (see Figure 6). Juan Alvarada sold or leased part of Lot 3 to James W. Robinson for $300 in 1850. This property is described as fronting on Washington/Wallace Street and covering the entire lot (San Diego Deed Book 1850:C/203). In 1851, Sarah and James W. Robinson deeded a portion of Lot 3 of Block 409 to the City of San Diego for the extension of Juan Street (San Diego Deed Book 1851a:C/292). The Robinsons either leased or sold their remaining property within Lot 3 of Block 409 to Isaac A. Goldman and Louis Strauss for $525 in March 1852 (San Diego Deed Book 1851b:C/65). In September 1852, Isaac Goldman leased or sold half of Lot 3 of Block 409 and all of the houses and improvements on the property to Louis Strauss (San Diego Deed Book 1852:D/66).

In 1852, Jewish merchant and French native Louis Strauss operated a dry goods store on the corner of Wallace and Juan Streets in Lot 3 of Block 409 that fronted on Wallace Street. The following year, he added an adjoining residence (see Figure 17) (Bevil 2014:18, California Census 1852; Helmbich and Clark 1991:GDP#52C). Goldman and Strauss operated the new store that sold foreign and domestic dry goods, including boots, shoes, hats, and clothing (San Diego Herald 1852). Strauss subsequently partnered with H. L. Kohn, but their partnership dissolved in March 1854 and Strauss continued to run the store (San Diego Herald 1854a, 1854b). He operated his business through 1855 in two locations, in the Rose, Pendleton, and Company building and at the corner of Juan Street and Washington/Wallace Street (San Diego Herald 1855a). By May 1856, Strauss and Charles Gerson assumed operation of the large Rose, Pendleton, and Company store and retained the store/residence. Strauss lived in San Francisco, and Gerson operated the two San Diego stores (San Diego Herald 1856a, 1856b). A new store was opened in September 1857, but it may have represented only a remodeling of the store at the corner of Juan Street and Washington/Wallace Street (San Diego Herald 1857). Strauss returned with his family from San Francisco in June 1858, and by November 1858 he had dissolved his partnership with Gerson (San Diego Herald 1858a, 1858b). In March 1859, Strauss’s store and “fine dwelling” were for sale (San Diego Herald 1859a). In April 1859, he still lived at his house/store property (San Diego Herald 1859b). Thereafter, he rented the building on Washington/Wallace Street and Juan Street (Helmbich and Clark 1991:GDP52). In 1867, Strauss leased to Henry Hancock for $500 a portion of Lot 3, where a store, house, warehouse, and potentially other ancillary buildings had been constructed (San Diego Deed Book 1867a:2/315). Hancock in turn leased the property to John Hancock a couple of weeks later (San Diego Deed Book 1867b:2/324). As previously mentioned, the Fitch brothers acquired all of Block 409 by February 1868. The buildings associated with this lot are hidden in Figure 19.

Third Development in Block 409: Bowling Saloon

In late 1853, George Lyons constructed a bowling saloon fronting on Wallace Street between the Fitch building and Strauss store in Lots 3 and 4 of Block 409 (Clement and Van Bueren 1993:30). The bowling saloon was one of two operating in Old Town at the time (Bevil 2014:19). The new bowling alley down the
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Street from Lyons’s store on Washington Street was nearly finished in December 1853 (San Diego Herald 1853a). One month earlier, George Lyons and Company had just established a cheap variety store and San Diego Fishing Company (San Diego Herald 1853b). In December 1856, Lyons was constructing a cottage “on the west side of the river” where he and his family could live and attend to their garden (San Diego Herald 1856c). By March 1859, he lived in a house near the river (San Diego Herald 1859c). Lyons still lived near the river in 1861-1862 when the major flood overtook his garden and carried away large sycamore trees nearby (Hayes 1929:142).

George Lyons

George Lyons, a native of Donegal, Ireland, came to San Diego in 1847 as a carpenter aboard a whaling ship from the Northwest coast. He married Bernarda Billar, the daughter of Lieutenant Billar, who had been the commandant of the San Diego Presidio. The couple eventually had seven sons and three daughters. Lyons was a merchant in Old Town from 1851 to 1858 and during that time he also served as City Trustee (1853-1854), member of the Board of Supervisors (1853 and 1855), and postmaster (1853 and 1857). He was also a director of the old San Diego & Gila railroad from its organization in 1854, along with E. W. Morse, Louis Strauss, and others. He served as Sherriff from 1858 to 1862, when James McCoy succeeded him (Black 1913:161). During the 1880s, Lyons and H. A. Howard were successful in the real estate business (Bevil 2014:19; Black 1913:139, 161, 420; Smythe 1908:277-278).

Physical Description of Bowling Saloon

The main one-story adobe building that housed the saloon and an elongated gable-roofed wooden framed wing extended along Wallace Street toward Juan Street. The elongated attached wing of the building contained a single-lane bowling alley (Bevil 2014:19; Clement and Van Bueren 1993:30). A room also existed next to the saloon that served as an improvised bedroom (San Diego Herald 1855b). The San Diego Herald reported on June 2, 1855, that the saloon had caught on fire and been destroyed on May 29, 1855. The newspaper reported that “the entire wooden portion of the building was destroyed, together with a large stock of liquors, bar fixtures, furniture, and some valuable books and papers” (San Diego Herald 1855b). Lyons informed the newspaper that he intended to replace the building with an adobe house (San Diego Herald 1855b). Based on an 1874 photograph of Old Town and on the study by Zink (1969), a small adobe structure was rebuilt, and it occupied almost the same footprint as the original saloon portion of the business.

Land Use of Block 409 from 1873 to 1898

During the decline of Old Town, many buildings were left to decay as New Town developed. All of the structures constructed in the early 1850s on Block 45/409 were demolished between 1874 and 1893, including the Fitch store, the Strauss store, and Lyons’s Saloon and Bowling Alley. By 1893, a wood-framed residence had been constructed near the location of the Old Town water supply well, as identified by Zink (1969) (Figures 20-21) (Clement and Van Bueren 1993:30). No records of the demolition of the buildings have been found. The dates of the demolition are based on an examination of historic photographs of the Project area in 1874 and 1893 by Clement and Van Bueren (1993) and reexamined by ASM Affiliates. A lack of photographic and documentary evidence due to a transfer of documents from Old Town to New Town and the disastrous fire of 1872 limits the analysis of this period. In addition, given that many of the people associated with these properties had houses elsewhere and had many real estate properties in Old Town and New Town, it is highly likely that persons living on these properties were lessees. Records of these types were not kept consistently, and lessee information after 1868 is not available at the San Diego History Center.

---

14 On August 20, 1857, George Lyons operated a store on part of Lot 1, Block 44/426 that was disputed by Josepha Fitch and Reuben E. Raimond. Shortly after Raimond was granted part of that lot, he sold it to Andrew Cassidy, who in turn quickly conveyed the property (Brandes 1974:302).
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Figure 20. 1893 photograph showing the Project Area and a structure near the potential old well site as identified by Zink (1969).
*Courtesy of the San Diego History Center.*

Figure 21. 1898 photograph showing the Project Area and a structure near the potential old well site as identified by Zink (1969).
*Courtesy of San Diego History Center.*
In January 1876, James McCoy acquired all of Block 409 from William Evans\(^{15}\) (Kieley 2014; San Diego Deed Book 1876:27/212, 1881:40/248). The property changed hands several times from 1885 to 1889, passing from James McCoy to Ephraim W. Morse, from Morse and Thomas Whaley, and from Whaley and R. H. Dalton (Kieley 2014). In December 1897, R. H. Dalton and Carol Dalton sold the property to Mary Isabelle Davies, who quickly sold it to Winifred McCoy, the widow of James McCoy, in January 1898.

**James McCoy (1821-1895)**

James McCoy came to the United States from County Antrim, Ireland in 1842. He joined the military and moved to San Luis Rey in 1849, where he stayed for two years. He became the County Assessor in 1859 and in 1861 he was elected Sherriff. He and Winifred Kearny married in 1868; they did not have any children. McCoy continued to serve as Sheriff until 1871, when he became a state senator (Smythe 1908:279-280).

**Ephraim W. Morse (1823-1906)**

One of the earliest American settlers who moved to California from Massachusetts during the Gold Rush, he helped form a company that collectively funded the purchase of a ship for the purposes of trading. Most of the company’s associates were known personally to Morse and were teachers, like him, as well as farmers, carpenters, clerks, bookkeepers, bookbinders, masons, seamen, blacksmiths, geologists, sail-makers, joiners, traders, moulders, brass finishers, machinists, truckmen, laborers, curriers, civil engineers, shoemakers, tailors, chemists, harness-makers, saddlers, and weavers. Morse arrived in San Francisco in February 1849, and after hearing about San Diego, decided to continue south. He arrived in April 1850 with a stock of goods for a general store and a ready-framed house and established their home and store in Davistown, a small settlement on the San Diego Bay. Morse returned home to Massachusetts in 1851, during his stay he married, and he returned in 1852. A new opportunity presented itself in 1853 as Davistown dwindled. He partnered with Thomas Whaley and moved to Old Town, where they owned and operated a general merchandise store in one of the adobe buildings on the plaza. Three years later, the two dissolved their partnership and Morse left for Palomar to raise stock and farm for a time. When he returned, he took up his business as a merchant in the Louis Rose house and worked as an agent for Wells, Fargo and Company Express. He sold out of Old Town ventures in June 1869 and moved onto the burgeoning Horton’s Addition (New Town), where he thrived, aiding in the organization of the early banks, and was director and officer of the San Diego & Gila, among other railroad activities. He was part of the real estate firm of Morse, Noell\(^{16}\) & Whaley from 1880 to 1886, and for about a year longer of the firm of Morse, Whaley & Dalton (Smythe 1908:280-284).

**Thomas Whaley (1823-1890)**

In the summer of 1851, Thomas Whaley, a New Yorker living in San Francisco, facilitated the chartering of a vessel with a cargo of goods. Lewis A. Franklin and George H. Davis sailed the vessel down the California Coast to San Diego. They stayed in San Diego, and Thomas followed in October 1851. Whaley and Franklin opened the Tienda California. The store did not remain open long, and in April 1852, Whaley partnered and bought the interest of R. E. Raymond in the *Tienda General*. From that store, he and his partner, Jack Hinton, made a great deal of money. When Hinton retired in April, 1853, E. W. Morse joined the partnership, and Whaley also got married. Three years later, Morse retired, leaving Whaley the sole proprietor. Whaley also began making the first burnt bricks in San Diego County. He constructed his home and store in Old Town in 1857 using his own bricks. His short-lived mercantile business in 1858 was followed by his return to New York in 1859 for a time. He returned to San Diego, bringing capital and goods as well as E. W. Morse with him. The two partnered with Philip Crosthwaite, but the partnership was

---

\(^{15}\) Evans was born in England and was a trader in 1850 (United States Census 1850).

\(^{16}\) Charles Noell and Agostin Haraszthy who were two of the many owners of Middletown, the area between Old Town and New Town, the 687 acres granted in May 1850 (Smythe 1908:321-322).
short-lived despite their move to Horton’s Addition in 1870. From 1873 to 1878, Whaley lived in New York before again returning to San Diego, where he took up the real estate business with his long-time friend and partner, E. W. Morse. Shortly thereafter, Charles P. Noell joined them. R. H. Dalton bought out Noell in February 1886. Whaley retired in 1888 but owned significant properties in Old Town, new San Diego, and La Playa (Smythe 1908:290-292).

**Land Use of Block 409 from 1899 to 1910**

Winifred Kearny McCoy married Francis Murtha in 1899 or 1900 (Clement and Van Bueren 1993:30). The Murthas owned a large amount of property throughout San Diego, which they sold in various real estate transactions (Bevil 2014:16). They lived in a home in neighboring Block 408 (Bevil 2014:16). The Murthas retained ownership of Block 409 until they sold it to E. W. Akerman in September 1910.

Akerman co-owned an olive oil processing and pickling business, Akerman and Tuffley (Kieley 2014). The company was the only one of its kind operating in San Diego in 1901, and its operation was in Old Town. The firm did not exist in 1889-1900 (1899-1900 Directory; San Diego Directory Company 1901). By 1905, there were two oil and olive oil producers: Akerman and Tuffley operated in Old Town at the former Casa de Bandini/Cosmopolitan Hotel (2660 Calhoun Street), and Gifford’s Olive Works existed in New Town (Bevil 2014:14; Frye et al. 1905:600). Four years later, there were four operations that produced olive oil. The new companies were in National City and Alpine, and they only produced oil and did not pack olives. The olive oil producing operation in National City failed, and by 1910 there were only three companies (Frye et al. 1905:60; San Diego Directory Company 1910:695).

**Land Use of Block 409 from 1911 to 1950**

Akerman and Tuffley continued to operate their olive packing and oil producing operation in competition with Gifford’s Olive Works in New Town (San Diego Directory Company 1912:991, 1913:1319). The company soon outgrew the facilities at 2660 Calhoun Street and needed to expand (Bevil 2014:14). Sometime after purchasing the McCoy/Murtha property in 1910, the company began construction on its new operation at 4090 Wallace Street. In 1914, it had constructed a new factory (Bevil 2014:14). Figure 22 shows the two-story California Mission Revival-style factory that fronted on Juan Street, with an extension to Wallace Street that operated as a warehouse building. A loading ramp fronted on Juan Street. Along Calhoun Street was an elongated, roofed shed supported by posts that was later used as a semi-enclosed pimento factory. It is uncertain at what point in time the company began processing pimentos and whether that structure was used for processing olives and then pimentos. Another structure fronted on Juan Street in 1915, but in the photograph it is hidden behind a large tree (San Diego History Center 1915). Figure 23 shows an aerial view of the operations (Union Trust and Title Company 1916-1917).

