

2.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

This section assesses general cultural and paleontological resource conditions in the County of San Diego (County) and identifies potential cultural and paleontological resource impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. The information used in this analysis is general in nature and is derived from the most readily available information in applicable resource and planning documents.

2.5.1 Existing Conditions

Cultural resources are the tangible or intangible remains or traces left by prehistoric or historical peoples. Cultural resources can also include traditional cultural places, such as gathering areas, landmarks, and ethnographic locations. Paleontological resources are the remains and/or traces of prehistoric life, exclusive of human remains, and include the localities of where fossils were collected and the sedimentary rock formations in which they were formed. The following describes the existing cultural and paleontological resources found within the County.

Cultural Resources

San Diego County Cultural Background

Archaeological evidence reveals that the County has a long cultural history beginning approximately 10,000 years ago. The following cultural background discusses the characteristics of each cultural period of prehistory and history, as taken from the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources (County of San Diego 2007b), dated December 5, 2007.

Pre-Contact Background

The body of current research of Native American (Pre-Contact) occupation in the County recognizes the existence of at least two major cultural traditions, discussed here as Early Period/Archaic and Late Period, based upon general economic trends and material culture. Within the County, the Early Period/Archaic includes the period from 10,000 to 1,300 years ago, while the Late Period is from 1,300 years ago to historic (Spanish) contact. The Post-Contact/Historic Period covers the time from Spanish contact to present.

Early Period/Archaic

The Early Period/Archaic includes the San Dieguito, La Jolla, and Pauma complexes, which are poorly defined, as are the interrelationships between contemporaneous inland, desert, and coastal assemblages. Initially believed to represent big game hunters, the San Dieguito people are better

typified as a hunting and gathering society. These people had a relatively diverse and non-specialized economy wherein relatively mobile bands accessed and used a wide range of plant, animal, and lithic resources. Movement of early groups from the California desert may have been spurred by the gradual desiccation of the vast pluvial lake system that dominated inland basins and valleys during the early to middle Holocene. This hypothesis is supported by the similarity between Great Basin assemblages and those of Early Holocene Archaic sites in the County.

Early Period/Archaic sites from 10,000 to 1,300 years ago within the County include a range of coastal and inland valley habitation sites, inland hunting and milling camps, and quarry sites, usually in association with fine-grain metavolcanic material. Material culture assemblages during this long period are remarkably similar in many respects. These deposits may well represent a process of relative terrestrial economic stability and presumably slow cultural change. Though various culture traits developed or disappeared during the long span of 10,000 to 1,300 years ago, there is a clear pattern of cultural continuity during this period. The earliest known sites, found near coastal lagoons and river valleys of the County, are the Harris Site (CA-SDI-149), Agua Hedionda sites (CA-SDI-210/UCLJ-M-15 and CA-SDI-10695), Rancho Park North (CA-SDI-4392/SDM-W-49), and Remington Hills (CA-SDI-11069), dating from 9,500 to 8,000 years ago.

Late Period

During the Late Period (circa 1,300 to historic contact), a material culture pattern similar to that of historic Native Americans first becomes apparent in the archaeological record. The economic pattern during this period appears to be one of more intensive and efficient exploitation of local resources. The prosperity of these highly refined economic patterns is well evidenced by the numerous Kumeyaay/Diegueño and Luiseño habitation sites scattered throughout the County. This increase in Late Period site density probably reflects both better preservation of the more recent archaeological record and a gradual population increase within the region. Artifacts and cultural patterns reflecting this Late Period pattern include small projectile points, pottery, the establishment of permanent or semipermanent seasonal village sites, a proliferation of acorn milling sites in the uplands, the presence of obsidian from the Imperial Valley source Obsidian Butte, and interment by cremation.

Luiseño occupation in northern San Diego County during the late Holocene has been viewed as an occupation that migrated from the desert to the coast called “the Shoshonean Wedge” (County of San Diego 2010). Late Period culture patterns were shared with groups along the northern and eastern periphery of San Diego County, incorporating many elements of their neighbors’ culture into their own cultures. This transference and melding of cultural traits between neighboring groups makes positive association of archaeological deposits with particular ethnographically known cultures difficult. This is particularly true of the groups within the County. Although significant differences exist between Luiseño and Kumeyaay/Diegueño cultures (including

linguistic stock), the long interaction of these groups during the Late Period resulted in the exchange of many social patterns. Archaeologists must rely heavily on ethnographic accounts of group boundaries as recorded during the historic period, although it is not known how long these boundaries had been in place or the validity of these boundaries as presently reported.

Historic Resources

Historical Resources Background

The history of San Diego County is commonly presented in terms of Spanish, Mexican, and American political domination. A discussion of historic land use and occupation under periods of political rule by people of European and Mexican origin is justified on the basis of characteristics associated with each period, when economic, political, and social activities were influenced by the prevailing laws and customs. Certain themes are common to all periods, such as the development of transportation, settlement, and agriculture.

Spanish Period (1769–1821)

The Spanish Period represents exploration, the establishment of the San Diego Presidio and missions at San Diego (1769) and San Luis Rey (1798), and the addition of asistencias (chapels) to the San Diego Mission at Santa Ysabel (1818) and to the San Luis Rey Mission at Pala (1816). Horses, cattle, agricultural foods and weed seeds, and a new architectural style and method of building construction were also introduced. Spanish influence continued after 1821 when California became a part of Mexico. For a period of time under Mexican rule, the missions continued to operate as in the past, and laws governing the distribution of land were also retained.

Mexican Period (1821–1848)

The Mexican Period includes the initial retention of Spanish laws and practices until shortly before secularization of the missions in 1834, a decade after the end of Spanish rule. Although several grants of land were made prior to 1834, vast tracts of land were dispersed through land grants offered after secularization. Cattle ranching prevailed over agricultural activities, and the development of the hide and tallow trade increased during the early part of this period. The Pueblo of San Diego was established and transportation routes were expanded. The Mexican Period ended in 1848 as a result of the Mexican–American War.

American Period (1848–Present)

The American Period began when Mexico ceded California to the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Terms of the treaty brought about the creation of the Lands Commission in response to the Homestead Act of 1851, which was adopted as a means of validating and

settling land ownership claims throughout the state. Few Mexican ranchos remained intact because of legal costs and the difficulty of producing sufficient evidence to prove title claims. Much of the land that once constituted rancho holdings became available for settlement by immigrants to California. The influx of people to California and the San Diego region resulted from several factors including the discovery of gold in the state, the conclusion of the Civil War, the availability of free land through passage of the Homestead Act, and later, the importance of the County as an agricultural area supported by roads, irrigation systems, and connecting railways. The growth and decline of towns occurred in response to an increased population and the economic boom and bust cycle in the late 1800s.

