THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: October 7, 2025

TO: Policy Subcommittee of the Historical Resources Board

FROM: Kelley Stanco, Deputy Director, City Planning Department

SUBJECT: Preservation and Progress Package A, Part 3

At the Historical Resources Board meeting in February of this year, Heritage Preservation staff presented a Preservation and Progress Workshop item, which provided an overview of Preservation and Progress and an outline of potential updates to the City's Heritage Preservation program. The potential updates were grouped into Package A and Package B. Several items from Package A were presented to the Policy Subcommittee at the meetings of July 14, 2025 and August 7, 2025 (Attachments 1 and 2.)

During the July meeting, the Policy Subcommittee provided feedback on the municipal code amendments presented and requested that the item related to appeals of historic designation be returned to the Subcommittee for additional discussion. During the August meeting, the Policy Subcommittee reviewed the proposed amendments to the General Plan Historic Preservation Element and requested that the proposed amendments to the historic designation appeal process be revised to limit the ability to appeal when properties are not designated to the property owner.

For the October meeting, staff has revised the proposed amendments to the appeal process as requested by the Policy Subcommittee and has also addressed public feedback that the new appeal finding of "findings not supported" did not appropriately address appeals of decisions to not designate, as the Historical Resources Board does not make findings in those instances. Both issues were addressed by providing a separate set of findings for decisions to designate and decisions to not designate, with an intro stating who can appeal in those instances. For decisions to not designate, it is specified that only the "record owner" as defined by the Municipal Code can appeal, and the "findings not supported" appeal finding has been modified to "decision not supported." In addition, staff has proposed additional amendments specifying that an appellant must submit additional information in support of an appeal within 90 days of filing the appeal or the right to appeal will be forfeit and the action of the Board will be final. The appeal must then be docketed for City Council within 90 days of submittal of the additional documentation.

Lastly, Package A, Part 3 includes proposed amendments to Appendix F of the General Plan. Appendix F is a summary of San Diego history. The City is in the first year of a multi-year effort to prepare a Citywide historic context statement. Once that effort is complete,

Appendix F will be comprehensively updated to reflect the work of the Citywide historic context statement. In the interim, staff has proposed amendments to address more glaring deficiencies in how tribal cultural history and prehistory is addressed, as well as how past zoning and lending practices impacted segregated and inequitable development patterns and infrastructure. For the latter, the proposed amendments include a reference to the Housing Element Appendix A, which includes an "Integration and Segregation" section that includes a narrative history under "Other Relevant Factors" (see page HE-A-33).

With these items, Policy Subcommittee will conclude review of Preservation and Progress Package A. The entirety of Package A will be presented to the Historical Resources Board at the October 23rd meeting, followed by Planning Commission and Land Use & Housing in November and December and City Council in January. The Preservation and Progress website has been updated with information regarding what items are included in Package A and Package B, as well as a timeline for public hearings for Package A.

Kelley Stanco
Deputy Director

KS

Attachments:
1. Link to Policy Subcommittee Meeting of July 14, 2025, which includes the proposed amendments related to appeals of historic designations.
2. Link to Policy Subcommittee Meeting of August 7, 2025, which includes the proposed amendments related to appeals of historic designations.
3. Preservation and Progress Package A, Part 3 Draft Proposed Amendments to Appendix F of the General Plan and Revised Amendments to the Designation Appeal Process.

Preservation and Progress: Package
DRAFT Land Development Code Amendments
October 1, 2025

§111.0206 Historical Resources Board

(a) [No change in text.]

(b) Appointment and Terms

(1) The Historical Resources Board shall consist of 11 members, each appointed by the Mayor and subject to confirmation by the City Council. Each member shall serve a 2-year term without compensation and shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed. No member shall serve more than 4 consecutive terms. The members shall be appointed so that the terms of not more than 6 members will expire in any year. The expiration date of all terms of appointment shall be March 1. The Mayor may designate 1 member as Chairperson during March of each year. If the Mayor has not designated a chairperson by April ~~15~~30, the Board shall elect a Chairperson from among its members.

(2) At least one Board member shall be appointed from among professionals in each of the following five historic preservation-related disciplines as required to meet the "Certified Local Government" criteria of the State Office of Historic Preservation, as established by the National Historic Preservation Act: architecture, history, architectural history, archaeology, and landscape architecture. If a qualified volunteer cannot be found to fill one of the five professional Board positions, that Board position may be filled by a second professional from one of the other four historic preservation-related disciplines. However, no more than two professional Board positions should be filled by professionals in the same historic preservation-related field. Other Board members appointed may have experience or background in law, real estate, engineering, general contracting, finance, planning, or fine arts and should reflect diverse neighborhood representation and have demonstrated a special interest in historical preservation. No more than three owners of *designated historical resources* shall serve at any time.

(c) through (d) [No change in text.]

§123.0202 Designation Process for Historical Resources

(a) [No change in text.]

(b) Public Notice to Owner. ~~The owner of a property being considered for designation by the Historical Resources Board shall be notified~~ The City Manager shall mail a notice to the owner of the property being considered for designation at least 10 *business days* before the Board hearing. Notice to the owner shall contain information about the potential impacts of designation and a request to contact the Board's administrative staff regarding information for making a presentation to the Board on the proposed designation. No action shall be taken by the Board to designate a *historical resource* except at a public hearing that provides all interested parties an opportunity to be heard.

(c) Adequacy of Research Report. The decision on whether or not to designate a historical resource shall be based on the information in a research report, as specified in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual. If the Board determines, either by public testimony or other documentary evidence presented to it, that the research report is not adequate to assess the significance of the historical resource, the Board may continue its consideration of the property for up to two regular meetings and direct that a research report be prepared by the applicant with specific direction from staff as to the inadequacies of the original report. The revised research report may be prepared by City staff or volunteers, with a copy provided to the owner at least 10 business days before the next Board meeting at which the designation will be considered. If a final decision is not made within 90 calendar days ~~of receipt of a nomination for designation~~from the first Historical Resources Board meeting in which the property is heard, the consideration of the property by the Board shall terminate unless a continuance has been granted at the request of the property owner.

(d) through (g) [No change in text.]

§123.0203 Appeal From Historical Resources Board Decision

A decision by the Historical Resources Board to designate or not to designate a property may be appealed to the City Council in accordance with this section. No other actions of the Board may be appealed.

(a) The Historical Resources Board's action to designate a property may be appealed to the City Council by an *applicant* or an *interested person* on

any of the following grounds:

(1) Factual Error. The materials or information provided to the Historical Resources Board at the designation hearing were inaccurate; or

(2) New Information. New information relevant to the property's eligibility for historic designation is available to the applicant or the interested person that was not available through that person's reasonable efforts or due diligence at the time of the designation hearing; or

(3) *Findings* Not Supported. The Board's stated findings to designate are not supported by the information provided to the Board; or

(4) Violation of bylaws. In making the designation decision, the Board or an individual member did not adhere to the Board's bylaws or hearing procedures.

