

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES..... 4.5-1**

4.5.1 Introduction ..... 4.5-1

4.5.2 Methodology ..... 4.5-1

4.5.3 Existing Conditions ..... 4.5-3

4.5.4 Potential Impacts ..... 4.5-14

4.5.5 Project Design Features and Ordinary Construction/Operating Restrictions..... 4.5-19

4.5.6 Applicant Proposed Measures ..... 4.5-19

4.5.7 Detailed Discussion of Significant Impacts ..... 4.5-19

4.5.8 References ..... 4.5-19

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 4.5-1: Recorded Cultural Resources within the Proposed Project Area..... 4.5-10

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix 4.5-A Paleontological Record Search

THIS PAGE IS INTENDED TO BE LEFT BLANK

---

## 4.5 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 Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

### 4.5.1 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. Components of the Proposed Project that could affect cultural resources include removal of existing poles/structures and power line, construction of new poles and stringing of new power lines, grading access roads, use of pulling stations, construction yards and laydown areas, or establishing HLZs.

Cultural resources as defined in 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. Although cultural resources identified within the Proposed Project site include prehistoric and historic archaeological sites and isolates, the Proposed Project will not result in significant impacts, either because the resources were not relocated, or will not be impacted. There are no known fossil localities within one mile of the Proposed Project. This is probably due to the widespread occurrence of non-fossil bearing igneous rocks. There is one geologic formation, the Pomerado Conglomerate, which has a high sensitivity potential for paleontological resources. With the implementation of ordinary construction restrictions (refer to Section 3.8), potential impacts to cultural and paleontological resources that may result from the Proposed Project would remain less than significant.

### 4.5.2 Methodology

#### 4.5.2.1 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 Central

Information Center (SCIC) housed at San Diego State University. Sources reviewed consisted of all recorded archaeological and historic sites records, and cultural resource reports within a ½ mile radius of the Proposed Project area. Additional resources that were consulted for relevant information included the National Register of Historic Places, 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.

#### **4.5.2.2 Native American Scoping**

In order to acquire more information about potential cultural resources located in or near the Proposed Project area, a request for information in the Sacred Lands file database was submitted to the NAHC in July 2010. The NAHC responded on July 25, 2010 and indicated that there are cultural resources recorded in the NAHC Sacred Lands file within a ½ mile of the Proposed Project area. The NAHC also enclosed a list of 21 Native American individuals and/or organizations that might have further knowledge of cultural resources in or near the Proposed Project area.

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) sent letters to all the individuals and/or organizations provided on the list by the NAHC. At this time, there have been no responses.

#### **4.5.2.3 Cultural Resources Field Surveys**

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. Gallegos & Associates, E<sup>2</sup>M/HDR, and ASM conducted cultural resources field surveys of the Proposed Project area. The eastern and central portions of the Proposed Project were examined during Gallegos & Associates survey in 2007 for the Sunrise Powerlink Project; this survey included the 10 poles on BLM land. E<sup>2</sup>M/HDR conducted the initial cultural resources surveys at 53 poles and their access roads, string areas, the Santa Ysabel Substation laydown yard, and the Creelman Substation Staging Yard in 2009. ASM conducted additional field surveys in 2011, but did not revisit the areas surveyed by Gallegos & Associates and E<sup>2</sup>M/HDR.

E<sup>2</sup>M/HDR's cultural field surveys were conducted on March 5, 6, and 9, 2009. The survey included an approximate 40-foot radius around each pole to account for possible anchor placements. ASM's cultural field surveys occurred on April 26, 27, and May 2, 2011, and included 10 meter transects around each pole location. When a previously recorded site boundary was encountered, five meter transects were utilized and extended for a total distance of 50 meters, when previously recorded sites were not initially re-identified.

#### **4.5.2.4 Paleontological Resources**

A thorough literature and record search was conducted by the Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum (SDNHM) on March 27, 2012. Relevant published geologic maps and reports, unpublished paleontological reports and unpublished museum collection locality data were reviewed. The Proposed Project and a one-mile radius were searched for fossil localities. There are no known fossil localities within one mile of the Proposed Project. The paleontological record search results letter can be found in Appendix 4.5-A.

### **4.5.3 Existing Conditions**

#### **4.5.3.1 Regulatory Setting**

##### **Federal Regulations**

###### *National Historic Preservation Act*

Enacted in 1966, the NHPA 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 National Register of Historic Places, 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 listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places, and makes the heads of all federal agencies responsible for the preservation of historic properties owned or controlled by their agencies.