Paleontological Resources

The County covers varying landforms and geologic formations. The location of geologic formations plays an important role in determining the presence of paleontological resources. Fossils are a result of the preservation of organic remains. They commonly include marine shells; bones and teeth of fish, reptiles, and mammals; leaf assemblages; and petrified wood. Fossil traces include internal and external molds and casts. Trace fossils consist of evidence of the past activities of fossil organisms. Examples of trace fossils include footprints and trackways, burrow and boreholes, and coprolites and nests. Most fossils found in the County are represented by shells or tests (hard coverings) of marine invertebrates. Skeletal remains of terrestrial vertebrates are also locally present and important; they characterize certain geologic rock units and interval times. Terrestrial fossils within the County also include remains and impressions of plants including leaf assemblages and petrified wood (County of San Diego 2011).

Paleontological Sensitivity

Based on rock type and location of previously recorded fossils, areas within the County are put into the following categories for potential paleontological resources: high sensitivity, moderate sensitivity, low sensitivity, and marginal sensitivity. High resource sensitivity areas are those with geological formations known to contain paleontological localities with rare, well-preserved critical fossil materials. Areas of high sensitivity within the County include the following: Pliocene–Pleistocene Nonmarine formation within the northern portion of the Pala–Pauma; Pliocene–Pleistocene Nonmarine and Quaternary Alluvium formations in the North Mountain; Cretaceous Plutonic formations dispersed throughout Ramona; Cretaceous Plutonic formations in the westernmost portion of the Bonsall; Eocene Marine and Nonmarine in the North County Metro; Eocene Marine and Nonmarine and Quaternary Alluvium formations in the San Dieguito; the Upper Jurassic and Lower Cretaceous formations in the Jamul–Dulzura; and Eocene Marine and Nonmarine and Upper Jurassic and Lower Cretaceous formations within the Spring Valley Community Planning Area (CPA). There are also areas of high sensitivity in the varied formations of the Sweetwater CPA. Finally, the largest areas of high sensitivity are found in the

westernmost portion of Lakeside and consist of Eocene Marine and Nonmarine formation. Approximately 1% of the total land within the County is categorized as high sensitivity (County of San Diego 2010).

The moderate sensitivity category is applied to areas with geologic formations known to contain paleontological localities with a strong, but often unproven, potential for containing unique fossil remains (County of San Diego 2009). The largest concentrations of moderate sensitivity are two areas of Quaternary Alluvial Fan deposits in the northern portion of the Pala–Pauma Valley Subregional Plan Area. Other areas of moderate sensitivity within the County are as follows: Cretaceous Plutonic formations in the south portion of Ramona and the northern Lakeside CPA; Upper Cretaceous Nonmarine formations in central Alpine; Eocene Marine and Nonmarine and Upper Jurassic and Lower Cretaceous formations in Sweetwater; and Quaternary Alluvium formation in the southwestern area of the Desert Subregion (County of San Diego 2010).

Most of the County is underlain by geologic formations with no potential, low sensitivity, or marginal sensitivity for paleontological resources and is therefore unlikely to contain important fossils.

2.5.2 Regulatory Setting

Federal Regulations

National Register of Historic Places, 1981

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is an authoritative guide to be used by federal, state, and local governments; private groups; and citizens to identify the nation's cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment. Listing of private property on the NRHP does not prohibit under federal law or regulation any actions that may otherwise be taken by the property owner with respect to the property.

State Regulations

California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that cultural resources be considered when assessing the environmental impacts of proposed projects (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.; 14 CCR 15000 et seq.).

California Register of Historical Resources

A number of state regulations and standards apply to cultural resources. The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) considers a cultural resource significant if it:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States
- Is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values
- Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation (State of California 2008).

These criteria do not preclude a lead agency from determining that a resource may be a historical resource as defined in California Public Resources Code, Sections 5020.1(j) and 5024.1. These provisions also apply to archaeological sites.

California Public Resources Code

California Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1 (a), establishes the CRHR. Section 5024.1 (c–f) provides criteria for CRHR eligibility listing. In addition, the CRHR also automatically includes the following: California properties listed on the NRHP, State Historic Landmark No. 770 and all consecutively numbered state landmarks following No. 770 (landmarks preceding No. 770 shall be reviewed for eligibility by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)), and points of historical interest that have been reviewed by the SHPO and recommended for inclusion in the CRHR in accordance with criteria adopted by the State Historic Resources Commission.

Public Resources Code, Section 5097–5097.6, identifies that the unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources located on public lands is a misdemeanor. It prohibits the knowing destruction of objects of antiquity without a permit (expressed permission) on public lands, and it provides for criminal sanctions. This section was amended in 1987 to require consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) whenever Native American graves are found. Violations for taking or possessing remains or artifacts are felonies.

Public Resources Code, Section 5097.5, states that “no person shall knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure, or deface, any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, rock art, or any other archaeological, paleontological or

historic feature situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over the lands.”

Public Resources Code, Section 5097.9 (interference with Native American religion or damage to cemeteries or places of worship, etc.), states that no public agency or private party shall cause severe or irreparable damage to any Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine located on public property, except on a clear and convincing showing that the public interest and necessity so require.

Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, states that whenever the NAHC receives notification of Native American human remains from a county coroner, the NAHC shall immediately notify the most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD may, with permission from the owner of the land in which the human remains were found, inspect the site and recommend to the owner or the responsible party conducting the excavation work a means for treating and/or disposing of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD is required to complete their site inspection and make their recommendation within 48 hours of their notification from the NAHC.

Additionally, Public Resources Code, Section 30244, states that “where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.”

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 2001

The California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Cal NAGPRA) conveys to American Indians, of demonstrated lineal descentance, human remains, and funerary items that are held by state agencies and museums. Human remains require special handling and must be treated with dignity. Procedures are pursuant to Section 15064.5e of the CEQA Guidelines, Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code, and Section 87.429 of the Grading Ordinance. In the event of the discovery of human remains and/or funerary items, the following procedures as outlined by the NAHC shall be followed (14 CCR 15000 et seq.):

1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:
 - A. The County Coroner must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and
 - B. If the Coroner determines that the remains are Native American:
 - i. The Coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours.

- ii. The NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.
 - iii. The MLD may make the recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, or
2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance.
 - A. The NAHC is unable to identify an MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission;
 - B. The descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or
 - C. The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

California Health and Safety Code

California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods, regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, requires that if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area reasonably suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the county coroner has examined the remains (Section 7050.5b). If the coroner determines or has reason to believe the remains are those of a Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC within 24 hours (Section 7050.5c). The NAHC will notify an MLD. With the permission of the landowner, the MLD may inspect the site of discovery. The inspection must be completed within 24 hours of notification of the MLD by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native Americans.

Mills Act

The Mills Act, enacted in 1972 by the State of California, enables local jurisdictions “to enter into contracts with property owners of qualified historic properties who actively participate in the restoration and maintenance of their historic properties while receiving property tax relief” (City of San Diego 2006). The County has passed an ordinance (Ordinance No. 9425) for historical properties in the unincorporated areas of the County. The purpose of the ordinance is to provide

incentives to increase local reinvestment and take advantage of historical preservation opportunities within the County.

