

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES..... 5.5-1

5.5.1 Introduction..... 5.5-1

5.5.2 Methodology 5.5-2

5.5.3 Existing Conditions..... 5.5-3

5.5.4 Potential Impacts..... 5.5-16

5.5.5 Applicant Proposed Measures..... 5.5-21

5.5.6 Detailed Discussion of Significant Impacts 5.5-22

5.5.7 References..... 5.5-23

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.5-1: Recorded Cultural Resources within/just adjacent to the Proposed Project 5.5-12

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 5.5-A Archaeological Survey Report Artesian 230 kV Substation Project, San Diego County, California (**CONFIDENTIAL**)

Appendix 5.5-B Paleontological Resources Record Search (**CONFIDENTIAL**)

THIS PAGE IS INTENDED TO BE LEFT BLANK

5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless APMs Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5.5.1 Introduction

This section of the PEA describes the archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources identified within the Proposed Project area, and identifies potential impacts that could result from construction, operation, and maintenance of the Proposed Project. This section reviews the Proposed Project in accordance with local, state and federal laws and regulations that protect cultural resources and articulates avoidance and minimization measures that will be implemented. Implementation of Applicant Proposed Measures (APMs) will ensure that any potential impacts that could affect cultural and paleontological resources would be less than significant. Components of the Proposed Project that could affect cultural and paleontological resources include but are not limited to: removal of existing poles/structures and power lines; construction of new poles and stringing of new power lines; construction of undergrounding power line in Rancho Bernardo Road; substation expansion and alterations; installation of new poles, and clearing and use of stringing sites, guard structures, and staging yards.

Cultural resources as defined by CEQA include prehistoric and historic period archaeological sites, districts, and objects;; historic buildings, structures, and traditional/cultural sites; or the locations of important historic events. Cultural resources, including prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, were identified during the literature and records search within the Proposed Project area. None of the known sites were re-located during the survey. Impacts to previously documented cultural resources resulting from the Proposed Project will be less than significant as the Proposed Project has been designed to avoid known cultural resources, and implementation of SDG&E’s APMs will avoid or minimize potential impacts to cultural resources that may be inadvertently discovered.

In addition to cultural resources, there is one known fossil locality within 0.25 mile of the Proposed Project alignment. The Proposed Project alignment is underlain by two geologic formations, Mission Valley and Friars, which have a high sensitivity and potential for paleontological resources. With the implementation of APMs, potential impacts to cultural and paleontological resources that may result from the Proposed Project will remain less than significant.

5.5.2 Methodology

5.5.2.1 Cultural Resources Records Search

Cultural resources information for existing conditions in the Proposed Project area was obtained from the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS). The CHRIS maintains regional offices that manage cultural resource records for known cultural resource locations and related technical studies. The regional office for San Diego County is the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) housed at San Diego State University. SDG&E conducted the record search under contract to SCIC and provided the results to Chambers Group. Sources reviewed consisted of all recorded archaeological and historic site records, and cultural resource reports, within a 0.5-mile radius of the Proposed Project area. Additional resources were consulted for relevant information included the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the Historic Property Data File, the California Register, the California Historical Landmarks, the California Inventory of Historic Resources, the California Points of Historical Interest, and historic maps. A cultural resources survey report was prepared for the Proposed Project and has been included as Appendix 4.5-A; *Archaeological Survey Report Artesian 230kV Substation Project, San Diego County, California*.

5.5.2.2 Native American Scoping

Chambers Group submitted a request for information in the Sacred Lands file database from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on April 8, 2015 in order to acquire more information about potential cultural resources located in or near the Proposed Project area. The NAHC responded on August 31, 2015 and indicated that there are no Native American traditional cultural places recorded in the NAHC Sacred Lands file within a 0.5 mile of the Proposed Project area. The NAHC also enclosed a list of 12 Native American individuals and/or organizations that might have further knowledge of cultural resources in or near the Proposed Project area. Chambers Group sent letters to the Native American individuals and/or organizations on October 14, 2015. As of this time, there has been one response from the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians on November 12, 2015.

5.5.2.3 Cultural Resources Field Survey Methods

The purpose of the cultural resource field surveys was to relocate and update any previously recorded cultural resources, as well as to check for the presence/absence of any cultural resources on any previously unsurveyed portions of the Proposed Project area. Chambers Group conducted cultural resources field surveys of the Proposed Project area on June 5 and July 17, 2015 within a 300-foot corridor.

5.5.2.4 Paleontological Resources

A previous record search from March 12, 2012, conducted by the San Diego Natural History Museum Department of Paleontology, covered the entire Proposed Project alignment; this previous search was utilized for the analysis of the Proposed Project. This record search reviewed relevant published geologic maps and reports, unpublished paleontological reports and unpublished museum collection locality data. Site records document one fossil locality within a 0.25-mile radius of the Proposed Project and none occurring directly within the Proposed Project alignment boundary. The paleontological record search results letter can be found in Appendix 5.5-B. No paleontological resource surveys were conducted.

5.5.3 Existing Conditions

5.5.3.1 Regulatory Background

Federal Regulations

National Historic Preservation Act

Enacted in 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 16 U.S.C., Section 470 et seq., has become the foundation and framework for historic preservation in the United States. The NHPA authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to expand and maintain a NRHP, establishes an Advisory Council on Historic Preservation as an independent federal entity, requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, affords the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on any undertaking that may affect historic properties that are listed, or eligible for listing, in the NRHP, and assigns responsibility to the heads of all federal agencies for the preservation of historic properties owned or controlled by their agencies.

Section 106 of the NHPA governs federal agencies' obligations for cultural resources. The goal of the Section 106 process is to offer a measure of protection to sites that are determined eligible for listing on the NRHP. The criteria for determining National Register eligibility are found in 36 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Part 60.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

For activities on federal lands, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), enacted in 1990, provides a framework for determining the rights of lineal descendants and Native American tribes to repatriate Native American remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or other objects of cultural patrimony with which they are associated. NAGPRA applies to items found on federal lands, and agencies that obtain federal funding. It requires consultation with "appropriate" Indian tribes prior to the intentional excavation, or removal after inadvertent discovery, of several kinds of cultural items, including human remains and objects of cultural patrimony.

Paleontological Resource Preservation Act

On March 30, 2009, the Paleontological Resources Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470aaa (PRPA) became law. This requires the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to manage and protect

paleontological resources on Federal lands using scientific principles and expertise. New policies from these agencies regarding paleontological resources are in progress.