In 1915, Akerman and Tuffley began operating under the name of Old Mission Brand California Olives and Olive Oil (Bevil 2014). In December 1919, E. W. Akerman sold the property to Rufus E. Eggelton, who sold it to the Old Mission Packing Corporation that same day (Kieley 2014). For a brief time during the 1918 influenza pandemic, the factory served as a hospital and mortuary. In 1920, the business was sold and transformed into the Old Mission Packing Corporation. In 1924, it was renamed the Old Mission Products Company, Inc. (Clement and Van Bueren 1993:30).
2.0 Historical Context

Figure 22. 1915 photograph showing the olive and olive oil-producing factory (at center) and elongated shed. *Courtesy of San Diego History Center.*

Figure 23. 1916-17 photograph showing the olive and olive oil producing factory (at center) and elongated, partially enclosed shed. View toward the southwest. *Courtesy of San Diego History Center.*
Figure 24 shows the Project area, now referred to as Block 4559 (previously 4025). It identifies the uses of the building, including the warehouse that fronted on Juan Street and included a concrete vault and the three-story tower, the packing facility, the olive crushing and pressing on the first floor, and the warehouse on the second floor. The elongated shed had become a factory where pimentos were cooked and canned. It had three walls and a roof supported by wood posts. The fourth side partially opened to the yard. The building worker’s locker room was an interior room. Secondary facilities existed as part of the operations, including several located mid-block at Calhoun Street: a brine house with an attached dwelling, adjacent bathroom, and an area for open barrel storage. A night watchmen worked the property. At the center of the property was a 288-square-ft. boiler room. A 2,500-gal. concrete fuel oil tank was sunk in the ground near that structure. A one-story auto garage existed at Juan Street, as did a two-story structure used for barrel storage. Adjacent to the building was a structure for housing paints, oil, and repair parts. A significant portion of the block along Taylor and Wallace Streets was undeveloped for the plant operations (Sanborn Fire Insurance Map Company 1921). By at least 1928, the open area along Wallace Street had become a garden area (Figure 25; see Figure 24) (Tax Factor 1928).

A 1928 photograph shows the Project area, now referred to as Block 4610 (previously 4559), and the Old Mission Packing Corporation Ltd. (Figure 26). The operations were largely the same, with the demolition of the boiler room, the 2,500-gal. underground tank, and the auto storage, barrel storage, and paints, oils, and repair parts structures off Juan Street. Another one-story auto storage structure existed off Calhoun Street. A watchman still worked at the factory. The northeast portion of the block was still not developed for the plant operations, but the yard was used to store brine olives in barrels (Sanborn Fire Insurance Map Company 1940). The 1940 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows the a few additions to the Old Mission Products Company complex, including the addition of a large single-story room to the back of the original olive processing factory, a new storage building, and a residence at 2840 Calhoun Street. Also, the use of the building at 2834 Calhoun Street was as a boiler room (Figure 27) (Sanborn Fire Insurance Map Company 1950).

In 1950, the entire block was sold to Caltrans for the construction of a new District 11 Office complex (Clement and Van Bueren 1993:30). Plans were set forth by the California State Division of Architecture, Department of Public Works, and Division of Highways to replace the existing 1938 Spanish/Mediterranean Revival style District 11 office. C.J. Paderewski, Mitchell & Dean, and Adrian Wilson were hired to design the new office building (Davis 2014). The former Caltrans District 11 office building was constructed in three phases: the first in 1953, another in 1958, and the final phase in 1964. From 1951 to 1953, the first section of the complex was constructed facing Taylor Street. The project was described by the Department of Public Works, Division of Highways as,

a new reinforced concrete office building having a three-story center section and three two-story wing sections; a new addition to a cafeteria building and remodeling of an existing building, a covered carport; a covered walk between office buildings and the cafeteria building and site work, grading paving, fending, electrical and mechanical services.

(Caltrans 2011)

Preparation of the site began in 1953 when M. M Golden began removing concrete slabs associated with the olive processing plant, the underground fuel storage tank, and mature eucalyptus and pepper trees on

---

17 Note the addresses associated with the operations: 2830 and 2840 Calhoun Street (pimento factory operations), 2825 Juan Street (olive factory operations), and 2849 Juan Street for the auto storage, barrel storage, and paints, oils, and repair parts.
18 Note the addresses associated with the operations: 2830, 2834, 2840, and 2876 Calhoun Street (pimento factory operations), 2875 Juan Street (olive barrels in yard), and 2825 Juan Street (olive processing factory).
Calhoun Street (Figures 28-30) (Sanborn Fire Insurance Map Company 1940). The first section of the building was completed by the summer of 1953. M.M. Golden was the general contractor, and J.M. Harlan was the overseer of the project. Paderewski was the principal architect on this phase and was responsible for this original design of the building. However, Paderewski, Mitchell, Dean and Wilson were not hired to design the later additions (Davis 2014).

In 1958, an addition was built along Calhoun Street. It was designed by Ell Hampton, Assistant State Architect of the California Department of Public Works, Division of Architecture, Los Angeles Branch. The final phase of the building complex was in 1964, when the need for additional space resulted in remodeling the building and adding office space along Wallace and Juan Streets. The 1964 remodel included nearly doubling the size of the existing office building complex; moving the main entrance from Taylor to Juan Street; creating an enclosed courtyard to the complex; reconfiguring landscaping and walkways; and providing interior access from each building addition throughout the entire complex. The architect in charge of the 1964 remodel was James A. Gillem, Assistant State Architect of the California Department of Public Works, Division of Architecture, Los Angeles Branch (Davis 2014).

The former Caltrans District 11 Building Complex was in use until 2006, when the new District 11 office was constructed across the street, and the building complex was left vacant (Davis 2014).

**Pepper Tree at Wallace Street**

A large pepper tree is currently located along the boundary of the Project area and Wallace Street approximately 80 ft. southwest of the intersection of Wallace and Juan Streets. The pepper tree was identified on the 1951 drawing (see Figure 29). A pepper tree is clearly evident in photographs taken in April 1898 (see Figure 21) and in 1915 from similar viewpoints (see Figure 22). However, it is not evident in a photograph taken in 1874 (see Figure 19). The tree was preserved both during the construction of the Caltrans building and by the City of San Diego during the paving of Wallace Street. It was likely associated with the Project area’s previous inhabitants and owners, and, given its size in the 1898 photograph, it likely predates the period of ownership by Francis D. and Winifred Murtha. It is likely associated with some owner of Lot 3, Block 409 between 1874 and 1898, who may have been William Evans, James and Winifred McCoy, Ephraim W. Morse, Thomas Whaley, R. H. and Carol Dalton, or someone who leased the property.
2.0 Historical Context

Figure 25. 1928 Tax Factor aerial showing the olive and olive oil-producing factory.

Figure 26. 1928 photograph of the olive and olive oil producing factory 6716-A. Courtesy of San Diego History Center.
Figure 27. 1940 Sanborn map of Block 4610 (previously 4559).
Courtesy of the Los Angeles Public Library.
Figure 28. 1950 Sanborn map of Block 4610. Courtesy of the Los Angeles Public Library.
Figure 29. 1951 Plot Plan drawing (Sheet 1 of 13) of the District XI Office Building.
Figure 30. 1958 Plot Plan (P1 of 4) drawing of the addition to the District XI Office Building. Prepared by the Department of Public Works, Architecture Division. December 12, 1958.
3.0 PREVIOUS STUDIES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides a brief summary of the record searches conducted at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and the San Diego Museum of Man for the Project and the correspondence with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Following is a summary of previous archaeological work in the vicinity of the Project area and a review of the claims that human remains have been previously uncovered within the Project area. Record search confirmations from the SCIC and the San Diego Museum of Man are included in Appendix A. Correspondence with the NAHC is included in Appendix B.

3.2 SCIC RECORD SEARCH RESULTS

A request for a records search of the SCIC’s files for the Project area and a 0.25-mi. radius surrounding it was submitted by ASM on August 5, 2014. The results of that records search were received on September 5, 2014. The results indicated that there are 43 cultural resources within 0.25 mi. of the Project area (Table 2). Only one of the cultural resources, SDI-14297, has been mapped within the boundaries of the project area. SDI-14297 is the Fitch House Site, and possibly contains the remains of the house; however, only a single privy has been identified during archaeological investigations (Felton 1996). While SDI-14297 has been mapped by the SCIC as slightly intersecting the Project area, the site record states that it is located on the western side of Calhoun Street, and not within the Project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Recorder/Year</th>
<th>Within Boundaries of the Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-37-012131</td>
<td>CA-SDI-12131</td>
<td>HP2. Single family property</td>
<td>Pierson 1992</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-013663</td>
<td>CA-SDI-13663</td>
<td>AH4. Trash scatter</td>
<td>Shultz 1993</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-013664</td>
<td>CA-SDI-13664</td>
<td>AH4. Trash scatter</td>
<td>Shultz 1993</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-013665</td>
<td>CA-SDI-13665</td>
<td>AH4. Trash scatter</td>
<td>Shultz 1993</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-013666</td>
<td>CA-SDI-13666</td>
<td>AH4. Trash scatter</td>
<td>Shultz 1993</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Previous Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Recorder/Year</th>
<th>Within Boundaries of the Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-37-014690</td>
<td>CA-SDI-14293</td>
<td>AP2. Lithic scatter, AP16. Other - shell</td>
<td>California Department of Parks &amp; Recreation 1996</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-014691</td>
<td>CA-SDI-14294</td>
<td>HP1. Unknown – Adobe Site</td>
<td>California Department of Parks &amp; Recreation 1996</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-014694</td>
<td>CA-SDI-14297</td>
<td>AH1. Unknown, AH4. Privy</td>
<td>California Department of Parks &amp; Recreation 1996</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-021853</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>HP2. Single Family Property – Whaley House City of San Diego Historical Site Board Register No. 24</td>
<td>City of San Diego n.d.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-027055</td>
<td>CA-SDI-17688</td>
<td>AH4. Trash scatter</td>
<td>EDAW 2005</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-027056</td>
<td>CA-SDI-17689</td>
<td>AH4. Trash scatter</td>
<td>EDAW 2005</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Recorder/Year</th>
<th>Within Boundaries of the Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-37-028238</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP34. Military property – Air Force Plant 19 City of San Diego Historical Site Board Register No. unknown</td>
<td>U.S. Navy, Department of Defense 2007</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-028431</td>
<td>CA-SDI-18352</td>
<td>HP39. Other – Presidio Park City of San Diego Historical Site Board Register No. 3</td>
<td>City of San Diego n.d.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-028444</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP21. Dam – Derby Dike City of San Diego Historical Site Board Register No. unknown California Historical Landmark #244</td>
<td>City of San Diego n.d.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-028502</td>
<td></td>
<td>HP40. Cemetery – Franciscan Gardens Site City of San Diego Historical Site Board Register No. 44</td>
<td>City of San Diego n.d.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-028573</td>
<td>CA-SDI-18383</td>
<td>AH2. Foundations</td>
<td>ASM Affiliates, Inc. 2007</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-028595</td>
<td></td>
<td>AH16. Other – Casa de Cota Site City of San Diego Historical Site Board Register No. 14b</td>
<td>2007 (Historic Preservation Dept.)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-028600</td>
<td>CA-SDI-18591</td>
<td>HP44. Adobe Building – Casa de Estudillo City of San Diego Historical Site Board Register No. 14a California Historic Landmark No. 53</td>
<td>State of California District Preservation Officer 2007, Department of Parks and Recreation 2008</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two hundred and three (203) cultural resource studies have been conducted within 0.25 mi. radius of the Project area, and of those studies, 12 took place within or intersect the Project area (Table 3). Previous cultural resource studies have addressed the entire Project area. While these 12 studies have addressed the Project area, the area has been completely developed since 1950, and none of the previous studies have addressed subsurface archaeology within the Project area.

Sixty-one historic addresses have been recorded within the 0.25-mi. record search radius around the Project area. Only one historic address, 0 Taylor Street, has been recorded on the block containing the Project area. 0 Taylor Street is described as Buildings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Taylor Street Annex. It is unclear if this refers to the former Caltrans District 11 Offices currently within the Project area.
### 3.0 Previous Studies

#### Table 3. Previous Studies Subsuming or Intersecting the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Archaeological Database Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1120639</td>
<td>Flower, Douglas, Darcy Ike, and Linda Roth</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Archaeological Investigation at Old Town San Diego State Historic Park Vol. 1 Historical Research and Field Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123283</td>
<td>Clement, Dorene and Thad N. Van Bueren</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Historic Architectural Survey Report and Historic Study Report for the Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, Old Town, San Diego City / County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123461</td>
<td>Kyle, Carolyn and Roxana L. Phillips</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Constraint Study for the North Bay Redevelopment Project City Of San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125596</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Mitigated Negative Declaration for Group Job 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127457</td>
<td>Kupel, Douglas E.</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>The Calhoun Street Parking Lot: A Historical &amp; Archaeological Investigation of Block 408 Old San Diego 11825-910065-5957005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131231</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Old Town – Estudillo House, Chapel of the Immaculate Conception, Gilla House Site, Whaley House, Exchange Hotel, Johnson House, Mason St. School, San Bias Bell, Exchange Hotel, Casa de Machado-Stewart, Casa de Machado-Silvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131232</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Old Town – Miscellaneous Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133195</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Disposal of the Former California Department of Transportation District Office Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133987</td>
<td>Prouty, Michael</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>An Archaeological Overview of the San Diego River Watershed, San Diego County, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134033</td>
<td>Pham, Angela and James Daniels</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>A Negative Monitoring Report Using the Archaeological Resources Report Form (Appendix D) for the Juan Street Rehabilitation Project, San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134242</td>
<td>Bonner, Wayne, Sarah Williams, and Kathleen Crawford</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Records Search and Site Visit Results For Sprint Nextel Candidate Sd40xc308 (Caltrans), 2829 Juan Street, San Diego, San Diego County, California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 SAN DIEGO MUSEUM OF MAN RECORD SEARCH RESULTS

A record search at the San Diego Museum of Man was conducted on September 17, 2014 by Karen Lacy. The record search identified 15 archaeological sites and 12 previous studies within a 0.25-mi. radius around the Project area (Table 4).

