

TABLE OF CONTENTS	<u>PAGE</u>
4.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES	4.1-1
4.1.1 Affected Environment	4.1-2
4.1.2 Environmental Consequences including Cumulative Analysis	4.1-18
4.1.3 Mitigation Measures	4.1-21
4.1.4 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards	4.1-22
4.1.5 Agencies and Agency Contacts	4.1-30
4.1.6 Required Permits.....	4.1-30
4.1.7 References	4.1-30

TABLES	
Table 4.1-1 Study, Survey, and APE Areas.....	4.1-2
Table 4.1-2 Surveys Conducted Within 0.25-Mile of the Survey Area	4.1-7
Table 4.1-3 Historical Maps Reviewed	4.1-9
Table 4.1-4 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within the Study Area	4.1-10
Table 4.1-5 Applicable LORS for Cultural Resources.....	4.1-23
Table 4.1-6 Agencies and Agency Contacts for Cultural Resources	4.1-30

4.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section addresses the potential impacts to cultural resources associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Project.

Cultural resources are past and present expressions of human culture and history in the physical environment and include prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, structures, natural features, and biota that are considered important to a culture, subculture, or community. The term also includes aspects of the physical environment that are a part of traditional lifeways and practices and are associated with community values and institutions. Cultural resources are often divided into categories of prehistoric and historic. For the purposes of this AFC, the term "prehistoric" is used to describe any material remains, structures, and items used or modified by people before Euro-Americans established a presence in the region. The term "historic" is used to refer to material remains and the landscape alterations that have occurred since the arrival of Euro-Americans. A category of "Native American resources" is also used to refer to traditional resources, activities, or locations that are identified and used by the modern Native American population. Historical resources are a subset of cultural resources that meet specific eligibility criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (Public Resources Code [PRC] 5024.1; CCR Title 14, Section 4850.3; and CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(a)). These include resources within California that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) ("historic properties"; 36 CFR 60.4), which are automatically listed on the CRHR. Unique archaeological resources are another subset of cultural resources that include prehistoric and historic archaeological resources that can contribute to current research questions, are considered unique or special in the field of archaeology, and are related to a specific event or person (PRC 21083.2(g)).

The cultural resources assessment prepared for the proposed Project (Farmer and King 2011; Appendix C) includes a description of the Project site and affected environment; existing site conditions; a summary of the ethnography, prehistory, and history of the region; a review of site records for previously completed cultural resource investigations and recorded sites in the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and within a 1-mile study area; the results of the archaeological survey; and results of the Native American consultation. It is important for the reader to note that the Project footprint at the time of the survey and associated research was larger than that analyzed here. For the purposes of this AFC, only those resources within the research radius and survey buffer defined in accordance with *Rules of Practice and Procedure, Power Plant Site Certification and Designation of Transmission Corridor Zones* (CEC 2008:86-87) for the current Project layout are discussed in this section. Further, terminology used is relative to the current Project layout and those CEC-defined buffers (i.e., "survey area" is defined differently in the technical report). Complete documentation of the full resource inventory is provided in the confidential Appendix C, Cultural Resources Technical Report.

For the purposes of this AFC section a study area, survey area, and APE were established. These are defined in Table 4.1-1 below. The APE is also depicted in Appendix C, Figure 1-3.

Table 4.1-1 Study, Survey, and APE Areas

Term	CEC-Requirement	AFC Definition
Study Area	Identify cultural and historic architectural resources within an area not less than a 1-mile radius around the Project site and not less than one-quarter (0.25) mile on each side of the linear facilities.	The area within 0.25-mile of the gas lateral pipeline and gen tie corridors and within 1 mile of the Project boundary and preliminary SDG&E switchyard. Boundaries of paved, existing offsite parking area.
Survey Area	New pedestrian archaeological surveys shall be conducted inclusive of the Project site and Project linear facility routes, extending to no less than 200 feet around the project site, substations and staging areas, and to no less than 50 feet to either side of the ROW of project linear facility routes.	Project site and a 200-foot buffer around the proposed Project boundary and preliminary SDG&E switchyard and a 50-foot buffer around the gas lateral pipeline and gen tie corridors.
APE	The geographic area or areas within which the Project may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist (36 CFR 800.16 (d)).	The surfaces and depths that will be disturbed within the proposed Project footprint (gas lateral pipeline and gen tie corridors, the plant site, the utility switchyard, the laydown area, and paved, existing offsite parking area).

This section is based on the confidential cultural resources technical report (Appendix C; Farmer and King 2011) and assesses the potential affects that earth-moving activities associated with construction of the proposed Project will have on cultural resources that may be eligible for the CRHR. All cultural resources work for the Project was carried out under the direct supervision of an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR 61, Appendix A). Qualifications of the individuals contributing to this report are provided in Appendix C. The cultural resources investigation was done in accordance with the Warren-Alquist State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Act (PRC, Section 25000 et seq.); CEC’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Power Plant Site Certification and Designation of Transmission Corridor Zones (CEC 2008: Appendix B). Also, this study was done in accordance with CEQA (PRC Section 21000 et seq. and Title 14 of the CCR, Chapter 3, Section 15000).

4.1.1 Affected Environment

The following discussions address the cultural and historical context for the immediate and surrounding 5-mile radius areas as required by the CEC (2008: Appendix B), results of research efforts, and results of the field survey conducted for the Project.

4.1.1.1 Prehistoric Context

For purposes of this report, “prehistory” is considered the period of human occupation prior to Spanish contact (Anno Domini [AD] 1542). The prehistoric cultural chronology developed for Southern California has been extensively detailed in numerous previous investigations (Basgall and True 1985; Moratto 1984; Erlandson and Colton 1991). Archaeological complexes within the San Diego region are focused upon here, although they are discussed chronologically. Prehistorically, the proposed Project region sustained varying sequences of population densities and utilization. Current California archaeological theory characterizes prehistoric human

occupation of the region as one that evolved through adaptation of settlement and subsistence strategies to the environment and available resources.

Pleistocene Period

Pleistocene occupation prior to circa (ca.) 10,000 years before present (BP) in the region has been debated, although less so recently, and remains an unsettled topic. Some have argued that assemblages consisting of “crude” cobble artifacts represent a very early human presence. However, without formal artifacts such as projectile points or ornamental items, or even human remains, this argument continues to be contested. Many believe the cobble artifacts to be of a natural origin. Laylander (2011) suggests that future archaeological investigations in the San Diego region, including observations of geological processes and materials, may be able to contribute additional information regarding the natural or cultural origin of such cobble assemblages.

A Late Pleistocene presence is generally more accepted due to the somewhat scarce occurrence of fluted points characteristic of the Clovis Pattern. However, even the temporal association of these is contested in the San Diego region due to their early use and potential to be traded through time periods. Of the three fluted points identified in the region (Laylander 2011), only one fluted point, made of obsidian, came from a controlled archaeological excavation (Kline and Kline 2007). However, when the material was sourced it was found to be from the Casa Diablo source in Mono County of Northern California. The expansive distance between this material source and the artifact’s final deposition may suggest a comparable amount of time passed before it was brought into the San Diego region by a more recent, post-Pleistocene population. However, Kline and Kline (2007: page 58) argue that if this were the case “it would more likely have been intermingled with later artifacts closer to the surface levels.”

Early Period/Archaic Period

During this period between 10,000 and 1300 BP, people were highly mobile and their subsistence strategy focused on hunting large and small game and gathering seasonally available plants. A paucity of ground stone tools has led some to conclude that vegetal resources were not heavily utilized during this period (Rogers 1966; Warren 1967; Moratto 1984).

Two cultural complexes, San Dieguito and La Jolla, have been identified in the San Diego region. Distinguishing between these two complexes has presented much fodder for debate. Crescents, bifaces, and scrapers are believed to be more common in San Dieguito site assemblages. Further San Dieguito lithic technology appears to be based on a combination of percussion and pressure flaking techniques, with a material preference of fine-grained felsitic (fine-grained igneous rock consisting essentially of quartz and feldspar) rock. San Dieguito sites are typically found on mesas, ancient desert terraces, inland dry lakes, and near river valleys and coastal lagoons (Warren 1966). La Jolla assemblages, on the other hand, are dominated by more “crude” hammers/choppers, cores, and manos. Tools in this complex are considered inferior to San Dieguito tools and are typically made of water-worn cobbles (Laylander 2011). The La Jolla complex has been identified primarily in coastal settings, transverse valleys, sheltered canyons, benches, and knolls (Wallace 1955, Moriarty 1966).

The traditional view has placed La Jolla sites as later temporally than San Dieguito sites, but more recently this view has been challenged by new theories that propose the complexes are representations of different functions rather than cultural/population or temporal differences.

Archaic-Late Prehistoric Transition

There is debate as well regarding the transition from Archaic to Late Prehistoric populations. In general, four theories have been postulated and have been summarized by Laylander (2011):

- Archaic populations persisted into the Late Prehistoric, their culture evolving independently and in place;
- Populations were influenced by neighboring groups and possibly by immigration of those groups into the San Diego region;
- Neighboring groups migrated into the San Diego area, displacing earlier populations; or
- An occupational hiatus occurred in the San Diego area as Archaic populations moved or died out and Late Prehistoric populations later migrated in.

In any case, there is a demonstrated scarcity of radiocarbon dates in the region between 1300 BP and AD 200. Linguistic studies have identified a separation or transition of local, ethnographically-known languages at approximately the same time.

Late Prehistoric Period

The Late Prehistoric Period in southern San Diego County spanned between 1300 BP and Spanish Contact. In this region, the period is represented by the Cuyamaca complex. Cuyamaca populations are regarded as the ancestors of the ethnohistorically documented Kumeyaay culture. This complex is defined by the use of the bow and arrow, smaller projectile points, presence of obsidian and pottery, changes in mortuary practices from inhumations to cremations, and an emphasis on inland/upland food gathering (e.g., acorns, piñon nuts) and processing. Settlement patterns range from permanent villages along or near water courses, or semi-permanent seasonal village sites, to temporary camps. Artifact assemblages include small, triangular pressure-flaked projectile points (Cottonwood and Desert Side Notched series), serrated projectile points, Butte obsidian, portable milling implements, bedrock milling features, buff and brownware pottery, bone awls, *Olivella* shell beads, and other stone and shell ornaments and cremations. Pictographs, petroglyphs, and geoglyphs are also associated with this complex (Meighan 1954, Moratto 1984).

During this period, numerous trail systems developed for short- and long-range travel as people continued to diversify their resource base by accessing nearby habitat and acquiring goods through long distance trading networks. Commodities such as obsidian, marine shell, fish, and salt were traded and purchased. Late Prehistoric sites are generally associated with water sources, aquatic resource areas, trails, pictographs, petroglyphs, bedrock grinding surfaces, permanent and temporary camps, caches, and rock shelters (Moratto 1984).