State Regulations

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires that impacts to cultural resources be identified and, if impacts will be significant, that mitigation measures be implemented to reduce those impacts to the extent feasible. In the protection and management of the cultural environment, both the statute and its *CEQA Guidelines* provide definitions and standards for cultural resources management. Pursuant to Guideline 15064.5(a), the term “historical resource” includes:

- (1) *A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.....*
- (2) *A resource included in a local register of historical resources,... or identified as significant in a historical resource survey... shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.*
- (3) *Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript, which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources..., including the following:*
 - a. *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;*
 - b. *Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;*
 - c. *Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or*
 - d. *Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*
- (4) *The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), not included in a local register of historical resources..., or identified in a historical resources survey... does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource...*

As defined in Section 21083.2(g) of CEQA, a “unique archaeological resource” is:

An archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

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

Section 15064.5(b)(1) of the *CEQA Guidelines* explains that effects on cultural properties that qualify as historical resources would be considered adverse if they involve physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired.

The statutes and guidelines cited above specify how cultural resources are to be analyzed for projects subject to CEQA. Archival and field surveys must be conducted, and identified cultural resources must be inventoried and evaluated in prescribed ways.

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

The California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Cal NAGPRA) of 2001 is contained in the California Health and Safety Code Sections 8010-8021, and 8025-8030. Cal NAGPRA provides for the repatriation of human remains and cultural items in the possession or control of a state or local agency or museum to the rightful California Native American tribe. This law defines the term California Native American tribe to include non-federally recognized groups.

California Public Resources Code

Provisions can be found under the Public Resources Code (PRC) regarding the treatment of human remains in Sections 5097.9 through 5097.99994. These sections explain the actions to be taken when Native American remains are found. Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that anyone who knowingly disinters, disturbs, or willfully removes any human remains in or from any location other than a cemetery without the authority of law is guilty of a misdemeanor, except those circumstances as described in Section 5097.99 of the PRC. Under these provisions, if a county coroner determines that remains found during excavation or disturbance of land are Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC within 48 hours, and the NAHC must determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD) who shall complete inspection of the site within 24 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

Assembly Bill 52

California Assembly Bill (AB) 52 was enacted on September 25, 2014, and specifies that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change to a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have

a significant effect on the environment. The bill, as codified in PRC Section 21074, defines “tribal cultural resources” as (1) sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and either on or eligible for inclusion in the CRHR and (2) a resource determined by a lead agency, at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant. As of July 1, 2015, AB 52 requires early notice and, if requested by a tribe, consultation with California Native American tribes on the NAHC list. Although the CEQA Guidelines will not be updated with the new question regarding tribal cultural resources until July 2016, in the interim period, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) suggests that lead agencies consider the following question in their environmental documents:

- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC 21074?

Local Regulations

Because the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has exclusive jurisdiction over the siting, design, and construction of the Proposed Project, the Proposed Project is not subject to local discretionary land use regulations. The following analysis of the local regulations relating to cultural and paleontological resources is provided for informational purposes. As outlined in the following subsections, the construction and operation of the Proposed Project will not conflict with any environmental plans, policies, or regulations related to cultural or paleontological resources.

San Diego County

The San Diego County regulations and policies pertaining to cultural resources can be found in the Conservation and Open Space Element of the *County of San Diego General Plan*. The Board of Supervisors adopted the current version of the *County of San Diego General Plan* on August 3, 2011.

The Conservation and Open Space Element includes three goals that deal with Cultural/Historic and Paleontological Resources. Goal 1 is the protection and preservation of the County’s important archaeological resources for their cultural importance to local communities, as well as for their research and educational potential. The County has developed the following six policies to help ensure the protection of the County’s resources.

- Preserve important archaeological resources from loss or destruction and require development to include appropriate mitigation to protect the quality and integrity of these resources.
- Require development to avoid archaeological resources whenever possible. If complete avoidance is not possible, require development to fully mitigate impacts to archaeological resources.
- Require the appropriate treatment and preservation of archaeological collections in a cultural appropriate manner.
- Require consultation with affected communities, including local tribes to determine the appropriate treatment of cultural resources.

- Require human remains be treated with the utmost dignity and respect and that the disposition and handling of human remains will be done in consultation with the MLD and under the requirement of Federal, State and County Regulations.
- Coordinate with public agencies, tribes, and institutions in order to build and maintain a central database that includes a notation whether collections from each site are being curated, and if so, where, along with the nature and location of cultural resources throughout the County of San Diego.

Goal 2 is the protection, conservation, use, and enjoyment of the County's important historic resources. The County has developed the following two policies to help ensure the protection of the County's resources.

- Encourage the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of historic sites, structures, and landscapes as a means of protecting important historic resources as part of the discretionary application process, and encourage the preservation of historic structures identified during the ministerial application process.
- Encourage and promote the development of educational and interpretive programs that focus on the rich multicultural heritage of the County of San Diego.

Goal 3 is that paleontological resources and unique geologic features should be conserved for educational and/or scientific purposes. The County has developed the following two policies to help ensure the protection of the County's resources.

- Require the salvage and preservation of unique paleontological resources when exposed to the elements during excavation or grading activities or other development processes.
- Require development to minimize impacts to unique geological features from human related destruction, damage, or loss.

City of San Diego

The City of San Diego regulations and policies pertaining to cultural resources can be found in the Historic Preservation Element of the *City of San Diego General Plan*.

The City of San Diego Municipal Code Chapters 11, 12 and 14 establish a Historical Resources Board and regulations for historical resources. These regulations are intended to protect, preserve, and where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations require that designated historical resources, important archaeological sites, and traditional cultural properties be preserved unless deviation findings can be made as part of a discretionary permit. Along with the Municipal Code, the General Plan has policies in place to protect cultural resources. The City has developed the following policies geared toward the preservation, protection and consideration of cultural resources to help ensure the protection of the City's resources:

- Strengthen historic preservation planning.
- Fully integrate the consideration of historical and cultural resources in the larger land use planning process.
- Foster government-to-government relationships with the Kumeyaay/Diegueno tribes of San Diego.

- Actively pursue a program to identify, document and evaluate the historical and cultural resources in the City of San Diego.
- Designate and preserve significant historical and cultural resources for current and future generations.

5.5.3.2 Cultural Setting

Historic Overview

Prehistoric Background

There is little evidence of early human occupation of southern California. A few sites have yielded artifacts that may date to the Clovis era (circa 11,000 years before present [B.P.]), and the oldest reliable dates for occupation come from Daisy Cave on San Miguel Island. Dates from this site indicate that the islands (and, therefore, probably the coast) were occupied as early as 11,600 to 11,000 B.P. Radiocarbon dates as old as 10,000 to 9,000 B.P. have been reported from coastal sites.