(b) The Historical Resources Board's action to not designate a property, either through an action to not designate or through failure of a motion to designate, may be appealed to the City Council by the *record owner* of the property on any of the following grounds:

(1) Factual Error. The materials or information provided to the Historical Resources Board at the designation hearing were inaccurate; or

(2) New Information. New information relevant to the property's eligibility for historic designation is available to the applicant or the interested person that was not available through that person's reasonable efforts or due diligence at the time of the designation hearing; or

(3) Decision Not Supported. The Board's decision to not designate the property is not supported by the information provided to the Board; or

(4) Violation of bylaws. In making the designation decision, the Board or an individual member did not adhere to the Board's bylaws or hearing procedures.

(~~a~~c) ~~The action of~~ A decision by the Historical Resources Board ~~in the designation process~~ to designate or not to designate a property is final 11 *business days* following the decision of the Board unless an appeal to the City Council is filed with the City Clerk no later than 10 *business days* after the ~~action~~ decision of the Board. ~~The decision of~~

~~the Historical Resources Board may be appealed by an *applicant* or an *interested person*. An appeal shall be in writing and shall specify wherein there was error in the decision of the Board. The City Council may reject designation on the basis of factual errors in materials or information presented to the Board, violations of bylaws or hearing procedures by the Board or individual member, or presentation of new information.~~

(d) An application for an appeal shall be submitted to the City Clerk in writing and contain the following information:

(1) The name, address, and telephone number of the person filing the appeal;

(2) The name of the *record owner*;

(3) The name of the *applicant*;

(4) The decision being appealed and the date of the decision;

(5) The specific grounds, clearly identified, upon which the appellant is filing the appeal. All grounds must be specified in the appeal.

(~~b~~c) Upon the filing of the appeal, the appellant shall submit additional information in support of the stated grounds for appeal within 90 calendar days or the right to appeal will be forfeited and the decision of the Board to designate or not to designate shall become final. T~~t~~he City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing ~~as soon as is practicable~~ no later than 90 calendar days after the date on which the additional information in support of the appeal is submitted by the appellant and shall give written notice to the property owner and the appellant of the time and date set for the hearing. Failure to hold the hearing within the time frames specified above shall not limit the authority of the City Council to consider the appeal. At the public hearing on the appeal, the City Council may by resolution affirm, reverse, or modify the determination of the Board and shall make written *findings* in support of its decision.

(~~c~~f) The appellant may withdraw an appeal at any time prior to the commencement of the public hearing before the City Council. The withdrawal of the appeal must be in writing and filed with the City Clerk. If the appellant withdraws an appeal, no appeal hearing will be conducted. The withdrawal of an appeal does not entitle the appellant to any refund of appeal-related costs or fees incurred as of the date of the withdrawal.

§123.0206 State and National Register

(a) As a Certified Local Government, the Historical Resources Board is required by Section 101(c)(2)(A) of the National Historic Preservation Act to opine on whether a property nominated for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places meets the criteria for listing. Upon receipt of a request from the California Office of Historic Preservation, the Historical Resources Board shall review the nomination and provide a recommendation to the City Manager for conveyance to the State Historic Resources Commission consistent with the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act.

(b) If a nomination to the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources is prepared and submitted by the City of San Diego, the~~The~~ City Council ~~shall~~may consider endorsing the nomination ~~of a *historical resource* for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places~~ upon recommendation of the Historical Resources Board.

§143.1002 Application of Complete Communities Housing Solutions Regulations

(a) [No change in text.]

(b) Appointment and Terms

(1) through (5) [No change in text.]

(6) *Development* located within a designated *historical district* ~~or subject to the Old Town San Diego Planned District.~~, with the following exceptions:

(A) *Development* on properties that are not designated as contributing resources to the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District; and

(B) *Development* on properties that are not designated as contributing resources to the Chinese Asian Thematic Historical District.

(7) *Development* that is subject to the Old Town San Diego Planned District.

~~(7)~~(8) *Development* that includes visitor accommodation, except an SRO *hotel*.

(c) through (f) [No change in text.]

General Plan: Appendices

F Appendix F: Historic Preservation Element

City of San Diego San Diego History

The history of a region provides the context for the evaluation and management of historical resources. The history of San Diego can be divided into four prehistoric periods, one ethnohistoric period and three historic periods. These periods are discussed below as summarized in Rosen (1994) and Van Wormer (1995). For a detailed discussion of San Diego's history, visit the San Diego's City Planning archive of contexts and surveys online. ~~see for example, the Historic Properties Background Study for the City of San Diego Clean Water Program (Brian F. Mooney Associates n.d.).~~

Tribal Cultural History (Pre-European Contact)

Tribal cultural history is reflected in the history, beliefs and legends retained in songs and stories passed down through generations within Native American tribes. There is also an ethnohistoric period of events, traditional cultural practices and spiritual beliefs of indigenous peoples recorded from the post-European contact era. The traditional origin belief of the Yuman-speaking peoples in Southern California reflects a cosmology that includes aspects of a mother earth and father sky, and religious rituals were tied to specific sacred locations. A pre-historic material culture is contained in the archaeological record and reflects subsistence practices and settlement patterns over several prehistoric periods.

The cultural history presented below is based on documentation from both the archaeological and ethnographic records and represents a continuous human occupation in the region spanning the last 10,000 years. While this information comes from the scientific reconstructions of the past, it does not necessarily represent how local indigenous groups see themselves. While the material culture is contained in the archaeological record, their history, beliefs, and legends have persevered and are retained in the songs and stories passed down through the generations. It is important to note that Native American aboriginal lifeways did not cease at European contact.

Two indigenous groups are described from the ethnohistoric period as inhabiting San Diego County: the Luiseño and the Kumeyaay. The present-day boundaries of the City of San Diego are part of the ancestral homeland and unceded territory of the Yuman-speaking Kumeyaay, which stretched approximately from the Pacific Ocean to the west, El Centro to the east, Escondido to the north, and the northern part of Baja California, Mexico to the south.

The ethnohistoric period in San Diego began with the arrival of Europeans and continued through the Spanish, Mexican, and early American periods.

When the Mission San Diego de Alcalá was founded in 1769, it brought major changes to the Kumeyaay way of life. Many were forced to join the mission, and new diseases greatly reduced their population. Early records about Native life often came from limited or biased sources. More recently, Native people and researchers have worked together to better understand Kumeyaay history, culture, and language. Today, the Kumeyaay are recognized as the Most Likely Descendants of any Native remains found in San Diego.

The Kumeyaay traditionally lived in small, semi-permanent, politically autonomous seasonal camping spots or villages, often located near local springs and water sources. Larger villages were located in river valleys and along the shoreline of coastal estuaries. Houses were typically made with tule of California bulrush. At the time of Spanish contact, the Kumeyaay had villages across Southern California, southwestern Imperial County, and parts of northern Baja California.

Subsistence cycles were seasonal and generally focused on an east-west or coast-to-desert route based around the availability of vegetal foods, while hunting and shellfish harvesting added a secondary food source to gathering practices. The Kumeyaay migrated to the mountains during certain seasons of the year to harvest acorns and grain grasses, as well as to trade with neighboring tribes to the east. The general route of today's Kumeyaay Highway (Interstate 8), follows the route of historic waterways through Alvarado Canyon and was one route used by the Kumeyaay to travel between the coast and the interior.