4.1.1.2 Ethnohistoric Context

The project falls within the territory ethnographically inhabited by the Kumeyaay, a Yuman-speaking group of the Hokan language stock. The Kumeyaay occupied territory from the

Batiquitos Lagoon in the north, extending south past Ensenada Mexico, west to the coast, and near the Colorado River to the east. Their northern neighbors were the Luiseño, who spoke a Takic language (Kroeber 1925). In the 20th century, the Yuman-speaking bands of southern California and northern Baja California acquired the tribal name of Kumeyaay. They are also referred to as the Ipai (northern region), Tipai (southern region), and the Kamia (eastern desert region) (Luomala 1978).

Traditionally the Kumeyaay were mobile hunters and gathers that existed in autonomous bands, exploiting a variety of coastal, mountain, and desert resources. Settlements were scattered and band size varied, as people moved through a seasonal gathering round for available water, plant, and animal resources. Dwellings varied from windbreaks, cave and rock shelters, and sunken, dome thatched structures with wooden pole framework (Luomala 1978). The selected structure type depended on need, the season, locality, and available raw materials. Hunting resources consisted of small game such as rabbit, rodents, and birds, and occasional bighorn sheep and deer. A wide variety of seeds and plants were gathered including acorns, rice grass, piñon nuts, wild plums, mesquite pods, yucca, agave (mescal), and cacti (Luomala 1978, Spier 1923).

Today, the descendents of the Kumeyaay bands are divided among 12 reservations in the southern portion of San Diego County, and the Luiseño bands are divided among five reservations in the northern portion of the county. The traditional origin belief of the Kumeyaay people is expressed through the oral tradition of ceremonial song cycles, known as the Bird Songs. These songs describe how the Kumeyaay people were created within the region and have been there from the beginning of time. They believe there is continuity between the ancestral coastal, mountain, and desert people of the region and the Native descendents of today (Wilson 2001, Russell et. al 2007).

4.1.1.3 Historic Context

Written history in the area begins with early Spanish mission settlement and exploration, Euro-American settlement, railroad and mining development, and the military. The first Spanish mission and presidio was founded in 1769 at present day San Diego, followed by San Luis Rey (1798), the San Luis Rey Mission at Pala (1816), and Chapels of the San Diego Mission at Santa Ysabel (1818). Local Native American tribes were indoctrinated into the mission system as a source of forced labor under the auspices of religious conversion. One of the first Spanish expeditions through the region was Juan Bautista de Anza, who led an expedition in 1774 to establish an overland route that would serve as a route for supplies and personnel moving north from Mexico to the missions in California. The Spanish introduced horses, cattle, agricultural tools and products, and new architectural and construction styles. In 1821, Mexico successfully revolted against Spain, achieving independence and shifting control of southern California to Mexico. During this time, cattle ranching dominated agricultural activities in the region. After the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, California became a territory of the United States and in 1850 achieved statehood (Robinson 1948).

The 1849 California Gold Rush brought thousands of diverse immigrants to the state. By 1854, the San Diego Trail (formally Pedro Fages' Oriflamme Canyon route) became the main route for travelers coming from the east. In 1865, the San Diego to Fort Yuma Wagon Road was opened.

This access road later became the basis of the Old Highway 80 alignment (Bates 1970, Rensch 1957).

During the 1860s to 1870s, settlers were drawn yet again to the San Diego region due to the discovery of gold near Cuyamaca and Julian. The first lode was discovered in 1870 at the Julian Mine. The mines were worked by individuals and by corporations such as the Chariot Mining and Milling Corporation. Production for mining peaked between 1872 and 1873 and was only practiced at a small scale level after the rush (Cook and Fulmer 1981). The increase in population and migration created the need for efficient transportation corridors in the region. Several trails, stage roads, and eventually rail lines and automobile roads crossed the area, providing a means of travel and transportation of supplies for people.

Homesteading was also encouraged in the region in the late 1800s. The historic community of Linda Vista was established in 1886 as a dispersed settlement of farmsteads centered northwest of the Project area in San Clemente Canyon. However, the community was considered to cover farmsteads scattered across the immediate area practicing mixed farming, including cattle and chicken ranching and growing wheat. Residents constructed wells in canyons and pumped water up to the mesas to supplement the limited water supply in the area. Earthen dams were also constructed across drainages and cisterns were used to store rainwater for household use. The community declined and eventually ceased when the community school closed in 1912 and devastating flooding occurred in 1916. The establishment of military facilities in the area displaced any remaining community members (Hector et al 2004: pages 18-20).

Several military facilities have existed within the boundaries of what is now Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar, north and west of the proposed Project. These included Camp Kearny (National Guard, 1917-1920), Camp Holcomb/Camp Elliot (1934-1960), Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Camp Kearny (1943-1946), and Miramar (1946-present) (Hector et al 2004: pages 20-23). The activities of all of these bases were focused to the east and west of the Project area in Sycamore and San Clemente Canyons, respectively.

4.1.1.4 Resource Inventory

Identification efforts for this project included a records search via the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC); review of existing site records, previously conducted surveys in the area, and historic maps; consultation with the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and local Native American representatives; and a field survey of the APE and a buffer. The discussions below detail these efforts.

Records Search Results

A cultural resources record search was requested of the Project area and a 1-mile buffer on May 9, 2011 and was completed by the SCIC, part of the California Historical Resources Information System, at San Diego State University on May 12, 2011. Full copies of existing survey reports within a ¼-mile radius of the Project area were received on May 17, 2011. Additionally, the Santee Historical Society and the Museum of Man were consulted to determine if they knew of any resources in the proposed Project area that may not be on file with the SCIC. The Santee Historical Society did not know of any. The Museum of Man identified 73 resources within the proposed Project study area, many of which were on file at the SCIC. As

stated above under Section 4.1, a significantly larger project footprint and associated study area than those analyzed here were utilized in the records searches. Therefore the number of returned resources and surveys are higher than discussed here. Only those resources within the study area (CEC 2008) of the final project layout are presented below. A more detailed listing of the overall results of the records searches is provided in the technical report (Appendix C; Farmer and King 2011).

Archival Review

The records search determined that the entirety of the APE and survey area had been previously surveyed for cultural resources at various times between 1973 and 2008, and several other surveys had been performed within the study area (see Table 4.1-2 for a complete listing). In addition to reviewing available survey reports, lists or registers of historic properties, such as the CRHR and NRHP, as well as local landmarks on the list of Historical Landmarks Designated by the San Diego Historical Resources Board were reviewed to identify cultural resources within the study area. Historical maps were also reviewed to determine where unrecorded historic structures and features may be located (see Table 4.1-3 for a complete listing).

Sixty-nine surveys have been conducted within the study area, 28 of which are within a 0.25-mile radius of the survey area and will be provided to the CEC with the technical report (Appendix C). Fourteen of those included portions of the survey area and APE (not including the paved temporary offsite parking). Table 4.1-2 provides a detailed listing of those previous surveys within 0.25-mile of the survey area and denotes which reports covered the APE. Most of the surveys in and around the APE identified only isolates or did not identify cultural resources at all. All indicated that ground surface visibility was fair to poor and topography was considered steep and unlikely to be suitable for habitation sites. Several focused only on ridgetops and saddles, avoiding less “productive” steep slopes. Within the larger study area, the majority of surveys identified isolates, lithic deposits, milling stations, and few habitation sites.

Table 4.1-2 Surveys Conducted Within 0.25-Mile of the Survey Area

Report Title	Author(s) (Firm)	Date	SCIC Survey Report #
<i>An Archaeological Survey of the Sycamore Canyon Landfill Site</i>	Fink, Gary R. (San Diego County Engineer Dept.)	1973	1120935*
<i>Mast Boulevard Archaeological Survey and Mitigation Report</i>	Cupples, Sue Ann, Ruth C. Tolles, and Dr. Larry L. Leach (SDSU Foundation)	1974	1120517
<i>An Archaeological Survey of the San Diego River Valley</i>	Cupples, Sue Ann (SDSU Foundation)	1975	1120546*
<i>Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Proposed Grossmont Union High School District Sites</i>	Carrico, Richard L. (WESTEC Services, Inc.)	1976	1120348
<i>A Cultural Resource Study of the Murray, Cowles, and Fortuna Mountain Regional Park</i>	Hanna, David C. (RECON)	1978	1120994*
<i>Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Lake Murray, Cowles, and Fortuna Mountain Regional Park</i>	Hanna, David C. (RECON)	1978	1124185*
<i>Archaeological and Historical Survey of the Mast Boulevard Housing Project Site</i>	Carrico, Richard L. (WESTEC)	1982	1120415

4.1 Cultural Resources

Report Title	Author(s) (Firm)	Date	SCIC Survey Report #
<i>First Addendum Archaeological Survey Report for Proposed State Route 52 Santo Road to State Route 67 (Portion) 11-SD-52 P.M. 7.3/17.2 11222-047050</i>	Corum, Joyce (Caltrans)	1985	1125043
<i>Archaeological Test Excavation at Sites CA-SDi-5655, 5658, 9239, 9240, 9246, 9247, 9913 in Shepherd Canyon, San Diego, California 11-SD-52 P.M. 7.3/17.2 11222-047050</i>	Corum, Joyce and Karen Crotteau (Caltrans)	1985	1120779
<i>Negative Archaeological Survey Report 8-Fairmount Ave.-Westbound Auxiliary Lane</i>	Donovan, Mary	1985	1126526
<i>Extended Phase I and Phase II Archaeological Test Excavations at Sites CA-SDI-205, 5053, 8594, 9242, 10148, Santee, CA 11-SD-52 P.M. 7.3/17.2</i>	Corum, Joyce (Caltrans)	1986	1124934
<i>Negative Archaeological Survey Report District II County of San Diego</i>	Kelsay, Richalene (San Diego State University Cultural Resource Management Center/Caltrans)	1987	1125675
<i>Second Addendum Phase I Archaeological Survey and Extended Phase I Investigation for Proposed State Route 52, Santo Road to State Route 67, 11-SD-52 P.M.7.3/17.2 11222-047040</i>	Corum, Joyce M. (Caltrans)	1988	1121206*
<i>A Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed East Elliott Community Planning Area</i>	Wade, Sue & Susan Hector (RECON)	1988	1124184*
<i>Cultural Resources Inventory: Mast Boulevard Extension, Santee, California</i>	Gross, Timothy, and Mary Robbins-Wade (Affinis)	1989	1129427
<i>Clean Water Program for Greater San Diego Santee Basin Water Reclamation Project Draft Environmental Report, Appendix E - Historic Properties Inventory Report for the Santee Water Reclamation Project, San Diego, California</i>	Gallegos, Dennis, Joyce Clevenger, & Anne Cooper (ERC Environmental & Energy Services Co.)	1990	1124181*
<i>Cultural Resources Survey for Ordnance Clearance at Former Camp Elliot, Mission Trails Regional Park, San Diego, California</i>	Dames & Moore	1991	1123331
<i>Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration of PacTel Cellular Communications Facility East Elliot, San Diego County, California</i>	City of San Diego	1994	1122822*
<i>Cultural Resources Survey of Sycamore Landfill Entrance Facility in San Diego, California</i>	Hanna, David C. (County of San Diego Dept. of Public Works)	1994	1123073
<i>A Cultural Resource Study for the PacTel Cellular-Fischer Project</i>	Smith, Brian F. & Stephen J. Burke (Brian F. Smith & Associates)	1994	1122928*
<i>Archaeological Survey off the SDG&E Power Line Relocation for Little Sycamore Canyon Landfill, San Diego County, California</i>	Robbins-Wade, Mary (Affinis)	1995	1123039*
<i>Historical/Archaeological Survey Report for the Water Repurification Pipeline and Advanced Water Treatment Facility, City of San Diego, California</i>	Schroth, Adella B., Dennis R. Gallegos, Peti McHenry, & Nina Harris (Gallegos & Associates)	1996	1123720*
<i>Archaeological Monitoring for the East Mission Gorge Trunk Sewer Rehabilitation Project, San Diego, California</i>	Robbins-Wade, Mary (Affinis)	1998	1129214