Local Regulations

County of San Diego Local Register of Historic Resources

The County also has a series of criteria to determine the significance of historical resources for inclusion on its Local Register of Historic Resources (Ordinance No. 9493). These guidelines closely follow those for CEQA, but are focused on resources of County significance. Historic resources are eligible for this local register if they:

1. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the County's history and cultural heritage
2. Are associated with the lives of persons important to the history of the County or its communities
3. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, County region, or method of construction, or represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic values
4. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance

The Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) requires that cultural resources be evaluated as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process for certain permit types. If cultural resources are found to be significant pursuant to the RPO, they must be preserved (County of San Diego 2007a). The RPO prohibits development, trenching, grading, clearing, and grubbing, or any other activities that could potentially impact cultural resources (except during scientific investigations with an approved research design prepared by archaeologists certified by the Society of Professional Archaeologists (now the Register of Professional Archaeologists)).

Pursuant to the RPO (2007), a resource is significant in the jurisdiction of the County if it is:

1. A location of past intense human occupation where buried deposits can provide information regarding important scientific research questions about prehistoric or historic activities that have scientific, religious, or other ethnic value of local, regional, state, or federal importance.
2. A prehistoric or historic district, site, interrelated collection of features or artifacts, building, structure, or object included in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or the State Landmark register.

3. Included or eligible for inclusion, but not previously rejected, for the San Diego County Historical Site Board List.
4. A location of past or current sacred religious or ceremonial observances protected under Public Law 95-341, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act or Public Resources Code 5097.9, such as burial(s), pictographs, petroglyphs, solstice observatory sites, sacred shrines, religious ground figure, and natural rocks or places which are of ritual, ceremonial, or sacred value to any prehistoric or historic ethnic group.

County of San Diego Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance

The Grading, Clearing, and Watercourses Ordinance (Grading Ordinance) requires that projects involving grading, clearing, and/or removal of natural vegetation obtain a Grading Permit, unless the project meets one or more of the exemptions listed in Section 87.202 of the Grading Ordinance. The Grading Permit is discretionary and requires compliance with CEQA. Section 87.216 of the Grading Ordinance also requires a modification to a Grading Permit when “information has been received indicating that previously unknown historical resources or unique archaeological resources may be located on the site.” A permit modification would be issued to protect or preserve sensitive historical or archaeological resources.

Section 87.430 of the Grading Ordinance provides for the requirement of a paleontological monitor at the discretion of the County. In addition, the suspension of grading operation is required upon the discovery of fossils greater than 12 inches in any dimension. The ordinance also requires notification of the County official (e.g., Permit Compliance Coordinator). The ordinance gives the County official the authority to determine the appropriate resource recovery operation, which the permittee shall carry out prior to the County official’s authorization to resume normal grading operation.

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance

The County Zoning Ordinance, Sections 5700 through 5749, Historical/Archaeological Landmark and District Area Regulations, provide provisions to “identify, preserve, and protect the historic, cultural, archaeological, and/or architectural resource values of designated landmarks and districts and encourage compatible uses and architectural design.” Section 5703 specifically designates historic/archaeological areas with a Special Area Designator “H” (Historic/Archaeological Landmark or District) or “J” (Specific/Julian Historic District). Lands associated with the “H” or “J” designation contain limitations on use and construction and other regulations intended to conserve and protect on-site resources.

2.5.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance

2.5.3.1 *Historical Resources*

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Following the federal lead (e.g., the National Historic Preservation Act), the term “historic resources” under CEQA and in this document encompasses both historic and prehistoric resources. The County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance – Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources (2007b) are consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and are intended to provide consistency in the environmental process. The guidelines of significance apply to the direct and indirect impact analysis as well as the cumulative impact analysis.

A significant impact would result if:

- The project causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. This shall include the destruction, disturbance, or alteration of characteristics or elements of a resource that cause it to be significant in a manner not consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Analysis

Historical sites within the County are designated on local, state, and national historical lists and meet the definitions of historical resources under Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. These historical resources are most densely concentrated in the communities of Fallbrook, San Dieguito, Ramona, and Spring Valley (County of San Diego 2011). Historical resources range from ceramic scatters to historic structures such as residences, school houses, stage depots, and cemeteries. Special Area Designators “H” and “J” are applied to the zoning for a property if historical resources are known to exist. However, some historically significant resources existing within the County have yet to be identified or designated.

Some equine uses will be located on developed lots with no historic resources and will not have an impact on any historic resources. Other future equine uses may be built on land that contains identified or unidentified historic resources, which will be the focus of the following analysis. The proposed project is not subject to the RPO which has provisions for protection of historic resources, because the RPO does not apply to Zoning Ordinance amendments, ministerial projects, Administrative Permits for clearing, or for Grading Permits (Section 86.603(a)).

Tier One and Tier Two

The Tier One and Tier Two commercial horse stable uses could result in an increase in equine facilities as well as related infrastructure including driveways, fences, parking lots, and accessory buildings. These additional equine facilities and related infrastructure could cause an adverse physical impact to historical resources; however, they would be limited by the maximum uses of the Tier One and Tier Two categories, the useable area on the property, and the appropriate setbacks for these facilities.

For purposes of evaluating equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two, a worst-case scenario disturbance footprint was developed based on CEQA assumptions described in Section 1.4.2 and Table 1-3 in Section 1.0, Project Description, and listed as follows:

1. Construction of Tier One and Tier Two projects would involve the erection of structures associated with equine facilities including horse stables, animal enclosures, and pastures, as well as related infrastructure including parking lots, driveways, fences, and buildings.
2. In order to account for an average deduction of setbacks, single-family homes, other accessory uses, and driveways, 0.5-acre was removed from every qualifying property.
3. It was assumed that all qualifying properties 5 acres or less would be completely built out and all qualifying properties over 5 acres would disturb 5 acres (the maximum allowed under Tier Two).
4. Lands that would not be affected by this project were removed, including tribal lands, institutional, trans/communication/utilities, airports, shopping centers, education, parks, and open space easement and conservation lands.
5. Lands containing slopes of 25% or more were removed because equine uses tend to be located on relatively flat or gently sloping land.

Under this scenario, the maximum ground disturbance for the entire County under Tier One and Tier Two would be a total of 113,941 acres. It should be noted that the ground-disturbance footprint does not include design parameters associated with barriers such as trees and bluffs that are considered on a site-specific basis.

Under this scenario, the maximum ground disturbance for the entire County under Tier One and Tier Two would be a total of 113,941 acres, with 12,271 acres occurring on land with an “H” or “J” historic/archaeological area designation. These potential disturbance areas located within the County Zoning Ordinance Historical/Archaeological Landmark and District Area Regulations associated with the “H” or “J” designations contain limitations on construction and other regulations intended to conserve and protect on-site resources. Also, all future equine uses established pursuant to this Zoning Ordinance Amendment would be required to comply with all existing state and federal regulations that ensure the protection of historic resources. However,

not all historical resources existing within the County have been identified or designated. These potential historic resources could be impacted by the effects associated with the worst-case ground-disturbance scenario.