This early culture represents the post-Pleistocene adaptation to big game hunting of large mammals, possibly even members of the late Pleistocene megafauna such as mammoth, although direct evidence of this type of aboriginal megafauna exploitation is lacking from mainland southern California. Although it is reasonable to assume that vegetable foods were an important part of the diet, a lack of ground stone artifacts indicates that hard seeds were not routinely exploited. This early hunting tradition ended around 6,000 B.P. This is probably due to the advent of much warmer and drier times associated with the Altithermal, which led to a shift in subsistence strategies focused on plants and small game. However, regional and sub-regional variation and adaptation of toolkits, residence patterns, and resources exploited appears to have been the rule.

The following period, termed the Millingstone Substratum or the La Jolla/Pauma Complexes, dates from approximately 8,000 B.P. to 3,000 B.P. This horizon marks the technological advancements of seed grinding for flour as a staple of diet. This period has traditionally been thought of as the beginning of large-scale marine fauna exploitation, but recent research indicates marine fauna were probably an important part of the diet in earlier times. Diagnostic artifacts for this tradition include manos, metates, scraper planes, choppers, core tools, doughnut stones, discoidals, and cogstones. This period includes archaeological cultures/complexes such as Pauma, La Jolla, Topanga, Oak Grove, and Sayles. This period was not homogeneous across either time or space, and was characterized by adaptation to changing environments on both the regional and sub-regional scales.

The Pauma Complex, first identified by Delbert L. True, was primarily restricted to the areas east of Escondido in the peninsular ranges of northern San Diego County. It appears to have been a millingstone complex based on a hunting and seed-gathering economy. An assemblage of San Dieguito-like crescents, leaf-shaped points, La Jollan millingstone artifacts, core scrapers, and stone discoidals characterizes this complex, date to around 8,000 B.P. It is not known whether the Pauma Complex was an inland variant of the coastal La Jolla Complex, or represents seasonal inland encampments and adaptations of coastal groups, though recent studies have suggested that permanent inland and interior populations were more common than has traditionally been thought. It was also during this time that geographically expansive trade networks began to appear, with shell beads generated on the Channel Islands during this period being found as far away as Oregon.

The late Middle Holocene of San Diego County has not been well understood, with Moratto stating that there may have been a hiatus or reduction in occupation from 3,000 B.P. to 1,500 B.P. It is unlikely that the interior was abandoned completely, and it may be the case that interior adaptations were similar enough to those of the previous or later periods that they seem “invisible” in the archaeological record, or that occupation of the interior followed an ephemeral pattern that is not easily “seen” through the archaeological record.

The Late Prehistoric period began around 1,000 B.P. and continued until European contact. The period is characterized by three basic shifts in the economy: (a) intensification of land-based collecting and diversification of foods collected, (b) collection at specifically targeted shellfish resource areas and diversification of shellfish collected, and (c) the development or intensification of a quasi-maritime economy. Archaeologically the period is characterized by the introduction of the mortar and pestle, projectile points associated with bow and arrow technology, cremations, and the introduction of pottery around 1,000 B.P. The late period is represented by the San Luis Rey Complex, which is divided into stages I (550-200 B.P.) and II (200-100 B.P.). The complex was first proposed by Meighan based on his work at CA-SDI-132.

Archaeologically, the San Luis Rey Complex represents a termination of most of the millingstone practices in favor of greater reliance on acorn exploitation and establishment of semi-permanent villages in centralized resource locations. Small satellite camps surrounding the villages served as strategic foraging locations, allowing a flexible and varied resource base. San Luis Rey I assemblages are characterized by millingstones, bedrock mortars, cremations and small triangular points. San Luis Rey II contains all those plus pottery, cremation urns and, after contact, glass beads and metal knives.

The Late Prehistoric period essentially ended with Spanish colonization and establishment of the missions. Disease and forced relocation, which reduced the populations considerably among the coastal settlements, did much to destroy the cultural pattern established during that period.

Historic Background

The first Europeans to explore future California were in the 1542 expedition of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo. It is possible that Gaspar de Portola could have first visited the Black Mountain Ranch area near the Proposed Project in 1769, as he led a 62-person expedition from San Diego to Monterey.

After an initial period of exploration, the Spanish concentrated on the founding of presidios, missions, and secular towns with the land held by the Crown (1769-1821). In contrast, the later Mexican policy stressed individual ownership of the land. In 1821, Mexico declared independence from Spain and within 12 years began closing the missions. Former mission lands were granted to soldiers, other Mexican citizens, and a few wealthy foreigners.

The signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 ended the Mexican-American War and California became a territory of the United States. The discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in 1848 influenced the history of the state and the nation. Thousands of settlers and immigrants poured into the state, particularly after the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869. California became the 31st state in 1850, primarily due to the gold rush.

The Black Mountain Ranch community and surrounding area has historically been associated with farming and ranching activities. A prominent local ranchero, Jose Snook, began some of the largest livestock raising operations in the country by the 1850s within the current Rancho Bernardo area (Bartlett, 1965). However, Snook was subject to the same hardships many rancho families faced and by the end of 1867, the large stock-raising facility and land holdings were sold off in parcels. This pattern of subdivision continued, breaking the nearly 18,000 acre original land holding into smaller ranches and settlements that now constitute portions of Escondido, Rancho Bernardo, and the surrounding area.

The last of the working ranchers in this area was George Daley. After working the ranch on lease since the 1920s, he purchased the remaining 6,000,000-acre holding outright in 1943. Daley continued ranching on this land until his death in 1957, after which the land passed to his sons. In 1961, developers began planning with the Daley brothers to develop the area into what is now Rancho Bernardo, a master-planned self-contained community. This community's western margin is considered 4S Ranch.

An approximately 5,000-acre area directly west of Rancho Bernardo was purchased in 1988 by Fred Maas of Pacific EcoCompanies LLC. The land was located within a 12,000,000-acre area the San Diego City Council defined as the "North City Future Urbanizing Area.." The portion purchased by Maas has since become the Black Mountain Ranch community. Development of the master-planned, self-contained Black Mountain Ranch community finally began in 2006, after a lengthy 17-year litigation process. During this process, Maas navigated several issues, particularly those pertaining to the houses per acre allotment outlined by Proposition A, which passed in 1985. Overwhelming public outcry, including support by the Sierra Club and smaller environmental organizations, defeated a 1994 proposition (C) in which Maas sought to develop one house per acre. Maas later reached an agreement with the Sierra Club to follow additional restrictive building guidelines and Proposition K was passed in 1998.