Of the 15 archaeological sites, none are located within or adjacent to the Project area. The exact location of W-291A, possibly the Village of Cosoy (Kosoi), has been debated, and is discussed in Chapter 2.
### Table 4. Record Search Results of Previously Recorded Sites from the San Diego Museum of Man

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum of Man Site Number</th>
<th>Corresponding Trinomial or Primary Number</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Recorder/Year</th>
<th>Within Boundaries of the Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W-291B</td>
<td>SDI-12469</td>
<td>Historic home locations, prehistoric temporary camp</td>
<td>Carrico and Clevenger 1991,</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-4709</td>
<td>SDI-4611</td>
<td>Seeley Stable Site</td>
<td>Germeshawn 1973</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-5490</td>
<td>SDI-9292</td>
<td>Franklin House</td>
<td>Woodward, Foster, Luberski, and Price 1981</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-5491</td>
<td>SDI-1213</td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow</td>
<td>Pierson 1992</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-54924</td>
<td>SDI-1182</td>
<td>Robinson-Rose Adobe</td>
<td>Colombo 1990</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-5880A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Historic refuse</td>
<td>Shultz 1993</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-5880B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Historic refuse</td>
<td>Shultz 1993</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-5881</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Historic refuse</td>
<td>Shultz 1993</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-5882</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Historic refuse</td>
<td>Shultz 1993</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-5883</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Historic refuse</td>
<td>Shultz 1994</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-6698</td>
<td>P-37-014247</td>
<td>Historic refuse</td>
<td>Van Wormer 1995</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-6715</td>
<td>SDI-14307</td>
<td>Adobe walls and foundations, historic refuse, wood frame house and cellar remains</td>
<td>Phillips and McHenry 1996</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-6737</td>
<td>SDI14527H</td>
<td>Aguirre Adobe, adobe building remains, historic structure, historic refuse</td>
<td>Gallegos and Associates 1997</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-6544</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Historic refuse</td>
<td>Cheever 1997</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Museum of Man had records of 12 cultural resources studies conducted within 0.25 mi. of the Project area. None of the studies have addressed the Project area directly (Table 5).

### Table 5. Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Studies Provided by the San Diego Museum of Man

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum of Man Report Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIS-210</td>
<td>Norris, Frank and Richard Carrico</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Historical Study of Proposed Old Town Square, San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS-984</td>
<td>Schaefer, Jerry</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Archaeological and Historical Investigations at El Campo Santo Cemetery and Mission Hills, San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS-1048</td>
<td>Mooney, Brian F.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Negative Declaration – Group Job No. 483, San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS-1130</td>
<td>Smith, Brian F.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Results of an Archaeological Study for the Old Town Commercial Project, San Diego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Previous Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum of Man Report Number</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIS-1163</td>
<td>Smith, Brian F., and Larry J. Pierson</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Results of an Archaeological Study for the Great Wall Café Project, San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS-1355</td>
<td>Mooney, Brian F.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Proposed North Metro Interceptor Sewer Project, San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS-1465</td>
<td>Robbins-Wade, Mary</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Sewer and Water Replacement Group Joh 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS-1481</td>
<td>Van Wormer, Stephen R.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Test excavations of the suspected location of the Juan Maria Marron Adobe, Old Town, San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS-1506</td>
<td>Kyle, Carolyn, et al.</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Historical / Archaeological Test for the Casa de Aguirre Adobe Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS-1610</td>
<td>Gallegos, Dennis, and Carolyn Kyle</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Historical / Archaeological Test for the Old Town Hitching Post Project A Portion of Lot 1 Block 481 (27), Old Town San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION RECORD SEARCH OF THE SACRED LANDS FILE AND CORRESPONDENCE

California State Parks requested a record search of the Sacred Land File (SLF) held at the NAHC on December 16, 2013. On December 19, 2013, the NAHC responded that the record search did indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural places within the Project area. State Parks held a Native American consultation meeting on February 26, 2014; 11 individuals representing seven bands and groups attended the meeting gave comments and voiced their concerns.

A request for a search of the SLF held by the NAHC was made by ASM on September 9, 2014. On September 15, 2014, the NAHC responded that the record search had failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources within the immediate project area. The NAHC provided a list of Native American individuals and organizations to contact for further information. ASM sent letters of inquiry to all of the recommended Native American contacts on September 22, 2014.

David Singleton, the former Director of the NAHC, responded, on September 9, 2014, that the Project area is sacred to the Kumeyaay, as it is near the ancient Village of Cosoy and burials have been reported. On September 25, 2014, Clint Linton, Director of Cultural Resources for the Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, responded that a Native American Monitor should be required for the Project, and that Carmen Lucas would be the most appropriate Native American Monitor for the Project. In addition, Mr. Linton stated that the Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (KCRC) should be named the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) for all human remains identified during the Project as being of Native descent. On September 30, 2014, Julie Hagen, the Environmental Coordinator for the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians, responded that the Project area has cultural significance or ties to Viejas and that the Viejas Band requested that a Native American Cultural Monitor be on site for initial ground-disturbing activities. To date, no additional responses have been received. All NAHC correspondence is provided in Appendix B.
3.5 SUMMARIES OF PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK WITHIN THE VICINITY OF THE PROJECT AREA

Numerous archaeological excavations and studies have taken place within the vicinity of the Project area. The results of these previous investigations can be used as a guide to the types and date ranges of possible archaeological deposits within the Project area, any preservation issues, and the possibility of discovering prehistoric artifacts including human remains. The studies summarized below are on file with the SCIC or with California State Parks’ Southern Service Center (SSC) in San Diego.

3.5.1 Old Town State Historic Park, Schematic Master Plan (Brandes 1974 and Brandes 1975)

The historic report by Brandes (1974 and 1975) provides historic details for many of the early developments within Old Town. Brandes states that the Fitch Property, the Project area, was granted to Fitch on June 6, 1846, and that Josefa Fitch laid out a garden adjacent to the Fitch Store. Fitch owned portions of all four lots on the block. Brandes reviews many of the land transfers involving the block, all of which are discussed in the Land Use History above.

Brandes also reviews the topography of Old Town and states that the earliest residents were able to obtain water from the San Diego River directly, as it flowed so close to the pueblo. The earliest recorded flooding of the San Diego River was in 1811, and additional floods took place between 1821 and 1825 and in 1839, 1840, 1855, 1857 and 1862 (Brandes 1974:322M). The 1862 flood greatly affected Old Town, and many structures were damaged.

Brandes describes excavations that took place adjacent to the Bandini House, on Block 41, two blocks east of the Project area. The research design for the excavations focused on learning about a wooden structure on the property in the 1870s. Much like the residence present in the current Project area in the 1890s, a wooden structure was identified on the property in historic photographs, but little historic information pertaining to the structure was found. The excavations revealed that the wooden building was likely the San Diego Fruit Store Building, which was constructed over a small adobe building which had been destroyed during the 1862 flood. The cobblestone foundation was probably part of the north wing of the Bandini House which was damaged in the 1862 flood and subsequently removed. Brandes states that fine sediment covers the property within this stratum, probably resulting from the 1862 flood. Such sediment is possibly present within the Project area as well.

Brandes also summarizes the excavation of the Bandini Plaza-Patio Fountain and Cistern, which is relevant to the one or possibly two wells present within the Project area. He states that the earliest wells dug by the Spanish extended to the water table at a depth of 25 to 40 ft. (Brandes 1974). He reports that the average elevation of Old Town is 25 to 28 ft. above sea level; however, the western side of Old Town, at the Project area, is only 0 to 8 ft. above sea level. In the summer months, the water table dropped below the depth of many of Old Town’s wells, and cisterns were constructed to save water during dry spells. The cisterns were also used for garden irrigation. The excavations identified the remains of the Bandini cistern at a depth of 28 in. below the surface. The cistern had a cobble foundation and was lined with adobe plaster. The cistern measured approximately 15 x 15 ft. (5 x 5 varas), and was by 9.5 ft. (3 varas) in depth or 5 by 5 by 3 varas.

3.5.2 The Calhoun Street Parking Lot (Kupel 1982)

Kupel’s 1982 report summarizes the land use history for Block 408 within the Calhoun Street parking lot, directly across Calhoun Street from the Project area. Kupel identified that there would likely be historically significant structures below the parking lot and that any work in the area would necessitate archaeological evaluations and data recovery. The buildings that were historically present, and possibly preserved...
3.0 Previous Studies

archaeologically include: the Fitch House, La Casa de Aguilar, La Casa de Osuna, Snook House, Snook-Silva Structures, Rose-Robinson Building, Little Plaza School, James McCoy House, Congress Hall, and McCoy Storeroom.

3.5.3 Archaeological Investigations at Old Town San Diego State Historic Park, Volumes I and II (Flower et al. 1982)

Flower, Ike, and Roth (1982) performed excavations throughout Old Town. The goals of their project were to establish the historical elevations of selected street grades and the plaza, identify the nature of archaeological deposits within selected utility trenches, provide management recommendations for archaeological deposits within Old Town, and assist in the historical interpretation of Old Town. Their investigations found numerous residential refuse deposits, dating from the 1850s to modern times, as well as cobble foundations. They were not able to identify the original street or plaza grades.

Flower and his associates (1982) found that the utility corridor between Wallace and Mason Streets had the greatest concentration of refuse deposits, wells, and privy pits. Such refuse deposits shed light on the differences between commercial and residential establishments and differences in socioeconomic status. In general, they found that it was standard for Old Town residents to deposit refuse surrounding their residences or places of business. Refuse spread across Old Town from the San Diego Presidio in a Successive System Process, and the refuse reflected behavioral changes between the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods. Flower and his associates did not find any deposits which were attributable to Native American habitation. Finally, they did identify that the western side of the utility corridor, the area closest to the current Project, contained less dense deposits than areas farther east in Old Town.

3.5.4 Old Town San Diego State Historic Park Entrance Redevelopment Project (Davis and Felton 1996)

Davis and Felton’s 1996 report compiles historic primary and secondary sources to provide a land use history of all of Block 408, approximately half of Block 407, and the western edge of Block 427, which is adjacent to the current Project area. Their historical review hypothesizes that significant archaeological remains will be located within their project area.

3.5.5 Archaeological Treatment Plan for the Entrance Redevelopment Project (Felton and Farris 1997)

An Archaeological Treatment Plan for the Entrance Redevelopment Project, Old Town San Diego State Historic Park was prepared by Felton and Farris in 1997. The Treatment Plan was prepared for Blocks 407, 408, and 427, to the southwest of the Project area. Extensive archaeological work and studies have been conducted within the Treatment Plan’s project area, which resulted in the identification of nine historic-period archaeology sites and one prehistoric archaeology site (Felton and Farris 1997). The treatment plan also focuses on the prehistoric, Spanish, and Mexican eras in Old Town, as little is known about these time periods.

Felton and Farris state that the exact location of the earliest Spanish settlement in San Diego, including the gardens associated with the mission and presidio, are unknown and were possibly within the Treatment Plan’s project area, immediately adjacent to the current Project area. In addition, the Treatment Plan’s project area contained buildings constructed throughout the 1800s, beginning in 1821, when the Carrillo/Fitch Adobe was constructed, followed by the Aguilar-Serrano Adobe in ca. 1827-1830, the Osuna Adobe prior to 1838, and an unidentified adobe ca. 1820s-1840s. Therefore, while there is no record of the current Project area having been developed prior to 1848, development began in the neighboring blocks over 20 years prior to that date. Felton and Farris also state that the earliest buildings within Old Town were not constructed within the street grid, which was put in place in the 1850s. Therefore it is possible that the
remains of the older buildings overlap with the current sidewalks and streets. The investigators also state that the early gardens, orchards, and grazing lands were located within the low-lying flood terrace of the river, which characterized the current Project area.

Evidence of Native American habitation, possibly prehistorically as well as during the historic period, was identified during excavations at the McCoy House, to the southwest of the Project area. Several hundred lithic artifacts as well as projectile points made of glass were uncovered during excavations for the McCoy House reconstruction (Felton and Farris 1997).

3.5.6 Reconstruction Archaeology at the Silvas-McCoy Site (Felton and George 1997)

Felton and George state that adjacent to the current Project area, during the excavations for the reconstruction of the McCoy House, overlapping foundations from both the McCoy House and an earlier adobe were identified. The adobe building had a foundation of kiln wasters, which might also be possible for the adobes within the Project area. In addition, within the property, over 20 small postholes were identified, which were likely used for the construction of covered ramadas to fully enclosed jacal buildings. No historic mention of such structures was found.

3.5.7 Old Town San Diego State Historic Park Entrance Redevelopment Project (Davis 1997)

Davis’s 1997 report analyzed the significance of the historic structures, historic archaeology sites and one prehistoric archaeology site within the Old Town San Diego State Historic Park Entrance Redevelopment Project area, which is adjacent to the current Project area. The prehistoric site, SDI-14293, consisted of three loci of lithic scatters and shell. The site was recommended not eligible. Eleven historical archaeology sites are within their project area and five historic structures. These are all listed or recommended eligible.