Grading associated with a building permit that involves 200 cubic yards (CY) to 2,500 CY with no more than 200 CY of import or export may only require a minor grading permit, which is considered ministerial review, and would not require further environmental analysis under CEQA. The ministerial process would involve the review of any known or identified cultural resources on the project site. Grading of up to 5,000 CY may also be considered minor grading if the requirements set forth in Sections 87.206(a) and (c) of the Grading Ordinance are met. However, if grading associated with an arena or other equine facility other than a building or structure exceeds 200 CY, and does not meet all requirements in Sections 87.206(a) and (c), a major grading permit may be required and would require further environmental review pursuant to CEQA. If significant resources are present, the permit conditions would be developed to protect or preserve the significant resources and would include measures to mitigate impacts to historic resources. Equine uses that meet the requirements of Section 87.202 of the Grading Ordinance would be exempt from the County's Grading Ordinance and associated reviewing processes (County of San Diego 2004). Additionally, arenas and other equine type facilities would most likely be located on flat grounds near existing development which would not involve substantial grading that would require a major grading permit.

Potential impacts to historical resources would be minimized by the zoning verification process with setbacks, usable area limits, manure management, and best management practices required under Tier Two, and the regulations intended to conserve and protect on-site resources for the "H" and "J" historical/archaeological area land use designations. However, some historical resources in the County remain unidentified or undesignated, and the specific impacts from development under the Tier One and Tier Two equine uses are unknown. Consequently, it is possible that the proposed project could cause a **significant impact** to historical resources (**CR-1**).

Tier Three and Tier Four

Future Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses will be subject to discretionary review and required to obtain an Administrative Permit or a Major Use Permit, respectively. As part of the County's discretionary review process, all future projects would be evaluated under CEQA and would be required to implement measures to minimize impacts to historical resources, as necessary. Examples of mitigation measures include avoidance, preservation, replacement of resources, data recovery and project design changes. CEQA requires proposed projects to provide detailed information on the potentially significant environmental effects they are likely to have, list ways in which the significant environmental effects would be minimized, possibly identify alternatives that

would reduce or avoid the significant impacts identified for the project, and propose mitigation for significant impacts.

Additionally, the Administrative Permit required for Tier Three equine uses and the Major Use Permit (MUP) required for Tier Four equine uses is subject to the RPO, which requires that cultural resources be evaluated as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process. All future equine uses established pursuant to this Zoning Ordinance Amendment would also be required to comply with all existing state and federal regulations that ensure the protection of historic resources. However, impacts to unidentified or undesignated historic resources could occur from the construction of equine structures and their associated infrastructure including access roads, parking areas, and construction staging areas. If cultural resources are found to be significant pursuant to the RPO, they must be preserved (County of San Diego 2007a). Although the discretionary review process and compliance with the RPO prior to project approval would minimize potential impacts, there is ultimately no guarantee on a project-specific level that mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, the proposed project may result in **significant impacts** related to historical resources (**CR-2**).

2.5.3.2 *Archaeological Resources*

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources (2007b) are consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and are intended to provide consistency in the environmental process. The guidelines of significance apply to the direct impact and indirect analysis, as well as cumulative impact analysis.

A significant impact would result if:

- The project causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. This shall include the destruction or disturbance of an important archaeological site or any portion of an important archaeological site that contains or has the potential to contain information important to history or prehistory.

Analysis

Important archaeological resources, including, but not limited to, prehistoric bedrock milling features, hearth features, lithic scatters, and rock sites, are found throughout the County. The proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment applies to a large area of the County that could contain archaeological resources that have not been identified or designated. The proposed project would allow development of some future equine uses that could adversely affect archaeological

resources through ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading, which have the potential to damage or destroy archaeological resources that may be present on or below the ground surface, particularly in areas that have not previously been developed. These particular future equine uses will be the focus of the analysis below.

The proposed project is not subject to the RPO which has provisions for protection of sensitive habitat lands, including riparian resources, because the RPO does not apply to Zoning Ordinance amendments, ministerial projects, Administrative Permits for clearing, or for Grading Permits (Section 86.603(a)).

Tier One and Tier Two

Future Tier One and Tier Two horse stable uses resulting from this proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment could result in increased developed areas including horse stables and animal enclosures, and related infrastructure including parking spaces, fences, driveways, and accessory buildings, which could potentially affect archaeological resources. Although the proposed project could result in more equine facilities and related infrastructure, these facilities would be limited in size according to the Tier One and Tier Two limits on the number of horses, the usable area on the property, as well as the setbacks for animal enclosures and structures associated with a horse stable. The zoning verification process required for Tier Two equine uses would also minimize potential impacts from the resultant equine facilities and their related infrastructure because, as described in Section 1.4.1 of Chapter 1.0, Project Description, the zoning verification permit requires the applicant to go through a checklist of clearances for permit approval. Furthermore, the potential disturbance areas located within the County Zoning Ordinance Historical/Archaeological Landmark and District Area Regulations associated with the “H” or “J” designations contain limitations on construction and other regulations intended to conserve and protect on-site resources.

These future equine uses could involve ground disturbance that would not be subject to environmental review and could affect identified or unidentified archaeological resources. For the purposes of evaluating equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two, a worst-case disturbance scenario was developed based on CEQA assumptions described in Section 1.4.2 and Table 1-3 in Section 1.0, Project Description. For equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two, the worst-case scenario would include 113,941 acres of total ground disturbance that could potentially result for the entire County. Furthermore, the worst-case footprint determines that approximately 12,271 acres of ground disturbance could potentially occur within the “H” and “J” historic/archaeological area designations.

Not all archaeological resources existing within the County have been identified or designated. These potential archeological resources could be impacted by ground-disturbing effects associated with the worst-case ground-disturbance scenario.

Grading of up to 200 CY of material for non-agricultural uses would not require discretionary approval (Section 87.202 of the Grading Ordinance) and would not be subject to the County's discretionary environmental review process (CEQA), although grading of up to 200 CY of material or other types of exempt grading could occur in areas with identified or unidentified archaeological resources. Grading associated with a building (e.g., barn) may only require a ministerial grading permit, for grading volumes between 200 CY and 2,500 CY and not more than 200 CY of import or export (Section 87.206 of the Grading Ordinance). The ministerial grading permit would not be subject to CEQA; however, potential effects on known archaeological resources would be reviewed through the ministerial grading checklist and stormwater management (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/docs/DPLU009_public.pdf and <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/landpdf/gradingchecklist.pdf>) that would limit the potential adverse impact on archaeological resources. Grading of up to 5,000 CY may also be considered minor grading if the requirements set forth in Sections 87.206(a) and (c) of the Grading Ordinance are met.