16 USC Section 470 (Section 106) of the NHPA governs federal regulations 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 National Register of Historic Places. The criteria for determining National Register eligibility are found in 36 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 USC 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. The term “historical resource” is defined as follows:

- (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, 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 cultural 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.*

The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources, or identified in an historical resources survey does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an 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(a) (3) of the *CEQA Guidelines* explains that effects on cultural properties that qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological 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 managed in the context of projects subject to CEQA. Briefly, 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 PRC regarding the treatment of human remains. These provisions are detailed in Section 5097.9 through 5097.996. 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 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.

### **Local Regulations**

#### *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.



*Community of Ramona*

The *Ramona Community Plan* identifies one goal regarding cultural resources, this goal relates to the importance of Historic Resources, and several policies that relate to cultural resources. Below are the policies that relate to cultural resources:

- **Policy COS 1.3.3** Incorporate significant archaeological and historical sites into public projects wherever feasible.
- **Policy COS 1.3.4** Encourage public agencies and private property owners to preserve archaeological and historical resources.

**4.5.3.2 Cultural Setting****Historic Overview***Prehistoric Background*

Evidence of early human occupation of southern California is scanty. A few sites have yielded artifacts that may date to the Clovis era (circa 11,000 years before present [B.P.]), but 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 came to an end 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. This complex, dated to around 8,000 B.P., is characterized by an assemblage of San Dieguito-like crescents, leaf-shaped points, La Jollan millingstone artifacts, core scrapers, and stone discoidals. 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 the Santa Maria Valley (Ramona area) near the Proposed Project could have been first visited in 1769 by Gaspar de Portola, as he led a 62-person expedition from San Diego to Monterey.

The closest mission to the Proposed Project area is the Mission San Luis Rey, which was founded in 1798 under the supervision of Padre Presidente Fermin Francisco de Lasuen. The mission inducted large numbers of mountain Indians. In 1818, the Santa Ysabel mission outpost

(*asistencia*) was established several miles north of the Santa Maria Valley near the present day community of Santa Ysabel.

In 1833, during the secularization process, Narcisco Botello, a Mexican soldier received the Santa Maria land grant. He was unsuccessful at ranching, and abandoned the land. In 1843, the grant was passed to Jose Joaquin Ortega and his son-in-law, Captain Edward Stokes.

In 1872, Adolfo Stokes sold all but 1,000 acres to Juan Arrambide. Arrambide and French immigrant Bernardo Etcheverry developed the valley in fruit orchards, vineyards, and grain fields, and ran a prosperous sheep operation on several thousand acres in Santa Maria Valley.

A steady flow of settlers came to southern California during the 1880s and 1890s; this included the Santa Maria Valley. The Santa Maria land grant was sold off in large and small parcels to various land speculators, and homesteaders. The area continued to grow gradually, with the predominant emphasis on turkey ranches, beehives and horse stables. From 1930 to the early 1970s, Santa Maria Valley and Ramona itself were known as the “Turkey Capital” of the world. The area has continued to grow with urban developments over the last several decades.

### **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 concrete evidence of this, the Kumeyaay were certainly adept resource managers with a history of intensive plant managing.

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. Table 4.5.1:Recorded Cultural Resources within the Proposed Project Area, includes the 17 archaeological resources previously recorded as well as the six new sites and isolates located by ASM.

**Table 4.5-1: Recorded Cultural Resources within the Proposed Project Area**

Site/Isolate Designation	USGS Quad	Description	NRHP/CRHR Status	Relocated
SDI-5038	Ramona	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	No
SDI-11266	Santa Ysabel	Historical Foundation	Not Evaluated	No
SDI-11633	Ramona	Prehistoric Lithic Scatter	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-11634	Ramona	Prehistoric Lithic Scatter	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-11638/H	Ramona	Multi Component	Not Evaluated	No
SDI-12448	Santa Ysabel	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	No
SDI-13247	Ramona	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	No
SDI-17954	Santa Ysabel	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	No
SDI-17958	Santa Ysabel	Multi Component	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-18434	Santa Ysabel	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	No
SDI-18964	Santa Ysabel	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-19025	Santa Ysabel	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-19030	Santa Ysabel	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-19031	Santa Ysabel	Historic Foundations	Not Evaluated	Yes
37-028748	Santa Ysabel	Historic Rock Wall	Not Evaluated	Yes
37-029760	Santa Ysabel	Historic Well	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-20241	Santa Ysabel	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	Yes
BC-I-01	Ramona	Prehistoric Isolate (Groundstone)	Not Eligible	Yes
BC-I-02	Ramona	Prehistoric Isolate (Core)	Not Eligible	Yes