The Black Mountain Ranch community is currently subject to a large amount of ongoing development. Primarily, this development is characterized by parks and open spaces, residential complexes of apartments and condominiums, as well as single-family residential neighborhoods. This development follows the parameters set forth in the Black Mountain Ranch Subarea Plan, adopted by the San Diego City Council in 1998. This plan designates approximately 67 percent of the community for parks and open spaces, 29 percent for residential development, two percent for schools, and two percent for commercial and employment uses.

Ethnographic Overview

At the time of European contact, the Proposed Project area was occupied by the Kumeyaay (also known as Kamia, Ipai, Tipai, and Diegueño), a Yuman speaking people. The Kumeyaay ranged from the San Diego coastal region east to beyond the Salton Sea and south to beyond Ensenada in Mexico, the northern extents included Mount Palomar. They lived in semi-sedentary villages, with temporary camps radiating out from the central location. The basic social unit was the patrilocal extended family with marriage being exogamy (marriage outside of group) and virilocal residence (couples living with the male's group).

The Kumeyaay were hunter-gatherers with an emphasis placed on acorn procurement and processing, as well as the capture of rabbits and other small game. Several scholars believe that the Kumeyaay, or at least some bands of the Kumeyaay, were practicing proto-agriculture at the time of Spanish contact. Although there is no definitive evidence of this, the Kumeyaay were adept resource managers with a history of intensive plant management.

Most tools were made from locally available materials, but obsidian was imported from the desert areas. Flaked tools included projectile points, scrapers, and biface knives. The common groundstone tools included metates, manos as well as mortars and pestles. Pottery came to the Kumeyaay quite late and was predominantly a plain brownware. The Kumeyaay were highly skilled in basket weaving, utilizing both coiled and twined construction methods. Some baskets were so tightly woven that they could carry water.

The Kumeyaay practiced many forms of spiritualism with the assistance of shamans. These spiritual leaders neither were elected nor inherited their position. Important ceremonies included male and female puberty rites, the cremation ceremony, as well as the yearly mourning ceremony. The primary ceremonial direction among the Kumeyaay is east, and the Kumeyaay are the only California tribe known to possess a color-direction system in which white represents the east, green-blue the south, black the west, and red the north.

Cultural Resources in the Proposed Project Area

Record Search Results

The record search results were taken from the cultural technical report (see Appendix 5.5-A, *Archaeological Survey Report Artesian 230kV Substation Project, San Diego County, California*). Sixty-three cultural resources have been previously recorded within 0.5 mile of the Proposed Project, of these only nine are within/directly adjacent to the Proposed Project. These nine sites are listed in Table 5.5-1, Recorded Cultural Resources within/just adjacent to the Proposed Project. Five studies have previously been conducted within the vicinity of the Proposed Project area.

The remainder of this page is intentionally kept blank.

Table 5.5-1: Recorded Cultural Resources within/just adjacent to the Proposed Project

Site/Isolate Designation	Description	Evaluation Status	Re-located
CA-SDI-5097	Prehistoric Habitation	Recommended Not Eligible (2015)	No
CA-SDI-5098	Prehistoric Lithic Scatter	Not Evaluated	No
CA-SDI-10493	Prehistoric Habitation, and Historic Agricultural Structures	Recommended Eligible (1986)	No
CA-SDI-11487	Prehistoric Temporary Camp	Recommended Eligible (1995)	No
CA-SDI-11508	Prehistoric Temporary Camp	Recommended Eligible (1995)	No
CA-SDI-12663	Prehistoric Lithic Scatter	Recommended Not Eligible (2015)	No
CA-SDI-12747	Prehistoric Lithic Scatter	Recommended Not Eligible	No
CA-SDI-13309	Refuse Scatter	Recommended Not Eligible (1995)	No
CA-SDI-13312	Prehistoric Temporary Camp	Evaluated (1995) Recommendation unknown	No

Archaeological Field Survey and Testing Results

Chambers Group archaeologists Lucas Tutschulte and Joel Levanetz conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of the Proposed Project area on June 5, 2015. To account for changes to the proposed alignment, Mr. Levanetz conducted a supplemental pedestrian survey on July 17, 2015. This survey addressed the overhead tie line approach to the Proposed Project that follows the existing power line corridor. While walking 15 meter transects, the archaeologists closely examined the limited amount of undisturbed ground surface for evidence of any prehistoric and historic period activity or cultural resources. No cultural materials were observed during the survey effort and none of the previously recorded resources were relocated.

In addition to the archaeological surveys conducted by Chambers Group, two proposed staging yards associated with the Proposed project were surveyed for the presence of cultural resources by ASM Affiliates, Inc. Senior Archaeologist Brian Williams completed these surveys on June 5, 2015. Since then, one staging yard, the Four Gee Road Staging Yard, has been removed from the

Proposed Project. No cultural materials were observed during the survey effort of the proposed Four Gee and Carmel Valley Road Staging Yards.

CA-SDI-5097: This prehistoric site, located directly under the existing Artesian Substation, was originally recorded by M. Rogers and updated by R. May in 1974. In May's update, he cites Rogers' report that the site was identified as a San Dieguito I or II culture pattern with tools indicative of this designation. The research potential of the site, stated by R. May from Rogers, included whether or not manos belonged to the toolkit of the San Dieguito phase. Artifacts recovered from these two previous surveys include numerous lithic flakes, hammerstones, cores, scrapers and blades; all were found in two separate loci. Since the most updated recording by May in 1974, the surrounding area has been completely developed into residential neighborhoods and multi-lane streets.

For the present survey, only the Northern section of the site boundary was surveyed. This section of the site has been disturbed by construction of Camino Del Sur road, by a parallel graded and graveled road to the north, and by heavy residential development to the north and south. Visibility was poor in this area, due to dense, non-native grasses and broom baccharis. The previously recorded artifact loci were not identified. No additional cultural resources were identified in the present survey. The Southern and central portions of the site are in the process of being developed and this has negatively impacted the rest of the site. This site is directly beneath the existing Artesian Substation, and remnants of the site may still be intact. This site was further tested for subsurface evidence; see results below.

CA-SDI-5098: This prehistoric site was recorded by R. May in 1974 and updated by C. Walker in 1980. At that time, the site consisted of six felsites flakes and one scraper of unknown material. It was noted in the updated site record the site had been impacted by grading and impending development. The site was not re-located during the current survey. It was likely destroyed due to the construction of housing developments in the area and the continued development of the surrounding areas since the last site update. .