However, if an equine use involves substantial landform modification/grading over 200 CY and does not meet all requirements in Grading Ordinance Sections 87.206(a) and (c), a major grading permit may be required and would require further environmental review pursuant to CEQA and would avoid or reduce substantial adverse effects on archaeological resources. In addition, if clearing of land in preparation for construction of a building for an equine use is not specifically exempted, it is subject to Section 87.501 et seq. of the County Code (clearing of land for non-agricultural purposes) and Grading Ordinance 87.504 (provision for non-agricultural clearing); a discretionary clearing permit would be required and would require further environmental review. Based on an analysis of existing facilities, arenas and other equine type facilities other than a building would likely be located on flat grounds near existing development which would not involve substantial grading that would require a major grading permit. Although potential impacts to archaeological resources would be minimized by the zoning verification process and possible environmental review in compliance with the Grading Ordinance, Tier One horse stable facilities that include ground disturbance that is exempt from the Grading Ordinance has the potential to damage or destroy identified or unidentified archaeological resources resulting in a potentially **significant impact** to archaeological resources (**CR-3**).

Tier Three and Tier Four

The proposed project would allow equine uses that fall under Tier Three with an Administrative Permit and equine uses that fall under Tier Four with an MUP. Under these tiers, discretionary review would be required, and projects would be evaluated as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process (CEQA). CEQA requires proposed projects to provide detailed information on the potentially significant environmental effects they are likely to have, list ways

in which the significant environmental effects would be minimized, and identify alternatives that would reduce or avoid the significant impacts identified for the project.

The Administrative Permit necessary for Tier Three equine uses and the MUP required for Tier Four equine uses is subject to the County's RPO. The RPO also requires that cultural resources be evaluated as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process and that projects apply the maximum feasible mitigation, as necessary. Examples of mitigation measures include avoidance, preservation, replacement of resources, data recovery and project design changes. However, there is ultimately no guarantee on a project-specific level that mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses may result in **significant impacts** to archaeological resources (**CR-4**).

2.5.3.3 *Human Remains*

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Cultural Resources: Archaeological and Historic Resources (2007b) are consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and are intended to provide consistency in the environmental process. The guidelines of significance apply to the direct and indirect impact analysis, as well as cumulative impact analysis.

A significant impact would result if:

- The project disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Analysis

Human burials have been found throughout unincorporated San Diego County and have the potential to occur outside of formal cemeteries, usually associated with archaeological resource sites and prehistoric peoples. Therefore, areas with known archaeological resources sites may have a higher risk for containing human remains. However, the disturbance of any human remains is considered a significant impact, regardless of archaeological significance or association. The proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment includes a large area of the County; therefore, it includes sites within the County that may potentially contain human remains. The proposed project would allow development of equine uses that could inadvertently adversely affect human remains through ground-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading.

Tier One and Tier Two

Future Tier One and Tier Two horse stable uses could result in increased developed area including horse stables, animal enclosures, and related infrastructure such as driveways, fences,

parking lots and accessory buildings. The additional equine facilities and related infrastructure that require grading or excavation could disturb human remains. However, the area of disturbance would be limited by the maximum allowances of the Tier One and Tier Two categories, the useable area on the property, and the appropriate setbacks for these facilities.

The worst-case ground-disturbance scenario was developed using the CEQA assumptions described in Section 1.4.2 and Table 1-3 in Section 1.0, Project Description. Under this scenario, the maximum ground disturbance for the Tier One and Tier Two analysis would be a total of 113,941 acres. Not all sites of human remains are known within the County and these potential human remains could be impacted by the effects associated with the worst-case ground-disturbance scenario.

Grading of up to 200 CY of material for non-agricultural uses would not require discretionary approval (Section 87.202 of the Grading Ordinance) and would not be subject to the County's discretionary environmental review process (CEQA), although grading of up to 200 CY of material or other types of exempt grading could occur in areas with human remains. Grading associated with a building (e.g., barn) may only require a ministerial grading permit for grading volumes between 200 CY and 2,500 CY and not more than 200 CY of import or export (Section 87.206 of the Grading Ordinance). Although the ministerial grading permit would not be subject to CEQA, review through the ministerial grading checklist would limit the potential adverse impact that could occur to human remains. Grading of up to 5,000 CY may also be considered minor grading if the requirements set forth in Sections 87.206(a) and (c) of the Grading Ordinance are met.

However, if an equine use involves substantial landform modification/grading over 200 CY and does not meet all requirements in Grading Ordinance Sections 87.206(a) and (c), a major grading permit may be required, which would require further environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Major grading permits are discretionary actions which are subject to CEQA, as well as other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations. Compliance with these regulations would avoid or reduce substantial adverse effects to human remains. In addition, if clearing of land in preparation for construction of a building for an equine use is not specifically exempted, it is subject to Section 87.501 et seq. of the County Code (clearing of land for non-agricultural purposes) and Grading Ordinance 87.504 (provision for non-agricultural clearing); a discretionary clearing permit would be required, which would require further environmental review. Arenas and other equine type facilities other than a building would likely be located on flat grounds near existing development which would not involve substantial grading that would require a major grading permit.

Some human remains in the County remain unidentified and the amount that could occur within the maximum disturbance area, created by the development of Tier One and Tier Two equine uses, is unknown. Therefore, it is possible that the proposed project could result in **significant impacts** to human remains (**CR-5**).

Tier Three and Tier Four

The proposed project would allow equine uses that fall under Tier Three with an Administrative Permit, and equine uses that fall under Tier Four would continue to require an MUP. Under these tiers, discretionary review would still be required, and projects would be evaluated as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process (CEQA). The County's discretionary environmental review process involves environmental review pursuant to CEQA, which requires proposed projects to provide detailed information on the potentially significant environmental effects they are likely to have, list ways in which the significant environmental effects would be minimized, and identify alternatives that would reduce or avoid the significant impacts identified for the project. Examples of mitigation measures include avoidance, preservation, replacement of resources, data recovery and project design changes.

Additionally, Cal NAGPRA requires special handling of human remains, which must be treated with sensitivity and dignity. Procedures are pursuant to Section 15064.5e of the CEQA Guidelines, Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code, and Section 87.429 of the Grading Ordinance. All Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses must comply with these regulations prior to approval. However, there is ultimately no guarantee on a project-specific level that these regulations and any required mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a level below significant due to the possible presence of previously unknown human remains. Therefore, the proposed project may result in **significant impacts** to human remains (**CR-6**).

2.5.3.4 *Paleontological Resources*

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

The County's Guidelines for Determining Significance: Paleontological Resources (2009b) is consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and is intended to provide consistency in the environmental process. The guidelines of significance apply to the direct and indirect impact analysis, as well as cumulative impact analysis.