**Table 4.5-1 (cont): Recorded Cultural Resources within the Proposed Project Area**

Site/Isolate Designation	USGS Quad	Description	NRHP/CRHR Status	Relocated
SDI-20240	Ramona	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-20242	Santa Ysabel	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-20243	Santa Ysabel	Historic Refuse Scatter	Not Evaluated	Yes
SDI-20669	Santa Ysabel	Prehistoric Bedrock Milling	Not Evaluated	Yes

### *Archaeological Field Survey Results*

During the field surveys, ten of the previously recorded archaeological resources were relocated, and updated by E<sup>2</sup>M/HDR or ASM (SDI-11633, SDI-11634, SDI-17958, SDI-18964, SDI-19025, SDI-19030, DI-19031, 37-028748, 37-029760, and SDI-20241). Seven previously recorded sites were not relocated within the Proposed Project area (SDI-5038, SDI-11266, SDI-11638, SDI-12448, SDI-13247, SDI-17954, and SDI-18434). Additionally, ASM identified four new sites (SDI-20240, SDI-20242, SDI-20243, and SDI-20669) and two new isolates (BC-I-01, and BC-I-02).

**SDI-5038:** CA-SDI-5038 was originally recorded in 1979 by Johnson and Pettus as a milling area containing two mortars, 16 slicks, and three basins. The site was updated in 1990 by Andrew Pigniolo as containing two milling areas and four loci of lithic debris, including hundreds of flakes and several associated artifacts. In 2009, ASM completed an updated cultural resource study for the property and noted that the site is still present but not all of the constituents could be re-located. Two milling areas were identified as well as a sparse lithic scatter; however, Pigniolo's four lithic scatter loci could not be re-located. The site boundaries were extended to include both milling loci. This site also contains a sparse lithic scatter of approximately 30+ metavolcanic and quartzite flakes. There were no apparent loci of debitage present; however, there appears to have been substantial erosion on the area, which may have affected surface deposits. In addition, at the time of the survey ground visibility was poor due to dense grasses. During the 2011 ASM survey, no elements associated with the previous recording were identified near the pole locations.

**SDI-11266:** This historical site was originally recorded in 1986 by Jenkins as an historical rock foundation and associated refuse scatter. During the 2011 ASM survey, no elements associated with the previous recording were identified near the pole locations.

**SDI-11633:** This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 1990 by Pigniolo as three pieces of quartz debitage among a natural quartz exposure. ASM identified the quartz exposure and possible pieces of debitage within the original project boundary.

**SDI-11634:** This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 1990 by Pigniolo as three pieces of quartzite debitage. During the 2011 ASM survey, this site was identified as previously recorded.

**SDI-11638/H:** This site was originally recorded in 1990 by Pigniolo and Briggs as a lithic testing and procurement site with a light scatter of flakes and tested cobbles. The site contained 200+ flakes and 40+ core tools over a very large area along a north/south trending ridge. Also recorded was the presence of a historic olive grove within the north central portion of the site. In 2009, ASM completed an updated cultural resource study for the property and noted that the site is still present, however the amount of lithic material is very sparse and spread out over a very large area. At the time of the 2011 ASM survey, the majority of the site was covered with very dense dry grasses resulting in minimal ground visibility. The historic component of the site was also relocated. A historic era olive grove consisting of eight rows of trees with approximately 10 trees in each row. Also present is a stacked cobble wall, running east west, for approximately 105 feet along the northern edge of the olive grove. The wall appears to be constructed with cobbles removed from the olive grove. The olive grove and rock wall are likely associated with homesteading activities within the vicinity. No elements associated with the previous recording were identified near the pole locations.

**SDI-12448:** This site was originally recorded by Saunders in 1991 as more than 20 milling elements, a rock circle, brownware sherds, stone tools, cores, and debitage. During the ASM survey, no elements associated with the previous recording were identified near the pole locations.

