



ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Sound Science. Creative Solutions.

Pasadena Office
625 Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 190
South Pasadena, CA 91030
Tel 626.240.0587 Fax 626.240.0607
www.swca.com

April 28, 2008

Kathleen Brady
BonTerra Consulting
151 Kalmus Drive, Suite E-200
Costa Mesa, California 92626
Via email to: KBrady@bonterraconsulting.com

RE: Response to Peer Review Comments on the Revised Addendum to Cultural Resources Assessment for the Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension Project, City of Corona, Riverside County, California

Dear Ms. Brady:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to peer review comments made by Ms. Casey Tibbet of LSA Associates, Inc. dated April 16, 2008 regarding the revised addendum to the *Cultural Resources Assessment for the Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension Project, City of Corona, Riverside County, California* that was completed by BonTerra Consulting in June 2006. In order to expedite your receipt of our response, we have prepared the following letter rather than reformatting the Revised Addendum, which can be appended to the original report and subsequent addenda.

Methods

Research for this project was undertaken quickly to meet a very aggressive schedule. In commencing work, an overview was undertaken to establish the basic historic context to the development of the community (see below under Context Statement). As is customary, building permit research was then performed, although none for the subject property existed in City of Corona or Riverside County records. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for Corona were also reviewed (none of which included the proposed project site) and U.S. Geological Survey maps as early as 1910 and dating to 1947 were investigated to establish when nearby roads were built and the surrounding area was developed. Research was subsequently conducted at the W. D. Addison Heritage Room at Corona Public Library, with the assistance of the reference librarian and the services of a very diligent volunteer. Names of all known owners of the subject property were researched, and local directories dating from the 1920s to the 1970s were reviewed. The library's photograph collection was investigated for any records of former owners and/or photographs of any kind of the subject property. The volunteer thankfully found aerial photos of the project area dating from 1973, which were misfiled under "Maybe Canyon" rather than the correct spelling of Mabey Canyon. Other sources included use of the Heritage Room card catalog (which had a unique format) and review of vertical files on various related subjects.

The subscription web service Ancestry.com was used a source to review census data regarding former owners, and the California Social Security Death Index was drawn on for birth and death data. The question of whether or not a nursery may have existed at one time on the subject property was part of the research design, but certainty as to its existence was never established.

Telephone interviews were held with parties who may have had knowledge of the subject property, including a former local fireman, various city planning and public works staff members, and numerous staff members at Riverside County Flood Control District. Although the architectural historian who performed this task has a great deal of experience evaluating bridges for National and California register significance, her broad base of bridge knowledge was augmented by further bridge research. Sources of that research included National Register of Historic Places separate and district listings, results of the project records search, the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) index at the Library of Congress, and various pontist (defined as "bridge builder;" loosely translated as Latin for bridge aficionado) websites. Those searches revealed the existence of no other such known arroyo stone footbridges in California. Various books and other technical publications on bridges, focusing primarily on bridges in California, were used as well.

As described in the addendum, a field visit was made to the site on February 11, 2008, the site was walked as far as was practicable, field notes were made, and digital photographs were taken.

An informal bibliography of sources that were used but may not have been cited in the distilled brief report are as follows:

Brick Firm Founder Dies.

1965 *The Daily Independent*, 3 February, pp. 1, 3.

California Social Security Death Index 1940-1997. n.p.

Durham, David L

1998 *Geographic Names: A Gazetteer of Historic and Modern Names of the State*. Quill Driver Books, Sanger, California.

Find Lakes

Electronic document, findlakes.com/mabey_canyon_california~ca01103.htm, accessed February 21, 2008.

Freeman, Marjorie

1967 Family Fun Is the Schedule Set for the Sky Ranch. *The Daily Independent*, 17 May, n.p.

Gunther, Jane Davies

1984 *Riverside County, California, Place Names: Their Origins and Their Stories*. Rubidoux Printing Co., Riverside, California.

Jameson, Charles

1987 Unpublished typewritten notes from interview with by Gloria Frial, May 1987. On file at Corona Public Library under "Biography."

Ranchos.