3.5.8 Archaeological Monitoring and Trenching for the Caltrans District 11 New Headquarters (Bowden-Renna and Dolan 2006)

The Archaeological Monitoring and Trenching for the Caltrans District 11 New Headquarters, (Blocks 4535, 4536, 4548, 4549, 4550, 4553, 4554, and 4556) San Diego, California Project (Bowden-Renna and Dolan 2006) was conducted by EDAW and consisted of preconstruction trenching and archaeological monitoring during construction on the western side of Taylor Street, across from the Project area. The EDAW project identified 66 historic features. Features located on the same block were combined into a single archaeological site, resulting in six separate archaeology sites. The 66 historic features consisted of 12 cisterns/wells, six metal or clay pipes, six concrete remains, nine burn areas, four modern features, 14 charred residential debris, three wood and/or brick remains, eight trash deposits, one bottle dump, one plastic and ceramic feature, and two remnant fence lines. The earliest features are a burn area dating from 1888 to 1950, eight brick-lined cisterns/wells dating from 1900 to 1940, a deposit of plaster and ceramics dating from 1900 to 1938, and residential debris dating from 1905 to 1964. The majority of the features date from 1930-1940. No prehistoric archaeological remains were identified. A large number of wells/cisterns were identified, which were possibly constructed by the San Diego Water Company, which owned part of the EDAW project area. Water from these wells was pumped to a reservoir, which was used throughout Old Town prior to the completion of the San Diego Flume in 1899. Surprisingly few artifacts were identified in the cisterns/wells, and it is possible that the wells/cisterns were connected to the early sewer system in the area in the 1920s. All of the features were determined to be not significant, with concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).
3.5.9 Historic-Period Lithic Technologies in Old Town San Diego
(Sampson and Bradeen 2006)

Sampson and Bradeen (2006) analyzed the flaked and ground stone lithic and glass artifacts from the 1990s excavations on Block 408. They identified intensive manufacture and use of traditional aboriginal tool types, from the Late Prehistoric Period, of locally available lithic raw materials. Sampson and Bradeen wanted to identify if the stone artifacts were part of the historic period artifact assemblages or were they from an earlier Late Prehistoric deposit. The excavations placed the flaked and ground stone artifacts in the historic era. Over 8,000 stone artifacts were identified during the excavations on Block 408; the largest percentage of stone artifacts came from the Silvas/McCoy Parcel. The stone artifact assemblage includes, flake tools, ground stone, cores, core tools, manos, projectile points, pieces of steatite, steatite bead, metates from non-local material, metates from local material, flaked glass artifacts and battered tools. The artifact collection of stone tools is consistent with lithic components of local Late Prehistoric Period archaeology sites. Sampson and Bradeen found that the local Kumeyaay people were likely responsible for the stone artifacts found within Block 408 and they represented a continuity of tradition from pre-contact contexts.

3.5.10 Archaeological Investigations in the Yard of Casa de Estudillo,
(Smith, Ruston, and Sampson 2009)

Smith, Ruston and Sampson conducted archaeological and documentation investigations for a restroom replacement in the yard of Casa de Estudillo. The excavations took place in the approximate location of a prior tool house. Previous archaeological excavations took place in the area in 1976. Casa de Estudillo was restored in 1909. Other previous excavations at Casa de Estudillo have identified a cobblestone foundation at approximately 1.2 ft. below the surface, a late-nineteenth-century trash deposit, 1.4 ft. below the surface and a trash pit dating to the 1909 restoration approximately 2.5 ft. below the surface. A Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) study was performed within the excavation area, in order to identify any potential for buried structures or features and was used to place the excavation units. Five units and two shovel test pits were excavated and resulted in 1,263 artifacts. No features were identified. Previous archaeological work stated that a large amount of fill had been placed within the Estudillo yard, but this project did not support that hypothesis. Construction monitoring of the restroom construction resulted in an additional 220 artifacts. The artifacts date from the Estudillo family occupation to the late twentieth century.

3.5.11 Testing Report and Data Recovery Program for the Juan Street Repavement Project (Davidson and McLean 2010)

LSA conducted an archaeological testing program for the Juan Street Repavement Project. They evaluated SDI-13655H, which contained historic ceramics, faunal materials, Native American style pottery, and metal and glass artifacts. The artifact deposit was dated from the 1850s to the early 1900s. It also represented a substantial Native American presence in the area, with a possibly flaked glass artifact, Tizon Brownware, and two bone awls/needles. SDI-13665H was found to contain intact subsurface deposits and was recommended eligible for listing to the CRHR. A data recovery program and construction monitoring were recommended, if that site was not avoided by project design changes.

3.5.12 Results of Soil Core Sampling for the Juan Street Repave Project
(McLean 2012)

LSA performed soil core sampling to identify if the remains of the Soto House Adobe were present within the project area. Four soil cores were taken. The results were negative, and no evidence of human occupation was identified within the soil cores.
3.5.13 Native American Participation in the Casa de Bandini Household
(Schaefer 2012)

Schaefer identified archaeological evidence of local Kumeyaay Indians during excavations in the Casa de Bandini, including Tizon Brown Ware ceramics and milling equipment. Schaefer reports that Tizon Brown Ware is commonly found in Mexican and early American era Old Town household debris, and elsewhere in San Diego County. The ceramic artifacts identified in the Casa de Bandini collection are similar to those constructed prehistorically; however the vessel walls appear to be thicker with more rounded lip profiles. The pottery appears to only be used in large mouthed jars and bowls and globular round bowls. Other ceramic types were replaced by historic ceramics. The milling tools found in Casa de Bandini represent both local materials and tools imported from Mexico. Lithic debitage, a late stage biface core, cores, retouched flakes and one hammer stone were also identified in the excavations. A ceramic disk with ground edges, a possible gaming piece or a jar stopper was found and attributed to Native American inhabitants of the Casa de Bandini. One Olivella shell bead and numerous glass trade beads were also identified as being Native American in origin. Most of the artifacts associated with the Native American inhabitants were identified in the kitchen area.

3.5.14 Cultural Resources Monitoring Report for Rehab Activities
(Roy 2014)

This monitoring Project took place at the intersection of Taylor and Juan Streets. All work took place within Taylor and Juan Streets, within previously excavated gas line trenches. No cultural resources were identified.

3.5.15 Therese Muranaka, Ph.D., former State Parks Archaeologist,
Personal Communication, September 19, 2014

Muranaka stated that midden was identified under the Padre Trail Inn during its construction. However, recent construction monitoring of the demolition of the Padre Trail Inn and grading of the parcel failed to identify any prehistoric materials (Daniels and Ní Ghabhláin 2014).

In addition, Muranaka stated that Calhoun Street has been previously graded and 3 ft. of deposit was removed from the surface, which lowered the ground surface below the Mexican-era archaeological deposits. During the grading, the remains of the Aguilar, Osuna, Fitch and Snook/Clayton houses were identified. In addition, within the Calhoun Street Parking Lot, southwest of the Project area, Mexican-era archaeological deposits, include house foundations, are preserved directly under the asphalt.

3.6 REPORT OF HUMAN REMAINS IDENTIFIED DURING THE
CONSTRUCTION OF THE 1953 CALTRANS DISTRICT 11 BUILDING

Oral accounts have reported that at least one Native American cremation in an olla was identified and removed during the 1953 construction of the Caltrans Building. ASM attempted to identify the validity of these accounts, and identify the possibility of additional cremations being disturbed during the Project.

Individuals contacted in regards to these accounts include: Therese Muranaka Ph.D., former California State Parks Archaeologist; Martin Rosen, former Caltrans Archaeologist; David Singleton, former NAHC Director; Nicole Turner, California State Parks Archaeologist; Karen Lacy, Collections Manager at the San Diego Museum of Man; and Jamie Lennox, Collections Manager at the South Coastal Information Center and San Diego State University. Research into the oral accounts of the discovery of human remains was conducted at the San Diego History Center, including a search of San Diego newspapers.
No official records regarding the human remains were identified. However, email communication from Therese Muranaka states that the accounts of the human remains came from June Redding in 1971 to Dr. Muranaka directly. Redding, who was at the time the Director of the Whaley House Museum, witnessed that the construction crew unearthed a human cremation in an olla during construction of the building in 1953. Muranaka did not recall if Redding witnessed the unearthing of a single cremation or three cremations. Redding reported that the remains were in an olla, that there was not a metate over the olla, and there was no treatment at the neck of the olla. There is no record what was done with the remains after they were removed.

David Singleton, via email, reported that the Project area and vicinity is sacred to the Kumeyaay, who believe that it is the ancient site of the Village of Cosoy. He stated that burials in the area have been reported to the San Diego County Medical Examiner and that Tony Pinto, then Chair of the Ewiaapaayp Band of the Kumeyaay was named the MLD in 1990.

The site form for W-291 provided by the San Diego Museum of Man states that “when the Inland Highway Bridge was built most of Kosoi was pulled down into the river bed to form the southern approach. City Engineers told me that in making this fill six Indian burials were scraped out” (Rogers n.d.). This report further documents the presence of human remains within the vicinity of the Project area, however it is unknown which bridge, presumably spanning the San Diego River, Rogers is referring to.

The location of the western portion of the Project area within the bed of the San Diego River prior to the channelization of the river, and the entire Project area within the alluvial floodplain of the river does not preclude the possible presence of prehistoric subsurface deposits. In the past, monitoring within the San Diego River floodplain has identified significant prehistoric deposits buried under fluvial sediments (Schaefer 1997). Muranaka stated that midden was also identified under the Padre Trail Inn, across Taylor Street, from the Project area, and also within the San Diego River bed, during its construction (Muranaka, personal communication 2014).

In addition, Muranaka stated that soil from Presidio Hill was used to flatten Taylor Street. It is possible that prehistoric artifacts were present in this soil and were therefore secondarily deposited in the vicinity of the Project area.
4.0 RESEARCH DESIGN

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Following the establishment of Old Town San Diego State Historic Park (OTSDSHP) in 1968, archaeological investigations focused primarily on structural restoration and development of project-specific land use histories. Early studies addressed the Machado-Silvas Adobe (Wallace 1973); the Casa de Rodriguez (Brandes and Moriarty 1973; Roth and Berryman 1984); the Casa Machado-Wrightington House (Brandes and Moriarty 1977; the José Manuel Machado Adobe and the Francisco María and Tomasa Alvarado houses (Flower et al. 1982); and the Light-Freeman Adobe and American Hotel site, the U.S. House, and the Courthouse (Luberski and Schulz 1987). Most of these early studies took place to investigate recorded building locations and to re-locate foundations as a first step in reconstruction projects. For the most part, the early studies focused on American-period structures and artifact collections. While these studies played an important role in the development of OTSDSHP, the limitations of the early archaeological studies have been recognized:

Much of the archaeological work here and elsewhere in Old Town San Diego State Historic Park (SHP) was conducted in direct response to development activities, including reconstruction, transportation and parking improvements. In such instances, initial archaeological objectives are often highly particularistic; Are archaeological resources present? Where and how big was the building? How thick were the walls and of what were the foundations made? Were there any property line walls between parcels? Who were the property owners? Problems and limitations of development-driven historical archaeological research have been pointed out often (Barker et al. 1995:12-13, 20-21; Theodoratus Cultural Research 1980:58). An archaeologist might successfully address site-specific issues to project planners’ satisfaction while neglecting much of the information potential of resources that were not of immediate concern to the project. While it is important not to minimize the utility and interpretive potential of particularistic architectural and spatial data, it is clear that extracting other kinds of information from the archaeological and archival records requires a more comprehensive approach; such an approach must include an understanding of historic context and current social history and material culture research trends [Felton and Farris 1997:7].

Archaeological investigations for the Entrance Development Project, located at the northwestern corner of Old Town, immediately south of Block 409, included an explicit research design addressing research themes and questions relevant not only to this particular project but also to Mexican-period studies in the region (Felton and Farris 1997). This study investigated the James McCoy house site with the intention of recovering data relevant to the reconstruction of the 1869 McCoy house for use as an interpretive center. The rigorous methods employed in the excavation, together with extensive historical research and specialist studies of the artifact collections, have generated substantive research that promises to address important regional research issues (Davis et al. 1997; Farris 2006; Felton 1995; Felton and Farris 1997; Sampson and Bradeen 2006).

4.2 THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

The household is the basic unit of analysis in this type of archaeology. A household is defined as a domestic residential group consisting of the inhabitants of a dwelling or set of dwellings that is identified as a discrete group in historical records. The household can include a single person living alone or a nuclear or extended family, or it may be the unrelated residents of a boarding house or hotel. It includes all the residents who
may have contributed to the artifact deposits within the defined property boundaries (Beaudry 1984; Deetz 1982; Henry 1987a, 1987b; King 2006; Spencer-Wood 1987b:2). Analysis of larger deposits that are not directly associated with a known household, such as neighborhood dumps, define broader demographic patterns (Van Wormer 1996a).

The documentary record available to historical archaeologists makes it possible to define, with some level of accuracy, the composition of individual households, including ethnicity, class, occupation, and income level. As Felton and Farris pointed out, comprehensive social and family histories are a critical component in the interpretation and analysis of the archaeology of individual households and, on the aggregate scale, of the community. The quality and range of historical documentation vary widely, however. One reason the Mexican period between 1822 and 1846 has been relatively neglected in research and interpretation at OTSDSHP in comparison with the American period is the greater availability of documentary sources from the American period (Felton and Farris 1997:8; Williams and Newlands 1996). Documentary history and archaeology, in combination with oral history, have the potential to generate data to address important research questions that may not be adequately addressed by either discipline independently (Wilke 2006:47). The archaeological record can provide information on all levels in society from the most influential and wealthy to the least visible members of society in terms of the documentary sources, including working-class and ethnic households, indigenous populations, laborers, women, and children.

Functional pattern analysis and consumerism studies provide a theoretical background appropriate for the analysis of historical archaeological assemblages that reveal broad trends and patterns that testify to underlying processes influencing human behavior (Spencer-Wood 1987b). The focus of functional pattern analysis is on identifying key differences or similarities between social groups. Stanley South first developed a methodology for identifying functional artifact patterns (called profiles) for pre-Civil War sites in the eastern United States, using a classification system with eight artifact groups (South 1977). Later studies expanded South’s classification system to account for the greater complexity of a consumer-oriented culture that developed by the end of the nineteenth century (Phillips and Van Wormer 1991; Van Wormer 1996a, 1996b; Van Wormer and Schaefer 1991).