Several important Kumeyaay villages were located in or near modern-day San Diego including, but not limited to, Cosoy near today's Old Town San Diego, Jamo (Rinconada) near Mission Bay, Nipaquay, along the San Diego River, Las Chollas, near Chollas Creek, and Ystagua, along Penasquitos Creek.

Estimates for the population of the Kumeyaay vary substantially: Scholars speculate anywhere from 3,000 to 19,000 people lived in the region prior to the establishment of the Spanish missions in 1769. However, by the mid-nineteenth century, the Kumeyaay population had dwindled to a few thousand, with many living on reservation lands.

PREHISTORIC PERIODS

Systematic archaeological studies in San Diego County began with the work of Malcolm J. Rogers of the San Diego Museum of Man in the 1920s and 1930s. Rogers (1929, 1945, 1966) developed a three part chronologic sequence of prehistoric cultures for the region which was subsequently built upon by Claude Warren (1967, 1968). More recent studies have sought to further refine (Cárdenas 1986, 1987; Moratto 1984; Moriarty 1966, 1967; True 1970, 1980, 1986; True and Beemer 1982; True and Pankey 1985; Waugh 1986) or criticize (Bull 1983, 1987; Gallegos 1987) this sequence. The prehistory

of the region is divided into three ~~four~~ major periods: Early Prehistoric Period, ~~Early Man, Paleo-Indian, Early~~ Archaic Period, and Late Prehistoric.

EARLY PREHISTORIC ~~MAN~~ PERIOD (BEFORE 8500 BC-6000 BC)

The Early Prehistoric Period represents the time period of the first known inhabitants in California and in San Diego. No firm archaeological evidence for the occupation of San Diego County before 10,500 years ago has been discovered and our understanding of occupation during this time period is from tribal cultural knowledge and stories. ~~The myths and history that is repeated by the local Native American groups now and at the time of earlier ethnographic research indicate both their presence here since the time of creation and, in some cases, migration from other areas. There are some researchers who advocate an occupation of southern California prior to the Wisconsin Glaciation, around 80,000 to 100,000 years ago (Carter1957, 1980; Minshall 1976). Local proposed Early Man sites include the Texas Street, Buchanan Canyon and Brown sites, as well as Mission Valley (San Diego River Valley), Del Mar and La Jolla (Bada et al. 1974; Carter 1957, 1980;Minshall 1976, 1983, 1989; Moriarty and Minshall 1972; Reeves 1985; Reeves et al. 1986). However, two problems have precluded general acceptance of these claims. First, artifacts recovered from several of the localities have been rejected by many archaeologists as natural products rather than cultural artifacts. Second, the techniques used for assigning early dates to the sites have been considered unsatisfactory (Moratto 1984; Taylor et al. 1985).~~

Careful scientific investigation of any possible Terminal Pleistocene (pre-10,000 years ago) and the Early Holocene (beginning 10,000 years ago) ~~Early Man~~ archaeological remains in this region would be assigned a high research priority. Such a priority would reflect both the substantial popular interest in the issue and the general anthropological importance which any confirmation of a very early human presence in the western hemisphere would have. ~~Anecdotal reports have surfaced over the years that Early Man deposits have been found in the lower levels of later sites in Mission Valley. However, no reports or analyses have been produced supporting these claims.~~

~~PALEO-INDIAN PERIOD (8500-6000 BC)~~

The Early Prehistoric Period is associated with the Big-Game-Hunting activities of the peoples of the Last Ice Age. Most evidence for Big-Game-Hunting peoples during this time period derives from finds of large, fluted spears and projectile points (Fluted-Point Tradition). At least three isolated flute point occurrences have been found in San Diego County. While there have been isolated occurrences of fluted points in the San Diego area, the earliest archaeological sites documented to be circa 10,000 years old belong to the San Dieguito Tradition (Warren et al. 2008; Warren and Ore 2011). The San Dieguito Tradition, with an artifact assemblage distinct from that of the Fluted-Point Tradition, has been documented mostly in the coastal area in San Diego County, as well as in the

southeastern California deserts (Carrico et al. 1993; Rogers 1939, 1966; Warren 1966, 1967; Warren and True 1961). The San Dieguito Complex was reclassified as the San Dieguito Tradition in 1968. This tradition is characterized by an artifact inventory consisting almost entirely of flaked stone biface and scraping tools but lacking the fluted points associated with the Fluted-Point Tradition.

Diagnostic artifact types and categories associated with the San Dieguito Tradition include elongated bifacial knives, large leaf-shaped projectile points, distinctive scraping tools, crescentics, and, in the desert, Silver Lake and Lake Mojave projectile points (Knell and Becker 2017; Rogers 1939, 1966; Vaughan 1982; Warren 1966, 1967; Warren and True 1961). ~~The earliest generally-accepted archaeological culture of present-day San Diego County is the Paleo-Indian culture of the San Dieguito Complex. This complex is usually assigned to the Paleo-Indian Stage and dated to about 10,500 years ago. It would therefore appear to be contemporary with the better-known Fluted Point Tradition of the High Plains and elsewhere and the Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition of the Desert West.~~ The San Dieguito Complex, is believed to represent a nomadic hunting culture by some investigators of the complex (Davis et al. 1969; Moriarty 1969; Rogers 1929, 1966; Warren 1966, 1967~~). characterized by the use of a variety of scrapers, choppers, bifaces, large projectile points and crescentics, a scarcity or absence of milling implements, and a preference for fine-grained volcanic rock over metaquartzite.~~

Careful scientific investigation of San Dieguito Complex/Tradition sites in the region would also be assigned a high research priority. Major research questions relating to the Early Prehistoric~~Paleo-Indian~~ Period include continued confirmation of the presence of the Fluted Point Tradition in San Diego County (Davis and Shutler 1969); better chronological definition of the San Dieguito Complex; determination of whether the San Dieguito assemblages do in fact reflect an early occupation, rather than the remains from a specialized activity set belonging to an ~~Early~~ Archaic Period culture; clarification of the relationship of the San Dieguito Complex, if it represents a separate culture, to the subsequent ~~Early~~ Archaic Period cultures; determination of the subsistence and settlement systems which were associated with the San Dieguito Complex; and clarification of the relationship of the San Dieguito Complex to similar remains in the Mojave Desert, in northwestern and central California, in southern Arizona and in Baja California. The San Dieguito Complex was originally defined in an area centering on the San Dieguito River valley, north of San Diego (Rogers 1929).

~~EARLY~~ARCHAIC PERIOD (6000 BC-AD 0)

As a result of climatic shifts and a major change in subsistence strategies, a new cultural pattern assignable to the Archaic Stage is thought by many archaeologists to have replaced the San Dieguito culture before 6000 BC. A large number of archaeological site assemblages dating to this period have been identified at a range of coastal and inland sites. This appears to indicate that a relatively stable, sedentary hunting and gathering

complex, possibly associated with one people, was present in the coastal and immediately inland areas of what is now San Diego for more than 7,000 years.

These assemblages, designated as the La Jolla/Pauma complexes, are considered part of Wallace's (1955) "Early Milling Stone Horizon" and of Warren's (1968) "Encinitas tradition." These complexes are characterized as a gathering culture which subsisted largely on shellfish and plant foods from the abundant littoral resources of the area.