1974 Unpublished vertical file at Corona Public Library, June 1974, n.p.

United States Census Bureau

1900a United States Census-1900 Population Schedule, Corona. June 18, 1900, sheet A9.

United States Census Bureau

1900b United States Census-1900 Population Schedule, Riverside. June 18, 1900, sheet B2.

United States Census Bureau

1930a United States Census-1930 Population Schedule, Corona. April 5, 1930, sheet 4A.

United States Census Bureau

1930b United States Census-1930 Population Schedule, Redlands City. April, 4 1930, sheet 3A.

Young, Gayland (retired City of Corona fire fighter)

2008 Telephone interview with Francesca Smith, February 11, 2008.

Results

Context Statement

With more than 20 years of experience in architectural history, historic preservation consulting, and enforcing regulations, the architectural historian indeed developed a brief informal local context to familiarize herself with the local history of the area in order to make this evaluation. The contracted task, preparing a Revised Addendum to an existing Cultural Resources Assessment, did not warrant development either a brief or full context statement as part of the scope of work.

Directing our staff to review the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (Standards and Guidelines)* does not take into account the fact that this project was limited to the evaluation of a single property with an aggressive deadline of approximately two weeks and less than two weeks of staff time. We are well aware of the contents of this document. The *Standards and Guidelines* expressly state under Preservation Planning that they are not intended to be “regulatory and do not set or interpret agency policy....Activities undertaken to meet the goals must be designed to deliver a *usable product* within a *reasonable period of time*. The scope of the activity must be defined so the work can be completed with *available budgeted program resources* [emphasis added].” The task was to make findings as a basis for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance; thus, no development of a full historical context statement for the community was necessary.

Water Tank

While clarification of the brief evaluation of the water tank does not seem necessary—it was found not to be significant under any California Register criteria—additional explanation is enumerated below:

- It is not known whether or not the water tank was completed more or less than 45 years ago; there are no clear records of the development of the subject property that were readily available for use preparing the evaluation.
- Note that the California Register does not have a parallel 50-year age criterion to the National Register. California regulations states that a resource completed less than 50 years ago "may be considered for listing in the California Register if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance, " but it need not be exceptionally important. [California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 11.5, Section 4852(d)(2).
- The water tank was briefly considered, found to be a very common resource type and thus found to not be significant under any of the four California Register criteria.
- Because of these factors and based on our observations, no information was found to warrant further consideration of the water tank.

Evaluation

Results versus Evaluation

Historical information presented in the Evaluation section was used to set up the context by which the resources were evaluated. Switching the background to the Results or Conclusion section, which would be a matter of personal taste, would not substantively change the report or its conclusions, and does not warrant revising the report.

Local Criteria

Evaluation of the subject property according to local landmark criteria would have been outside of the agreed scope and moreover would not be germane to CEQA conformance. The property has not been designated a "Historic Landmark," it is not listed in the Corona Register of Historic Resources, nor does it appear to have been previously surveyed for historic significance in the City of Corona Heritage Inventory. Whether or not the subject property were *eligible* for local designation is not relevant to its California Register eligibility for this evaluation, as the California Public Resources Code asserts in Section 5024.1:

- (d) The California Register shall include the following:
- (1) California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places.
 - (2) State Historical Landmark No. 770 and all consecutively numbered state historical landmarks following No. 770. For state historical landmarks preceding No. 770, the office shall review their eligibility for the California Register in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the [California Historical Resources] commission.
 - (3) Points of historical interest which have been reviewed by the office [of Historic Preservation] and recommended for listing by the commission for inclusion in the California Register in accordance with criteria adopted by the commission.

- (e) If nominated for listing in accordance with subdivision (f), and determined to be significant by the commission, the California Register *may* include the following:
- (1) Individual historical resources.
 - (2) Historical resources contributing to the significance of an historic district under criteria adopted by the commission.
 - (3) Historical resources identified as significant in historical resources surveys, if the survey meets the criteria listed in subdivision (g).
 - (4) Historical resources and historic districts designated or listed as city or county landmarks or historic properties or districts pursuant to any city or county ordinance, *if the criteria for designation or listing under the ordinance have been determined by the office to be consistent with California Register criteria adopted by the commission.*
 - (5) Local landmarks or historic properties designated under any municipal or county ordinance. (emphasis added)

Please note that (e)(4) and (5) clarify that the property must be designated or listed—the presumption of local eligibility, which is usually less objective than California Register eligibility. Most local historic preservation ordinances have a lower threshold for significance than the California Register, and many local commissioners who decide on designation do not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards. No evidence was found that the City of Corona is a Certified Local Government (Office of Historic Preservation 2008).