A significant impact would result if:

- The project proposes activities directly or indirectly damaging to a unique paleontological resource or site. A significant impact to paleontological resources may occur as a result of the project, if project-related grading or excavation will disturb the substratum or parent material below the major soil horizons in any paleontologically sensitive area of the County.

Analysis

The unincorporated County has a variety of paleontological environments. Based on rock type and location of previously recorded fossils, areas within the County are put into sensitivity categories for potential paleontological resources, including high sensitivity, moderate sensitivity, low

sensitivity, and marginal sensitivity. High resource sensitivity areas are those with geological formations known to contain paleontological localities with rare, well-preserved critical fossil materials. As described in Section 2.5.1, most of the County consists of areas with no, low, or marginal paleontological resource potential and sensitivity and is therefore unlikely to contain important fossils; however, the North Mountain/Palomar Mountain Subregional Plan Area contains areas of high sensitivity. Paleontological resources in North Mountain or other communities may be impacted by ground disturbance from the development of future equestrian facilities.

Tier One and Tier Two

Although the proposed project could result in more equine facilities and related infrastructure, these facilities would be limited in size according to the Tier One and Tier Two limits on the number of horses and acres, the usable area on the property, as well as the setbacks for animal enclosures and structures associated with a horse stable. The zoning verification process required for Tier Two equine uses would also minimize potential impacts from the resultant equine facilities and their related infrastructure.

Future equine uses within Tier One and Tier Two would not be subject to discretionary review and may be located in areas with paleontological resources. These future equine uses could involve ground disturbance that would not be subject to environmental review and could affect paleontological resources. For equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two, the worst case scenario would include 113,941 acres of total ground disturbance that could potentially result for the entire County (refer to Section 1.4.2 for further details).

Grading of up to 200 CY of material for non-agricultural uses would not require discretionary approval (Section 87.202 of the Grading Ordinance) and would not be subject to the County's discretionary environmental review process (CEQA), although grading of up to 200 CY of material or other types of exempt grading could occur in areas with paleontological resources. Grading associated with a building (e.g., barn) may only require a ministerial grading permit for grading volumes between 200 CY and 2,500 CY and not more than 200 CY of import or export (Section 87.206 of the Grading Ordinance). The ministerial grading permit would not be subject to CEQA. Grading of up to 5,000 CY may also be considered minor grading if the requirements set forth in Sections 87.206(a) and (c) of the Grading Ordinance are met.

However, if an equine use involves substantial landform modification/grading over 200 CY and does not meet all requirements in Grading Ordinance Sections 87.206(a) and (c), a major grading permit may be required and would require further environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Major grading permits are discretionary actions which are subject to CEQA. Compliance with these regulations would avoid or reduce substantial adverse effects to paleontological resources. In addition, if clearing of land in preparation for construction of a building for an equine use is

not specifically exempted, it is subject to Section 87.501 et seq. of the County Code (clearing of land for non-agricultural purposes) and Grading Ordinance 87.504 (provision for non-agricultural clearing); a discretionary clearing permit would be required and would require further environmental review. Arenas and other equine type facilities other than a building would likely be located on flat grounds near existing development which would not involve substantial grading that would require a major grading permit.

Most of the County is underlain by geologic formations with no potential, low sensitivity, or marginal sensitivity for paleontological resources and is therefore unlikely to contain important fossils. Approximately 1% of the total land within the County is categorized as high sensitivity (County of San Diego 2010). However, the depth of soil below the surface that is not considered likely to contain paleontological resources is unknown for the entire project area and varies considerably. San Diego County boring data show that the soil depth can range from zero to 65 feet (County of San Diego 2009). Sites that have been previously graded may also be closer or at the parent material or substratum that are considered paleontologically sensitive areas.

Since the depth of soil horizons and the depth that paleontological resources could occur throughout the project area vary and are currently unknown on a site-by-site basis, the Tier One and Tier Two equine uses could potentially disturb paleontological resources in the substratum or parent material below the major soil horizons in any of the paleontologically sensitive areas of the County. Therefore, the proposed project may result in potentially **significant impacts** to paleontological resources (**CR-7**).

Tier Three and Tier Four

The proposed project would allow equine uses that fall under Tier Three with an Administrative Permit and equine uses that fall under Tier Four would continue to require an MUP. Under these tiers, discretionary review would still be required, and projects would be evaluated as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process (CEQA) and would be required to implement measures to minimize impacts to paleontological resources, as necessary. Examples of mitigation measures include avoidance, preservation, replacement of resources, data recovery and project design changes. CEQA requires proposed projects to provide detailed information on the potentially significant environmental effects they are likely to have, list ways in which the significant environmental effects would be minimized, and identify alternatives that would reduce or avoid the significant impacts identified for the project.

Additionally, the Administrative Permit necessary for Tier Three equine uses and the MUP required for Tier Four equine uses is subject to the County's RPO. The RPO also requires that cultural resources be evaluated as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process and that projects apply the maximum feasible mitigation, as necessary. However, the

location of paleontological resources throughout the proposed project area is unknown, and there is no guarantee on a project-specific level that mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, the proposed project could result in **significant impacts** to paleontological resources (CR-8).

2.5.4 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The geographic scope of cumulative impact analysis for cultural resources varies depending on the type of resource with potential to be impacted. Geographic scope can be the entire area within which the resource has the potential to occur. For the purpose of this EIR, the geographic scope for the cumulative analysis of cultural resources includes the San Diego region, which encompasses the entire County, including both incorporated and unincorporated areas, as well as surrounding counties, and tribal and public agency lands.

2.5.4.1 Historical Resources

Cumulative projects located in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with the loss of historical resources if in combination they would result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of historical resources. Cumulative projects that would have the potential to result in adverse impacts to historical resources from development activities include the County's General Plan and the development of land uses as designated by surrounding jurisdictions' general plans. These projects are regulated by federal, state, and local regulations, including California Public Resources Code, Section 5097; California Penal Code, Section 622; the Mills Act; California Health and Safety Code, Section 18950–18961; and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and would be required to comply with these regulations. The County's General Plan would implement policies that encourage the preservation and/or adaptive reuse of historic sites, as well as mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to historical resources to a level less than significant. Additionally, even with regulations in place, individual historical resources would still have the potential to be impacted or degraded from demolition, destruction, alteration, or structural relocation as a result of new private or public cumulative projects. Therefore, the cumulative destruction of significant historical resources from construction and development planned within the region would be considered to be a cumulatively significant impact.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.5.3.1, future equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two may result in a potentially significant adverse impact to historical resources because these uses could result in excavation and grading activities that are not subject to discretionary review. The maximum

disturbance scenario, which assumes all properties within the project area develop equine uses to the maximum allowed under Tier Two, would result in a total disturbance area of 113,941 acres. This area of disturbance along with that from other past, present, and future projects could impact resources that have not been identified or designated. Therefore, the development of equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two of the proposed project would contribute to a **cumulatively considerable impact (CR-9)**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

As described in Section 2.5.3.1, all future equine uses on land with an “H” or “J” historic/archaeological area designation would be limited or required to implement measures intended to conserve and protect on-site resources. The Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses would also be subject to the County’s discretionary review process which requires environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA. Additionally, the Administrative Permit required for Tier Three equine uses and the MUP required for Tier Four equine uses is subject to the RPO, which requires that cultural resources be evaluated as part of the County’s discretionary environmental review process. If cultural resources are found to be significant pursuant to the RPO, they must be preserved. However, the potential disturbance of historic resources that have not been identified or designated would remain and there is no guarantee that project-level mitigation measures will reduce impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses of the proposed project would contribute to a **cumulatively considerable impact (CR-10)**.