**SDI-13247:** Desautels and Beer originally recorded this prehistoric site in 1993 as nine bedrock milling features, potsherds, finished stone tools, preforms, projectile points, handstone, groundstone, bone fragments, and percussion tools. During the 2011 ASM survey, no elements associated with the previous recording were identified near the pole locations.

**SDI-17954:** ASM originally recorded this prehistoric site in 2006 as three bedrock-milling features with four surfaces, four brownware body sherds, a mano and a volcanic piece of debitage. During the 2011 ASM survey, no elements associated with the previous recording were identified near the pole locations.

**SDI-17958:** ASM originally recorded this site in 2006 as two bedrock milling features with 13 milling surfaces, a mano, more than 15 brownware sherds, more than 25 pieces of quartz debitage, a quartz Cottonwood projectile point, and a historical rock wall. Gallegos & Associates combined the two sites in 2009 and noted two additional milling features with five milling surfaces. During the 2011, ASM survey, this site was identified as previously recorded.

**SDI-18434:** This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 2006 by Gallegos & Associates as two bedrock-milling features with three milling slicks. During the 2011 ASM survey, no elements associated with the previous recording were identified near the pole locations.

**SDI-18964:** This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 2006 by Gallegos & Associates as four bedrock milling features with 15 milling slicks, one buffware sherd, 11 brownware sherds, a piece of quartz debitage, a piece of obsidian debitage and a quartz biface. During the 2011 ASM survey, the site was identified as previously recorded.

**SDI-19025:** This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 2007 by SWCA as two bedrock-milling features with three surfaces. Both ASM and e<sup>2</sup>M/HDR found this site to be as previously reported.

**SDI-19030:** This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 2007 by SWCA as two bedrock milling feature with two milling slicks. During the 2011 ASM survey, the site was identified as previously recorded.

**SDI-19031:** This historical site was originally recorded in 2007 by SWCA as five features associated with a former milling operation, included a water conveyance system, a wood structure ruin, a concrete foundation with discarded machinery, a concrete footing, and a concrete foundation with wood planks. Both ASM and e<sup>2</sup>M/HDR found this site to be as previously reported.

**37-028748:** This historical rock wall was originally recorded in 2007 by Gallegos & Associates. Both ASM and e<sup>2</sup>M/HDR found this site to be as previously reported.

**37-029760:** This historical well was originally recorded in 2007 by SWCA. E<sup>2</sup>M/HDR and ASM found this site to be as previously reported.

**SDI-20241:** This prehistoric site was originally recorded in 2009 by E<sup>2</sup>M/HDR as a bedrock-milling feature with one milling slick.

**BC-I-01:** This prehistoric isolate consists of one granitic groundstone fragment.

**BC-I-02:** This prehistoric isolate consists of one volcanic core.

**SDI-20240:** This prehistoric site consists of one bedrock-milling outcrop with a single milling slick.

**SDI-20242:** This prehistoric site consists of one bedrock-milling outcrop with a single milling slick.

**SDI-20243:** This historical site consists of glass shards and a cold cream jar.

**SDI-20669:** This prehistoric site consists of one bedrock-milling outcrop with a single milling slick.

Twenty-seven of the replacement pole locations were identified as lying near or within 20 feet of known cultural sites. These sites were identified through record searches and cultural surveys, and avoidance measures were developed through field visits to these poles and facilities by ASM staff. Several poles were moved in order to avoid impacts to known cultural resources. In all cases, the pole locations are far enough from the cultural resource locations that no direct impacts should occur where ordinary construction restrictions are implemented.

In the event of an unanticipated discovery of archaeological materials within a work area during construction monitoring, all ground-disturbing work at the work area will be suspended. The archaeological monitor will carefully inspect the ground surface around the discovery and the displaced dirt in order to determine whether the discovery is an isolated find (fewer than three items) or a site (three or more items, or a feature). If the discovery is determined to be a site, SDG&E archaeologists will be notified of the nature and extent of the discovery. The project

archaeologist and SDG&E archaeologists will work together to determine the correct course of action. The level of effort will be dictated by the nature and extent of the discovery and on the results of the initial evaluation effort.