4.1 Cultural Resources

Report Title	Author(s) (Firm)	Date	SCIC Survey Report #
<i>Mitigated Negative Declaration for Sycamore Landfill Continued Operations - Brushing and Clearing</i> (Report missing from SCIC database.)	City of San Diego	2001	1124675*
<i>Archaeological Resources Survey - Mission Trails Regional Park, Multi-Use Staging Area, San Diego</i>	Robbins-Wade, Mary (Affinis)	2001	1126377
<i>Cultural Resource Survey for the Sycamore Landfill EIR Project, City of San Diego, California</i>	Guerrero, Monica C. & Dennis R. Gallegos (Gallegos & Associates)	2003	1129570*
<i>Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Sycamore Landfill Master Plan</i>	City of San Diego Development Services	2008	1131513*

Notes:

*Denotes survey report within the survey area and APE.

Of the historical maps reviewed (Table 4.1-3), none indicated features, trails, or other notable locations within the study area. The 1953 USGS La Mesa quadrangle indicates that the entirety of the APE and most of the survey area are within the historic boundaries of MCAS Miramar. Gravel pits are depicted in Little Sycamore Canyon and at the southern end of the ridgeline separating Little Sycamore and Spring Canyons on the 1978 USGS 1:250,000 topographic map of San Diego (USGS and National Ocean Survey 1978). The existing SDG&E transmission line corridor is shown on the 1979 San Diego, California-Baja California Norte USGS 1:250,000 topographic map (USGS and National Ocean Service 1979).

Table 4.1-3 Historical Maps Reviewed

Map Title (Author)	Date	Resources Shown Within Quail Brush Survey Area
Map Showing Roads and Trails in Use from 1769-1885, San Diego County, California, 1:100,000 (San Diego County Office of County Assessor)	1955 (Indicating 1769-1885 Time Period)	None
La Jolla, CA, 1:62,500 (USGS)	1903 (Reprinted 1913)	None
La Jolla, CA, 1:62,500 (USGS)	1903 (Reprinted 1942)	None
La Mesa and Poway Valley, 1:24,000 (USGS, Compiled by SCIC)	1953 (La Mesa), 1952 (Poway Valley)	Naval Reservation Boundary inclusive of APE and study area.
San Diego, 1:250,000 (USGS and National Ocean Survey)	1958 (Revised 1978)	Gravel Pits in Little Sycamore Canyon (presumably currently active gravel production area at landfill) and at southern toe of ridge separating Little Sycamore and Spring Canyons (in the current parking area for the Mission Trails Park).
San Diego, California-Baja California Norte, 1:250,000 (USGS, National Ocean Service)	1979	Transmission line crossing Spring and Little Sycamore Canyons.

There are no previously recorded historic properties or historical resources within the survey area, nor are there any listed on the San Diego Historical Resources Board's list of landmarks. There is one historical resource within the study area that is listed on the CRHR and the

Historical Resources Board’s list: the Mission Dam (P-37-20910). The site is approximately 0.6-mile southwest of the APE along the San Diego River and within the Mission Trails Regional Park. According to viewshed analyses conducted for this project (Figure 5.5-1), the plant site and gen tie would not be visible from the dam structure.

Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

A review of resources recorded within the study area provides a more-informed overview of the archaeological landscape of the Project. A total of 55 archaeological sites and 50 isolates were previously recorded within the study area (Table 4.1-4). One of these archaeological sites, CA-SDI-13593 (P-37-13593), and one of these isolates (P-37-16213) were mapped by the SCIC as within the survey area and APE. CA-SDI-13593 is a lithic and groundstone deposit that was previously collected and subsurface tested (Smith and Burke 1994: page 42). The isolate consists of a core/cobble tool. All noted materials appear to have been locally derived.

Table 4.1-4 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within the Study Area

Primary Number	Trinomial	Recorder, Date Recorded	Notes
37-000203	CA-SDI-203	Treganza, nd; RECON, 1978; Affinis, 1993	Habitation Site
37-000204	CA-SDI-204	Treganza, nd; ASM Affiliates, 2009	Bedrock Milling Site
37-004353	CA-SDI-4353	M. J. Hatley, 1975	Milling Station
37-004353	CA-SDI-4353	RECON, 1975	Milling Station (Museum of Man Site #W-952)
37-005686	CA-SDI-5686	David C. Hanna, Jr., 1978	Flake Scatter
37-005689	CA-SDI-5689	David C. Hanna, Jr., 1978	Bedrock Milling Site
37-009242	CA-SDI-9242	Anna Noah, 1982; Caltrans, 1986; Gallegos & Associates, 1992	Habitation Site (Previously recorded as a light lithic scatter.)
37-010052	CA-SDI-10052	Unknown	Milling Station
37-010053	CA-SDI-10053	Unknown	Flake and Tool Scatter
37-010054	CA-SDI-10054	Gallegos & Associates, 1996	Flake and Tool Scatter with Milling Stations
37-011057	CA-SDI-11057	Caltrans, 1988; ERC Environmental, 1990; Gallegos & Associates 1993	Limited or Temporary Habitation Site with Bedrock Milling Slick (Previously recorded as sparse tool scatter.)
37-011459	CA-SDI-11459	Brian F. Mooney Associates, 1989	Sparse Lithic and Groundstone Scatter
37-011606	CA-SDI-11606	ERC Environmental, 1990; Gallegos & Associates, 1993	Milling Station (Previously recorded with Tizon Brownware and flake scatter.)
37-011607	CA-SDI-11607	ERC Environmental, 1990	Limited or Temporary Habitation Site
37-011608	CA-SDI-11608	ERC Environmental, 1990	Flake and Groundstone Scatter
37-011761	CA-SDI-11761	ERC Environmental, 1990	Possible Historic Cistern
37-013227	CA-SDI-13227	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993; William Manley Consulting 1995; Anteon Corp. 2002	Historic Refuse Deposit ca. 1870-1937 with Prehistoric Flake and Tool Scatter, NRHP-eligible
37-013228	CA-SDI-13228	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993; ASM Affiliates, 2009	Originally recorded as lithic scatter with historic glass. Lithic material later determined to be natural and glass could not be re-located. Not considered a site for the purposes of this study.

4.1 Cultural Resources

Primary Number	Trinomial	Recorder, Date Recorded	Notes
37-013230	CA-SDI-13230	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light Lithic Scatter
37-013231	CA-SDI-13231	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Temporary Camp, 2 Loci
37-013232	CA-SDI-13232	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light Lithic Scatter
37-013233	CA-SDI-13233	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light Lithic Scatter
37-013234	CA-SDI-13234	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light Lithic Scatter
37-013235	CA-SDI-13235	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Temporary Camp
37-013236	CA-SDI-13236	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Temporary Camp
37-013237	CA-SDI-13237	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993; ASM Affiliates, 2009	Originally recorded as lithic scatter. Lithic material later determined to be natural. Not considered a site for the purposes of this study.
37-013238	CA-SDI-13238	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light Lithic Scatter
37-013239	CA-SDI-13239	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Bedrock Milling Station
37-013489	CA-SDI-13489	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light Lithic Scatter
37-013561	CA-SDI-13561	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light to Moderate Lithic Scatter
37-013562	CA-SDI-13562	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light to Moderate Lithic Scatter
37-013563	CA-SDI-13563	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993; ASM Affiliates, 2009	Originally recorded as lithic scatter with historic artifacts. Lithic material later determined to be natural and historic materials could not be re-located. Not considered a site for the purposes of this study.
37-013564	CA-SDI-13564	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light to Moderate Lithic Scatter
37-013565	CA-SDI-13565	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Moderate Lithic Scatter
37-013566	CA-SDI-13566	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Moderate Lithic Scatter
37-013567	CA-SDI-13567	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994; ASM Affiliates, 2009	Originally recorded as lithic scatter. Lithic material later determined to be natural. Not considered a site for the purposes of this study.
37-013568	CA-SDI-13568	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Light to Moderate Lithic Scatter
37-013569	CA-SDI-13569	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light Lithic Scatter
37-013570	CA-SDI-13570	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light Lithic Scatter