Analysis of archaeological assemblages using functional pattern analysis can result in the identification of specific behavioral patterns. Assemblages from temporally and spatially discrete deposits such as trash pits, privies, cisterns, and wells can be associated with specific households, thereby permitting comparisons in consumer behavior across socioeconomic lines and between different ethnic groups. The success of functional pattern analysis depends on the availability of data from a range of site types, thereby allowing cross-site comparisons.

Consumer studies indicate that consumers make purchases based not just on functional considerations but for cultural reasons. People use material cultural to define their affiliation with certain social groups, whether defined by class, ethnicity, gender, or status. Archaeological studies of consumer patterns have found strong correlations between socioeconomic status, ethnic affiliation, gender, economic roles, and household composition and the consumer patterns discernible in the types of artifacts recovered from archaeological deposits.

Several methodologies have been developed to analyze consumer behavior, including economic indexing, consumption pattern analysis, and dietary studies. George Miller developed an economic index for ceramic tableware based on the relative cost of different wares as recorded in catalogs and bills of sale (Miller 1980). Susan Henry later refined Miller’s ceramic index to include the wider range of ceramics available in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Henry 1982, 1987b, 1991). Building on these indices, Suzanne Spencer-Wood and others have identified consumer-choice profiles (Spencer-Wood 1987a, 1987b; Spencer-Wood and Heberling 1987). Similar indices have been developed for faunal remains, including
Research Design

4.3 RESEARCH THEMES FOR OTSDSHIP

Felton and Farris (1997), in their research design for the Entrance Redevelopment Project, identified three broad research domains appropriate to Old Town: Reconstructing Community and Settlement Patterns, Architecture, and Artifacts and Economy. They cautioned that these were not independent domains, but that research issues could span several of these domains.

This research design draws on Felton and Farris’s research design, expanding on the research themes and property types to include all periods of use recorded for Block 409, including Transitional period (1846-ca. 1856), Early American period (ca. 1856-1872), Decline of Old Town (1872-ca. 1910) and Industrial and Tourism (ca. 1910-1950s) periods. While there was no recorded development on Block 409 prior to the construction of the Fitch store and residence, this research design also includes research questions relating to Native American prehistoric use of the study area and possible Mexican-period (1822-1846) land use, as cultural deposits and structures relating to these periods may be encountered during construction monitoring. Although the primary interpretive period for OTSDSHIP is 1822-1872 (Helmich and Clark 1991), deposits and structures associated with the Old Mission Packing Corporation plant are likely to be encountered during construction monitoring. Research themes and research questions are provided to address evaluation of deposits and features associated with the industrial use of the property.

4.3.1 Reconstructing Community and Settlement Patterns

Native American Settlement Patterns

The exact location of the ethnohistoric village of Cosoy is unknown. Bancroft identified Cosoy as the location at which the presidio was established (1886:137). Clement and Van Bueren (1993:12) have suggested that the Charles H. Brown site, east of the Presidio, is the most likely location for the village while Schaefer et al. (1993) argue that the village site was a large area extending from south of Old Town to Presidio Hill and into Mission Valley “that included activity loci beyond the major center of population aggregation”. The Heron Site (CA-SDI-14152), discovered under 3 m of alluvium in the lower San Diego River valley, is thought to be a part of a complex of sites that made up the prehistoric antecedent to the ethnohistoric village of Cosoy (Schaefer 1997).

Block 409 was located within the floodplain of the San Diego River. Between 1825 and 1877 when its course was permanently diverted, the river flowed immediately west and south of Old Town. In the 1850s, prior to the construction of the Derby Dike, the river bank extended through the middle of Block 409. The river bed at that point was a sand-filled channel, but it is likely that marsh and mud flats environments formed in the river channel near Old Town when the river emptied into Mission Bay. These environments would have represented an attractive source of food and other resources to Native Americans living in the vicinity. Excavations conducted on adjacent blocks 407 and 408 in the 1990s resulted in the identification of several deposits interpreted as Late Prehistoric shellfish processing sites. A samples of shell submitted from one deposit on Block 407 yielded a radiocarbon determination of 290 ±70 B.P. (calibrated to A.D. 1490-1659) (Davis et al. 1997:21).

An oral account of the discovery of at least one Native American cremation in an olla during the 1953 construction of the Caltrans Building raises the possibility of the presence of Native American cremations on Block 409. Rogers (n.d.) also recorded that portions of W-291 (the possible site of the village of Cosoy) were used as fill in the river bed when the “Inland Highway Bridge” was constructed and that City engineers reported to him that in making this fill six Indian burials were scraped out. Given the previous construction-related disturbance on Block 409, the potential for the disturbance of human remains is slight, but the...
possibility of such a discovery remains. The treatment of human remains must comply with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code 7050.5 (see Section 5.2).

**Research Questions**

- Is there any evidence of Native American occupation or exploitation of resources on Block 409?
- What kinds of resources were being exploited?
- What activities took place on site?
- Was site use related to short-term resources processing and/or collection, or related to a temporary camp or longer occupation?
- When was the site occupied? Are materials present to provide radiocarbon dating samples?

**Spanish-period Land Use (1769-1821)**

Bancroft recorded that a temporary camp was established by the Portolá expedition near the San Diego River at the base of Presidio Hill

at what is now Old, or North San Diego, at the foot of the hill on which are still to be seen the remains of the old presidio. Here camp is pitched and fortified a corral for the animals and a few rude huts are built. …The immediate purpose is that the camp may be near the river… For six weeks officers, priests, and soldiers are occupied in attending the wants of the sick and unloading the San Antonio [Bancroft 1886:133-134, quoted in Felton and Farris 1997:12].

It is unlikely that remnants of the Portolá temporary camp will be encountered during construction activities on Block 409, since the camp was transitory and any remains are likely to be ephemeral at best, but the possibility must be raised, given the proximity of the project site to the river bank. Repeated flooding of the site area also reduces the potential for remnants of the camp to remain.

The river terrace is likely to have been used after the presidio and mission were established. The area may have been used for grazing livestock, cultivation of gardens and orchards, and as a source of raw materials for construction, particularly sand, gravel, and clay. Some industrial processing, including shaping adobe brick and roof tile and firing roof tile, may have taken place adjacent to the river.

**Research Questions**

- Is there any evidence of temporary buildings/shelters associated with the Portolá temporary camp? Evidence might take the form of stakes or postholes, fire pits or hearths, and a sparse scatter of historic artifacts.
- What form did temporary shelters take?
- Is there any evidence of contact between the Portolá expedition members and Native Americans? Evidence of contact might include presence of trade beads or native artifacts.
- Were industrial activities carried out within Block 409 prior to the establishment of Old Town, such as the production of adobe brick and roof tile?
- Is there any evidence for irrigation or cultivation?
- Were early wells excavated on Block 409 prior to site development?

**Mexican-period Land Use (1821-1846)**

There are no documented structures present on Block 409 that predate the construction of the Fitch store in 1848. However, excavations on adjacent Block 408, in association with the reconstruction of the 1869 McCoy House, uncovered not only the foundations of the McCoy House but also the foundations of an earlier Mexican-period adobe thought to have been associated with María Eugenia Silvas, in addition to a
series of postholes suggestive of ramada-type, jacal, or temporary structures. The Mexican-period structures were associated with artifact deposits dating to the 1830s and 1840s, including British earthenwares, Chinese porcelains, and smaller quantities of Mexican majolica (Felton and George 1997).

The potential for Mexican-period structures on Block 409 is judged to be low, given the fact that the edge of the San Diego River cut through the middle of the block into the 1850s. A river embankment was constructed during the Mexican period to provide some protection from flooding to nearby residences. However, the proximity of residential buildings on the adjacent block during the 1820s-1840s raises the possibility that the land close to the river may have been used for dumping refuse from nearby dwellings, either as sheet trash or within trash pits.

The land adjacent to the river was also used to cultivate orchards and crops. Evidence of gardening may be identified by the presence of irrigation features. Evidence of temporary or ramada-type structures associated with short-term occupation or gardening activities is also possible on Block 409. At least one well is recorded from the 1850s on Block 409. Its location adjacent to the river bank would have made Block 409 also a likely location of a well during the Mexican period.

**Research Questions**

- Is there evidence for repeated flood episodes on Block 409?
- Were flood-control measures, such as the river embankment, successful in reducing flooding episodes?
- Were attempts to reclaim land on Block 409 made during the Mexican period? Evidence of efforts at reclamation may have taken the form of flood protection measures and drainage works.
- Were industrial activities, including production of adobe brick and roof tile, carried out within Block 409 during the Mexican period?
- Is there any evidence for irrigation or cultivation of orchards or gardens?
- Were wells excavated on Block 409 during Mexican period?
- Is there any evidence of Mexican-period structures in Block 409? If structures were present, were they temporary structures or long-term residential structures?
- Was the area adjacent to the river bank used for dumping during the Mexican period? Evidence for dumping may take the form of sheet trash or excavated trash pits.

**Transitional and American Periods (1846-1872)**

Development on Block 409 began around 1848 with the construction of the Fitch store and residence at the corner of Fitch/Calhoun Street and Wallace/Washington Street on Lot 4. A second phase of construction was completed by 1855, creating an L-shaped, two-story adobe structure (Figure 31). A long porch extending down the length of the building was completed in 1852. The store occupied the ground floor, and the Fitch residence was on the second story of the building. A corral, enclosed by what appears to have been an adobe wall, surrounded the property. Josepha Carrillo de Fitch’s garden may have extended from the corral to the river embankment. Several ancillary buildings may have been present on the Fitch property. The nature of these buildings is unknown, but they likely included one or more privies, a well house, storage structures, or sheds.

The Strauss Dry Goods store (Strauss store) was constructed prior to 1852. This store was also a two-story adobe building. A residence was constructed shortly afterward. By 1867, when Strauss leased a portion of Lot 3 to Henry Hancock, a store, house, warehouse, and other ancillary buildings were present (San Diego Deed Book 1867b:2/324). A walled or fenced enclosure is not visible in photographs or maps showing the Strauss store, but it is likely that some form of property boundary existed, separating the store from the adjacent bowling saloon. Other structures on the property likely included one or more privies, refuse pits, and a well or cistern.
Figure 31. Structures present within the Project Area from 1848-1872.
The original Lyons Bowling Saloon (constructed in 1853) consisted of a one-story adobe building, the saloon, with an attached wood-frame bowling alley. After the bowling alley burned to the ground in 1855, Lyons rebuilt it in adobe. The saloon was likely associated with one or more privies and trash deposits, the latter possibly deposited in trash pits. Sheet trash and bottle caches were likely associated with the saloon.

One or two wells may be located toward the middle of the block, near the river embankment. The wells may be cobble-lined. Evidence for the 15-ft.-high river embankment may be recovered, although this was likely graded for the construction of the Old Mission Packing Corporation structures.

With regard to the likely survival of archaeological structures and deposits, the Fitch store was located underneath one of the former Caltrans buildings, while much of the corral is sealed underneath an asphalt parking lot. Recovery of archaeological features is possible in this location, as this area was not developed with Old Mission Packing Corporation buildings. Remnants of the foundations of the Strauss store may survive near the intersection of Wallace and Juan Streets, an area that is currently landscaped. The location of the Lyons’ Bowling Saloon is partially under the former Caltrans building, but remnants of the building foundations may survive adjacent to Wallace Street.

Felton and Farris point out the importance of establishing the exact orientation of historic building foundations in Old Town, recognizing that historic plat maps tended to “straighten up” the orientation of buildings to fit the superimposed street grid. The actual orientations of Mexican-period building foundations were often askew relative to the American-period street grid. Similarly, property boundaries were also frequently not perpendicular to the street. Establishing the correct orientation of foundations and property boundaries is key to establishing the association of archaeological features and deposits with known households (Felton and Farris 1997:15).

- Did the placement of Transitional-period buildings reflect the American-imposed street grid, or were they aligned with regard to topography or other environmental variables?
- Were the Transitional-period buildings aligned with respect to a preexisting Mexican street pattern?
- Can property boundaries be established or clarified based on archaeological evidence? Property deeds of the Transitional period do not provide detailed descriptions of the boundaries of properties. Property boundaries may take the form of adobe walls, cobblestone walls, or wooden fence-lines.
- The Fitch property appears to have been enclosed by an adobe wall, creating a corral. Does any evidence for this enclosure exist? Is there evidence of similar enclosures around the Strauss property or the Lyons property?
- Josepha Carrillo de Fitch was praised by local residents for the garden she cultivated (Hayes 1929:302). The exact location of this garden is unknown, as the Fitch family also owned property on Block 408. Is there any evidence for cultivation of a garden or orchard on the Fitch property adjacent to the river embankment? Evidence for a garden might include irrigation ditches.

Decline of Old Town (1872-1910)

All of the structures constructed in the early 1850s on Block 409 were removed sometime between 1874 and 1893. Contemporary accounts indicate that buildings were often left to decay, eventually collapsing. Once the roof of an adobe building is gone, the walls of the adobe decay quite rapidly. By 1893, all previous buildings on the block had been removed or decayed in place, and a wood-framed building had been constructed. The exact location of this building is unknown, although it appears to have fronted on Calhoun Street, toward the center of the block (Figure 32). The family associated with this building is also not known, as the property changed hands several times in the years prior to 1893.
Figure 32. Structures present within the Project Area from 1873-1910.
Remnants of foundations of this building may remain together with associated structures such as a well and/or cistern, privy, and trash pits. The location of this structure appears to have been under the south wing of the former Caltrans building.

**Research Questions**

- Can the location of the wood-framed residence on Block 409 be confirmed?
- Can property boundaries associated with the residence be established?
- Is there evidence for cultivation on the remainder of Block 409 during this period of decline?

**Old Mission Packing Corporation (1911-1950)**

Akerman and Tuffley had constructed their Old Mission Packing Corporation olive processing plant by 1914. The two-story California Mission Revival-style factory fronted on Juan Street, with an extension on Wallace Street that operated as a warehouse building (Figure 33). A roofed shed supported by posts on Calhoun Street was later used as a semi-enclosed pimento factory.