CA-SDI-10493: This multi-component site was originally recorded in 1986 by Westec and was described as a late habitation site with bedrock milling and associated artifacts. Westec tested the prehistoric portion of the site in 1986 and deemed it significant. The historic component consists of a house and outbuildings. In 1992, Ogden revisited the site and commented that the site contains a dense midden and occupation debris and that the historic component contains the remnants of the Lusardi Ranch complex. The site was not relocated during the survey.

CA-SDI-11487: This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 1989 then evaluated for CRHR/NRHP eligibility in 1995 by Brian F. Smith and Associates. Smith reported a bedrock outcrop with a single milling slick and an associated midden deposit. The midden occurred to a depth of 60 centimeters below surface (cmbs) and with the surface collection consisted of five brown ware potsherds, four cores, 472 pieces of debitage, two choppers, a hammerstone, a retouched flake, five scrapers, two scraper planes, a spoke shave, three utilized flakes. The site area has been heavily disturbed by grading and landscaping. In the most recent survey, ground visibility was poor due to dense, non-native ground-cover plants. No cultural materials were identified. Expanded transects were employed in an effort to locate the site.

CA-SDI-11508: This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 1989 then evaluated for CRHR/NRHP eligibility in 1995 by Brian F. Smith and Associates. Smith reported a midden deposit which occurred to a depth of 70 cmbs. With the surface collection 32 hand stones, 13 milling slabs, a mortar fragment, a pestle, six cores, 770 pieces of debitage, four choppers, 10 hammerstones, four drills, four knives, a perforator, a projectile point, nine retouched flakes, 30 scrapers, two scraper planes, a spokeshave, 68 utilized flakes. The entire previously recorded site area has been destroyed by construction of the 4S Commons shopping mall, and a large associated parking lot. No cultural materials were identified during the current survey.

CA-SDI-12663: This prehistoric site was originally recorded by Munz in 1974 as a small lithic scatter and was updated by B. Glenn in 1992. The scatter consisted of one core tool, and three flakes. At the time of the last update, the site was reported to be in fair condition. During the present survey, the site was unable to be re-identified. The area has been subject to plowing and grazing by agricultural activities in the past as well as recent development of housing in the immediate area. This site was further tested for subsurface evidence; see results below.

CA-SDI-12747: This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 1992, and then evaluated for CRHR/NRHP eligibility in 1995 by Brian F. Smith and Associates. Smith reported a light density lithic scatter with a hand stone, a milling slab, three cores, 15 pieces of debitage, five choppers three scraper, and a utilized flake to a depth of 10cm below surface. The majority of this site has been destroyed by construction of Rancho Bernardo Road, which bisects the site from the southwest to the northeast. The remainder of the site, on both sides of the road, has been heavily disturbed by landscaping. Ground visibility was good, and no cultural materials were identified during the survey.

CA-SDI-13309: This historic site was originally recorded in 1993, and then evaluated for CRHR/NRHP eligibility in 1995 by Brian F. Smith and Associates. Smith reported a refuse scatter associated with the site of an old barn building; materials and machinery pieces take up the bulk of the deposit with some household, kitchen and personal items, and munitions. The Northern portion of the previously recorded site area has been destroyed by residential development, and the remainder of the site has been heavily impacted by landscaping. A narrow dirt road passes just to the south of the site boundary. No cultural materials were identified.

CA-SDI-13312: This site was originally recorded in 1993 by Brian F. Smith and Associates, and was described as a lithic scatter. One knife fragment and one mano were found. In 1995, Brian F. Smith tested the site using 44 shovel test pits (STP's) and 2 units, and determined it to be a temporary camp. The site appears to have been completely destroyed as it is under an existing structure. This site is well outside the Proposed Project area.

Along with conducting an intensive pedestrian survey of the entire project area, in April of 2015, Chambers Group also performed subsurface testing on two archaeological sites (CA-SDI-5097 and CA-SDI-12663) located within and adjacent to the footprint of the existing Artesian Substation.

As part of the subsurface investigation, the cultural team used STPs to determine the nature and extent of any potential intact subsurface deposit(s) present within the Proposed Project area. Chambers Group archaeologists placed systematic STP locations at approximately 20 to 30-meter intervals and assigned a unique number to each. STPs measured approximately 35 centimeters

(cm) in diameter, and were excavated in 20 cm levels until reaching sterile soil, a minimum depth of 40 cm, a maximum depth of 80 cm, or bedrock. There were a total of 24 STPs. The cultural team screened all soils from the STP excavations through 1/4-inch hardware mesh using shaker screens. Similar to the intensive survey of the Proposed Project area, no cultural materials were observed during the testing effort within or adjacent to the footprint of the existing Artesian Substation or within the footprint of the proposed Substation expansion.

Tribal Cultural Resources in the Proposed Project Area

Chambers Group submitted a request for a Sacred Land File (SLF) search to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on April 8, 2015. Chambers Group received a formal email response with the SLF results on August 31, 2015. The NAHC sacred land file record search did not identify any Native American cultural resources within the Proposed Project area. Upon receipt of the formal NAHC response, Chambers Group mailed project notification letters to all Tribal Group representatives listed by the NAHC on October 14, 2015. Chambers Group archaeologists called each Tribal Group Representative listed to confirm receipt of the project notification letter on November 6, 2015. At this time, there has been one response from the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians on November 12, 2015. The letter requested a copy of the cultural report for the project in order to make an informed decision/recommendation regarding potential impacts that may result from the Proposed Project. Tribal consultation will continue throughout all phases of the Proposed Project, as deemed necessary.

5.5.3.3 Paleontological Resources within the Proposed Project Area

The literature and record search conducted by the SDNHM indicates that there is one known fossil locality directly adjacent to the Proposed Project alignment (refer to Appendix 5-B). This one fossil location occurs in the Mission Valley Formation, which is highly sensitive.

Sedimentary rocks, including the Friars Formation and the Mission Valley Formation, predominantly underlie the Proposed Project area.

The Friars Formation consists predominantly of sandstones, and siltstones, and is a Middle Eocene age sedimentary formation, which is approximately 45 to 46 million years in age. This formation has a high paleontological sensitivity due to its rich vertebrate terrestrial mammal fossil collections such as primates, and artiodactyls. It also can contain well-preserved marine microfossils as well as fossil leaves.