In general, the content of these site assemblages includes manos and metates; shell middens; terrestrial and marine mammal remains; burials; rock features; bone tools; doughnut stones; discoidals; stone balls; plummets; biface points/knives; beads made of stone, bone, or shell; and cobble-based tools at coastal sites and increased hunting equipment and quarry- based tools at inland sites (True 1958, 1980). As originally defined by True (1958), the "Pauma complex" aspect of this culture is associated with sites located in inland areas that lack shellfish remains but are otherwise similar in content to the La Jolla complex. The Pauma complex may, therefore, simply represent a non-coastal expression of the La Jolla complex (True 1980; True and Beemer 1982)

~~This new pattern, the Encinitas Tradition, is represented in San Diego County by the La Jolla and Pauma complexes. The coastal La Jolla Complex is characterized as a gathering culture which subsisted largely on shellfish and plant foods from the abundant littoral resources of the area. The La Jolla Complex is best known for its stone-on-stone grinding tools (mano and metate), relatively crude cobble- based flaked lithic technology and flexed human burials. Inland Pauma Complex sites have been assigned to this period on the basis of extensive stone-on-stone grinding tools, Elko Series projectile points and the absence of remains diagnostic of later cultures.~~

Among the research questions focusing on this period are the delineation of change or the demonstration of extreme continuity within the La Jolla and Pauma complexes; determination of whether coastal La Jolla sites represent permanent occupation areas or brief seasonal camps; the relationship of coastal and inland Archaic cultures; the scope and character of Archaic Period long-range exchange systems; the role of natural changes or culturally-induced stresses in altering subsistence strategies; and the termination of the Archaic Period in a cultural transformation, in an ethnic replacement or in an occupational hiatus in western San Diego County.

LATE PREHISTORIC PERIOD (AD 0-1769)

The Late Prehistoric Period in San Diego County is represented by two distinct cultural patterns, the Yuman Tradition from the Colorado Desert region and the Shoshonean Tradition from the north. These cultural patterns are represented locally by the Cuyamaca Complex from the mountains of southern San Diego County and the San Luis Rey Complex of northern San Diego County. The people of the Cuyamaca and San Luis Rey

complexes are ancestral to the ethnohistoric Kumeyaay (Diegueño) and Luiseño, respectively. Prehistorically, the Kumeyaay were a hunting and gathering culture that adapted to a wide range of ecological zones from the coast to the Peninsular Range. A shift in grinding technology reflected by the addition of the pestle and mortar to the mano and metate, signifying an increased emphasis on acorns as a primary food staple, as well as the introduction of the bow and arrow (i.e., small Cottonwood Triangular and Desert Side-notched projectile points), obsidian from the Obsidian Butte source in Imperial County and human cremation serve to differentiate Late Prehistoric populations from earlier peoples. Pottery is also characteristic of the Cuyamaca Complex, but is absent from the San Luis Rey Complex until relatively late (post AD 1500).

Explanatory models applied to Late Prehistoric sites have drawn most heavily on the ethnographic record. Notable research opportunities for archaeological sites belonging to the Late Prehistoric period include refining chronology, examining the repercussions from environmental changes which were occurring in the deserts to the east, clarifying patterns of inter- and intra- regional exchange, testing the hypothesis of pre-contact horticultural/agricultural practices west of the desert, and testing ethnographic models for the Late Prehistoric settlement system. Hector (1984) focused on the Late Prehistoric Period to examine the use of special activity areas within large sites typical of this period. At issue was whether activities such as tool making, pottery manufacturing and dining were conducted in specific areas within the site, or whether each family unit re-created these activity areas throughout the site. Her findings indicated that no specialized areas existed within Late Prehistoric sites, and furthermore that tools made during this period served a variety of functions.

Late Prehistoric sites appear to be proportionately much less common than Archaic sites in the coastal plains subregion of southwestern San Diego County (Christenson 1990:134-135; Robbins-Wade 1990). These sites tend to be located on low alluvial terraces or at the mouths of coastal lagoons and drainages. Of particular interest is the observation that sites located in the mountains appear to be associated with the Late Prehistoric Period. This suggests that resource exploitation broadened during that time, as populations grew and became more sedentary.

ETHNOHISTORIC PERIOD

The founding of Mission San Diego de Alcalá in 1769 by Father Junípero Serra and Mission San Luis Rey de Francia in 1798 by Father Lasuén brought about profound changes in the lives of the Yuman-speaking Kumeyaay (Diegueño) and Shoshonean-speaking Luiseño of San Diego County. The coastal Kumeyaay and Luiseño were quickly forced ~~brought~~ into their respective missions or died from introduced diseases. Ethnographic work, therefore, has concentrated on the mountain and desert peoples who were able to retain some of their ~~aboriginal~~ culture. As a result, ethnographic accounts of the coastal Kumeyaay and Luiseño are few. Today the descendants of the Kumeyaay bands are

divided among 12 reservations in the south county; the descendants of the Luiseño bands among five reservations in the north county.

The Kumeyaay are generally considered to be a hunting-gathering society characterized by central-based nomadism. While a large variety of terrestrial and marine food sources were exploited, emphasis was placed on acorn procurement and processing as well as the capture of rabbit and deer. Both traditional knowledge and the archaeological record (Shipek (1963, 1989b)) suggests that the Kumeyaay, or at least some bands of the Kumeyaay, were practicing proto-agriculture at the time of Spanish contact. ~~While the evidence is problematic, the Kumeyaay were certainly adept land and resource managers with a history of intensive plant husbandry.~~

Kumeyaay houses varied greatly according to locality, need, choice and raw materials. Formal homes were built only in the winter as they took some time to build and were not really necessary in the summer. Summer camps needed only a windbreak and were usually located under convenient trees, a cave fronted with rocks or an arbor built for protection from the sun. During the summer, the Kumeyaay moved from place to place. Research suggests bands would return to the same summer camping spots annually. ~~camping wherever they were.~~ In the winter they constructed small elliptically shaped huts of poles covered with brush or bark. The floor of the house was usually sunk about two feet into the earth. In the foothills and mountains hiwat brush or deer broom was applied in bundles tied on with strands of yucca. In cold weather the brush was covered with earth to help keep the heat inside. Bundles of brush were tied together to make a door just large enough to crawl through.

Most activities, such as cooking and eating, took place outside the house. The cooking arbor was a lean-to type structure or four posts with brush over the top. Village owned structures were ceremonial and were the center of many activities. Sweathouses were built and used by the Kumeyaay men. They were built around four posts set in a square near a river or stream and usually had a dug-out floor. The sweathouse was also used sometimes as a place for treating illnesses.