Archaeological features associated with this olive factory may include remnants of the concrete foundations of the olive processing plant, the pimento processing factory and warehouse, storage barrels, possible foundations and remnants of a steam engine, fuel tanks, caches of olive and pimento bottles and jars, and trash deposits associated both with the business and the workers employed on site. The concrete foundations of the Old Mission Packing Corporation buildings were likely removed prior to the construction of the Caltrans building in 1953, as indicated on the plot plans for the proposed construction (see Figure 29). Only deeply buried features of the Old Mission Packing Corporation plant are likely to survive. These may include remnants of the 1910s steam engine and possibly trash pits or bottle caches.

**4.3.2 Architecture**

The recovery and careful documentation of building foundations and other architectural features is an essential first step in the reconstruction of historical buildings for historic interpretation purposes, which is one of the principal objectives of OTSDSPH. The archaeological recovery and analysis of architectural remains can provide valuable data on historic building methods and technology that are often not provided by documentary sources.

**Research Questions**

- Were any Spanish- or Mexican-period structures constructed on Block 409?
- What types of traditional non-adobe Spanish/Mexican buildings were present, if any? Palisade (*palizado*), and wattle and daub (jacal), construction has been documented, often for temporary structures prior to the construction of more permanent buildings. These temporary structures were roofed with grass or mud (Bancroft 1886:203-204; Felton and Farris 1997:18).
- Excavation on Block 408 for the McCoy house reconstruction uncovered a series of postholes capped by deposits containing 1830s and 1840s artifacts that were interpreted as the remains of temporary shelters, ramadas, or a corral fence (Felton and Farris 1997:19; Felton and George 1997). Is there evidence for similar structures on Block 409? Any evidence for postholes, particularly associated with artifacts dating to before 1820, should be carefully investigated.
Figure 33. Structures present within the Project Area from 1911-1950.
4.0 Research Design

- What types of foundations were used for the adobe buildings on Block 409? Stream cobbles were the traditional material used for foundations of adobe buildings in San Diego. Some variations in foundation types have been observed in Old Town. There is evidence that some 1850s adobe buildings in Old Town were constructed without any foundations; an example is the Rose-Robinson Adobe (Schulz et al. 1987:12). Substantial cobblestone foundations were used in the construction of the Bandini House (Schaefer et al. 2015:27-45; Turner 2012:90). Excavations for the McCoy reconstruction uncovered evidence that floor and roof tile kiln wasters were placed in a shallow trench in place of river cobbles to serve as foundations (Felton 1995:20-21). Felton hypothesized that a tile manufacturing operation was located in the vicinity of Block 408, and that wasters from a dump associated with the operations may have been used as a matter of convenience on the part of the builder.
- What measures, if any, did the business owners and resident on Block 409 take to prevent flooding of their properties? Were embankments constructed surrounding their properties? Were substantial cobblestone foundations or other foundations constructed to raise the level of their buildings?
- How did the architecture of the Fitch and Strauss stores/residences compare with the construction techniques and layout of residential buildings in Old Town of the same period? Was more money invested in commercial buildings than in residential buildings?
- Was the Lyons Bowling Saloon distinctive in terms of layout and construction techniques compared to the Fitch and Strauss stores? Was the Bowling Saloon actually rebuilt in adobe after the fire of 1855?
- Was the ca. 1880s wood-frame residence built on a foundation? If so, what type of foundation was used?
- If foundations of the Old Mission Packing Corporation survive, what types of foundations were used? How does the layout of the buildings compare with that recorded by the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps?

4.3.3 Artifacts and Economy

Acculturation, Adaptation, and Cultural Persistence

The local Kumeyaay population is almost invisible in the historical record of Old Town. Recent archaeological research has provided insights into the contributions made by the local indigenous population to the local economy and social structure. Early research reports from Old Town questioned whether the Native ceramics were truly from historic contexts, but the weight of evidence from recent excavations leaves no doubt that the Native American ceramics, milling equipment, and flaked lithic artifacts indicate a strong Native American presence in Old Town from the Mexican period through the Transitional and American periods (Barter and Felton 2005; Barter et al. 2014; Felton 2006; Sampson and Bradeen 2006; Schaefer 2012).

Farris (2006) has suggested that some former Mission Indians sought work in Old Town after the secularization of the missions in 1834-1835, while others found work on ranchos or joined Indian rancherias. Farris found 26 Indian servants and their families attached to 13 households in the 1836 census of Old Town. Indian servants included housemaids, nannies, and gardeners. Cooks were often male. Work performed by household servants included cooking, grinding corn and grain, slaughtering animals, and collecting firewood. The presence of Indian servants in Old Town households continued well into the American period. The 1860 census identifies approximately 28 Indian servants, many of them children and teenagers. They are identified by the fact that they were born in California and are listed under first name only (Farris 2006; Schaefer 2012:138).
Over 20,000 Tizon Brown Ware sherds, approximately two-thirds of the ceramic assemblage, were recovered from excavations of the María Eugenia Silvas Adobe on Block 408. In their analysis of the Native American ceramics, Barter et al. (n.d.?) investigated the possibility that at least some of the materials might reflect introduced historic traditions from Mexico. Careful analysis of vessel form, manufacturing methods, and paste composition confirmed that the brown wares recovered reflect a continuation of prehistoric ceramic traditions and not an introduction of historic traditions from Mexico (Barter and Felton 2005; Barter et al. 2014.; Felton 2006). Subtle changes in the ceramics were detected, however, suggesting some degree of acculturation and adaptation. A larger percentage of vessels were used for cooking, a lower percentage of sherds were decorated, and there were some indications of thicker vessel walls, suggesting a declining level of craftsmanship. A small number of Mexican-style vessels were produced using traditional Native American pastes and methods (Barter et al. 2014.).

Jerry Schaefer’s analysis of Native artifacts recovered from excavations at Casa de Bandini confirms the presence of Native American laborers and domestic servants in the Bandini household and testifies to the persistence of Native American traditions well into the historic period (Schaefer 2012). Excavations at Casa de Bandini resulted in the recovery of over 1,000 Tizon Brown Ware sherds, 43 hand stones or manos, a range of flaked lithic artifacts, 53 glass trade beads, a whole *Olivella biplacata* shell bead, and a repurposed ceramic disc flaked from a fragment of Euro-American ceramics, thought to be a gaming piece (Schaefer 2012). Most of the Native American artifacts were recovered from secure historic contexts dating to the period of occupation by the Bandini family. Almost half of the ceramic sherds by weight were recovered from the Bandini kitchen, suggesting the presence of a Native American cook, probably male.

Conditions were difficult for Indian servants and laborers, and included indentured servitude, public floggings for minor offenses, and even murders at the hands of Euro-Americans (Carrico 1986; Shipek 1986, 1987). An abortive plot by Indian servants in Old Town to rob the Fitch store, kill the manager, and kidnap Mrs. Fitch and Mrs. Marrón provides interesting insights into both persistence of cultural traditions and resistance on the part of the Indian population. The account of the plot includes the detail that the weapons to be used were “sharp pointed arrows” rather than guns. This indicates not only the continued production of arrowheads, but may also be indicative of lack of access to firearms on the part of the Native population (Farris 2006:11). A projectile point recovered behind the Silvas Adobe that was manufactured with glass is reflective of both acculturation and persistence of traditional technologies (Farris 2006).

**Research Questions**

- By what economic or cultural process did Native American ceramics and other artifact types arrive in Old Town?
- Were Native American household servants and laborers using traditional methods to manufacture ceramics on site for use within Mexican and American households?
- Were Native American ceramics a commodity being manufactured and traded to the pueblo and ranchos?
- Were Native ceramics produced elsewhere, possibly on nearby rancherías, and traded to the pueblo?
- Through what mechanism did trade of Native American ceramics take place? Were ceramics exchanged through barter or using currency?
- Were Native ceramics sold at open markets or brought door-to-door to individual households in Old Town?
- What evidence is there of persistence of Native American material culture and technologies into the American period?
- How did Native Americans adapt their traditional technologies in ceramic production and lithic production to cater to requirements of Californio and American residents of Old Town?
The excavations on Block 408 in Old Town produced over 8,000 flaked and ground stone and flaked glass artifacts from securely historic contexts (Sampson and Bradeen 2006). The persistence of Native lithic technology into the Mexican and even American periods has been observed at several locations in Old Town, at the Presidio, and other Mission and Mexican-period sites throughout California (Allen 1998; Greenwood 1976; Sampson and Bradeen 2006; Silliman 2004; Williams 2005). Rebecca Allen has argued that “one possible reason for retention of native culture was the lack of real integration [of Indian neophytes] into Hispanic society.” (quoted in Sampson and Bradeen 2006:3).

**Research Questions**

- For what functions were Native Americans in Old Town employing traditional flaked stone technology?
- Were stone tools being produced solely by local Kumeyaay?
- Is there any evidence that mestizo and Mexican residents were producing flaked stone tools?
- Is there evidence for the evolution of traditional flaked stone technology to produce new forms or to adapt existing tool forms for new functions?
- Where were raw materials for tool production acquired?
- How were lithic tools produced?
- Is there any evidence for nontraditional tool manufacture techniques?
- Were lithic tools discarded after use, or is there evidence for curation of stone tools?

**Old Town and the Global Market Economy**

Deposits of artifacts associated with the Fitch and Strauss stores may contain significant quantities of imported and luxury items traded in Old Town from the early 1850s. Fitch was the first American merchant to settle in Old Town and establish a store. While Fitch’s first store was located on the adjacent block, Fitch moved his store and residence to Block 409 around 1848.

Fitch traded with merchants from Boston, Mexico, and Honolulu, and with Californian traders. He traded all manner of goods:

- from pearl cigar cases and breast pins to ploughs and kegs of powder; textiles and dishes of all kinds such as pans, copper pots, kettles, knives, spoons, looking glasses, chairs, and clothing; and construction materials and tools. He sold articles from Mexican vessels such as: panocha, serapes, ponchos, rebozos, hats, and ornamental shell combs. Hawaiian vessels carried Chinese tea and other Oriental goods, coffee, sugar, and commodities from the United States. Materials carried on California vessels included: basic hides and tallow and a few furs, soap, vaquetas (tanned hides), aguardiente, saddles, boots, and figs [Ogden 1981].

Dumps of broken and discarded artifacts may survive in trash pits in association with the Fitch store. Similar deposits may be present in association with the Strauss store. Such deposits provide the opportunity to examine and analyze the types of goods being sold in Old Town between the 1850s and the 1870s.

From the 1820s until the establishment of New Town San Diego, Old Town served as the port of San Diego. Excavations from the McCoy House, the Wrightington Adobe, the Rose-Robinson site, and Block 407 have resulted in the recovery of substantial quantities of Chinese export porcelains (Felton and Farris 1997:25; Schulz et al. 1987:18-20). These patterns have also been recovered elsewhere in California in contexts dating to the 1830s and 1840s (Felton 1996). The distribution of these export Chinese porcelains indicates extensive Pacific Rim trade networks operating between Southeast Asia, Africa, and the west coast of California. Felton and Farris hypothesize that the distribution of these distinctive Chinese porcelains reflects California’s participation on a Pacific Rim trade pattern that did not extend to the east coast of North America or to Europe (Felton and Farris 1997:25).
Exportation of majolica to the Spanish borderlands is thought to have diminished during and after the Mexican War of Independence (1810-1821). Sites excavated in Old Town to date have yielded relatively low percentages of majolica relative to British earthenware, Chinese porcelain, or locally manufactured ceramics (Southern California Brownware). The paucity of majolica is considered to be indicative of deposits dating to the period of the Mexican War of Independence or later.

The presence of British earthenware in assemblages from Old Town reflects the participation of Alta California in a global market. Mass-produced British earthenware was transported to California via merchants in the eastern United States. Rapid stylistic changes in this earthenware makes it a particularly useful tool to mark chronology. It is also possible to compare the relative value of the ceramics from given assemblages using Miller’s (1980) economic scaling index. Ceramic assemblages from different households can then be analyzed to address a range of research questions concerning consumer choice among different socioeconomic groups.

**Research Questions**

- Do caches or dumps of discarded trade goods associated with the Fitch or Strauss properties contain significant quantities of distinctive Chinese porcelain?
- Are vessel forms of Chinese porcelain similar to those of British earthenware of the same period? The presence of quantities of wide, shallow bowls is thought to indicate a Californio preference for soups and stews (Felton and Schulz 1983:89-90).
- Are similar wares present in assemblages from the same period from Latin America, Mexico, and along the West Coast of North America?
- Does the economic index of British earthenware from assemblages associated with merchant households Block 409 reflect access to more expensive luxury items than other Mexican/Californio households in Old Town?

**4.4 SITE DISTURBANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR INTACT DEPOSITS**

The potential for intact features and deposits is low for much of the project site, given the degree of previous ground disturbance. Figure 34 provides an overlay of the Old Mission Packing Corporation buildings on an aerial photograph of the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex. Removal of the concrete slab foundations, tanks and other structures of the Old Mission Packing Corporation plant in the early 1950s, prior to the construction of the 1953 Caltrans building, would have resulted in ground disturbance to depths of approximately 1-3 ft. (see Figure 32). Removal of underground fuel tanks would have resulted in deeper levels of disturbance in limited areas of the plant. The subsequent construction of the 1953 Caltrans building and 1958 and 1964 additions resulted in substantial ground disturbance. All three buildings were constructed on foundations supported on concrete piles driven to depths of up to 50 ft. The 1953 building had a total of 234 cast-in-place concrete piles spaced at intervals ranging from 16 ft. to 25 ft. The 1958 and 1964 additions were also supported on concrete piles at spaced at similar intervals. The 1964 addition also had a basement measuring approximately 191 ft. x 90 ft. and 12 ft. deep. Given the extensive development on the parcel and the level of ground disturbance necessitated by the construction of the three wings of the former Caltrans complex, there remain only limited areas where intact deposits and features may survive. These include the southeastern corner near the intersection of Wallace and Calhoun streets, now occupied by an asphalt parking lot. This is where the Fitch residence and store was located (see Figure 31). Due to the presence of a basement under the 1964 addition, remnants of Lyons Bowling Saloon is unlikely to survive unless traces remain in the narrow strip between the building and the sidewalk. The extent to which the northeast corner, near the intersection of Wallace and Juan streets, was graded during construction of the 1964 addition is unknown. It is possible that if the area was not graded during the construction that some traces of the Strauss store might survive. Other areas with some potential for survival of subsurface deposits are the landscaped areas along Juan and Taylor streets.
Figure 34. Footprint of Old Mission Packing Corporation buildings and Caltrans District 11 Office Complex.
5.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

5.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING STRATEGIES

The Project alternatives include the partial demolition (Alternative 1) or full demolition (Alternative 2) of the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex. The demolition and removal of the foundations of the building has the potential to impact significant and sensitive archaeological deposits. Archaeological and Native American monitoring of all ground disturbance during the demolition will take place. The purpose of the construction monitoring program is to identify and protect sensitive cultural deposits and features. It will not be conducted as mitigation of impacts to cultural resources. If archaeological deposits and features are encountered during the demolition, resources shall be protected from construction impacts until a data recovery program can be implemented.