4.1 Cultural Resources

Primary Number	Trinomial	Recorder, Date Recorded	Notes
37-013571	CA-SDI-13571	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light to Moderate Lithic Scatter
37-013572	CA-SDI-13572	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Moderate to Dense Lithic Scatter
37-013573	CA-SDI-13573	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Light to Moderate Lithic Scatter
37-013574	CA-SDI-13574	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Light to Moderate Lithic Scatter
37-013575	CA-SDI-13575	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Cobble Testing Area
37-013576	CA-SDI-13576	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Light lithic scatter with one or two cores and 5+ debitage, all of a yellowish quartzite. Naturally occurring unmodified cobbles common.
37-013592	CA-SDI-13592	Brian F. Smith & Associates, 1994	Light Lithic, Tool, and Groundstone Scatter
37-013593*	CA-SDI-13593	Brian F. Smith & Associates, 1994	Light surface artifact scatter with a very sparse subsurface deposit. 48 artifacts recovered from two test units and surface collection, including 26 scrapers, 13 flakes, 4 cores, 1 knife, 1 mano, 3 choppers, 1 spokeshave, and 1 utilized flake.
37-014092	CA-SDI-14031	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1995	Temporary Camp/Possible Habitation Site
37-014093	CA-SDI-14032	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1995; ASM Affiliates, 2009	Originally recorded as lithic scatter. Lithic material later determined to be natural. Not considered a site for the purposes of this study.
37-014094	CA-SDI-14033	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1995; ASM Affiliates, 2009	Originally recorded as lithic scatter. Lithic material later determined to be natural. Not considered a site for the purposes of this study.
37-014095	CA-SDI-14034	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Bedrock Milling Stations
37-014096	CA-SDI-14035	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1995; ASM Affiliates, 2009	Originally recorded as lithic scatter. Lithic material later determined to be natural. Not considered a site for the purposes of this study.
37-014097	CA-SDI-14036	Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1995	Sparse Lithic Scatter
37-014101		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1995	Volcanic Secondary Flake
37-014102		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1995	Quartzite Chopper or Battered Core
37-014103		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1995	Secondary Quartzite Flake
37-014104		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1995	Unifacial Quartzite Scraper
37-014905		Caltrans, 1988	Porphyritic Flake Tool with Bifacial Retouching and Metavolcanic Flake

4.1 Cultural Resources

Primary Number	Trinomial	Recorder, Date Recorded	Notes
37-014908		Affinis, 1989	Unifacial Fine-Grained Metavolcanic Core/Possible Scraper (Probably associated with CA-SDI-10054.)
37-014909		Affinis, 1989	Utilized Quartzite Flake
37-015342		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Aphanitic Volcanic Unifacial Core/Test Cobble with Three Flake Scars
37-015345		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Aphanitic Volcanic Test Cobble
37-015346		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Quartzite Unifacial Core
37-015347		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Quartzite Unifacial Core and Porphyritic Secondary Flake
37-015348		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Porphyritic Secondary Flake
37-015349		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Quartzite Interior and Secondary Flakes
37-015350		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Aphanitic Volcanic Secondary Flake
37-015352		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Porphyritic Interior Flake and Unifacial Quartzite Core with Three Flake Scars
37-015353		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Unifacial Quartzite Test Cobble and Porphyritic Secondary Flake
37-015354		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Unifacial Quartzite Core with Four Flake Scars
37-015355		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Quartzite Interior Flake, Aphanitic Volcanic Secondary Flake, and Unifacial Quartzite Core with Five Flake Scars
37-015356		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Aphanitic Volcanic Flake
37-015357		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Aphanitic Volcanic Test Cobble with Two Flake Scars
37-015358		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Aphanitic Volcanic Unifacial Core and Quartzite Bifacial Core
37-015359		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Quartzite Unifacial Core with Eight Flake Scars
37-015360		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Porphyritic Secondary Flake
37-015361		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Porphyritic Secondary Flake, Quartzite Interior Flake, and Quartzite Secondary Flake
37-015362		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Four Aphanitic Volcanic Secondary and Interior Flakes
37-015363		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Sparse Lithic and Tool Scatter
37-015364		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Heavily Used Porphyritic Hammerstone
37-015365		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Aphanitic Volcanic Secondary Flake
37-015399		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Two Quartzite Unifacial Cores/Core Tools

4.1 Cultural Resources

Primary Number	Trinomial	Recorder, Date Recorded	Notes
37-015400		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Quartzite Secondary Flake
37-015401		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Porphyritic Secondary Flake
37-015402		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Quartzite Unifacial Core/Core Tool
37-015403		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Quartzite Interior Flake
37-015404		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Rhyolite Primary Flake
37-015405		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Porphyritic Test Cobble
37-015406		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Quartzite Test Cobble
37-015407		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Volcanic Core
37-015408		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Quartzite Core/Core Tool
37-015409		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1994	Quartzite Secondary Flake
37-015410		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Porphyritic Core and Possible Volcanic Test Cobble
37-015411		Ogden Environmental & Energy Services Company, 1993	Quartzite Core Test Cobble
37-016208		Gallegos & Associates, 1997	Two Quartzite Secondary Flakes
37-016209		Gallegos & Associates, 1997	Secondary Porphyritic Flake (Collected)
37-016210		Gallegos & Associates, 1997	Secondary Quartzite Flake (Collected)
37-016211		Gallegos & Associates, 1997	Large Secondary Porphyritic Flake (Collected)
37-016212		Gallegos & Associates, 1997	Porphyritic Core (Collected)
37-016213*		Gallegos & Associates, 1997	Porphyritic Core/Cobble Tool with Bifacial Edge
37-016214		Gallegos & Associates, 1997	Worn Volcanic Core (Collected)
37-016215		Gallegos & Associates, 1997	Core/Cobble Tool with Bifacial Edge (Collected)
37-020910		CRHR-Listing	Old Mission Dam (ca. 1800)
37-025460	CA-SDI-16904	ASM Affiliates, 2001	Sparse Lithic and Groundstone Scatter
37-030866	CA-SDI-19604	ASM Affiliates, 2009	Bedrock Milling Site

Notes:

*Denotes resources within the survey area and APE.

Review of Built Environment

There are no historic architectural resources within the survey area or within parcels adjacent to the APE. The only buildings and structures within the APE are mobile trailers used by Sycamore Landfill staff as offices and the existing SDG&E Miguel-Mission 230kV transmission line, reconstructed between 2004 and 2006 following the Cedar Fire (CPUC 2011, Figure A-1). The majority of adjacent parcels are open space associated with the landfill, MCAS Miramar, and Mission Trails Regional Park; however, to the east across Mast Boulevard there is a residential

subdivision, Carlton Oaks Community. Two parcels, Assessor Parcel Numbers 3834110100 (8304 Rumson Drive) and 3834160100 (8301 Rumson Drive), are adjacent to the east end of the proposed gas lateral pipeline. Both were constructed around 1973 according to the city's Property Assessor file (Angela Reeder, personal communication 2011). These two adjacent buildings are therefore not considered historic for the purposes of CEQA.

The Mission Dam (P-37-20910) discussed above is considered a historical resource and a historic built environment resource. However, it is not within or adjacent to the APE and the proposed Project would not be visible from the dam structure.

Native American Consultation

The NAHC was contacted in writing on May 9, 2011 to request a sacred lands file search and a list of suggested Native American contacts who may have knowledge of cultural resources within the Project site. A written response was received on June 1, 2011. The response stated that their database indicates "Native American cultural resources" within Township 15S/Range 2 West, but not Range 1 West. A specific location or description of the resources was not provided. The dividing line of Range 1 West and 2 West divides the APE almost directly along the ridge that separates Little Sycamore and Spring Canyons. The NAHC also provided a list of 21 suggested individuals to contact.

Initial contact letters were sent to the list of suggested Native Americans on June 7, 2011. The letters were also sent via e-mail to those who provided email addresses in their NAHC contact information. The letters requested any information and/or input the individuals may have regarding Native American concerns either directly or indirectly associated with the Quail proposed Project. Follow-up phone calls were placed to unresponsive contacts on July 1, 2011.

To date, two responses have been received. A detailed contact log for all contacted Native Americans along with the original contact letters and the NAHC consultation results are provided in Appendix C. No Native American resources have been identified by contacted parties as being specifically within the APE or adjacent areas.

Mr. Clint Linton, Director of Cultural Resources for the Ipai Nation of Santa Ysabel responded via e-mail on June 9, 2011. He requested that "a Kumeyaay Native Monitor [be present] for survey and all ground disturbing activities related to this project."

Mr. Louis Guassac, Executive Director of the Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy, responded via phone on July 1, 2011. Mr. Guassac is very concerned for archaeological sites in the area and stated that the Land Conservancy desires for archaeological sites to be duly recorded and treated properly. He strongly suggested a tribal monitor be present during construction. He stated that the Land Conservancy group has no problem with re-use of their ancestral lands; however, greater concern would be expressed should human remains or a sacred area become involved. Mr. Guassac noted the particular sensitivity of waterways and their historic use by the Kumeyaay as travel routes. He also noted that the Kumeyaay constructed the Mission Dam in the adjacent Mission Trails Regional Park. Mr. Guassac stated that he would visit the area the following week and would possibly have further input to provide based on his visit (personal communication, 2011).

Field Survey Methods

The field survey was conducted on May 16 and 17, 2011 by Tetra Tech EC, Inc. (TtEC) cultural resources staff Ms. Erin King, MA, RPA (Field Director/Project Archaeologist) and Ms. Kristina Gill, MA under the guidance of the Principal Investigator, Mr. Reid Farmer, MA, RPA. All staff meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology. As noted above, a larger area than analyzed here was surveyed and previously recorded resources were relocated. Only those within the survey area analyzed here are discussed below. All resources recorded or relocated during the survey are discussed in the Cultural Resources Technical Report (Appendix C, Farmer and King 2011).

The survey was conducted in 10- to 15-meter transects. Given the steep topography of the survey area, the survey focused on slopes less than 35-percent (19.3 degrees). Slopes steeper than this were visually inspected for structures, objects, or indications of unobstructed ground surfaces. The survey crew relocated previously recorded sites and isolates using a Trimble Global Positioning System (GPS) unit. The California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site records for these resources were then updated. The area around newly identified resources were intensively surveyed and then recorded on DPR forms and mapped using the GPS unit. No resources were collected during this survey. All newly recorded resources were given a temporary identification number starting with "QB." If the resource was an isolated find, its temporary identification number was appended with an "ISO."

Survey Results

Ground surface visibility within the survey area was poor (less than 10 percent). The landscape was dominated by thick grasses with minor areas of coastal scrub, and naturally eroding cobbles of the underlying Stadium Conglomerate. The locations of all previously recorded resources within the surveyed area, as it was defined at the time, were relocated to assess their current conditions and update their site records for submission to the SCIC. The three previously recorded isolates within the study area could not be relocated. No historic architectural resources were identified.

No new cultural resources were identified within the APE and survey area analyzed here. Previously recorded archaeological site CA-SDI-13593, within the APE and survey area, was found to be destroyed by ground disturbance that has occurred there. The one previously recorded isolate could not be relocated. It should be noted that isolates are generally not considered significant cultural resources or eligible for the CRHR. They are, however, potential indicators of additional resources, particularly in areas of poor ground surface visibility.

No buildings or structures were observed during the survey, other than those discussed above, under "Review of Built Environment."