For CEQA, three classes of historic significance can apply to any given property found to be significant; they are mandatory, presumptive, and discretionary historic significance (PRC Section 21084.1). If the resource is listed in (or has been found by the California Historic Resources Commission to be eligible for listing in) the California Register, that property possesses *mandatory* or obvious significance. However, if a resource is listed in a local register or survey of historical resources it has merely *presumptive*, or likely historic significance. In both cases, those resources would be presumed to be historically significant for the purposes of CEQA. In contrast, resources which have discretionary significance are those resources which, while not listed in either the California Register or found to possess significance in a local register or survey, may be found, based on substantial evidence (facts), to be historically significant. The potential or prospective case for local eligibility when the property has not been designated, as in this case, does not assign presumptive, mandatory, or discretionary significance under CEQA.

Types, Numbers, and Construction Methods (of other similar bridges)

In the peer review, it was recommended that “[i]nformation regarding the types, numbers, and construction methods of stone footbridges in the area should be added to support the significance evaluation.” Performing a comprehensive survey of footbridges, whether recommended at reconnaissance or intensive levels, is entirely outside the scope of evaluating the subject property with the agreed two-week time frame to provide brief California Register findings.

There is no known roster of stone footbridges (unlike vehicular bridges in California), and most would likely be located on private property, for which we have no authority to examine or review. Picturesque footbridges are generally located in the confines of public parks, cemeteries, and in private gardens.

A quick search of the HABS and the HAER collections at the Library of Congress reveals only one recorded stone bridge in California (Yosemite Creek Bridge, Spanning Yosemite Creek on Northside Drive, Yosemite Village, Mariposa County, CA), and one wood footbridge in San Bernardino County (Desert Queen Ranch, Keys Ranch House, Twentynine Palms vicinity, San Bernardino County, CA) (Library of Congress 2008).

Other searches for stone bridges including one site devoted to their recordation (Groundspeak, Inc. 2008) revealed only six other stone footbridges in the United States, although there may be up to 20 in total, many of which are not readily accessible to the public:

- Fall Creek Gorge Stone Bridge—Fall Creek, Illinois;
- Military Road Bridge—Sackets Harbor, New York;
- Monocacy Aqueduct—Pennsylvania;
- Old Stone Bridge, National Road—Hopewell, Ohio;
- Our Lady of St. Joseph Shrine Stone Bridge—Apple Creek, Missouri; and
- Steinhart Park—Nebraska City, Nebraska.
- Footbridge at Venetian Pool—Coral Gables, Florida.



Photograph 1. Stone footbridge at Venetian Pool, Coral Gables, Florida, depicting University of Miami, Men’s Glee Club (1928–1929). Listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Source: University of Miami Libraries, University of Miami Legacy, 2006.

Among the sources of study in evaluation this footbridge, one such source was *Historic Highway Bridges of California*, in particular the chapter on “Stone Arch Bridges” (Mikesell 1990). That work revealed that the existence of stone arch bridges in California is nearly entirely limited to Napa and Santa Barbara Counties. Mikesell’s work further confirmed that very few masonry arch bridges were built after World War I, which corroborated the researcher’s assertions about its rarity. Mikesell, currently the deputy State Historic Preservation Officer in California, asserts in that chapter:

No bridge type is more regionalized in California than the stone arch. An ancient bridge form, the stone arch was constructed in large numbers in the United States in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, before the Gold Rush brought great population increases to California. By the 1850s, newer bridge forms, especially timber and metal truss bridges, had replaced the stone arch as preferred bridge types throughout the United States. In short, California’s roads were developed after the time of the stone arch and *few such bridges were ever built here* [emphasis added].