The Mission Valley Formation is a Late Eocene age sedimentary formation, which is approximately 43 million years in age. This formation has a high paleontological sensitivity due to its production of abundant and generally well-preserved marine microfossils as well as a large and diverse assemblage of fossil land mammals.

Some pole locations are within sedimentary rock formations that could potentially yield fossils. There are usually two different types of foundations for the pole replacements. A (micropile) small borehole diameter (<12 inches) for installation of a single utility pole would typically pulverize subsurface deposits including any fossil remains. In contrast, larger pole diameters (concrete pier) could result in the potential for buried fossil remains to be impacted. At this time, the project description indicates no plans for any micropile foundations. There will be nine direct bury and five concrete pier foundations.

5.5.4 Potential Impacts

5.5.4.1 Significance Criteria

Cultural Resources

Under CEQA, the effects of Proposed Project construction, operation, and maintenance on historically significant cultural resources must be considered. A cultural resource is generally considered historically significant if it meets any of the following criteria:

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

The Proposed Project could have a potentially significant impact to cultural resources if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.
- Directly or indirectly, destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074.

For purposes of the first two thresholds, a “substantial adverse change” is defined as physical destruction, demolition, relocation, or alteration of an historical resource in Section 15064.5(b)(1) of the *CEQA Guidelines*.

Paleontological Resources

If the Proposed Project directly or indirectly destroys a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature, the impacts to paleontological resources would be considered significant. CEQA does not define “a unique paleontological resource or site” or “unique geologic feature”. Paleontologists generally use existing fossil and geological data to determine areas of potential significance, and a resource is deemed unique or important if:

- The particular geologic unit has previously recovered fossils.
- The geologic units that occur within the project area have recorded fossil localities.

- The fossil material recovered from the geologic unit are considered unique or important.

A fossil is defined as the remains of a prehistoric plant or animal. Fossils are considered to be non-renewable. Paleontological sensitivity is defined as the potential for a geologic unit to produce scientifically significant fossils. The sensitivity is based upon fossil data collected from the entire geologic unit, not just from a specific location or survey. Impacts to paleontological resources are identified from high to zero. The specific criteria are defined as follows:

- **High Potential Rating:** Rock units with a high potential for significant paleontological resources are those known to have yielded vertebrate fossils within the Proposed Project area or region. This does not necessarily imply that vertebrate fossils would always be recovered from high potential rated rock units, but only that there are recorded occurrences within the unit.
- **Moderate Potential Rating:** Rock units possessing some degree of potential, such as favorable depositional environment for resource preservation or lithologically similar rock units in the region that have yielded vertebrate fossils.
- **Low Potential Rating:** Rock units containing lithologies that do not commonly preserve significant fossil resources such as sediments of Holocene, sub-Holocene or Recent age are usually considered too young (less than 10,000 years old) in geologic time to preserve fossils.
- **Zero Potential Rating:** This rating is assigned to geologic formations that are igneous in origin, and therefore have no potential for producing fossil remains. This would also include artificial fill, as well as any non-fossiliferous metamorphic rock units.

5.5.4.2 Question 5a - Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Construction – Less than Significant

There are nine identified cultural resources located within or adjacent to the Proposed Project area. Four of these cultural resources have the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Project (CA-SDI-5097, 11487, 12663, and 12747) and of these four only one has been recommended as eligible for the NRHP/CRHR (CA-SDI-11487) and is thus identified as a historical resource for CEQA purposes. Only one pole location is in close proximity to this historical resource. With the implementation of APMs CUL-1 through CUL-6, any possible potential impacts to such historical resources would remain less than significant.

Construction of the Proposed Project (including excavation of holes and underground trenches for the installation of new structures and grading of access roads) could potentially impact unknown historical resources by disturbing subsurface soils, and potentially disturbing or destroying unknown buried cultural deposits. With the implementation of APMs CUL-1 through CUL-6, any possible potential impacts to such unknown historical resources would remain less than significant.

Operation & Maintenance – No Impact

SDG&E currently maintains and operates existing electric power, transmission, distribution and substation facilities throughout the Proposed Project site. To the extent that operation and

maintenance of the Proposed Project would occur in the same location as existing facilities and would have the same or substantially the same impacts, frequency and duration as operation and maintenance activities of the existing facilities, such activities are incorporated into the existing environmental setting and baseline for assessing impacts. Moreover, SDG&E already has standard internal programs and practices that avoid impacts to cultural resources and those programs and practices would not change as a result of the Proposed Project. There would be no ground disturbance as part of operations or maintenance that could affect cultural resources along the Proposed Project once the Proposed Project is constructed. The only activities that would occur would be regular inspection, maintenance, and repairs, such as structure and insulator replacements and underground line inspection (performed from the underground vaults). Any ground-disturbing activities associated with Proposed Project operation and maintenance would be performed at locations already disturbed for Proposed Project construction. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated during continued operation and maintenance following construction of the Proposed Project.

5.5.4.3 Question 5b - Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Construction – Less than Significant

There are nine identified cultural resources located within or adjacent to the Proposed Project area. Four of these cultural resources have the potential to be impacted by the Proposed Project (CA-SDI-5097, 11487, 12663, and 12747) and of these four, only one has been recommended as eligible for the NRHP/CRHR (CA-SDI-11487). The Artesian substation and four pole locations are in close proximity to these cultural resources. With the implementation of APMs CUL-1 through CUL-6, any possible potential impacts to these cultural resources would remain less than significant.

Construction of the Proposed Project (including grading and excavation of holes and underground trenches for the installation of new structures) could potentially impact prehistoric archaeological sites by disturbing subsurface soils, and potentially disturbing or destroying unknown buried cultural deposits. With the implementation of the proposed APM’s CUL-1 through CUL-6, any possible potential impacts would be less than significant.

Operation & Maintenance – No Impact

SDG&E currently maintains and operates existing electric power, transmission, distribution and substation facilities throughout the Proposed Project area. To the extent that operation and maintenance of the Proposed Project would occur in the same location as existing facilities and would have the same or substantially the same impacts, frequency and duration as operation and maintenance activities of the existing facilities, such activities are incorporated into the existing environmental setting and baseline for assessing impacts. Moreover, SDG&E already has standard internal programs and practices that avoid impacts to cultural resources and those programs and practices would not change as a result of the Proposed Project. There would be no regular ground disturbance as part of operations and maintenance that would affect cultural resources along the Proposed Project once the Proposed Project is constructed. The only activities that would occur would be regular inspection, maintenance, and repairs, such as structure and insulator replacements and underground line inspection (performed from the underground vaults). Any ground-disturbing

activities associated with Proposed Project operation and maintenance would be performed at locations already disturbed for Proposed Project construction. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated during continued operation and maintenance following construction of the Proposed Project.