All mechanical ground-disturbing activities shall be monitored by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor. Monitors shall observe all new cuttings and also inspect the back dirt piles for artifacts. Monitoring logs shall be completed for each day that monitoring is undertaken, including photographs of the project area and records of construction activities. A Trimble GPS system shall be used to accurately plot and map any discoveries (including diagnostic isolates) and to create working field maps and final report-quality maps.

If archaeological features or potentially significant concentrations of artifacts are encountered during monitoring, all ground-disturbing activities will immediately be redirected away from the discovered resource to allow for its evaluation and appropriate treatment. This evaluation will be undertaken by the archaeological Principal Investigator at the Southern Service Center. The discovery site shall be flagged to protect it from further construction impacts. Once the feature or deposit has been exposed to the extent possible, SSC archaeologists shall assess the eligibility of the feature or deposit. Methodology for significance testing and data recovery is provided in Section 5.2. If systematic data recovery is not immediately possible during the demolition phase of the Project, the archaeological deposit or feature shall be protected from any further disturbance until data recovery is possible.

Cultural material that is noted within the subsurface sediments but not associated with an intact feature or concentration of artifacts shall be recorded, GPS coordinates taken, and collected if relating to the primary interpretive period of OTSDSHP (1821-1872). Some of these artifacts may be used for interpretive purposes and may be collected for future exhibits. The provenience of diagnostic artifacts which were not associated with specific features may be documented according to lot number.

5.2 TREATMENT OF HUMAN REMAINS

Ground-disturbing activities conducted in association with the demolition and removal of the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex have the potential to disturb human remains. Reports of the discovery of a Native American cremation in an olla during construction of the building in the 1950s were investigated for this treatment plan. While ASM was unable to find any official records of this discovery, the oral account was attributable to June Redding, Director of the Whaley house at the time, who is said to have witnessed the discovery (see Section 3.5).

In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains within the project area, the following steps shall be taken. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the San Diego County Medical Examiner has been contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the Medical
Examiner determines the remains to be Native American, the Medical Examiner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.

The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) of the deceased Native American. As provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, the MLD may make recommendation for treatment or disposition with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. Alternatively, where the conditions listed below occur, an authorized representative of the California Department of Parks and Recreation shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance. The conditions are: (1) that the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify an MLD, or (2) the MLD fails to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission, or (3) CDPR rejects the recommendation of the MLD, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to CDPR. California Department of Parks and Recreation’s policy regarding the treatment of human remains is consistent with these guidelines.

5.3 ELIGIBILITY EVALUATION

Deposits and features identified during construction monitoring shall be evaluated for eligibility to the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Archaeological sites are generally evaluated for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the CRHR under Criterion d/4, that is, for their research potential “to yield information important in prehistory or history.” National Register Bulletin 36 (Little et al. 2000:29) details a five-step process for assessing the research potential of an archaeological site or site component:

1. Identify the property's data set(s) or categories of archeological, historical, or ecological information.
2. Identify the historic context(s), that is, the appropriate historical and archeological framework in which to evaluate the property.
3. Identify the important research question(s) that the property's data sets can be expected to address.
4. Taking archeological integrity into consideration, evaluate the data sets in terms of their potential and known ability to answer research questions.
5. Identify the important information that an archeological study of the property has yielded or is likely to yield.

Steps 1-3 were addressed in Chapter 4 above. The AIMS-R model (Association, Integrity, Materials, Stratigraphy and Rarity) developed by McIlroy and Praetzellis (1997) is a useful tool in assessing the archaeological research potential of a historic site or feature. This model is helpful in determining the eligibility of sites or individual features.

Association: The research potential of an archaeological deposit that has reliable sociocultural, historical, and chronological associations is greater than one whose associations are less clear. Within the context of the Old Town San Diego National Register District, it is not necessary to have a clear association to a known individual, household, or ethnic group for a feature or deposit to establish an association. The spatial location of the feature or deposit may be sufficient to provide an association with a certain work group or socioeconomic group.

Integrity: An archaeological feature that is intact or mostly intact has greater research potential than one whose integrity has been compromised.
Materials: The research potential of an artifact deposit increases with the number and variety of artifacts present.

Stratigraphy: A feature or site that has discrete vertical or horizontal depositional units has greater research potential than an unstratified deposit. Monitoring during construction may result in the identification of originally hollow features such as privies, cisterns, and wells, containing stratified deposits.

Rarity: Remains that represent uncommon content or activities have more research potential than remains of well-represented entities. Their scarcity may give these remains significance even when they fail to meet other thresholds of importance [McIlroy and Praetzellis 1997:277].

5.4 SIGNIFICANCE TESTING AND DATA RECOVERY EXCAVATION METHODS

The methodology employed for significance testing and data recovery excavations shall be consistent with the methodology detailed in the Archaeological Treatment Plan for the Entrance Redevelopment Project (Felton and Farris 1997:33-37), summarized below.

The size and configuration of excavation units will vary depending on the nature of the archaeological features and deposits present and the project recording requirements. Small standardized units (0.5-x-0.5-m to 1-x-1-m units) may be employed to investigate deposits, but they should not be utilized for data recovery purposes. As features and deposits are identified, they should be exposed in plan view, mapped in relation to a permanent datum, and photographed. Broad area exposures and continuous trenches are preferred during data recovery excavations to provide stratigraphic sections across a feature or structural foundation and to establish the stratigraphic relationship of individual features across the site.

All data recovery excavation will emphasize stratigraphic excavation, analysis, and artifact recovery. Sediment should be hand-excavated in natural or cultural strata, and should not be excavated in arbitrary levels. Hollow man-made features such as privies, cisterns, trash pits and wells may contain stratified cultural deposits. Care should be taken to excavate these strata in reverse order of deposition. Features containing stratified deposits should be sectioned where possible, so that one-half or one-quarter of the feature is excavated stratigraphically first to establish a profile of strata prior to excavating the remainder of the feature.

It is recommended that site stratigraphy be recorded and interpreted using the Harris Matrix (Harris 1989). This method requires that all layers and structural features (including cuts) are recorded on standard forms and each is given a unique designation. This technique allows for a very detailed record of individual layers and features and also their stratigraphic relationship to other deposits across the site. Each deposit, cut, and structural feature should be given an individual number (context number), and standard recording sheets should be used to document each deposit excavated in horizontal units. Cultural material should be collected, bagged, and labeled according to the individual context number. A basic artifact inventory, information on sediment type and color, termination depth, stratigraphic relationships to adjoining contexts, and general observations should be recorded for each context on context sheets. A plan view and a profile of each feature should be drawn to scale and mapped in relation to a permanent datum. Following excavation, all features should be photographed with an appropriate scale, and mapped. Plan drawings of exposures and profiles of stratified deposits should show the context numbers assigned. Analysis of the site stratigraphy will include the preparation of Harris Matrices for all areas excavated, graphically representing the relationship of all site deposits, surfaces, and structural features (Harris 1989).
A varied sampling strategy may be appropriate during testing and data recovery. Upper, mixed deposits may not require systematic screening, and diagnostic artifacts may be selectively recovered from disturbed contexts. For intact deposits dating to the prehistoric period and period of significance of OTSDSHP, 100 percent data recovery is recommended. This strategy may be adjusted if artifact recovery is poor.

Excavated soil should be screened through \(\frac{1}{4}\)-in. screen. When artifact-rich deposits are encountered, screening through 1/8-in. or 1/16-in. screen may be appropriate. Column samples should be taken for the recovery of microbotanical and macrobotanical remains if appropriate. Wet screening may be employed if increased recovery may be achieved.

Datum points and a site grid should be established at the commencement of testing and/or data recovery excavations. It is recommended that a Total Station or theodolite be used to map in the locations of archaeological excavation units and individual features. All dimensions, elevations, and drawings will be made in feet and tenths. All site, excavation, feature and diagnostic artifact data should be included in Old Town SHP Geo-database and appropriate maps included in final monitoring report.

5.5 LABORATORY METHODS

Laboratory procedures developed for the McCoy house archaeological excavations and implemented for the Entrance Redevelopment Project shall provide guidelines for any collections recovered in association with the former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex project (Felton and Farris 1997; George 1996).

Laboratory methods shall be consistent to ensure quality and standard data that allow for inter- and intra-site comparisons. For each feature or recovery type, materials shall be initially sorted by material type and labeled with appropriate provenience information. A tracking sheet shall be maintained to record artifacts by provenience and type. Artifacts shall be cleaned, but care shall be exercised to ensure that data are not destroyed during the process; for example, bottles containing paper labels should not be washed. Bone should also be dry-brushed rather than washed. Care shall be taken during cleaning to ensure that the provenience information remains with the artifact throughout the process.

Once they have been cleaned, artifacts shall be grouped by material type (e.g., ceramic, glass, or metal) and provenience (feature number and context) and cataloged using a computer database. Artifacts shall be given unique catalog numbers, although artifact/ecofact types from a single provenience can be cataloged under a single number. Under CDPR’s cataloging system, each item or group of items is assigned a three-part catalog number including a CDPR assigned accession number, lot number, and object number, separated by hyphens. Each artifact should be labeled using black or white ink if possible. On glass artifacts, the number should be sealed with a layer of clear nail polish. Paper tags may also be used, but care should be taken to ensure that the label is not separated from the artifact.

Once artifacts are cleaned, they can be sorted for cataloging. Ceramic vessels shall be sorted first by material (ironstone, white improved earthenware [WIE], porcelain etc.) and then by vessel form. Glass can be sorted by color and then by vessel form. Other material types (metal, bone) are sorted by material and function. The artifact catalog shall include sufficient fields to record artifact details, such as maker’s marks, decorative details, and other relevant information that will assist in dating the artifacts.

For archaeological cataloging purposes CDPR uses The Museum System (TMS) software supplied by Gallery Systems. Data entry conventions will follow current CDPR standards, matching as appropriate the data entry conventions used for the McCoy house archaeological excavations (George 1996) and implemented for the Entrance Redevelopment Project (Felton and Farris 1997).
Research shall be conducted to determine date and place of manufacture of artifacts when appropriate. Date ranges or mean artifact dates shall be determined for all artifacts when possible. The concept of minimum number of items or vessels (MNI or MNV) is critical to artifact analysis and interpretation. Counts of fragments do not prove an accurate picture of the actual number of objects represented. Several hundred ceramic fragments may represent only one or two actual vessels. For this reason, objects are cross-mended when possible. MNI is assigned based on key elements such as bases, finishes, rims, and spouts. For example, if there are 200 olive-colored wine bottle fragments, including three bases and two finishes, the MNI would be three. Objects that are components of a larger whole artifact do not receive MNIs. These are mostly structural objects such as nails, window glass, wood, and personal items such as buttons. Ceramics also can be assigned economic index values based on manufacturer and retailer catalogues (Henry 1991; Spencer-Wood 1987a).

Once artifacts and ecofacts have been cataloged, many of the materials with low research value may be deaccessioned (discarded). These would include non-diagnostic, fragmentary, and bulk items such as glass fragments, corroded non-diagnostic metal, and construction materials. Notes shall be made in the catalog and report text as to why materials were discarded.

5.6 REPORT PREPARATION

Upon completion of monitoring and any treatment of discoveries, a full report of findings shall be produced to CDPR specifications and generally following SHPO Archaeological Resource Management Report (ARMR) format. New discoveries also shall be documented on updated CDPR site records.
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APPENDIX A

Record Search Confirmations
CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL RESOURCES INFORMATION SYSTEM RECORDS SEARCH

Company: Sarah Stringer-Bowsher

Company Representative: ASM Affiliates, Inc.

Date Processed: 9/5/2014

Project Identification: CalTrans District 11 Old Town #19050.02

Search Radius: 1/4 mile

Historical Resources: YES

Trinomial and Primary site maps have been reviewed. All sites within the project boundaries and the specified radius of the project area have been plotted. Copies of the site record forms have been included for all recorded sites.

Previous Survey Report Boundaries: YES

Project boundary maps have been reviewed. National Archaeological Database (NADB) citations for reports within the project boundaries and within the specified radius of the project area have been included.

Historic Addresses: YES

A map and database of historic properties (formerly Geofinder) has been included.