### **4.5.3.3 Paleontological Resources within the Proposed Project Area**

Based on the records search conducted through the Department of Paleontology, SDNHM (refer to Appendix 4.5-A), no previously recorded vertebrate paleontological sites are known to exist within the Proposed Project area. The Proposed Project area is predominantly underlain by plutonic igneous rocks of the Cretaceous-age (120-90 million years old) Peninsular Ranges Batholith. The high temperature and pressure conditions associated with the formation of the plutonic rocks are responsible for the absence of fossils. However, there are portions of the Proposed Project area that are underlain by sedimentary rocks, including the Pomerado Conglomerate and Late Pleistocene to Holocene aged channel deposits.

The Pomerado Conglomerate is a Middle to Late Eocene age sedimentary formation, which is approximately 36 to 38 million years in age, includes fluvial/deltaic deposits. The formation consists of a massive cobble conglomerate with sandstone as the matrix and thin interlayer. It is the uppermost formation of the Poway group. This formation has a high paleontological sensitivity due to known occurrences within the unit in other regions of San Diego County.

Late Pleistocene to Holocene (500,000 years old to present) aged channel deposits have a low to moderately sensitive for paleontological resources. Sedimentary rocks underlie eight poles within the Proposed Project area. Six of these poles are underlain with the Pomerado Conglomerate having a high sensitivity, and two with the Late Pleistocene to Holocene channel deposits, which has a low to moderate sensitivity.

## **4.5.4 Potential Impacts**

### **4.5.4.1 Significance Criteria**

#### **Cultural Resources**

Under CEQA, Proposed Project construction, operation, and maintenance effects to unique or important cultural resources must be considered. A cultural resource is considered unique or important 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:



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

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*.

#### **4.5.4.2 Question 5a - Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?**

##### **Construction – Less than Significant Impact**

Twenty-three archaeological sites are located within or adjacent to the Project area. Twenty-one of these sites have not been evaluated for significance and may qualify as historical resources as identified in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a). For the purpose of this Project, these 21 sites are being assumed to qualify as “historical resources” as defines by CEQA, and impacts to these sites will be avoided.

Construction of the Proposed Project (including excavation of holes for the installation of the power line structures) could potentially impact historical resources by disturbing subsurface soils, and potentially disturbing or destroying unknown buried cultural deposits. By implementing project design features and ordinary construction restrictions, such as cultural resources sensitivity training for all construction personnel, and monitoring any areas that are considered environmentally sensitive, any possible potential impacts to historical resources would remain less than significant.

##### **Operation & Maintenance – No Impact**

The Proposed Project is the reconstruction of existing electric facilities within existing SDG&E ROW and substation property. To the extent 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 operational impacts on cultural resources along the Proposed Project once the Proposed Project is constructed. The only activities that would occur would be regular maintenance and repairs, such as structure and insulator replacements. These activities would decrease slightly from existing conditions, and would have no effect on historical resources. Any future potential maintenance-related construction projects would be evaluated under G.O. 131-D and CEQA for purposes of assessing whether further CPUC approval is required. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated during

the continuing operation and maintenance of TL 637 following construction of the Proposed Project.

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

**Construction – Less than Significant Impact**

Potential impacts to these 23 archaeological sites will remain less-than-significant with the implementation of project design features and ordinary construction restrictions, implementation of which is a standard SDG&E practice. The project design features and ordinary construction restrictions relevant to cultural resources (refer to Section 3.8) include: design changes to ensure impact avoidance, incorporation of avoidance and minimization measures during preconstruction, such as flagging approved work areas, and monitoring to ensure avoidance and minimization measures are followed into construction. Demarcation of known resources and construction monitoring will ensure avoidance of these resources during Project construction, operation, and maintenance; construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist; and training of construction personnel.

In the event that cultural resources are discovered during construction, 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 to mitigate impacts. Known archaeological sites will be avoided during Project construction, operation, and maintenance.

Construction of the Proposed Project (excavation of holes for the installation of the power line structures) could potentially impact prehistoric archaeological sites by disturbing subsurface soils, and potentially disturbing or destroying unknown buried cultural deposits. Any possible potential impacts would remain less than significant with the implementation of the cultural resources project design features and ordinary construction restrictions.

**Operation & Maintenance – No Impact**

The Proposed Project is the reconstruction of existing electric facilities within existing SDG&E ROW and substation property. To the extent 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 operational impacts on cultural resources along the Proposed Project once the Proposed Project is constructed. The only activities that

would occur would be regular maintenance and repairs, such as structure and insulator replacements. These activities would decrease slightly compared to existing conditions, and would have no effect on archaeological resources. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated during the continuing operation and maintenance of TL 637 following construction of the Proposed Project.