5.5.4.4 Question 5c - Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Construction – Potentially Significant Unless APMs Incorporated

Although the Proposed Project area potentially contains rock unit types that have a high potential for paleontological resources (the Friars and Mission Valley Formations), the records search indicated that no previously recorded vertebrate paleontological sites are known to exist within the Proposed Project area (refer to Appendix 5-B). There is the potential for impacts to paleontological resources to occur when earthwork activities are performed, such as grading operations and excavation that cuts into the geological deposits (formations) within which fossils are buried, especially when the excavations go below three feet in depth. Impacts by the Proposed Project to unique paleontological resources are potentially high within the Proposed Project area. However, potential impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of the proposed APMs CUL-1, CUL-8, and CUL-9.

Operation & Maintenance – No Impact

SDG&E currently maintains and operates existing electric power, transmission, distribution and substation facilities throughout the Proposed Project area. To the extent that operation and maintenance of the Proposed Project would occur in the same location as existing facilities and would have the same or substantially the same impacts, frequency and duration as operation and maintenance activities of the existing facilities, such activities are incorporated into the existing environmental setting and baseline for assessing impacts. Moreover, SDG&E already has standard internal programs and practices that avoid impacts to cultural resources and those programs and practices would not change as a result of the Proposed Project. There would be no regular ground disturbance as part of operations and maintenance that would affect cultural resources along the Proposed Project once the Proposed Project is constructed. The only activities that would occur would be regular inspection, maintenance, and repairs, such as structure and insulator replacements and underground line inspection (performed from the underground vaults). Any ground-disturbing activities associated with Proposed Project operation and maintenance would be performed at locations already disturbed for Proposed Project construction. Therefore, no impacts to paleontological resources are anticipated during continued operation and maintenance following construction of the Proposed Project.

5.5.4.5 Question 5d - Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Construction – Less Than Significant

There are no known existing cemeteries, previously recorded Native American or other human remains within or directly adjacent to the Proposed Project area. Therefore, the potential for the inadvertent discovery of Native American or other human remains during subsurface construction associated with the Proposed Project is considered low. If human remains are encountered during

the course of construction, SDG&E would halt work in the vicinity of the find and would implement the appropriate notification processes as required by law (California Health and Safety Code section 7050.5, PRC sections 5097.98-99, and NAGPRA). As a result, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Operation & Maintenance – No Impact

SDG&E currently maintains and operates existing electric power, transmission, distribution and substation facilities throughout the Proposed Project area. To the extent that operation and maintenance of the Proposed Project would occur in the same location as existing facilities and would have the same or substantially the same impacts, frequency and duration as operation and maintenance activities of the existing facilities, such activities are incorporated into the existing environmental setting and baseline for assessing impacts. Moreover, SDG&E already has standard internal programs and practices that avoid impacts to cultural resources and those programs and practices would not change as a result of the Proposed Project. There would be no regular ground disturbance as part of operations and maintenance that would affect cultural resources along the Proposed Project once the Proposed Project is constructed. The only activities that would occur would be regular inspection, maintenance, and repairs, such as structure and insulator replacements and underground line inspection (performed from the underground vaults). Any ground-disturbing activities associated with Proposed Project operation and maintenance would be performed at locations already disturbed for Proposed Project construction. Therefore, no impacts to human remains are anticipated during continued operation and maintenance following construction of the Proposed Project.

5.5.4.6 Question 5e – Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of Tribal Cultural Resources?

Construction – Less-than-Significant Impact

At this time, SDG&E is not aware of any tribal cultural resources in the Proposed Project. Tribal consultation will continue throughout all phases of the Proposed Project, as necessary. If any tribal cultural resources are identified in the Proposed Project area, they will either be avoided, preserved in place, or handled as determined appropriate during consultation. This may include implementing the proposed APM CUL-7. As a result, any potential impacts would be less than significant.

Operation & Maintenance – No Impact

SDG&E currently maintains and operates existing electric power, transmission, distribution and substation facilities throughout the Proposed Project area. To the extent that operation and maintenance of the Proposed Project would occur in the same location as existing facilities and would have the same or substantially the same impacts, frequency and duration as operation and maintenance activities of the existing facilities, such activities are incorporated into the existing environmental setting and baseline for assessing impacts. Moreover, SDG&E already has standard internal programs and practices that avoid impacts to cultural resources and those programs and practices would not change as a result of the Proposed Project. There would be no regular ground disturbance as part of operations and maintenance that would affect cultural resources along the Proposed Project once the Proposed Project is constructed. The only activities that would occur

would be regular inspection, maintenance, and repairs, such as structure and insulator replacements and underground line inspection (performed from the underground vaults). Any ground-disturbing activities associated with Proposed Project operation and maintenance would be performed at locations already disturbed for Proposed Project construction. Therefore, no impacts to tribal cultural resources are anticipated during continued operation and maintenance following construction of the Proposed Project.

5.5.5 Applicant Proposed Measures

Implementation of the following APMs would ensure that potential adverse impacts to cultural resources are less than significant:

- CUL-1:** Prior to the initiation of construction or ground-disturbing activities, all SDG&E, contractor, and subcontractor personnel would receive training regarding the appropriate work practices necessary to effectively implement the APMs and to comply with the applicable environmental laws and regulations, including the potential for exposing subsurface cultural resources and paleontological resources and to recognize possible buried resources. Training shall inform all construction personnel of the anticipated procedures that would be followed upon the discovery or suspected discovery of archaeological materials, including Native American remains, and their treatment, as well as of paleontological resources.
- CUL-2** A qualified archaeologist would attend preconstruction meetings, as needed, and a qualified archaeological monitor would monitor ground disturbing activities in the vicinity of all known cultural resources within the Proposed Project area. The requirements for archaeological monitoring would be noted on the construction plans. The archaeologist's duties would include monitoring, evaluation of any finds, analysis of collected materials, and preparation of a monitoring results report conforming to Archaeological Resource Management Reports guidelines.
- CUL-3** Approved work areas will be established and construction crews would be instructed to stay within the approved work areas and avoid disturbance of any culturally sensitive areas that have been identified.
- CUL-4** In the event that cultural resources are discovered, the archaeologist would have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The archaeologist would contact SDG&E's Cultural Resource Specialist and Environmental Project Manager at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with SDG&E's Cultural Resource Specialist, would determine the significance of the discovered resources. SDG&E's Cultural Resource Specialist and Environmental Project Manager must concur with the evaluation procedures to be performed before construction activities are allowed to resume. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program would be prepared and carried out.
- CUL-5** All collected cultural remains would be cataloged and permanently curated with an appropriate institution. All artifacts would be analyzed to identify function and

chronology as they relate to the history of the area. Faunal material would be identified as to species.