Historic Maps: YES

The historic maps on file at the South Coastal Information Center have been reviewed, and copies have been included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of SHRC Approved CHRIS IC Records Search Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSID: 879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSH: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Features: 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address-Mapped Shapes: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Database Records: 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quads: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial Photos: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDFs: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Pages: 395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not an invoice. Please pay from the monthly billing statement.
APPENDIX B

NAHC Correspondence
September 9, 2014

Mr. Dave Singleton
California Native American Heritage Commission
915 Capitol Mall, Room 364
Sacramento, CA 95814
Via Email: nahc@nahc.ca.gov/ gdavidsingle@sbcglobal.net
Via Fax: (916) 373-5471

Re: Sacred Land Search Request for the Research Design for Treatment of Inadvertent Discoveries and Assistance in Preparation of a Mitigation Monitoring Plan Related to the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2829 Juan Street, City of San Diego, California

Dear Mr. Singleton,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources investigation of the proposed Research Design for Treatment of Inadvertent Discoveries and Assistance in Preparation of a Mitigation Monitoring Plan Related to the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project, 2829 Juan Street, City of San Diego, California (Project). The proposed Project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex at 2829 Juan Street, San Diego. The Project area is shown on the USGS 7.5’ La Jolla Quad, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego. The Project is located in San Diego’s Old Town.

A records search for the project area was conducted by the South Coastal Information Center. I am writing to inquire if you have registered any cultural resources, traditional cultural properties, or areas of heritage sensitivity within this proposed project area? Our investigation will include direct contact with local tribal entities in a manner that ensures complete confidentiality. We request that you send a listing of the appropriate individuals to make contact with related to this project. Please submit your response to me at our Carlsbad office, listed below. Feel free to call, write, or e-mail if you have any questions. We appreciate any information you can provide on this project.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 15, 2014

Shelby G. Castells
ASM Affiliates Inc.
2034 Corte del Nogal
Carlsbad, CA 92011

Sent by Fax: (760) 804-5755
Number of Pages: 3

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County.

Dear Ms. Castells,

A record search of the sacred land file has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. The Commission makes no recommendation or preference of a single individual, or group over another. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe or group. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 373-3712.

Sincerely,

Katy Sanchez
Associate Government Program Analyst
Native American Contacts  
San Diego County  
September 15, 2014

Ewilaapaayp Tribal Office  
Robert Pinto Sr., Chairperson  
4054 Willows Road  
Alpine, CA 91901  
wimicklin@leaningrock.net  
(619) 445-6315  
(619) 445-9126 Fax

Kurneyaay Cultural Historic Committee  
Ron Christman  
56 Viejas Grade Road  
Alpine, CA 92001  
(619) 445-0385

Diegueno/Kumeyaay

La Posta Band of Mission Indians  
Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson  
8 Crestwood Road Boulevard  
Boulevard, CA 91905  
gparada@lapostacasino.com  
(619) 478-2113  
(619) 478-2125

Campo Band of Mission Indians  
Ralph Goff, Chairperson  
36190 Church Road, Suite 1  
Campo, CA 91906  
chairgoff@aol.com  
(619) 478-9046  
(619) 478-5818 Fax

Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation  
Leroy J. Elliott, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 1302  
Boulevard, CA 91905  
ljbirdsinger@aol.com  
(619) 766-4930  
(619) 766-4957 Fax

Jamul Indian Village  
Raymond Hunter, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 612  
Jamul, CA 91935  
jamulrez@sctdv.net  
(619) 669-4785

Diegueno/Kumeyaay

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation  
Daniel Tucker, Chairperson  
5459 Sycuan Road  
El Cajon, CA 92019  
ssilva@sycuan-nsn.gov  
(619) 445-2613  
(619) 445-1927 Fax

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee  
Steve Banegas, Spokesperson  
1095 Barona Road  
Lakeside, CA 92040  
sbenegas50@gmail.com  
(619) 742-5587  
(619) 443-0681 Fax

Diegueno/Kumeyaay

Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians  
Anthony R. Pico, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 908  
Alpine, CA 91903  
jhagen@viejasn.gov  
(619) 445-3810  
(619) 445-5337 Fax

Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians  
ATTN: Julie Hagen, Cultural Resources  
P.O. Box 908  
Alpine, CA 91903  
jhagen@viejasn.gov  
(619) 445-3810  
(619) 445-5337

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.95 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 office Complex, 2829 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County.
Native American Contacts
San Diego County
September 15, 2014

Ewilaapaayp Tribal Office
Will Micklin, Executive Director
4054 Willows Road
Alpine, CA 91901
wmicklin@leaningrock.net
(619) 445-6315
(619) 445-9126 Fax

Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy
Mr. Kim Bactad, Executive Director
2 Kwaaypaay Court
El Cajon, CA 91919
kimbactad@gmail.com
(619) 659-1008 Office
(619) 445-0238 Fax

Manzanita Band of Mission Indians
ATTN: Keith Adkins, EPA Director
P.O. Box 1302
Kumeyaay Boulevard
Alpine, CA 91905
(619) 766-4930
(619) 766-4957 Fax

Inter-Tribal Cultural Resource Protection Council
Frank Brown, Coordinator
240 Brown Road
Alpine, CA 91901
frbrown@viejas-nsn.gov
(619) 884-6437

lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
Clint Linton, Director of Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 507
Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
clilton73@aol.com
(760) 803-5694

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Bernice Paipa, Vice Spokesperson
P.O. 937
Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Santa Ysabel, CA 91905
bernicepaipa@gmail.com

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Sydney Morris, Environmental Coordinator
5459 Sycuan Road
El Cajon, CA 92019
smorris@sycuan-nsn.gov
(619) 445-2613
(619) 445-1927 Fax

lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
Virgil Perez, Chairperson
P.O. Box 130
Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
(760) 765-0845
(760) 765-0320

Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Nick Elliott, Cultural Resources Coordinator
P.O. Box 1302
Kumeyaay
Boulevard
San Diego County

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5957.94 of the Public Resource Section 5957.96 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office Complex, 2820 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County.
September 22, 2014

Manzanita Band of Mission Indians
Attn: Keith Adkins, EPA Director
P.O. Box 1302
Boulevard, CA 91905

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Adkins,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy
Mr. Kim Bactad, Executive Director
2 Kwaaypaay Court
El Cajon, CA 91919

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Bactad,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Steve Banegas, Spokesperson
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Banegas,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Inter-Tribal Cultural Resource Protection Council
Frank Brown, Coordinator and Viejas THPO
240 Brown Road
Alpine, CA 91901

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Brown,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Kumeyaay Cultural Historic Committee
Ron Christman
56 Viejas Grade Road
Alpine, CA 92001

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Christman,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Leroy J. Elliott, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1302
Boulevard, CA 91905

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Elliott,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man. We are contacting you to find out if you are aware of any issues of cultural concern regarding the area shown on the enclosed map. In particular, we would like to know if you have knowledge of any Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Sites, resource collecting areas, or any other areas of concern of which you wish us to be aware. We understand the need for confidentiality in these matters.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Nick Elliott, Cultural Resources Coordinator
P.O. Box 1302
Boulevard, CA 91905

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Elliott,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Campo Band of Mission Indians
Ralph Goff, Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1
Campo, CA 91906

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Goff,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man. We are contacting you to find out if you are aware of any issues of cultural concern regarding the area shown on the enclosed map. In particular, we would like to know if you have knowledge of any Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Sites, resource collecting areas, or any other areas of concern of which you wish us to be aware. We understand the need for confidentiality in these matters.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
ATTN: Julie Hagen, Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 908
Alpine, CA 91903

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Ms. Hagen,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man. We are contacting you to find out if you are aware of any issues of cultural concern regarding the area shown on the enclosed map. In particular, we would like to know if you have knowledge of any Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Sites, resource collecting areas, or any other areas of concern of which you wish us to be aware. We understand the need for confidentiality in these matters.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Jamul Indian Village
Raymond Hunter, Chairperson
P. O. Box 612
Jamul, CA 91935

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Hunter,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4' La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Ipai Nation of Santa Ysabel
Clint Linton, Director of Cultural Resources
PO Box 507
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Linton,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Ewiaapaayp Tribal Office
Will Micklin, Executive Director
4054 Willows Road
Alpine, CA 91901

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Micklin,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblos lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Sydney Morris, Environmental Coordinator
5459 Sycuan Road
El Cajon, CA 92019

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Ms. Morris,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Bernice Paipa, Vice Spokesperson
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Ms. Paipa,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man. We are contacting you to find out if you are aware of any issues of cultural concern regarding the area shown on the enclosed map. In particular, we would like to know if you have knowledge of any Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Sites, resource collecting areas, or any other areas of concern of which you wish us to be aware. We understand the need for confidentiality in these matters.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

La Posta Band of Mission Indians
Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson
PO Box 1120
Boulevard, CA 91905

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Ms. Parada,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man. We are contacting you to find out if you are aware of any issues of cultural concern regarding the area shown on the enclosed map. In particular, we would like to know if you have knowledge of any Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Sites, resource collecting areas, or any other areas of concern of which you wish us to be aware. We understand the need for confidentiality in these matters.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
Virgil Perez, Spokesman
P.O. Box 130
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Perez,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectoned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man. We are contacting you to find out if you are aware of any issues of cultural concern regarding the area shown on the enclosed map. In particular, we would like to know if you have knowledge of any Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Sites, resource collecting areas, or any other areas of concern of which you wish us to be aware. We understand the need for confidentiality in these matters.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Anthony R. Pico, Chairperson
P.O. Box 908
Alpine, CA 91903

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Pico,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man. We are contacting you to find out if you are aware of any issues of cultural concern regarding the area shown on the enclosed map. In particular, we would like to know if you have knowledge of any Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Sites, resource collecting areas, or any other areas of concern of which you wish us to be aware. We understand the need for confidentiality in these matters.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Ewiaapaayp Tribal Office
Robert Pinto, Chairperson
4054 Willows Road
Alpine, CA 91901

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr Pinto,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby Gunderman Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 22, 2014

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Daniel Tucker, Chairperson
5459 Sycuan Road
El Cajon, CA 92021

Re: Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex, 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California

Dear Mr. Tucker,

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) is conducting a cultural resources study for the Demolition of the Former Caltrans District 11 Office Complex Project (Project). The Project is located at 2839 Juan Street, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California, and is shown on the USGS 7.4’ La Jolla Quad Map, within the unsectioned pueblo lands of San Diego (Figure 1). The Project is located in the California State Park - Old Town San Diego. The proposed project includes the preparation of regulatory documents in preparation for the demolition of the former Caltrans District 11 office complex.

A records search with the California Native American Heritage Commission failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional cultural resources in the immediate project area. ASM has completed a records search at the South Coastal Information Center and the San Diego Museum of Man.

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

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project, we will contact you about the best way to include consideration of those concerns while maintaining confidentiality. You can contact ASM at the address and telephone number for our Carlsbad office, listed below, or myself at the e-mail address below. We appreciate any input you may have on this project, and understand that consultation is a private and ongoing process. Again, any information you provide us will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

Shelby G. Castells, M.A., RPA
scastells@asmaffiliates.com
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
Senior Archaeologist

Attachments: Figure 1
Figure 1. Map of the Project Area.
September 9, 2014

Dear Shelby:

Thank you for the search request. However, I am going to miss working with you on these important tasks as I left the NAHC recently after more than eight years. I loved the work there, but felt it was time to go. But I may run into you as I plan to do some work with San Diego County tribes as an independent consultant.

You I notice have already copied the NAHC office. They will probably give it to Katy Sanchez; you will enjoy working with her.

On your request, I know a great deal about this project site. Therese Muranaka, retired Parks archaeologist also knows a great deal. I responded the CEQA document from Caltrans; then the State Parks CEQA doc (Superintendent Clay Phillips - maybe you heard the interview with him on KPBS on Parks’ plans; then also the Light Rail part of the project, the SANDAG EIS/EIR. I can tell you that the site is quite sacred to the Kumeyaay; it is located in USGS Ranges 2 West and 3 West of Township 16 South of the Point Loma USGS Quadrangle. You might want to check behind yourself on your request which stated the La Jolla USGS Quadrangle. The ancient Village of Cosoy is near the site and there are burials there reported to the NAHC by the San Diego County Medical Examiner. Tony Pinto; then Chair of the Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay was named Most Likely Descendent (MLD) in 1990. That tribe and also Frank Brown from the Viejas Band may provide more information.

Even though I am not with the NAHC, I will always be glad to respond to any questions you have, if need be and appropriate. I assume you are still working in the Sorrento Valley project, albeit with Clint Linton. Keep up the good work!

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
(760) 801-8011
--------------------------------------------

On Tue, 9/9/14, Shelby Castells <scastells@asmaffiliates.com> wrote:

Subject: Sacred Lands Search Request
To: "nahc@nahc.ca.gov" <nahc@nahc.ca.gov>, "gdavidsingle@sbcglobal.net" <gdavidsingle@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Tuesday, September 9, 2014, 2:45 PM
Hi Dave,
Attached please find a record search request letter to the Sacred Lands File.

Thank you!
Shelby

Shelby Castells,  
M.A., RPA  
Senior Archaeologist  
ASM  
Affiliates • Carlsbad, CA  
(760) 804-5757  

E-mail: scastells@asmaffiliates.com  
Website: www.asmaffiliates.com
Hi Shelby,

This email is in response to your letter I received the other day for the demo of the CALTRANS building in Old Town. I suspect that the project already will require native monitoring but if not please have a NAM. Further from the buzz I am hearing around the Kumeyaay territory is that several folks think Carmen Lucas should be the monitor for this one. Please accept my recommendation for her to be the NAM.

Also KCRC should be the MLD for all human remains found to be of Native decent.

Thank you,

Clint
September 30, 2014

Shelby Gunderman Castells
2034 Corte del Nogal
Carlsbad, CA 92011

RE: Demolition of the Former Caltrans Complex

Dear Ms. Gunderman Castells,

The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians ("Viejas") has reviewed the proposed project and at this time we have determined that the project site is has cultural significance or ties to Viejas. Viejas Band request that a Native American Cultural Monitor be on site for initial ground disturbing activities to inform us of any new developments such as inadvertent discovery of cultural artifacts, cremation sites, or human remains. Please call Julie Hagen for scheduling at 619-659-2339 or email jhagen@viejas-nsn.gov. Thank you

Sincerely,

VIEJAS BAND OF KUMEYAAY INDIANS