As with most hunting-gathering societies, Kumeyaay social organization was formed in terms of kinship. The Kumeyaay had a patrilineal type of band organization (descent through the male line) with band exogamy (marriage outside of one's band) and patrilocal marital residence (married couple integrates into the male's band). The band is often considered as synonymous with a village or rancheria, which is a political entity. Almstedt (1980:45) has suggested that the term rancheria should be applied toboth a social and geographical unit, as well as to the particular population and territory held in common by a native group or band. She also stressed that the territory for a rancheria might comprise a 30 square mile area. ~~Many households would constitute a village or rancheria and several villages were part of a larger social system usually referred to as a consanguineal kin group called a cimuL. The members of the cimuL did not intermarry~~

~~because of their presumed common ancestry, but they maintained close relations and often shared territory and resources (Luomala 1963:287-289).~~

~~Territorial divisions among Kumeyaay residential communities were normally set by the circuit of moves between villages by cimuLs in search of food. 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. While a cimuL could own, or more correctly control, a tract of land with proscribed rights, no one from another cimuL was denied access to the resources of nature (Luomala 1963:285; Spier 1923:306); since no individual owned the resources, they were to be shared.~~

~~The Kumeyaay practiced many forms of spiritualism with the assistance of shamans and cimuL leaders. Spiritual leaders were neither elected to, nor inherited their position, but achieved status because they knew all the songs involved in ceremonies (Shipek 1991) and had an inclination toward the supernatural. This could include visions, unusual powers or other signs of communication with the worlds beyond. Important Kumeyaay ceremonies included male and female puberty rites, the fire ceremony, the whirling dance, the eclipse ceremony, the eagle dance, the cremation ceremony and the yearly mourning ceremony (Spier 1923:311-326).~~

Important areas of research for the Ethnohistoric Period include identifying the location of Kumeyaay settlements at the time of historic contact and during the following 50 years of the Spanish Period; delineating the effects of contact on Kumeyaay settlement/ subsistence patterns; investigating the extent to which the Kumeyaay accepted or adopted new technologies or material goods from the intrusive Spanish culture; and examining the changes to Kumeyaay religious practices as a result of contact.

HISTORIC PERIODS

San Diego history can be divided into three periods: the Spanish, Mexican and American periods.

SPANISH PERIOD (AD 1769- 1822)

While Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo visited San Diego briefly in 1542, the beginning of the Spanish colonization of Alta California (now San Diego) is generally given as 1769. ~~In spite of Juan Cabrillo's earlier landfall on Point Loma in 1542, the Spanish colonization of Alta California did not begin until 1769.~~ Concerns over Russian and English interests in California motivated the Spanish government to send an expedition of soldiers, settlers and missionaries to occupy and secure the northwestern borderlands of New Spain. This was to be accomplished through the establishment and cooperative inter-relationship of

three institutions: the Presidio, Mission and Pueblo. In 1769 a land expedition led by Gaspár de Portola reached San Diego Bay, where they met those who had survived the trip by sea on the San Antonio and the San Carlos. Initially camp was made on the shore of the bay in the area that is now downtown San Diego. Lack of water at this location, however, led to moving the camp on May 14, 1769, to a small hill closer to the San Diego River and near the Kumeyaay village of Cosoy. Father Junípero Serra arrived in July of the same year to find the Presidio serving mostly as a hospital. The Spanish built a primitive mission and presidio structure on the hill near the river. The first chapel was built of wooden stakes and had a roof made of tule reeds. Brush huts and temporary shelters were also built.

Tensions ~~Bad feelings~~ soon developed between the native Kumeyaay and the soldiers, resulting in construction of a stockade whose wall was made from sticks and reeds. By 1772 the stockade included barracks for the soldiers, a storehouse for supplies, a house for the missionaries and the chapel, which had been improved. The log and brush huts were gradually replaced with buildings made of adobe bricks. Flat earthen roofs were eventually replaced by pitched roofs with rounded roof tiles. Clay floors were eventually lined with fired brick.

In August 1774, the Spanish missionaries moved the Mission San Diego de Alcalá to its present location six miles up the San Diego River valley (modern Mission Valley) near the Kumeyaay village of Nipaguay. Begun as a thatched jacal chapel and compound built of willow poles, logs and tules, the new Mission was sacked and burned in the Kumeyaay uprising of November 5, 1775. The first adobe chapel was completed in October 1776, and the present church was begun the following year. A succession of building programs through 1813 resulted in the final rectilinear plan that included the church, bell tower, sacristy, courtyard, residential complex, workshops, corrals, gardens and cemetery (Neuerburg 1986). Orchards, reservoirs and other agricultural installations were built to the south on the lower San Diego River alluvial terrace and were irrigated by a dam and aqueduct system.

In 1798 the Spanish constructed the Mission San Luis Rey de Francia in northern San Diego County. They also established three smaller mission outposts (asistencias) at Santa Ysabel, Pala and Las Flores (Smythe 1908; Englehardt 1920; Pourade 1961). The mission system had a great effect on all Native American groups from the coast to the inland areas and was a dominant force in San Diego County.

Life for the new settlers at the San Diego Presidio was isolated and difficult. The arid desert climate and aggressive Native American population made life hard for the Spanish settlers. They raised cattle and sheep, gathered fish and seafood and did some subsistence farming in the San Diego River Valley to generate enough food to keep the fledgling community of a few hundred Spaniards and hundreds of Native American neophytes alive. The situation for Spanish Period San Diegans' was complicated by the

Spanish government's insistence on making trade with foreign ships illegal. Although some smuggling of goods into San Diego was done, the amounts were likely small (Smythe 1908:81-99; Williams 1994).

Significant research topics for the Spanish Period involve the chronology and ecological impact caused by the introduction of Old World plants and the spread of New World domesticates in southern California; the differences and similarities in the lifeways, access to resources and responses to change between different Spanish institutions; the effect of Spanish colonization on the Kumeyaay population; and the effect of changing colonial economic policies and the frontier economic system on patterns of purchase, consumption and discard.

MEXICAN PERIOD (AD 1822- 1846)

In 1822 the political situation changed. Mexico won its independence from Spain and San Diego became part of the Mexican Republic. The Mexican Government opened California to foreign ships, and a healthy trade soon developed, exchanging the fine California cattle hides for the manufactured goods of Europe and the eastern United States. Several of these American trading companies erected rough sawn wood-plank sheds at La Playa on the bay side of Point Loma. The merchants used these "hide-houses" for storing the hides before transport to the east coast (Robinson 1846:12; Smythe 1908:102). As the hide trade grew, so did the need for more grazing lands. Thus the Mexican government began issuing private land grants in the early 1820s, creating the rancho system of large agricultural estates. Much of the land came from the Spanish missions, which the Mexican government secularized in 1833. The mission system, however, had begun to decline when the Mission Indians became eligible for Mexican citizenship and refused to work in the mission fields. The ranchos dominated California life until the American takeover in 1846 (Smythe 1908:101-106; Robinson 1948, Killea 1966, Pourade 1963). The Mexican Period brought about the continued displacement and acculturation of the native populations.