2.5.4.2 Archaeological Resources

The proposed project has the potential to result in a significant impact associated with the loss of archaeological resources through development activities associated with future equine uses. Cumulative projects that would have the potential to result in adverse impacts to archaeological resources from development activities include the County’s General Plan and the development of land uses as designated by surrounding jurisdictions’ general plans. These projects are regulated by federal, state, and local regulations, including California Public Resources Code, Section 5097; California Penal Code, Section 622; the Mills Act; California Health and Safety Code, Sections 18950–18961; and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and would be required to comply with these regulations. The County’s General Plan would implement policies and mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to archaeological resources to a level less than significant. However, cumulative projects located in Mexico would not be subject to compliance with such regulations. Additionally, the loss of archaeological resources on a regional level may not be adequately mitigable through the data recovery and collection methods specified in these regulations, as their value may also lie in cultural mores and religious beliefs of applicable groups. Therefore,

the cumulative destruction of significant archaeological resources from planned construction and development projects within the region would be cumulatively significant.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.5.3.2, future equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two may result in a potentially significant adverse impact to archaeological resources because these uses could result in excavation and grading activities that are not subject to discretionary review. The maximum disturbance area of 113,941 acres along with the potential for other past, present, and future projects could impact previously unidentified archaeological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to a **cumulatively considerable impact (CR-11)**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

As described in Section 2.5.3.1, the Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses would also be subject to the County's discretionary review process which requires environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA. Additionally, as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process the MUP required for Tier Four equine uses is subject to the RPO, which requires that cultural resources be evaluated and if found significant they must be preserved. All future equine uses on land with an "H" or "J" historic/archaeological area designation would also be limited or required to implement measures intended to conserve and protect on-site resources. However, the potential disturbance of archaeological resources that have not been identified or designated and that do not occur on land with the "H" or "J" historic/archaeological designation would remain, and there is no guarantee that project-level mitigation measures will reduce impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, the proposed project could contribute to a **cumulatively considerable impact (CR-12)**.

2.5.4.3 Human Remains

Cumulative projects located in the Southern California region would have the potential to result in impacts associated with human remains due to grading, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activities. Projects that may result in adverse impacts to human remains from development activities include the County's General Plan or the development of land uses as designated by surrounding jurisdictions' general plans. Cumulative projects would be required to comply with the federal NAGPRA, Section 5097.9–5097.991 of the California Public Resources Code, Cal NAGPRA, and Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains were encountered during project development. The County's General Plan includes a policy for the treatment of human remains as well as mitigation measures to reduce impacts to human remains. Additionally, on a regional level, the disturbance of human remains that are also considered archaeological resources may not be adequately mitigable through methods specified in these regulations, as their value may also lie in the cultural mores and religious beliefs of applicable

groups. Therefore, the cumulative disturbance of human remains by construction and development within the region would be considered a cumulatively significant impact.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.5.3.1, future equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two may disturb human remains because these uses could result in excavation and grading activities that are not subject to discretionary review. The maximum disturbance from the build out of all possible parcels in the project area to the maximum Tier Two equine use would result in a total disturbance area of 113,941 acres. Not all locations of human remains are known within the County; therefore, the proposed project along, with other past, present, and future projects, could disturb these human remains. Consequently, the development of equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two of the proposed project would contribute to a **cumulatively considerable impact (CR-13)**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

As described in Section 2.5.3.1, all future Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses would be subject to the County's discretionary review process which requires environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA. This requires the proposed project to provide detailed information on the potentially significant environmental effects they are likely to have, list ways in which the significant environmental effects would be minimized, and identify alternatives that would reduce or avoid the significant impacts identified for the project. However, the potential disturbance of human remains that have not been identified or designated would remain, and there is no guarantee that project-level mitigation measures will reduce impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses of the proposed project could contribute to a **cumulatively considerable impact (CR-14)**.

2.5.4.4 *Paleontological Resources*

Cumulative projects that require significant excavation, such as regional energy and utility projects or the construction of new roadways under the County's General Plan have the potential to result in adverse impacts to paleontological resources. Additionally, if a cumulative project that requires excavation or grading is located in an area of high or moderate sensitivity, this would result in an increased potential for an adverse impact to a paleontological resource to occur. Cumulative projects on state or public lands would be required to comply with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097–5097.6, pertaining to impacts to paleontological resources. Most other cumulative projects would be regulated by state and local regulations, including CEQA and the County Grading Ordinance. The County's General Plan includes a policy for the preservation of unique paleontological resources as well as mitigation measures to reduce impacts to paleontological resources. The loss of paleontological resources on a regional level may not be adequately mitigable through methods specified in these regulations. Therefore, the cumulative destruction of significant

paleontological resources from planned construction and development within the region would be cumulatively significant. Additionally, past projects involving development and construction have already impacted paleontological resources within the region.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.5.3.2, future equine facilities under Tier One and Tier Two could involve grading or excavation that could impact paleontological resources because they are not subject to discretionary review. Although the County has geological formations with different paleontological resource sensitivity, without discretionary review it is possible that Tier One and Tier Two equine uses could adversely affect potential paleontological resources. The proposed project has a maximum disturbance area, without discretionary review, of 113,941 acres. This area along with the potential for other past, present and future projects could impact previously unknown paleontological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would contribute to a **cumulatively considerable impact (CR-15)**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

As described in Section 2.5.3.1, most of the County is underlain by geologic formations with no potential, low sensitivity, or marginal sensitivity for paleontological resources and is therefore unlikely to contain important fossils. Approximately 1% of the total land within the County is categorized as high sensitivity (County of San Diego 2010). Additionally, the Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses would also be subject to the County's discretionary review process which requires environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA. However, the depth and location where paleontological resources exist throughout the County is not known for the entire project area. There is no guarantee that mitigation measures implemented at a project-specific level would reduce potential impacts to a level below significant. Therefore, the proposed project could contribute to a **cumulatively considerable impact (CR-16)**.

2.5.5 Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigation

The proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts associated with cultural resources including historical resources (**CR-1, CR-2, CR-9, and CR-10**), archaeological resources (**CR-3, CR-4, CR-11, and CR-12**), human remains (**CR-5, CR-6, CR-13, and CR-14**), and paleontological resources (**CR-7, CR-8, CR-15, and CR-16**).