- CUL-6** An archaeological monitoring results report (with appropriate graphics), which describes the results, analyses, and conclusions of the monitoring program, would be prepared and submitted to SDG&E's Cultural Resource Specialist and Environmental Project Manager following termination of the program. Any new cultural sites or features encountered would be recorded with the SCIC.
- CUL-7** Native American monitoring may be implemented if substation, transmission, power or distribution line construction has the potential to impact identified and mapped traditional locations or places. The role of the Native American monitor shall be to represent tribal concerns and communicate with the tribal council. Appropriate representatives will be identified based on the location of the identified traditional location or place.
- CUL-8** A paleontological monitor would work under the direction of a qualified Project paleontologist and would be on site to observe excavation operations that involve the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits with high paleontological resource sensitivity (i.e., Friars and Mission Valley Formations). A paleontological monitor is defined as an individual who has experience in the collection and salvage of fossil materials.
- CUL-9** In the event that fossils are encountered, the paleontological monitor would have the authority to divert or temporarily halt construction activities in the area of discovery to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely fashion. The paleontologist would contact SDG&E's Cultural Resource Specialist and Environmental Project Manager at the time of discovery. The paleontologist, in consultation with SDG&E's Cultural Resource Specialist would determine the significance of the discovered resources. SDG&E's Cultural Resource Specialist and Environmental Project Manager must concur with the evaluation procedures to be performed before construction activities are allowed to resume. Because of the potential for recovery of small fossil remains, it may be necessary to set up a screen-washing operation on site. When fossils are discovered, the paleontologist (or paleontological monitor) would recover them along with pertinent stratigraphic data. In most cases, this fossil salvage can be completed in a short period of time. Because of the potential for recovery of small fossil remains, such as isolated mammal teeth, recovery of bulk-sedimentary-matrix samples for off-site wet screening from specific strata may be necessary, as determined in the field. Fossil remains collected during monitoring and salvage would be cleaned, repaired, sorted, cataloged, and deposited in a scientific institution with permanent paleontological collections, and a paleontological monitoring report would be written.

5.5.6 Detailed Discussion of Significant Impacts

Based upon the preceding analysis, no significant impacts relating to cultural resources are anticipated from the Proposed Project.

5.5.7 References

- Abbott, Patrick L. 1999. *The Rise and Fall of San Diego*. Sunbelt Publications, San Diego, CA.
- Bartlett, John Russell. 1965. *Personal Narrative of Explorations and Incidents in Texas, New Mexico, California, Sonora and Chihuahua*. Chicago: The Rio Grande Press Inc.; 2:114-116.
- Bean, Lowell John. 1976. Social Organization in Native California. In *Native California: A Theoretical Retrospective*. Edited by Lowell John Bean and Thomas C. Blackburn, pp. 99-124. Socorro, New Mexico: Ballena Press.
- Byrd, B. F. and L. M. Raab. 2007. *Prehistory of the Southern Bight: Models for a New Millenium*. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, T. Jones and K. Klar, eds. Altimira Press, New York.
- Castillo, Edward D. 1978. The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8, California, edited by R. F. Heizer, pp. 99-127. Smithsonian Institution: Washington, D.C.
- Cheever, Dayle *et al.*, 1986. Archaeological Test and Historical Review of Four Sites on the Bernardo Lakes Property: CA-SDI-5616. CA-SDI-5617. CA-SDI-5618. CA-SDI-10493. (Westec).
- City of San Diego. 2008. *City of San Diego General Plan*. Historic Preservation Element. Accessed October 10, 2012015.
- Collings, Ruth. 1997. Joseph Snook: English Mariner, California Don. *Journal of San Diego History*. Volume 43, No. 4, edited by Richard W. Crawford. San Diego Historical Society Quarterly.
- El Adli, Joseph J. 2012. Paleontological Record Search Results letter for Transmission Line 6961 Sycamore to Bernardo dated March 12, 2012.
- Farnsworth, Margie. 2009. *The Saga of Black Mountain Ranch*. Black Mountain Ranch LLC.
- Foglia, S.E. and J. Hennessey. 2014. *Archaeological Survey for Artesian 230kV Substation Expansion, San Diego, San Diego County, California*.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. 1925. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 78. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Luomale, Katherine. 1978. Tipai and Ipai. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8: California*. Smithsonian Institution.
- Meighan, C. W. 1954. *A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory*. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10: 215-217.
- Moratto, M. J. 1984. *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, Inc. San Diego.

- M. W. Steele Group; Rick Planning Group; Michael Stepner, FAIA, AICP. 1998. *Black Mountain Subarea Plan: A Plan for Subarea I of the North City Future Urbanizing Area*. Prepared for Black Mountain Ranch LLC. Adopted by San Diego City Council June 28, 1998.
- Rossi, Vincent. 2012. *A Capsule History of Rancho Bernardo*. Rancho Bernardo Historical Society website. Accessed April 18, 2015.
- Shipek, Florence C. 1982. *Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure*. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology. Vol. 4, No. 2. Pp. 296-303.
- Shipek, Florence C. 1991. *Delfina Cuero: Her Autobiography, An Account of Her Last Years and Her Ethnobotanic Contributions*. Ballena Press. Menlo Park, California.
- Spier, Leslie. 1923. *Southern Diegueno Customs*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology. 20:297-358.
- State of California. 2012. Health and Safety Code 7050.5
- State of California. 2012. Public Resources Code 5097.98-99.
- True, D. L. 1958. *An Early Complex in San Diego County, California*. American Antiquity, 23(3): 255-263.
- True, D. L. 1966. *An Early Complex in San Diego County, California*. American Antiquity 23(3): 255-263.
- Williams, Brian and Isabel Cordova. 2012. *Inventory of the Cultural Resources along SDG&E's Tie Line 6961, San Diego County, California*.
- Williams, Brian. 2015. *Survey for Four Gee Yard in SDG&E's Proposed Artesian Substation Project, San Diego County, California*.
- Williams, Brian. 2015. *Supplemental Survey for Camino del Sur Yard in SDG&E's Proposed Sycamore to Penasquitos Transmission Line Project (SX to PQ), San Diego County, California*.