Another change in Mexican San Diego was the decline of the presidio and the rise of the civilian pueblo. The establishment of Pueblos in California under the Spanish government met with only moderate success and none of the missions obtained their ultimate goal, which was to convert to a Pueblo. Pueblos did, however, begin to form, somewhat spontaneously, near the California Presidios. As early as 1791, presidio commandants in California were given the authority to grant small house lots and garden plots to soldiers and their families (Richman 1911:346). Sometime after 1800, soldiers from the San Diego Presidio began to move themselves and their families from the presidio buildings to the tableland down the hill near the San Diego River. Historian William Smythe noted that Don Blas Aguilar, who was born in 1811, remembered at least 15 such grants below Presidio Hill by 1821 (Smythe 1908:99). Of these 15 grants, only five within the boundaries of what would become Old Town had houses in 1821. These included the retired commandant

Francisco Ruiz adobe (now known as the Carrillo Adobe), another building later owned by Henry Fitch on Calhoun Street, the Ybanes and Serrano houses on Juan Street near Washington Street, and a small adobe house on the main plaza owned by Juan Jose Maria Marron (San Diego Union 6-15-1873:3). By 1827, as many as 30 homes existed around the central plaza and in 1835, Mexico granted San Diego official pueblo (town) status. At this time the town had a population of nearly 500 residents, later reaching a peak of roughly 600 (Killea 1966:9-35). By 1835 the presidio, once the center of life in Spanish San Diego, had been abandoned and lay in ruins. Mission San Diego de Alcalá fared little better. In 1842, 100 Indians lived under the care of the friars and only a few main buildings were habitable (Pourade 1963:11-12, 17-18). The town and the ship landing area (La Playa) were now the centers of activity in Mexican San Diego.

Adobe bricks were used as the primary building material of houses during the Mexican Period because wood was scarce and dirt and labor were plentiful. The technique had been brought to the New World from Spain, where it had been introduced by the Moors in the Eighth Century. Adobe bricks were made of a mixture of clay, water, sticks, weeds, small rocks and sand. The sticks, weeds and small rocks held the bricks together and the sand gave the clay something to stick to. The mixture was poured into a wooden form measuring about 4 inches by 11 inches by 22 inches and allowed to dry. A one-room, single-story adobe required between 2,500 and 5,000 bricks. Walls were laid on the ground or built over foundations of cobblestone from the riverbed. To make walls the adobe bricks were stacked and held together with a thick layer of mortar (mud mixed with sand). Walls were usually three feet thick and provided excellent insulation from the winter cold and summer heat. To protect the adobe bricks from washing away in the rain, a white lime plaster or mud slurry was applied to the walls by hand and smoothed with a rock plaster smoother. The lime for the lime plaster was made by burning seashells in a fire. The lime was then mixed with sand and water. Once the plaster had dried, it formed a hard shell that protected the adobe bricks. The roof was usually made of carrizo cane bound with rawhide strips. Floors were usually of hard packed dirt, although tile was also used.

The new Pueblo of San Diego did not prosper as did some other California towns during the Mexican Period. In 1834 the Mexican government secularized the San Diego and San Luis Rey missions. The secularization in San Diego County had the adverse effect of triggering increased Native American hostilities against the Californios during the late 1830s. The attacks on outlying ranchos, along with unstable political and economic factors helped San Diego's population decline to around 150 permanent residents by 1840. San Diego's official Pueblo status was removed by 1838, and it was made a subprefecture of the Los Angeles Pueblo. When the Americans took over after 1846, the situation had stabilized somewhat, and the population had increased to roughly 350 non-Native American residents (Killea 1966:24-32; Hughes 1975:6-7).

Two important areas of research for the Mexican Period are the effect of the Mexican

rancho system on the Kumeyaay population and the effect of changing colonial economic policies and the frontier economic system on patterns of purchase, consumption and discard.

AMERICAN PERIOD (AD 1846-PRESENT)

When United States military forces occupied San Diego in July 1846, the town's residents split on their course of action. Many of the town's leaders sided with the Americans, while other prominent families opposed the United States invasion. A group of Californios under Andres Pico, the brother of the Governor Pio Pico, harassed the occupying forces in Los Angeles and San Diego during 1846. In December 1846, Pico's Californios engaged U.S. Army forces under General Stephen Kearney at the Battle of San Pasqual and inflicted many casualties. However, the Californio resistance was defeated in two small battles near Los Angeles and effectively ended by January 1847 (Harlow 1982; Pourade 1963).

The Americans raised the United States flag in San Diego in 1846, and assumed formal control with the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848. In the quarter of a century following 1848, they transformed the Hispanic community into a thoroughly Anglo-American one. They introduced Anglo culture and society, American political institutions and especially American entrepreneurial commerce. By 1872, they even relocated the center of the City and community to a new location that was more accessible to the bay and to commerce (Newland 1992:8). Expansion of trade brought an increase in the availability of building materials. Wood buildings gradually replaced adobe structures. Some of the earliest buildings to be erected in the American Period were "Pre-fab" houses which were built on the east coast of the United States and shipped in sections around Cape Horn and reassembled in San Diego.

In 1850, the Americanization of San Diego began to develop rapidly. On February 18, 1850, the California State Legislature formally organized San Diego County. The first elections were held at San Diego and La Playa on April 1, 1850 for county officers. San Diego grew slowly during the next decade. San Diegans attempted to develop the town's interests through a transcontinental railroad plan and the development of a new town closer to the bay. The failure of these plans, added to a severe drought which crippled ranching and the onset of the Civil War, left San Diego as a remote frontier town. The troubles led to an actual drop in the town's population from 650 in 1850, to 539 in 1860 (Garcia 1975:77). Not until land speculator and developer Alonzo Horton arrived in 1867 did San Diego begin to develop fully into an active American town (MacPhail 1979).

Alonzo Horton's development of a New San Diego (modern downtown) in 1867 began to swing the community focus away from Old Town. After the county seat was moved in 1871 and a fire destroyed a major portion of the business block in April 1872, Old Town rapidly declined in importance.

American Period resources can be categorized into remains of the frontier era, rural farmsteads and urban environments, with different research questions applicable to each category. Important research topics for the frontier era include studying the changing function of former Mexican ranchos between 1850 and 1940, and investigating the effect on lifestyles of the change from Hispanic to Anglo- American domination of the pueblo of San Diego. Research domains for rural farmsteads include the definition of a common rural culture, comparing the definition of wealth and consumer preferences of successful rural farm families versus middle and upper- middle class urban dwellers, definition of the evolution and adaptation of rural vernacular architecture, and identification of the functions of external areas on farmsteads.

Several intersecting and overlapping factors impacted patterns of settlement and growth during the American period. Some of these factors led to segregation and integration of race and socio-economic status. These factors include White flight; housing costs; access to well-paying jobs and economic mobility; racially and economically restrictive covenants within real estate deeds; redlining; discriminatory real estate practices; zoning; freeway construction; ballot initiatives; and public resistance to increased housing and density. Refer to the Assessment of Fair Housing for the City of San Diego's 2021-2029 Housing Element for further analysis.

Research questions for urban environments include definition of an urban subsistence pattern; definition of ethnic group maintenance and patterns of assimilation for identifiable ethnic groups; identification of specific adaptations to boom and bust cycles; definition of a common culture for working, middle and upper-middle class urban residents; identification of adaptations to building techniques, architectural styles, technological change and market fluctuations through analysis of industrial sites; and investigation of military sites to relate changes in armament technology and fortification expansion or reduction to changing priorities of national defense.

ARCHITECTURE

The built environment, including structures and landscapes, is a vital source of historical evidence on past lifeways, work, ideas, cultural values and adaptations. The built environment is neither a product of random events, nor a static phenomena. The rearrangement of structural features and land use are part of the way in which people organize their lives. Landscapes are lands that have been shaped and modified by human actions and conscious design to provide housing, accommodate production systems, develop communication and transportation networks, designate social inequalities and express aesthetics (Rubertone 1989).