2.5.6 Mitigation Measures

2.5.6.1 Historical Resources

The proposed project would allow for development of equine uses under Tier One with no ministerial or discretionary permit, under Tier Two with a Zoning Verification Permit, under Tier

Three with an Administrative Permit, and Tier Four with an MUP. Development of equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two would have substantial adverse effects on historic resources. Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses also have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on historic resources (**CR-1, CR-2, CR-9, and CR-10**). The mitigation measure (M) described below has been identified to reduce potentially significant impacts, but not below a significant level.

Mitigation Measures

- M-CR-1:** The County shall provide incentives through the Mills Act to encourage the restoration, renovation, or adaptive reuse of historic resources. This will be done by reaching out to property owners with identified historic resources to participate.
- M-CR-2:** During the environmental review process for future Administrative Permits and Major Use Permits for equine uses, any proposed Horse Stable of more than 50 horses shall complete a full records search with the South Central Information Center (SCIC). The SCIC shall provide a recommendation regarding potential cultural resources and may recommend consultation with appropriate tribe(s).

Infeasible Mitigation Measures

The following measure was considered in attempting to reduce impacts associated with historical resources to below a level of significance. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure would not be implemented.

- Identify all potentially historic structures and resources within the County and enter the information in the Department of Planning and Development Services property database. Then monitor permits issued for all documented properties. This mitigation measure would be infeasible because the County does not have access to all of the potential sites or the legal right to survey all potential historic sites in the unincorporated areas.

Because the measure listed above has been found to be infeasible, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, provides a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project that would result in some reduced impacts associated with historical resources as compared to the proposed project.

2.5.6.2 Archaeological Resources

The proposed project would allow for development of equine uses under Tier One with no ministerial or discretionary permit, under Tier Two with a Zoning Verification Permit, under Tier Three with an Administrative Permit, and Tier Four with an MUP. Development of equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two as well as Tier Three and Tier Four would result in substantial adverse impacts on archaeological resources (**CR-3, CR-4, CR-11, and CR-12**). Mitigation measure **M-CR-2**, listed in Section 2.5.6.1 above, is also applicable to this issue and is

incorporated here by reference. Incorporation of this mitigation measure could reduce potentially significant impacts, but not below a significant level.

Infeasible Mitigation Measures

The following measures were considered in attempting to reduce impacts associated with archaeological resources to below a level of significance. However, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measures would not be implemented.

- Identify archaeological resources within the County and enter the information in the Department of Planning and Development Services property database. Then monitor permits issued for all documented properties. This mitigation measure would be infeasible because the County does not have access to all of the potential sites or the legal right to survey all potential historic sites in the unincorporated areas.
- Require an archaeological resource survey for all equine uses to ensure that impacts to archaeological resources will be avoided or mitigated. This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the project objectives to streamline the permitting process for equine facilities in order to better facilitate the development of such uses within the County.

Because the measures listed above have been found to be infeasible, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, provides a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project that would result in some reduced impacts associated with archaeological resources as compared to the proposed project.

2.5.6.3 Human Remains

The proposed project would allow for development of equine uses under Tier One with no ministerial or discretionary permit, under Tier Two with a Zoning Verification Permit, under Tier Three with an Administrative Permit, and Tier Four with an MUP. Development of equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two would potentially disturb human remains. Tier Three and Tier Four equine uses also have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human remains (**CR-5, CR-6, CR-13, and CR-14**). Mitigation measure **M-CR-2**, listed in Section 2.5.6.1 above, is also applicable to this issue and is incorporated here by reference. Incorporation of this mitigation measure could reduce potentially significant impacts, but not below a significant level.

Infeasible Mitigation Measures

The following measure was considered in attempting to reduce impacts associated with human remains to below a level of significance. However, the County has determined that this measure

would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure would not be implemented.

- Require a survey to identify potential human remains on site for all Tier One and Tier Two equine uses to ensure that impacts to human remains will be avoided or mitigated. This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the project objectives to streamline the permitting process for equine facilities in order to better facilitate the development of such uses within the County.

Because the measure listed above has been found to be infeasible, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, provides a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project that would result in some reduced impacts associated with human remains as compared to the proposed project.

2.5.6.4 Paleontological Resources

The proposed project would allow for development of equine uses under Tier One with no ministerial or discretionary permit, under Tier Two with a Zoning Verification Permit, under Tier Three with an Administrative Permit, and Tier Four with an MUP. Development of equine uses under Tier One and Tier Two as well as Tier Three and Tier Four could directly or indirectly damage a unique paleontological resource or site (**CR-7, CR-8, CR-15, and CR-16**). Appropriate feasible and enforceable mitigation measures could not be identified that would reduce potential impacts. A discussion of infeasible mitigation measures is provided as follows.

Infeasible Mitigation Measures

The following measure was considered in attempting to reduce impacts associated with paleontological resources to below a level of significance. However, the County has determined that this measure would be infeasible, as described below. Therefore, the following mitigation measure would not be implemented.

- Require a survey or grading monitor to identify potential paleontological resources on site for all equine uses to ensure that impacts to paleontological resources will be avoided or mitigated. This measure is not feasible as it would directly conflict with the project objectives to streamline the permitting process for equine facilities in order to better facilitate the development of such uses within the County.

Because the measure listed above has been found to be infeasible, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Chapter 4, Project Alternatives, provides a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project that would result in some reduced impacts associated with paleontological resources as compared to the proposed project.

2.5.7 Conclusion

The following discussion provides a synopsis of the conclusion reached in each of the above impact analyses and the level of impact that would occur after mitigation measures are implemented.

Historical Resources

Development of equine uses pursuant to the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would have the potential to result in significant adverse effects to historical resources. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant (**CR-1** and **CR-2**). The equine uses allowed by the proposed project would also potentially contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts to historic resources (**CR-9** and **CR-10**). The mitigation measures would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to historical resources, but not to below a level of significance.

Archaeological Resources

Development of equine uses under the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would have the potential to result in significant adverse effects to archaeological resources. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant (**CR-3** and **CR-4**). The equine uses allowed by the proposed project would also potentially contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts to archaeological resources (**CR-11** and **CR-12**). The mitigation measure would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to archeological resources, but not to below a level of significance.

Human Remains

The development of equine uses under the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would have the potential to disturb human remains. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant (**CR-5** and **CR-6**). The equine uses allowed by the proposed project would also potentially contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts to human remains (**CR-13** and **CR-14**). The mitigation measure would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to human remains, but not to below a level of significance.

Paleontological Resources

Development of equine uses under the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would have the potential to directly or indirectly damage a unique paleontological resource or site. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant (**CR-7** and **CR-8**). The equine uses allowed by the proposed project would also potentially contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts to paleontological resources (**CR-15** and **CR-16**). Feasible and enforceable mitigation measures that would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to paleontological resources could not be identified. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.