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

If the Proposed Project directly or indirectly destroys a unique paleontological resource, the impacts to paleontological resources would be considered significant. 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 low. 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 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, subHolocene or Recent age are usually considered too young (less than 10,000 years old) in geologic time to preserve fossils.

The type of proposed impacts for the pole replacements will be an important factor for example a small borehole diameter (<12 inches) for installation of a single utility pole will typically pulverize subsurface deposits and any contained fossil remains. In contrast, larger pole diameters often result in opportunities for the discovery and recovery of buried fossil remains.

#### **Construction – Less than Significant Impact**

The records search indicated that no previously recorded vertebrate paleontological sites are known to exist within the Proposed Project area (refer to Appendix 4.5-A). 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. Potential impacts by the Proposed Project to unique paleontological resources exist primarily in the Pomerado Conglomerate formation. However, potential impacts would remain less than significant with the implementation of ordinary construction restrictions, which includes cultural resources sensitivity training for construction personnel, and monitoring of areas considered to be sensitive for paleontology.

**Operation & Maintenance – No Impact**

The Proposed Project is the reconstruction of existing electric facilities within existing SDG&E ROW and substation property. As previously discussed above, to the extent 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. Ground-disturbing activities associated with Proposed Project operation and maintenance would be performed at similar intensities as they are currently conducted and at the locations already disturbed for Proposed Project construction. Therefore, no impacts to paleontological resources are anticipated during the continuing operation and maintenance of TL 637 following construction of the Proposed Project.

**4.5.4.5 Question 5d - Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?****Construction – Less than Significant Impact**

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 7050.5, PRC 5097.98-99, and NAGPRA). As a result, potential impacts would be less than significant.

**Operation & Maintenance – No Impact**

The Proposed Project is the reconstruction of existing electric facilities within existing SDG&E ROW and substation property. As previously discussed, to the extent 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. Ground-disturbing activities associated with Proposed Project operation and maintenance would be performed at locations that have been previously disturbed for Proposed Project construction. Therefore, no impacts to human remains are anticipated during the continuing operation and maintenance of TL 637 following construction of the Proposed Project.

#### 4.5.5 Project Design Features and Ordinary Construction/Operating Restrictions

With the implementation of the project design features and ordinary construction restrictions (as outlined within Section 3.8) potential impacts relating to cultural resources will remain less than significant.

#### 4.5.6 Applicant Proposed Measures

The Proposed Project has no potentially significant impacts relating to cultural resources; therefore, no APMs are proposed.

#### 4.5.7 Detailed Discussion of Significant Impacts

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

#### 4.5.8 References

Byrd, B. F. and L. M. Raab. 2007. Prehistory of the Southern Bight: Models for a New Millennium. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, T. Jones and K. Klar, eds. Altimira Press, New York.

California [State of], California Environmental Quality Act. 2011. *Statutes and Guidelines*. Printed by the Association of Environmental Professionals.

County of San Diego. 2011. *San Diego County General Plan*. Accessed November 12, 2012.

County of San Diego. 2011. *Ramona Community Plan*. Accessed December 11, 2012.  
[http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds/docs/CP/Ramona\\_CP.pdf](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/pds/docs/CP/Ramona_CP.pdf)

El Adli, Joseph J. 2012. Paleontological Record Search Results letter dated March 27, 2012.

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.

LeMenager, Charles R. 1989. *Ramona and Round About: A History of San Diego County's Little Known Backcountry*. Eagle Peak Publishing Company, Ramona, California.

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.

National Environmental Policy Act. 2011. Accessed at: <http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/welcome.html>

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. 1990.

<http://www.nps.gov/nagpra/mandates/index.htm>

Shipek, Florence C. 1982. Kumeyaay Socio-Political Structure. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*. Vol. 4, No. 2. Pp. 296-303.

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.

1966. An Early Complex in San Diego County, California. *American Antiquity* 23(3): 255-263.

True, D. L., C. W. Meighan, and H. Crew. 1974. *Archaeological Investigations at Molpa, San Diego County, California*. University of California Publications in Anthropology, 11.

Williams, Brian and Isabel Cordova. 2012. *Inventory of the Cultural Resources along San Diego Gas & Electric Tie Line 637, San Diego County, California*