Where the stone arch was built, it has to do with...regional factors, especially the availability of good stone and a tradition of stoneworking among the local population...

The stone masonry bridge was never constructed in large numbers in California.

Stone bridges are rare in California and more uncommon yet in Riverside County. Picturesque footbridges are also unusual in the state as well as the region. As a professional with more than 22 years of experience in evaluating thousands of vehicular and railroad bridges for historic significance, as an unreinforced masonry, arroyo stone footbridge, the subject property footbridge, at present, is a very rare resource type and is eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3.

The unreinforced masonry footbridge is a rare example of a very unusual type as asserted in the report. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) undertook an unprecedented survey of bridges under their purview in the late 1980s and developed a system for surveying bridges for historic significance that is recognized nationally. According to Caltrans bridge survey methodology, "if a bridge is an unusual or unique example of a particular construction method, it is held to be more significant than a common bridge type." Thus, the subject property footbridge is more significant than a common footbridge type, such as a stock or standard metal or wood footbridge. The arroyo stone, picturesque design is both unusual and a particularly well executed example of the Arts and Crafts-influenced design. The Caltrans Department of Transportation methodology affirms "[b]ridges are also valued when they are very beautiful..." as is the graceful and rustic design of this footbridge, "or when they possess unusual ornamental [such as the arroyo stone finish] or structural [such as unreinforced masonry] features." The footbridge meets the described threshold for both beauty (or "high artistic values") and structural and/or engineering distinction (or "method of construction").

Our research and observation has led us to believe that the cobble or arroyo stone footbridge is constructed in unreinforced masonry. Although there is a chance that concrete mortar in the bridge does contain reinforcing members such as rebar or some other type of reinforcement, the existence of reinforcing members would not diminish the significance of the footbridge. Its appearance is that of an unreinforced masonry arch executed in board-formed concrete. The barrel or lining of the arch shows the distinctive impression of boards that were likely used to support the inside of the arch or intrados during construction. Whether or not the small footbridge was constructed using unreinforced masonry, it is an example of an unusual structural system.

In the years following the Long Beach Earthquake, the use of unreinforced masonry was discontinued and its abandonment codified in Southern California building codes because of the increased risk of seismic activity. Unreinforced masonry construction such as the arroyo stone footbridge appears to suffer "lack of redundancy;" in the event of an earthquake, the main structural elements (arroyo stones and concrete) have no back-up, or alternate way to carry structural loads. Unreinforced masonry supports its load by compression, or all elements being stacked, affixed, and kept in that configuration, partly by gravity. The fact that the footbridge was constructed using archaic methods of construction, whether or not it was constructed

before or after the first World War, makes it important, because that method of engineering and that particular type of craftsmanship are no longer practiced.

Cobble or arroyo stone construction was most popular just after the turn of the 20th century, particularly in rugged settings such as the Arroyo Seco in nearby Pasadena. Noted Pasadena-based architects Charles and Henry Greene used these native materials skillfully in concert with other natural construction methods and finishes, which became an expression of the Craftsman or “Arts and Crafts” style. Resulting examples of cobble stone retaining and other walls, chimneys, porches, foundations, and other features adapted to rugged sites, blended effortlessly with land forms, their natural color palettes also unifying projects with their settings. In many cases the arroyo stones were collected from the project site, as the materials for this bridge may have been. These subtle forms were often battered, and the resulting nearly irregular appearance was frequently the end result of painstaking arrangement of stones of various sizes, shapes and subtle color differences. The end product echoed the rugged irregularity of the hillsides and translated the unusual natural vocabulary into organic expressions of buildings, structures and other features.

California Register Criteria

Although it is assumed that the peer reviewer has knowledge of the California Register criteria for evaluation, we direct them to the *Cultural Resources Assessment for the Foothill Parkway Westerly Extension Project, City of Corona, Riverside County, California* completed by BonTerra Consulting in June 2006. Because this report is an addendum, it was determined that repetition of regulatory background (which has not changed substantively since the original report was completed) was not necessary.