Cultural Resources Within the Survey Area

CA-SDI-13593 (P-37-013593)

The location of CA-SDI-13593, a moderately dense lithic deposit with a low density subsurface component, was found. As noted in the site record and Smith and Burke (1994:42), a concrete ditch runs through the site and the site has been surface collected. The area was found to have

been landscaped, graded, and paved and the site appears to no longer exist as previously recorded. Given the heavily disturbed nature of the site, it is not considered CRHR-eligible.

Isolate 37-016213

Following intensive survey of the vicinity of these isolates, they could not be relocated. This is likely due to either the thick vegetation cover or the natural movement of the artifacts downslope. They may also have been impacted by the Cedar Fire following their initial recording. Since these resources are isolates, they are not considered CRHR-eligible.

Archaeological Sensitivity of the APE

Archaeological sensitivity is based on a variety of factors. Specifically, these factors include site density, survey coverage, proximity to prehistoric and historic-era natural resources, extent of disturbances, the presence of buried landforms suitable in age for human occupation in the San Diego region (Late Pleistocene, Holocene, or historic), and depositional environments suitable for preserving archaeological resources. Either all or a combination of these factors may suggest that an area is sensitive for either surface or subsurface archaeological resources.

The APE is within Little Sycamore and Spring Canyons, roughly 1 mile north of the San Diego River valley. The area would have been closer to or farther from the river historically, depending on the river's meander path. The closer in proximity to a fresh water source, especially one as prolific as a river, makes that area more desirable for occupation. Little Sycamore Canyon has been developed as the Sycamore Canyon Landfill, but still includes steep hillsides that range from 400 to 825 feet above mean sea level (amsl). Spring Canyon is an area of undeveloped moderately steep hillsides ranging in elevation from 400 to 800 feet amsl. The intermittent drainages as well as the San Diego River would have provided the primary fresh water sources in this area.

Natural slopes generally range between 20 and 25 degrees (approximately 36-46 percent). The Stadium Conglomerate of the Eocene age Poway Group is the only bedrock unit exposed throughout the study area. This massive to thickly bedded cobble conglomerate contains fine to coarse-grained sandstone matrix that is slightly cemented and considered dense. Cobble-sized clasts consist predominantly of hard mildly metamorphosed volcanic and volcanoclastic rocks and quartzite. Sandstone lenses and interbeds from a few feet to tens of feet thick occur throughout the massive conglomerate. The Eocene-age Friars Formation underlies the conglomerate at the southern end of the Little Sycamore and Spring Canyons. It is known to consist mainly of fine grained sandstones and claystones (Davis and Weeraratne 2003).

Surficial units within the study area consist of Holocene age alluvium in the main canyons, slopewash deposits mainly in the side drainages, and scattered man-made fill. Alluvium in the canyon floors consists chiefly of loose, cobble-rich, yellow-brown sands with gravelly sands and a few thin silt and clayey silt lenses and interbeds. The maximum depths of alluvium have been difficult to determine (Davis and Weeraratne 2003). Along ridge tops, Holocene soils were observed during the field survey to be thin, with the Stadium Conglomerate cobble clasts eroding and exposed over the vast majority of the area.

The entirety of the APE has been surveyed numerous times in the past 28 years, although usually with poor ground surface visibility. There is a low density of archaeological resources

along the two ridgelines and within Little Sycamore Canyon, as surveys have primarily identified isolated artifacts. This may or may not be a factor of the poor ground surface visibility experienced by surveying archaeologists. The isolates may be indicators of archaeological resources masked by the vegetation or simply indicative of limited historical use of the area. The distribution of archaeological sites in the study area favors relatively flat slopes (less than 35 percent). Only the plant site and portions of the western gen tie corridor cross similar topography. The overall steep nature of the topography over much of the APE contributes to the movement of artifacts from their original location.

Little Sycamore Canyon has been extensively disturbed by construction of the Sycamore Landfill, associated roads, and the gravel processing plant at the head of the canyon. The western ridgeline has also been disturbed by construction of transmission lines, access roads, and bike trails. The entire area has been disturbed by the Cedar Fire in 2003.

Based on the above factors and in consideration of the poor ground surface visibility, which may have inhibited identification of resources within the survey area, the APE is considered to have low to moderate surface sensitivity for unidentified archaeological resources and no to low sensitivity for subsurface archaeological resources with the exception of areas within slopewash. In areas of slopewash, there is potential for buried or redeposited archaeological resources. Buried archaeological deposits would potentially be intact depending on the rate of deposition. Redeposited materials would likely not be considered significant resources.

4.1.2 Environmental Consequences including Cumulative Analysis

This section describes the environmental consequences of construction and operation of the proposed Project.

4.1.2.1 Significance Criteria

CEQA states that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or have a significant effect on a unique archaeological resource. Appendix C, Environmental Checklist Form, of CEQA addresses significance criteria with respect to cultural resources (PRC Sections 21000 et seq.). Under CEQA an impact on cultural resources would be considered significant if a project would either directly or indirectly:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource; or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Historical resources are those cultural resources that are considered eligible or listed on the CRHR. Criteria for CRHR listing and eligibility are defined in PRC 5024.1, and CCR Title 14, Section 4850.3. Specifically, a resource may be eligible for the CRHR if it:

- a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- b) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

- c) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- d) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

If an archaeological resource does not fall within the definition of a historical resource, it may meet the definition of a “unique archaeological resource” (PRC 21083.2(g)). Unique archaeological resources includes archaeological artifacts, objects, or sites that:

- a) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
- b) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
- c) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

If an archaeological resource does not meet the definitions of a unique archaeological resource or of an historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources are not considered a significant effect on the environment (CEQA Guidelines (15064.5 (c)(4))).

Significant effects on historical resources or unique archaeological resources can be eliminated by pursuing an alternative course of action or mitigating to less than significant levels. Preservation in-place (avoidance) is the preferred manner for mitigating impacts to archaeological resources (CCR 15126.4(b)(3)(A)). If preservation in-place is not feasible, data recovery excavation is an acceptable alternative pursuant to the provisions of CCR 15126.4(b)(3)(C).

Direct effects from a project could result from: vegetation clearing; grading of access roads; excavation and modification of the plant site; trenching for pipelines, electrical transmission lines, and drainage diversions; auguring for foundations for electrical towers or poles; and any other earth-moving activity that disturbs previously undisturbed or unevaluated cultural resources such as prehistoric objects or sites, making those objects and their cultural resources unavailable for future scientific investigation.

Although the full listing of the CEQA checklist for cultural resources also addresses paleontological resources and unique geological features, these resources are addressed in a separate section, Section 4.15, of this AFC.

4.1.2.2 Construction Impacts

Archaeological Resources

Impacts on archaeological resources as a result of construction of the proposed Project, such as disturbance or destruction, would be less than significant with mitigation.

The resource inventory did not identify any previously unrecorded cultural resources within the APE. Previously recorded cultural resources identified as within the APE were either found to have been destroyed or could not be relocated.

Due to the developing nature of the Project, one component, the eastern end of the North Loop overhead line portion of the gen tie route, has been preliminarily designed to extend outside of the surveyed area. Another component, the SDG&E switchyard, has been preliminarily placed along the boundary of the surveyed area in Spring Canyon. The CEC's required minimum 200-foot survey buffer therefore extends outside of the surveyed area as well. No previously recorded cultural resources are within these areas. However, unidentified resources may exist.

Given the overall archaeological sensitivity of the APE (none to moderate), there is a potential for unidentified archaeological resources, which may include human remains, to exist. Such resources would likely be shallow. If intact, the resources may be CRHR-eligible. Impacts on these resources as a result of construction-related ground disturbance would be considered significant. With incorporation of the mitigation measures listed below in Section 4.1.3, these significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Native American Resources

No Native American resources were identified during the resource inventory and consultation process as being within or adjacent to the APE. However, specific concern regarding archaeological resources was voiced during consultations. Therefore, impacts on Native American resources as a result of construction of the proposed Project are considered the same as those described for archaeological resources. With incorporation of the mitigation measures listed below in Section 4.1.3, these significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Built Environment Resources

No historic built environment resources were identified during the resource inventory as within or adjacent to the APE. The Mission Dam (P-37-20910) is a historical resource that is 0.6 mile west of the APE. The Project components will not be visible from the dam. Therefore, potential impacts on built environment cultural resources are not expected from the construction of the Project.

4.1.2.3 Operation and Maintenance Impacts

Archaeological Resources

If new ground disturbing activities were to occur during operation and maintenance of the Project, those activities would be within the survey area and areas monitored during construction (see CUL-3 below). Therefore no impacts on archaeological resources would be anticipated.

Native American Resources

Impacts on Native American resources as a result of operation and maintenance of the proposed Project would be similar to those described for archaeological resources. Since no Native American resources, including the one identified by the NAHC as within the larger Township and Range, were identified by consulted Native Americans as within or near the proposed Project, no visual impacts on such resources are anticipated.

Built Environment Resources

Impacts on historic built environment resources from the operation and maintenance of the Project would be the same as for construction-related impacts.

4.1.2.4 Cumulative Impacts

Past projects, current projects, and projects planned in the foreseeable future in the region could potentially cause significant impacts on identified cultural resources. However, with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, these impacts should be less than significant overall. Cumulative actions within the region, including highway/roadway construction, commercial and residential development, and construction of the landfill have resulted in impacts on cultural resources. LORS that are in place for development projects in general have and will provide for cultural resource protection and avoidance or mitigation of cultural resource impacts to a level that is less than significant.

Potential cumulative cultural resource impacts as a result of the proposed Project include the loss of historical resources, unique archaeological resources, or human remains. Additionally, if an unanticipated resource cannot be avoided, its loss would contribute to an overall diminishment of the region's archaeological landscape. The Project will not directly impact any known significant cultural resources. If construction were to encounter archaeological remains such as large, stratified, buried archaeological deposits that are evaluated as being historical resource(s) the possibility of cumulative impacts could arise if such sites could not be avoided or if the level of impact could not be reduced to a standard of less than significant. The potential to encounter previously unknown archaeological resources is low to moderate. The potential for impact will depend on the nature and extent of any discovered archaeological resources. Potential impacts to an archaeological resource encountered during construction would be minimized by monitoring and a stop-work procedure to allow for the identification, evaluation of significance, consideration of Project re-design, or implementation of appropriate mitigation measures. However, with implementation of mitigation measures, such impacts would likely be reduced to less than significant. No impacts on architectural resources are expected to occur. Therefore, cumulative impacts with other cumulative projects implemented in accordance with applicable LORS will be less than significant.

4.1.3 Mitigation Measures

The following protective measures will be implemented and adhered to prior to and during Project implementation in order to reduce impacts on cultural resources to less than significant under CEQA.