Vernacular architectural studies have demonstrated that pioneer farmers and urban dwellers used folk styles to meet specific needs. Analyses of these house types illustrate adaptation by households as a result of changing needs, lifestyle and economic status. Studies of structural forms at military complexes have documented changes in technology

and national defense priorities, and industrial site studies have documented technological innovation and adaptation. The spatial relationships of buildings and spaces, and changes in those relationships through time, also reflect cultural values and adaptive strategies (Carlson 1990; Stewart-Abernathy 1986).

San Diego's built environment spans over 200 years of architectural history. The real urbanization of the City as it is today began in 1869 when Alonzo Horton moved the center of commerce and government from Old Town (Old San Diego) to New Town (downtown). Development spread from downtown based on a variety of factors, including the availability of potable water and transportation corridors. Factors such as views, and access to public facilities affected land values, which in turn affected the character of neighborhoods that developed.

During the Victorian Era of the late 1800s and early 1900s, the areas of Golden Hill, Uptown, Banker's Hill and Sherman Heights were developed. Examples of the Victorian Era architectural styles remain in those communities, as well as in Little Italy.

Little Italy developed in the same time period. The earliest development of the Little Italy area was by Chinese and Japanese fishermen, who occupied stilt homes along the bay. After the 1905 earthquake in San Francisco, many Portuguese and Italian fishermen moved from San Francisco into the area; it was close to the water and the distance from downtown made land more affordable.

Barrio Logan began as a residential area, but because of proximity to rail freight and shipping freight docks, the area became more mixed with conversion to industrial uses. This area was more suitable to the industrial uses because land values were not as high: topographically the area is more level and not as interesting in terms of views as the areas north of downtown. Various ethnic groups settled in the area because there land ownership was available to them.

San Ysidro began to be developed at about the same time, the turn of the century. The early settlers were followers of the Littlelanders movement. There, the pattern of development was lots designed to accommodate small plots of land for each homeowner to farm as part of a farming-residential cooperative community. Nearby Otay Mesa-Nestor began to be developed by farmers of Germanic and Swiss background. Some of the prime citrus groves in California were in the Otay Mesa-Nestor area; in addition, there were grape growers of Italian heritage who settled in the Otay River Valley and tributary canyons and produced wine for commercial purposes.

At the time downtown was being built, there began to be summer cottage/ retreat development in what are now the Beach communities and La Jolla area. The early structure in these areas was not of substantial construction; it was primarily temporary vacation housing.

Development spread to the Greater North Park and Mission Hills areas during the early 1900s. The neighborhoods were built as small lots, a single lot at a time; there was not large tract housing development of those neighborhoods. It provided affordable housing away from the downtown area, and development expanded as transportation improved.

There was farming and ranching in Mission Valley until the middle portion of the 20th century when the uses were converted to commercial and residential. There were dairy farms and chicken ranches adjacent to the San Diego River where now there are motels, restaurants, office complexes and regional shopping malls. There was little development north of the San Diego River until Linda Vista was developed as military housing in the 1940s. The federal government improved public facilities and extended water and sewer pipelines to the area. From Linda Vista, development spread north of Mission Valley to the Clairemont Mesa and Kearny Mesa areas. Development in these communities was mixed-use and residential on moderate size lots.

San Diego State University was established in the 1920s; development of the state college area began then and the development of the Navajo community was an outgrowth from the college area and from the west.

Tierrasanta, previously owned by the U.S. Navy, was developed in the 1970s. It was one of the first planned unit developments with segregation of uses. Tierrasanta and many of the communities that have developed since, such as Rancho Peñasquitos and Rancho Bernardo, represent the typical development pattern in San Diego in the last 25 to 30 years: uses are well segregated with commercial uses located along the main thoroughfares, and the residential uses are located in between. Industrial uses are located in planned industrial parks.

Examples of every major period and style remain, although few areas retain neighborhood-level architectural integrity due to several major building booms when older structures were demolished prior to preservation movements and stricter regulations regarding historic structures. Among the recognized styles in San Diego are Spanish Colonial, Pre-Railroad New England, National Vernacular, Victorian Italianate, Stick, Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, Neoclassical, Shingle, Folk Victorian, Mission, Craftsman, Monterey Revival, Italian Renaissance, Spanish Eclectic, Egyptian Revival, Tudor Revival, Modernistic and International (McAlester and McAlester 1990).

Research interests related to the built environment include San Diego's railroad and maritime history, development in relationship to the automobile, the role of recreation in the development of specific industries, as well as the design and implementation of major regional planning and landscaping projects, the role of international fairs on architecture, landscape architecture and City building; the development of industrial and military technologies between the two world wars; the relationship between climate, terrain, native plant material and local gardening and horticultural practices, planning and

subdivision practices from the turn of the century to the present day and the post-war period of suburbanization.

REFERENCES CITED

Almstedt, Ruth

1980 Ethnohistoric Documentation of Puerta La Cruz, San Diego County, California. Prepared for the California Department of Transportation, District 11.

Bada, Jeffrey L., Roy A. Schroeder and George F. Carter

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

Bull, Charles S.

1983 Shaking the Foundations: The Evidence of San Diego Prehistory. Cultural Resource Management Center Casual Papers 1(3): 15-64. Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

1987 A New Proposal: Some Suggestions for San Diego Prehistory. In San Dieguito - La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.

Cárdenas, D. Seán

1986 Avocado Highlands: An Inland Late La Jolla and Pre-ceramic Yuman Phase Site from Southern San Diego County. Cultural Resource Management Center Casual Papers 2(2): 59-84. Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

1987 Some Thoughts on the Origins of Late Prehistoric Populations in San Diego County. Paper presented at the 21st Annual Meeting of the Society for California Archaeology, Fresno.

Carlson, Shawn Bonath

1990 The Persistence of Traditional Lifeways in Central Texas. Historical Archaeology 24(4):50-59.

Carter, George F.

1957 Pleistocene Man at San Diego. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

1980 Earlier Than You Think: A Personal view of Man in America. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.

Christenson, Lynne E.

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

City of San Diego

1989 Progress Guide and General Plan. Revised and updated.

1991 "Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program."

1995 San Diego Land Development Code.

Davis, Emma Lou, Clark W. Brott and David L. Weide

1969 The Western Lithic Co-Tradition. San Diego Museum Papers No. 6.

Davis, Emma Lou, and Richard Shutler, Jr.

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

Englehardt, Fr. Zephyrin

1920 San Diego Mission. San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co.

Gallegos, Dennis R.

1987 A Review and Synthesis of Environmental and Cultural Material for the Batiquitos Lagoon Region. In San Dieguito - La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.

Garcia, Mario T.

1975 Merchants and Dons: San Diego's Attempt at Modernization 1850- 1860. Journal of San Diego History 21 (Winter):52-88.

Harlow, Neal

1982 California Conquered: The Annexation of a Mexican Province 1846-1850. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hector, Susan M.

1984 Late Prehistoric Hunter-Gatherer Activities in Southern San Diego County, California. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Hughes, Charles

1975 The Decline of the Californios: The Case of San Diego 1846-1856. Journal of San Diego History 21 (Summer):1-32.

Jackson, R., M. Boynton, W. Olsen and R. Weaver

1988 California Archaeological Resource Identification and Data Acquisition Program: Sparse Lithic Scatters.Sacramento: Office of Historic Preservation.