The footbridge is not eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 because it cannot be demonstrated to have been “associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.” It is not eligible because of a direct association “with the lives of persons important in our past” under Criterion 2. There is no reason to believe the property “has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history” as required under Criterion 4. We had assumed that proving the significance of the resource under one of the four criteria was sufficient, as required for the California Historic Resources Commission, to prove its significance.

To further clarify the significance of the footbridge, it is eligible at the regional level of significance, its period of significance is from approximately 1939, when it may have been built, until 1963 (50-year cutoff). The approximate boundaries of the historical resource are approximately 150 feet up- and downstream, and 100 feet on either side of the footbridge. Boundaries include surrounding land that contributes to the significance of the resource by functioning as its setting, including the fact that there is a stream, and the adjacent natural, informal, linear path that exists on either side of the bridge.

Integrity by Criterion

For a property to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C (or California Register Criterion 3), National Park Service guidance asserts that “a property important for illustrating a particular architectural style or construction technique must retain *most of the physical features that constitute that style or technique,*” in “How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation” under “VIII. How to Evaluate The Integrity of a Property.” The footbridge plainly retains most of the physical features that constitute its unique arroyo stone and concrete construction. Only a few cobble stones from the hundreds that make up the bridge and its abutments have been removed or dislodged over time.

PHOTOGRAPHS



Photograph 2. View of wing wall (left side) and side of bridge. Note careful arrangement of vossior stones lining arch ring, and nearly even courses of stone comprising spandrel (11 February 2008, SWCA Environmental Consultants).



Photograph 3. View northwest of very few missing stones at low parapet. Note uneven parapet wall at upper left of center (11 February 2008, SWCA Environmental Consultants).



Photograph 4. Overall detail of footbridge, view northeast. Note impressions of board-formed concrete beneath bridge. Scale and proportion of the bridge were masterfully manipulated by the gentle arched slope of the deck and use of diminishing stone sizes from the arch to the parapet or railing. Note the subtle circular arrangement of stones at the crest of the arch, punctuating the gentle geometry of the larger form (11 February 2008, SWCA Environmental Consultants).

The previously cited guidance clarifies that a resource which is significant because of its distinctive design must be recognizable as the original design, and the components that make it exceptional must remain:

A property important for illustrating a particular architectural style or construction technique must retain *most of the physical features that constitute that style or technique*. A property that has lost some historic materials or details can be eligible *if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its style* in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows and doors, texture of materials, and ornamentation. The property is not eligible, however, if it retains some basic features conveying massing but has lost the majority of the features that once characterized its style.

In the late 1980s, Caltrans developed a quantitative evaluation system for evaluating the more than 23,000 bridges in the agency's purview for historic significance. Caltrans is widely recognized for their creative and wide-ranging bridge evaluation system. Their statewide survey resulted in a point system in which bridges that had reached 50 years of age were scored equally according to specific criteria. Integrity for bridges were circumscribed to "various categories of modifications commonly found among historic bridges, such as the addition of new approach spans, addition of a cantilevered sidewalk, [and] and new railings..." (Mikesell 1990). No new approach spans have been added to the footbridge, no cantilevered or other sidewalk changes can be detected, and there is no evidence that the original railings have been modified.

National Register guidance asserts "[a]ll properties change over time. It is not necessary for a property to retain all its historic physical features or characteristics.... The property must retain, however, the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity. These essential physical features are those features that define both *why* a property is significant and *when* it was significant." Its significance is in its picturesque design, diminutive scale and proportions, rustic arroyo stone materials, and its unreinforced masonry, single-arch engineering. The when is its identified period of significance from approximately 1939, when it may have been built, until 1963 (50-year cutoff). The bridge spans the same water feature over which it was likely design to carry foot traffic, it has the same relationship of solids to voids as when built, and it retains the unique haunched massing and charming arched form that made it distinctive when it was completed. The fact that the residence, outbuildings, and airstrip have been demolished and/or are no longer in use does not diminish the significance of the footbridge, which does not depend on those features to bolster or augment its importance. The footbridge is located on a footpath, in a relatively natural setting, and any connection to the residence and other above-described features is purely conjectural. The significance of the footbridge is not dependent on its association with any of the other features, and any connection to the builder of "Skypark," as described in the Addendum, would be a guess. Changes to nearby landforms that were made when the debris basin was constructed do not diminish the significance of the footbridge. Its significance under Criterion 3 is not based on any connection to the former residence or other features of the property. The bridge itself is the historical resource; it is nearly unaltered, save for a few missing cobble stones and some graffiti; it still bridges a small creek or stream; and it would undoubtedly be recognizable to whomever built it.