CUL-1: Native American Consultations—On behalf of the CEC, the Applicant will continue to consult with Native Americans identified by the NAHC in order to identify potentially sacred sites and/or resources that may be impacted by the Project as well as to identify appropriate Native American monitors. Additionally, the Applicant will determine if additional Native Americans require consultation based on the City's requirements and initiate contact with individuals not already contacted.

- CUL-2: Education/Training**—Prior to project implementation, all non-archaeological project personnel will be briefed by a trained archaeologist on the importance of, and the legal basis for, the protection of significant archaeological resources. Personnel will be given a training brochure regarding identification of cultural resources and reporting finds.
- CUL-3: Monitoring**—It has been requested by interested Native American Tribes that a Native American monitor be present during ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project. Additionally, the APE is considered to have low to moderate archaeological sensitivity for unidentified resources. Therefore, an archaeological monitor meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Qualifications for an Archaeologist as well as a Native American Consultant will be present onsite during initial ground disturbing activities. Given the geoarchaeological context of the proposed Project site and the proximity of the Stadium Conglomerate bedrock to the surface, it is recommended that only the upper 20 centimeters be monitored for cultural resources. It is also recommended that the monitors be allowed to conduct a cursory survey of the proposed Project site following any initial mowing of vegetation.
- CUL-4: Unanticipated and Inadvertent Discoveries**—If the construction staff or others observe previously unidentified archaeological resources during construction, they will halt work in the vicinity of the find(s) and immediately notify the Project Archaeologist so that the resource value may be assessed as soon as possible and appropriate next steps determined in coordination with the CEC as the lead CEQA agency. Such finds will be formally recorded and evaluated. The resource will be protected from further disturbance or looting pending evaluation.
- If human remains and/or cultural items defined by the California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5 are inadvertently discovered during construction activities, all work in the vicinity of the find will cease and the San Diego County Coroner will be contacted immediately. If the remains are found to be Native American as defined by the California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, work may be delayed in the vicinity of the find up to 30 days.
- CUL-5: Additional Field Survey**—If the finalized Project engineering design falls outside or beyond the current survey area, Quail Brush Genco, LLC will, in coordination with the CEC and City of San Diego, complete a cultural resources survey of those areas (including any CEC-required buffers). Results of the survey, maps of finalized engineering design and surveyed areas, and any additional recommended mitigation measures should be provided to the CEC and the City of San Diego for comment and approval.

4.1.4 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards

Cultural resources are non-renewable scientific resources and are protected by several federal, state, and local statutes. Design, construction, and operation of the Project, including pipelines and ancillary facilities, will be conducted in accordance with all LORS applicable to cultural

resources. Federal, state, and local LORS applicable to cultural resources are summarized in Table 4.1-5 and discussed briefly below, along with mitigation measures, if required.

Table 4.1-5 Applicable LORS for Cultural Resources

LORS	Applicability	AFC Reference	Conformity
Federal			
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, Public Law 102-575	Not Applicable – There is no federal agency involvement in the Project.	Section 4.1.4.1	N/A
Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 as amended, Public Law 96-95	Not Applicable – Project facilities are not located on public land.	Section 4.1.4.1	N/A
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, Public Law 101-601	Not Applicable – There is no federal agency involvement in the Project.	Section 4.1.4.1	N/A
Antiquities Act of 1906, as amended	Not Applicable – Project facilities are not located on public land.	Section 4.1.4.1	N/A
Executive Order No. 11593: Protection And Enhancement Of The Cultural Environment, 1971	Not Applicable – There is no federal agency involvement in the Project.	Section 4.1.4.1	N/A
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, Public Law 91-190	Not Applicable – There is no federal agency involvement in the Project.	Section 4.1.4.1	N/A
State			
The Warren-Alquist Act 1974, as amended	Applicable – Cultural resources have been identified in the Project region and isolated resources within the APE.	Section 4.1.4.2	A technical cultural resources report has been prepared, which found only isolated artifacts within the APE and the area to have low-moderate sensitivity for unidentified archaeological resources. Monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor is proposed as part of Project mitigation.
CEQA of 1970, as amended	Applicable – Significant historical or archaeological resources may be encountered.	Section 4.1.4.2	A technical cultural resources report has been prepared, which found only isolated artifacts within the APE and the area to have low-moderate sensitivity for unidentified archaeological resources. Monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor is proposed as part of Project mitigation.
California PRC Section 5020-5029.5	Applicable – No CRHR-eligible resources have been identified within the APE; however, unanticipated archaeological resources may be uncovered during construction of the Project.	Section 4.1.4.2	A technical cultural resources report has been prepared, which found no CRHR-eligible resources would be impacted by the Project. Monitoring and unanticipated discovery mitigation measures are proposed as part of the Project and include CRHR-evaluation of identified resources.
Senate Bill 922 (Ducheny 2005)	Applicable – Archaeological resources and sacred sites have been identified via the cultural resource inventory for this Project.	Section 4.1.4.2	The cultural resources technical report will be submitted to the CEC under a request for confidentiality and location information has been omitted from the publicly available AFC.

4.1 Cultural Resources

LORS	Applicability	AFC Reference	Conformity
Senate Bill 18 (Burton 2004)	Applicable – A community plan will require appending.	Section 4.1.4.2	The Applicant is in the process of initiating SB 18 consultations with individuals identified by the City of San Diego. If the City identifies individuals who have already been contacted based on the list of individuals provided by the NAHC, the existing consultation efforts are considered sufficient.
Senate Concurrent Resolution Number 87 (1994)	Not Applicable – No state lands involved.	Section 4.1.4.2	N/A
Administrative Code, Title 14, Section 4307	Applicable – Objects of archaeological or historical interest or value may be discovered during construction.	Section 4.1.4.2	The APE has been determined to have low-moderate archaeological sensitivity and unanticipated cultural resources may be uncovered during construction. Monitoring and unanticipated discovery mitigation measures are proposed as part of the Project to avoid damage or destruction of unanticipated cultural resources. An education and training program is also proposed as mitigation to reduce the potential of Project staff removing or harming cultural resources.
Government Code, Sections 6253, 6254, 6254.10	Applicable – Archaeological resources have been identified via the cultural resource inventory for this Project.	Section 4.1.4.2	The cultural resources technical report will be submitted to the CEC under a request for confidentiality and location information has been omitted from the publicly available AFC.
Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5	Applicable – Unanticipated discovery of human remains may occur during construction.	Section 4.1.4.2	The APE has been found to have low-moderate archaeological sensitivity, which may include human remains. Inadvertent discovery mitigation is proposed as part of the Project and requires all work in the vicinity of the find cease and the San Diego County Coroner contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the NAHC will be contacted to determine the most likely descendant.
Health and Safety Code, Section 7051	Applicable – Unanticipated discovery of human remains may occur during construction.	Section 4.1.4.2	The APE has been found to have low-moderate archaeological sensitivity, which may include human remains. An education and training program is proposed as mitigation to reduce the potential of Project staff removing or harming cultural resources, including human remains.
Health and Safety Code, Section 7052	Applicable – Unanticipated discovery of human remains may occur during construction.	Section 4.1.4.2	The APE has been found to have low-moderate archaeological sensitivity, which may include human remains. An education and training program is proposed as mitigation to reduce the potential of Project staff removing cultural resources, including human remains.
PRC 5097-5097.6	Not Applicable – No state lands involved.	Section 4.1.4.2	N/A

4.1 Cultural Resources

LORS	Applicability	AFC Reference	Conformity
PRC 5097.9-5097.991	Applicable – Unanticipated discovery of human remains may occur during construction and sacred sites have been identified as within the region by the NAHC.	Section 4.1.4.2	The APE has been found to have low-moderate archaeological sensitivity, which may include human remains. Inadvertent discovery mitigation is proposed as part of the Project and requires all work in the vicinity of the find cease and the San Diego County Coroner contacted immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the NAHC will be contacted to determine the most likely descendant. Native American consultations have not identified sacred sites within or adjacent to the APE.
CCR Section 1427	Applicable – Significant historical or archaeological resources may be encountered.	Section 4.1.4.2	A technical cultural resources report has been prepared, which found only isolated artifacts within the APE and the area to have low-moderate sensitivity for unidentified archaeological resources. Monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor is proposed as part of Project mitigation. An education and training program is proposed as mitigation to reduce the potential of Project staff impacting cultural resources.
Senate Concurrent Resolution Number 43	Applicable – CEC is a state agency.	Section 4.1.4.2	A cultural resources inventory has been conducted for the Project, including a survey, and documented in a technical report. No archaeological sites were identified within the APE. A monitoring program is proposed as mitigation and includes the evaluation of avoidance by the Project of resources identified during monitoring.
Penal Code, Title 14, Section 622.5	Applicable – Significant historical or archaeological resources may be encountered.	Section 4.1.4.2	A technical cultural resources report has been prepared, which found only isolated artifacts within the APE and the area to have low-moderate sensitivity for unidentified archaeological resources. Monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor is proposed as part of Project mitigation. An education and training program is proposed as mitigation to reduce the potential of Project staff impacting cultural resources.
Local			
County of San Diego, Resource Protection Ordinance (Ordinance No. 9842, County Code Chapter 6)	Not Applicable – City acting as local CEQA agency for Habitat Conservation Plan boundary changes and associated community plan amendments.	Section 4.1.4.3	N/A

4.1 Cultural Resources

LORS	Applicability	AFC Reference	Conformity
Municipal Code Chapters 12 and 14	Applicable – City acting as local CEQA agency for Habitat Conservation Plan boundary changes and associated community plan amendments and cultural resources have been identified.	Section 4.1.4.3	The Project has fulfilled the requirements of this code through completion of the cultural resources survey and technical report (Appendix C).
Conservation and Historic Preservation Elements of the San Diego County General Plan	Applicable – City acting as local CEQA agency for Habitat Conservation Plan boundary changes and associated community plan amendments and cultural resources have been identified.	Section 4.1.4.3	The Project has fulfilled the requirements of this code through completion of the cultural resources survey and technical report (Appendix C).
Zoning Ordinance, Sections 5700-5749	Applicable – Private landowners within the APE may allow changes to unanticipated historic resources.	Section 4.1.4.3	The AFC and supporting documents shall be submitted in lieu of a site plan, pending approval from the Historic Sites Board. Monitoring and mitigation measures discussed in the AFC will serve the purpose of the monitoring and mitigation measures required by County Zoning Ordinances.
Professional Standards			
None Applicable			

4.1.4.1 Federal

Federal protection of significant cultural resources does not apply to the Project because it does not involve federally owned or managed lands or approving federal agencies. Federal LORS pertaining to cultural resources is included here for the purposes of comprehensiveness only.