Killea, Lucy L.

1966 The Political History of a Mexican Pueblo: San Diego from 1825-1845. Journal of San Diego History 12 (July):5-35.

Luomala, Katharine

1963 Flexibility in Sib Affiliation among the Diegueño. Ethnology 2(3):282- 301.

MacPhail, Elizabeth C.

1979 The Story of New San Diego and of its Founder, Alonzo E. Horton. Revised edition, San Diego: San Diego Historical Society.

McAlester, Virginia and Lee McAlester

1990 A Field Guide to American Houses.New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Minshall, Herbert L.

1976 The Broken Stones: The Case for Early Man in California. La Jolla: Copley Books.

1983 Geological Support for the Age Deduced by Aspartic Acid Racemization of a Human Skull Fragment from La Jolla Shores, San Diego, California.Cultural Resource Management Center Casual Papers 1(3):65-75. Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

1989 Buchanan Canyon: Ancient Human Presence in the Americas. San Marcos: Slawson Communications.

Mooney, Brian F., Associates

n.d. Historic Properties Background Study for the City of San Diego Clean Water Program. Ms. on file with the City of San Diego Development and Environmental Planning Division, San Diego.

Moratto, Michael

1984 California Archaeology. Orlando: Academic Press.

Moriarty, James R.

1966 Cultural Phase Divisions Suggested by Typological Change Coordinated with Stratigraphically Controlled Radiocarbon dating in San Diego. Anthropological Journal of Canada 4(4):20-30.

1967 Transitional Pre-Desert Phase in San Diego, California. Science 155:533-556.

1969 The San Dieguito Complex: Suggested Environmental and Cultural Relationships. Anthropological Journal of Canada7(3):2-17.

Moriarty, James R., III, and Herbert L. Minshall

1972 A New Pre-Desert Site Discovered near Texas Street. Anthropological Journal of Canada 10(3):10-13.

Neuerberg, Norman

1986 The Changing Face of Mission San Diego. The Journal of San Diego History 32(1):1-26.

Newland, James D.

1992 The Americanization of the Cultural Landscape of Frontier San Diego 1846-1872. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

Office of Historic Preservation

1989 Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format. Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 4(a). Sacramento.

1991 Guidelines for Archaeological Research Design.Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5. Sacramento.

1995 Instructions for Recording Historical Resources. Sacramento.

Pourade, Richard F.

1961 The History of San Diego: Time of the Bells. San Diego: UnionTribune Publishing Co

1963 The History of San Diego: The Silver Dons. San Diego: UnionTribune Publishing Co.

Reeves, Brian O.K.

1985 Early Man in the Americas: Who, When, and Why. In Woman, Poet, Scientist: Essays in New World Anthropology Honoring Dr. Emma Louise Davis, edited by Clark W. Brott, pp. 79-104. Socorro: Ballena Press.

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

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

Richman, Irving

1911 California Under Spain and Mexico. Boston: Houghlin-Mifflin Company.

Robbins-Wade, Mary

1990 Prehistoric Settlement Patterns of Otay Mesa, San Diego County, California. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

Robinson, Alfred

1846 Life in California. New York: Wiley & Putnum.

Robinson, W.W.

1948 Land in California. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Rogers, Malcolm J.

1929 The Stone Art of the San Dieguito Plateau. American Anthropologist 31:454-467.

1945 An Outline of Yuman Prehistory. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 1:167-198.

1966 Ancient Hunters of the Far West. San Diego: Union-Tribune Publishing.

Rosen, Martin D.

1994 125-South Historic Properties Survey Report, 11-SD-125, 0.0/9.6, 11221/926475, 9.6/11.2, 11221/001400 (4 vols.). San Diego: California Department of Transportation.

Rubertone, Patricia E.

1989 Landscape as Artifact: Comments on "The Archaeological Use of Landscape Treatment in Social, Economic and Ideological Analysis". Historical Archaeology 23(1):5-54.

San Diego Union

1873 June 15, 1873 Issue.

Secretary of the U.S. Department of Interior

1995 "Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation."

Shipek, Florence

1963 Kumeyaay (Diegueño-Kamia) Land Use and Agriculture. Report to Attorneys' Docket 80, Mission Indian Land Claims Case.

1989 An Example of Intensive Plant Husbandry: The Kumeyaay of Southern California. In Foraging and Farming, edited by Davis R. Harris and Gordon C. Hillman. London: Uniwin Hyman.

Spier, Leslie

1928 Southern Diegueño Customs. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 20:292-358.

Smythe, William E.

1908 The History of San Diego 1542- 1908: An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Pioneer Settlement on the Pacific Coast of the United States. San Diego: The History Company.

State of California

1992 CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines. Office of Planning and Research, Office of Permit Assistance, Sacramento.

Stewart-Abernathy, Leslie C.

1986 Urban Farmsteads: Household Responsibilities in the City. Historical Archaeology 20(2):5-15.

Taylor, R.E., L.A. Payen, C.A. Prior, P.J. Slota, Jr., R. Gillespie, J.A.J. Gowlett, R.E.M. Hedges, A.J.T. Jull, T.H. Zabel, D.J. Donahue and R. Berger

1985 Major Revisions in the Pleistocene Age Assignments for North American Skeletons by C-14 Accelerator Mass Spectromety: None Older that 11,000 C-14 Years B.P. American Antiquity 50:136-140.

True, D.L.

1970 Investigation of a Late Prehistoric Complex in Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, San Diego County, California. Archaeological Survey Monographs No. 1. University of Great Basin Anthropology 4:233- 261.

1980 The Pauma Complex in Northern San Diego County: 1978. Journal of New World Archaeology 2(4:1-39).

1986 Molpa, a Late Prehistoric Site in Northern San Diego county: The San Luis Rey Complex, 1983. In Symposium: A New Look at Some Old Sites, edited by Gary S. Breschini and Trudy Haversat, pp. 29-36. Salinas: Coyote Press.

True, D.L., and Eleanor Beemer

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

True, D.L., and R. Pankey

1985 Radiocarbon Dates for the Pauma Complex Component at the Pankey Site, Northern San Diego County, California. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 7:240-244.

U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service

1986 National Register Bulletin 16. Guidelines for Completing National Register of Historic Places Forms.

Van Wormer, Stephen R.

1995 "Test Excavations of the Suspected Location of the Juan Maria Marron Adobe, Old Town San Diego, California." Ms. on file, Planning and Development Review Department, City of San Diego.

Warren, Claude N.

1966 The San Dieguito Type Site: Malcolm J. Rogers' 1938 Excavation on the San Dieguito River. San Diego Museum Papers No. 5.

1967 The San Dieguito Complex: A Review and Hypothesis. American Antiquity 32:168-185.

1968 Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. In Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States, edited by C. Irwin-Williams. Eastern New Mexico Contributions in Anthropology 1(3): 1-14.

Waugh, Mary Georgie

1986 Intensification and Land-use: Archaeological Indications of Transition and Transformation

in a Late Prehistoric Complex in Southern California. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

Williams, Jack

1994 Personal interview with James D. Newland (September 16, 1994).