Integrity and Criteria

The reviewer's assertion that the footbridge was evaluated for integrity rather than whether or not it meets California Register criteria is incorrect. In making findings for California Register eligibility, it is first necessary to establish whether or not a property retains sufficient integrity or "retain[s] enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance" (California Office of Historic Preservation "Technical Assistance Series #3, "What is the California Register?" 4 September 2002). If a property does not retain what is defined as requisite integrity, it is not generally necessary to perform additional research to establish whether or not a property meets any given significance criteria. There are certain cases in which significance overrides losses of integrity—cases where the resource is

more important for an event or its association than for its design and materials, and in considering contributors to a district, when integrity is a less crucial consideration than association.

In order for a property to be considered eligible for listing in the California Register, it must be found to be significant under at least one of the following four California Register criteria *and* must retain integrity to its period of significance. That was the case in our evaluation of the footbridge; after we established that it retained requisite integrity to be considered for California Register listing, it was evaluated against applicable criteria.

References

Groundspeak, Inc.

2008 Old Stone Bridge, National Road, Hopewell, OH, Electronic document, www.waymarking.com/waymarks/WM3MBA, accessed April 25, 2008.

Library of Congress

2008 Built in America: Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, 1933-Present. Electronic document, memory.loc.gov/ammem/collections/habs_haer, accessed April 25, 2008.

Mikesell, Steven D.

1990 *Historic Highway Bridges of California*. California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, California.

Office of Historic Preservation

CLG Contact List. Electronic document,

www.ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1072/files/clg%20contact%20list.pdf, accessed March 25, 2008.

University of Miami Libraries

2006 University of Miami Legacy. Electronic document,

[http://images.google.com/imgres?imgurl=http://scholar.library.miami.edu/umhistory/large_images/LG0206.jpg&imgrefurl=http://scholar.library.miami.edu/umhistory/DisplaySubjects.php%3Fsubject_id%3DMusic%2BSchool&h=491&w=800&sz=86&hl=en&start=10&um=1&btnid=u7O5Tf2Lp49Z-](http://images.google.com/imgres?imgurl=http://scholar.library.miami.edu/umhistory/large_images/LG0206.jpg&imgrefurl=http://scholar.library.miami.edu/umhistory/DisplaySubjects.php%3Fsubject_id%3DMusic%2BSchool&h=491&w=800&sz=86&hl=en&start=10&um=1&btnid=u7O5Tf2Lp49Z-M:&tbnh=88&tbnw=143&prev=/images%3Fq%3Dcobble%2Bstone%252Bbridge%26um%3D1%26hl%3Den%26sa%3DN)

[M:&tbnh=88&tbnw=143&prev=/images%3Fq%3Dcobble%2Bstone%252Bbridge%26um%3D1%26hl%3Den%26sa%3DN](http://images.google.com/imgres?imgurl=http://scholar.library.miami.edu/umhistory/large_images/LG0206.jpg&imgrefurl=http://scholar.library.miami.edu/umhistory/DisplaySubjects.php%3Fsubject_id%3DMusic%2BSchool&h=491&w=800&sz=86&hl=en&start=10&um=1&btnid=u7O5Tf2Lp49Z-M:&tbnh=88&tbnw=143&prev=/images%3Fq%3Dcobble%2Bstone%252Bbridge%26um%3D1%26hl%3Den%26sa%3DN), accessed April 25, 2008.



We appreciate this opportunity to assist you with the proposed project. Please feel free to contact us at 626-240-0587 or at kharper@swca.com or fsmith@swca.com to discuss the results of the evaluation in more detail.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Kip Harper". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "K".

Caprice D. (Kip) Harper, M.A., RPA
Project Manager – Cultural Resources

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Francesca G. Smith". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "F".

Francesca G. Smith, M.S.
Senior Architectural Historian