The National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to preserve or mitigate effects to historic properties that are eligible for inclusion on the NRHP. The Act is not applicable to the Project as there is no federal agency involvement.

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act provides for the protection of archaeological resources and sites that are on public lands and Indian lands. The Act is not applicable to the project as it is not located on public lands.

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act requires federal agencies and institutions that receive federal funding to return Native American cultural items and human remains to their respective peoples. Cultural items include funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony. The Act is not applicable to the Project as there is no federal agency involvement.

The Antiquities Act calls for protection of historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest on federal lands. It prescribes penalties for the theft or destruction of archaeological resources on public land and establishes procedure for issuance of permits for the conduct of research on cultural resources on public land. The Act is not applicable to the project as it is not located on public lands.

Executive Order No. 11593: Protection And Enhancement Of The Cultural Environment requires Federal agencies to administer the cultural properties under their control in a spirit of stewardship and trusteeship for future generations, initiate measures necessary to direct their policies, plans, and programs in such a way that federally owned sites, structures, and objects of historical, architectural, or archaeological significance are preserved, restored, and maintained and institute procedures to assure that Federal plans and programs contribute to the preservation and enhancement of nonfederally owned sites, structures, and objects of historical, architectural, or archaeological significance. The order is not applicable to the Project as there is no federal agency involvement.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires the analysis of the effect of federal undertakings on the environment to include the effect on cultural resources. The Act is not applicable to the Project as there is no federal agency involvement.

4.1.4.2 State

The Warren-Alquist Act establishes the CEC's certified regulatory program under CEQA. Under this certified program, the CEC is exempt from having to prepare an Environmental Impact Report. The Act requires cultural, historic, and aesthetic resources be taken into account in consideration of an Application for Certification and that a portion of any such resources on public land be set aside for public access. The Warren-Alquist Act is considered functionally equivalent to that of CEQA. Historic- and prehistoric-era cultural resources are required to be assessed and protected to the extent feasible under CEQA (California PRC 21083.2 and 21084.1). Cultural resources requirements of the AFC process are described in CEC's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Power Plant Site Certification and Designation of Transmission Corridor Zones (CEC 2008:Appendix B). Specifically, these protocols require the following:

- A summary of the ethnology, prehistory, and history of the region with an emphasis on a 5-mile radius of the project location;
- A literature search to identify cultural resources within no less than a 1-mile radius around the project site and not less than a 0.25-mile buffer on each side of any linear facilities;
- Field survey of project areas not surveyed in the past 5 years. The survey must include the a 200-foot buffer around the project site, substations, and staging areas and a 50-foot buffer to either side of the ROW of any linear facility routes;
- New historic architecture field surveys in urban and suburban areas must include the project site and extend no less than one parcel from all proposed plant site boundaries;
- A technical report of the results of the new surveys, conforming to the Archaeological Resource Management Report format (OHP 1990); and
- Request of a sacred lands file search by the NAHC and lists of Native Americans interested in the project vicinity. Identified Native Americans must be notified of the project.

CEQA applies to discretionary projects causing a significant effect on the environment and a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource. Resources listed on or determined to be eligible for listing on the CRHR (PRC §5024.1; Title 14, §4852 et seq., CCR) are those that must be given consideration in the CEQA process.

California PRC Section 5020-5029.5 establishes the criteria for the CRHR, creates the California Historic Landmarks Committee, and authorizes the Department of Parks and Recreation to designate Registered Historical Landmarks and Registered Points of Historical Interest. It also establishes criteria for the protection and preservation of historic resources.

Senate Bill 922 exempts from California Public Records Act information pertaining to Native American graves, cemeteries, archaeological sites, and sacred places in the possession of the NAHC and other state or local agencies.

Senate Bill 18 provides protection and preservation of Native American Traditional Cultural Places during city and county general plan development. The bill is not applicable to the Project as there are no General Plan amendments or development required.

Senate Concurrent Resolution Number 87 provides for the identification and protection of traditional Native American resource gathering sites on state land. The resolution is not applicable to the Project since there are no state lands involved.

Administrative Code, Title 14, Section 4307 prohibits individuals from removing, injuring, defacing, or destroying any object of paleontological, archaeological, or historical interest or value.

Government Code, Sections 6253, 6254, and 6254.10 states that disclosure of archaeological site information is not required for records that relate to archaeological site information maintained by the Department of Parks and Recreation, the State Historical Resources Commission, or the State Lands Commission.

Several sections of the California Health and Safety Code provide protection of human remains. Section 7050.5 requires construction or excavation to be stopped near human remains until a coroner determines whether the remains are Native American; requires the coroner to contact the NAHC if the remains are Native American. Section 7051 establishes removal of human remains from interment, or from a place of storage while awaiting interment or cremation, with the intent to sell them or to dissect them with malice or wantonness as a public offense punishable by imprisonment in a state prison. Section 7052 states that willing mutilation of, disinterment of, removal from a place of disinterment of, and sexual penetration of or sexual contact with any remains known to be human are felony offenses.

Several sections of the California Public Resource Code also provide protection of cultural resources. Section 5097-5097.6 provides guidance for state agencies in the management of archaeological, paleontological, and historical sites affected by major public works project on state land. This section is not applicable to the Project as there are no state lands involved. Subsections 5097.9-5097.991 establish regulations for the protection of Native American religious places and establishes the NAHC. They also require that California Native American remains and associated grave artifacts be repatriated and that notification of discovery of Native American human remains be made to a most likely descendant.

California Code of Regulations, Section 1427 recognizes that California's archaeological resources are endangered by urban development and that these resources need preserving. This section establishes as a misdemeanor the willful injury, disfigurement, defacement, or destruction of any object or thing of archaeological or historical interest or value by someone

who is not the owner, whether situated on private lands or within any public park or place. It also states that it is a misdemeanor to alter any archaeological evidence found in any cave, or to remove any materials from a cave.

Senate Concurrent Resolution Number 43 requires all state agencies to cooperate with programs of archaeological survey and excavation, and to preserve known archaeological resources whenever reasonable.

Penal Code, Title 14, Section 622.5 establishes as a misdemeanor offense for any person, other than the owner, who willfully damages or destroys archaeological or historic features on public or privately-owned land.

4.1.4.3 Local

The County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (Ordinance No. 9842, County Code Chapter 6) requires that a resource protection study be performed to evaluate the potential for a project to impact cultural resources. It also provides for protection of archaeological and historic resources within the County, and prohibits impacts on resources considered significant under the County's guidelines. Although the Project has fulfilled the requirements of this ordinance it is not applicable since the City will be acting as the local CEQA agency for Habitat Conservation Plan boundary changes and associated community plan amendments.

Chapters 12 and 14 of the City of San Diego's Municipal Code establish the cultural resource designation process including the nomination process, noticing and report requirements, appeals, recordation, amendments or rescission, and nomination of historical resources to state and national registers; and development regulations for historical resources. The purpose of these regulations is to protect, preserve, and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The historical resources regulations require that designated historical resources, important archeological sites and traditional cultural properties be preserved unless deviation findings can be made by the decision-maker as part of a discretionary permit. The Project has fulfilled the requirements of this code through completion of the cultural resources survey and technical report (Appendix C).

The Conservation Element of the City of San Diego's General Plan uses the CEQA Environmental Impact Report process to evaluate the potential impacts of proposed projects to cultural resources. It also prohibits excavation of archaeological sites except by qualified archaeologists. The Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan requires that any improvement, building, structure, sign, interior element and fixture, feature, site, place, district, area, or object may be designated a historical resource by the City's Historical Resources Board if it meets one or more of the following designation criteria for the San Diego Register of Historical Resources:

- a. Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's, a community's, or a neighborhood's, historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping or architectural development.
- b. Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history.
- c. Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.

- d. Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist, or craftsman.
- e. Is listed or has been determined eligible by the National Park Service for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or is listed or has been determined eligible by the State Historical Preservation Office for listing on the CRHR.
- f. Is a finite group of resources related to one another in a clearly distinguishable way; or is a geographically definable area or neighborhood containing improvements which have a special character, historical interest, or aesthetic value; or which represent one or more architectural periods or styles in the history and development of the City.

The Project has fulfilled the requirements of this ordinance through completion of the cultural resources survey and technical report (Appendix C).

San Diego County Zoning Ordinance, Sections 5700-5749 requires a landowner to submit a site plan concerning changes to historic resources to the County for approval.

4.1.5 Agencies and Agency Contacts

Table 4.1-6 lists the agency contacts for cultural resources.

Table 4.1-6 Agencies and Agency Contacts for Cultural Resources

Agency	Name	Title	Phone	Email	Mailing Address
CEC	Shaelyn Strattan	Cultural Resource Staff	916-654-3936	SStratta@energy.state.ca.us	1516 Ninth Street, MS 40 Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
City of San Diego	Myra Herrmann	Senior Planner, Development Services Department	619-446-5372	Mhermann@sandiego.gov	202 C Street, MS 5A San Diego, CA 92101
California Native American Heritage Commission	Dave Singleton	Program Analyst	916-653-6251	ds_nahc@pacbell.net	915 Capitol Mall, Room 364 Sacramento, CA 95814

4.1.6 Required Permits

No permits are required for cultural resources for the Project.

4.1.7 References

Basgall, M.E., and D.L. True. 1985. *Archaeological Investigations in Crowder Canyon, 1973-1984*. San Bernardino, California Department of Transportation.

Bates, J.B. 1970. The Plank Road. *The Journal of San Diego History* 16 (2) (1970).

California Energy Commission (CEC). 2008. Rules of Practice and Procedure, Power Plant Site Certification and Designation of Transmission Corridor Zones. Appendix B – Information Requirements for an Application. CEC-140-2008-003.

- California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). 1990. Archaeological Resource management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format.
- California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). 2011. *SDG&E Miguel-Mission 230kV #2 Project – Draft Environmental Impact Report*. Electronic document, http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/aspem/miguel_mission/toc-deir.htm, accessed July 2, 2011.
- Cook, J. and S. Fulmer. 1981. *The Archaeology of the McCain Valley Study Area in Eastern San Diego County, California: A Scientific Class II Cultural Resource Inventory*. Archaeological Systems Management. Submitted to Bureau of Land Management Cultural Resource Publications.
- Davis, Paul and Saroj Weeraratne. 2003. *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Sycamore Landfill Supplemental Grading, San Diego, California*. Diaz Yourman and Associates, Santa Ana, California. Project #227-02. Prepared for A-Mehr, Inc., Laguna Hills, California.
- Erlandson, J.M., and R.H. Colton. 1991. An Archeological Context for Early Holocene Studies on the California Coast. In J.M. Erlandson and R.H. Colton, eds., *Hunter-Gatherers of Early Holocene Coastal California*. Perspectives in California Archaeology 1:11-17, Los Angeles Institute of Archaeology, University of California.
- Farmer, Reid and Erin King. 2011. Cultural Resources Survey for Quail Brush Genco, LLC's Quail Brush Power Project at Sycamore Landfill, San Diego, California – Draft. Tetra Tech EC, Inc., Irvine, California. Submitted to Cogentrix Energy, LLC and California Energy Commission.
- Hector, Susan M., Sinead Ni Ghabhlain, Mark S. Becker, and Ken Moslak. 2004. *Archaeological Site Evaluations in Support for Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, San Diego County, California*. ASM Affiliates, Inc. Submitted to MCAS Miramar, Contract #GS10F0373N, Purchase Order #FPN-B-M-1200-3F. Copies available from South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University. SCIC Report #1129397.
- Kline, George E. and Victoria L. Kline. 2007. Fluted Point Recovered from San Diego County Excavation. *Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology* 20: 55-59. Ventura, California.
- Kroeber, A.L. 1925. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 78.
- Laylander, Don. 2011. Research Issues in San Diego Prehistory. Electronic document, <http://members.cox.net/dlaylander/SDResearch/>, accessed May 11, 2011.
- Luomala, K. 1978. Tipai-Ipai. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 91-98. *Handbook of North American Indians*, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, vol. 8. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Meighan, C. 1954. A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10:215-227.
- Moratto, M.J. 1984. *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, San Diego.

- Moriarty, J.R., III. 1966. Cultural Phase Divisions Suggested by Typological Change Coordinated with Stratigraphically Controlled Radiocarbon Dating in San Diego. *The Anthropological Journal of Canada*. 4(4):20-30
- Rensch, H.E. 1957. Lassator's in Green Valley. *The Journal of San Diego History* 3 (2) (1957). Robinson, W.W.
- Robinson, W.W. (1948). *Land in California*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA.
- Rogers, M.J. 1966. Ancient Hunters of the Far West. *Union-Tribune*, San Diego.
- Russell, G., D. Beddow, J., Giffen, E. Gibbson, D. Gallegos. 2007. County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources. Land Use and Environment Group. Department of Planning and Land Use Department of Public Works.
- Smith, Brian F. and Stephen J. Burke. 1994. *A Cultural Resource Study for the PacTel Cellular-Fischer Project*. Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California. Submitted to EnviroMine, San Diego, California. Copies available from South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University. SCIC Report #1122928.
- Spier, L. 1923. Southern Diegueño Customs. University of California Publications. In *American Archaeology and Ethnology* 20(16):295-358 Berkeley.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS) and National Ocean Survey. 1978. San Diego Quadrangle. 1958, Revised 1878. Topographic map, 1:250,000.
- _____. 1979. San Diego Quadrangle. Topographic map, 1:100,000.
- Wallace, W.J. 1955. A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11:214-230.
- Warren, C.N. 1966. The San Dieguito Type Site: M.J. Rogers. 1938 Excavation on the San Dieguito River. *San Diego Museum of Man Papers* 5:1-39.
- _____. 1967. The San Dieguito Complex: A Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity* 32(2):168-185.
- Wilson, D. D. 2001. *Report on Kumeyaay Cultural Affiliation*. Submitted by the University California Los Angeles Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Coordinating Committee.

DATA ADEQUACY WORKSHEETS

Adequacy Issue: Adequate _____ Inadequate _____ DATA ADEQUACY WORKSHEET Revision No. 0 Date _____
 Technical Area: Cultural Resources Project: _____ Technical Staff: _____
 Project Manager: Eric Solorio Docket: _____ Technical Senior: _____

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (g) (1)	...provide a discussion of the existing site conditions, the expected direct, indirect and cumulative impacts due to the construction, operation and maintenance of the project, the measures proposed to mitigate adverse environmental impacts of the project, the effectiveness of the proposed measures, and any monitoring plans proposed to verify the effectiveness of the mitigation.	Sections 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report		
Appendix B (g) (2) (A)	A summary of the ethnology, prehistory, and history of the region with emphasis on the area within no more than a 5-mile radius of the project location.	Sections 4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.2, 4.1.1.3		

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (g) (2) (B)	<p>The results of a literature search to identify cultural resources within an area not less than a 1-mile radius around the project site and not less than one-quarter (0.25) mile on each side of the linear facilities. Identify any cultural resources listed pursuant to ordinance by a city or county, or recognized by any local historical or archaeological society or museum. Literature searches to identify the above cultural resources must be completed by, or under the direction of, individuals who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Standards for the technical area addressed.</p> <p>Copies of California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms (Title 14 CCR §4853) shall be provided for all cultural resources (ethnographic, architectural, historical, and archaeological) identified in the literature search as being 45 years or older or of exceptional importance as defined in the National Register Bulletin Guidelines, (36CFR60.4(g)). A copy of the USGS 7.5' quadrangle map of the literature search area delineating the areas of all past surveys and noting the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) identifying number shall be provided. Copies also shall be provided of all technical reports whose survey coverage is wholly or partly within .25 mile of the area surveyed for the project under Section (g)(2)(C), or which report on any archaeological excavations or architectural surveys within the literature search area.</p>	<p>Section 4.1.1.4</p> <p>Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Appendix D)</p> <p>Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Figure 3-1)</p> <p>Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Appendix A)</p>		

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (g) (2) (C)	<p>The results of new surveys or surveys less than 5 years old shall be provided if survey records of the area potentially affected by the project are more than five (5) years old. Surveys to identify new cultural resources must be completed by (or under the direction of) individuals who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Standards for the technical area addressed.</p> <p>New pedestrian archaeological surveys shall be conducted inclusive of the project site and project linear facility routes, extending to no less than 200’ around the project site, substations and staging areas, and to no less than 50’ to either side of the right-of-way of project linear facility routes. New historic architecture field surveys in rural areas shall be conducted inclusive of the project site and the project linear facility routes, extending no less than .5 mile out from the proposed plant site and from the routes of all above-ground linear facilities. New historic architecture field surveys in urban and suburban areas shall be conducted inclusive of the project site, extending no less than one parcel’s distance from all proposed plant site boundaries. New historic architecture field reconnaissance (“windshield survey”) in urban and suburban areas shall be conducted along the routes of all linear facilities to identify, inventory, and characterize structures and districts that appear to be older than 45 years or that are exceptionally significant, whatever their age.</p> <p>A technical report of the results of the new surveys, conforming to the Archaeological Resource Management Report format (CA Office of Historic Preservation Feb 1990), which is incorporated by reference, shall be separately provided and submitted (under confidential cover if archaeological site locations are included).</p>	<p>Section 4.1.1.4 (“Survey Results” subsection)</p> <p>Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Section 3.1.1)</p> <p>Section 4.1.1.4 (“Survey Results” Section)</p> <p>Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Section 4)</p> <p>Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report</p>		

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (g) (2) (C) cont.	Information included in the technical report shall also be provided in the Application for Certification, except that confidential information (archaeological sites or areas of religious significance) shall be submitted under a request for confidentiality pursuant to Title 20, California Code of Regulations, § 2501 et seq. At a minimum, the technical report shall include the following:			
Appendix B (g) (2) (C) (i)	The summary from Appendix B (g)(2)(A) and the literature search results from Appendix B (g)(2)(B);	Sections 4.1.1.1 through 4.1.1.3 and Section 4.1.1.4 Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Sections 3.1 and 4, and Appendices)		
Appendix B (g) (2) (C) (ii)	The survey procedures and methodology used to identify cultural resources and a discussion of the cultural resources identified by the survey;	Section 4.1.1.4 (“Field Survey” Section) Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Section 3)		
Appendix B (g) (2) (C) (iii)	Copies of all new and updated DPR 523(A) forms. If a cultural resource may be impacted by the project, also include the appropriate DPR 523 detail form for each such resource;	Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Appendix D)		
Appendix B (g) (2) (C) (iv)	A map at a scale of 1:24,000 U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle depicting the locations of all previously known and newly identified cultural resources compiled through the research required by Appendix B (g)(2)(B) and Appendix B (g)(2)(C) (ii); and	Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Figures 3-3 and 7-1)		
Appendix B (g) (2) (C) (v)	The names and qualifications of the cultural resources specialists who contributed to and were responsible for literature searches, surveys, and preparation of the technical report.	Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Section 3.3, Appendix C)		

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (g) (2) (D)	Provide a copy of your request to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for information on Native American sacred sites and lists of Native Americans interested in the project vicinity, and copies of any correspondence received from the NAHC. Notify the Native Americans on the NAHC list about the project, including a project description and map. Provide a copy of all correspondence sent to Native American individuals and groups listed by the NAHC and copies of all responses. Provide a written summary of any oral responses.	Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Section 3.2 and Appendix B)		
Appendix B (g) (2) (E)	Include in the discussion of proposed mitigation measures required by subdivision (g)(1):	Section 4.1.3 Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Section 6.1)		
Appendix B (g) (2) (E) (i)	A discussion of measures proposed to mitigate project impacts to known cultural resources;	Section 4.1.3 Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Section 6.1)		
Appendix B (g) (2) (E) (ii)	A set of contingency measures proposed to mitigate potential impacts to previously unknown cultural resources and any unanticipated impacts to known cultural resources; and	Section 4.1.3 Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Section 6.1)		
Appendix B (g) (2) (E) (iii)	Educational programs to enhance employee awareness during construction and operation to protect cultural resources.	Section 4.1.3 Appendix C – Confidential Cultural Resources Technical Report (Section 6.1)		

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (i) (1) (A)	Tables which identify laws, regulations, ordinances, standards, adopted local, regional, state, and federal land use plans, leases, and permits applicable to the proposed project, and a discussion of the applicability of, and conformance with each. The table or matrix shall explicitly reference pages in the application wherein conformance, with each law or standard during both construction and operation of the facility is discussed; and	Section 4.1.4		
Appendix B (i) (1) (B)	Tables which identify each agency with jurisdiction to issue applicable permits, leases, and approvals or to enforce identified laws, regulations, standards, and adopted local, regional, state and federal land use plans, and agencies which would have permit approval or enforcement authority, but for the exclusive authority of the commission to certify sites and related facilities.	Section 4.1.4		
Appendix B (i) (2)	The name, title, phone number, address (required), and email address (if known), of an official who was contacted within each agency, and also provide the name of the official who will serve as a contact person for Commission staff.	4.1.5		
Appendix B (i) (3)	A schedule indicating when permits outside the authority of the commission will be obtained and the steps the applicant has taken or plans to take to obtain such permits.	4.1.6		