

## 2.5 Cultural Resources

An archaeological survey of the 248.26-acre Shadow Run Ranch project site was conducted by Philip de Barros with Professional Archeology Associates. The resulting report, entitled, "Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation of a 248.26-Acre Parcel in Pauma Valley, The Shadow Run Ranch, North of State route 76 San Diego, California," dated December 16, 2013, is included as Appendix D of the technical appendices to this DEIR. The current archaeological assessment is based upon the work of Professional Archaeology Associates that was done in 2001. The records search was done at the South Coastal Information Center on April 6<sup>th</sup> and the Museum of Man on April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2001. Field work was done between April 7<sup>th</sup> and July 22<sup>nd</sup> 2001, by Dr. Philip de Barros and Joel Paulson, M.A. Records identified are listed in Table 2-5-1, "Cultural Resources Identified by the Records Search."

The 2001 survey was conducted on a 286-acre parcel; however, the current Proposed Project as now designed covers 248.26 of the original 286 acres. In 2005, Professional Archaeological Services reviewed the findings of the 2001 archaeological survey and records search, with a main focus on the significance evaluation of sites SDI-9537/H and SDI-17501 through -17503, as well as boundary testing conducted on site SDI-714 to allow for project redesign that places the site within open space. The fieldwork was conducted between April 17<sup>th</sup> and May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2005 with some additional work done at one site on June 5<sup>th</sup>. No new records search was conducted in 2005 because no other work had taken place on the property since 2001.

Native Ground Monitoring and Research served as Native American monitors from the Pauma Indian Reservation. No human remains or gravesite items were encountered. Additionally, an attempt was made to see if there were any connections between Hugh Magee, the pioneer who homesteaded part of the subject property in 1899 and Magee family members at Pechanga and Pala Indian Reservations. However, attempted communications with both John Magee at Pechanga Indian Reservation and Leroy Miranda at Pala Indian Reservation regarding the family lineages were unsuccessful. The County of San Diego also initiated consultation with the Indian Reservations within the vicinity of Pauma Valley. In addition, a sacred lands file records check with the Native American Heritage Commission resulted in a negative finding.

### 2.5.1 Existing Conditions

A total of 15 sites were researched during the 2009 cultural resources survey, including six previously recorded sites (SDI-246, -266, -714, -731, -9537/H and -9906), three new sites recorded during the 2001 survey characterized as small bedrock milling sites (SDI-17501, -17502 and -17503), and one additional site with small bedrock milling features (SDI-18368) was discovered during a 2008 survey for a pipeline project. Five recorded sites, SDI-715, -722 and -723, SDI-5675 and -5676 could not be relocated, as it is likely that they were destroyed during the orchard expansion. These site locations fall within

proposed open space. The presence and significance of existing cultural resources associated with the Proposed Project were determined in accordance with the regulations and research methods outlined below.

**2.5.1.1 Existing Regulations**

The California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) establishes the evaluative criteria used by CEQA in defining an historic resource. An historic resource is significant if it meets one or more of the criteria for listing in the CRHR. Resources are eligible for listing on the CRHR if they:

1. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history and cultural heritage of California or the United States.
2. Are associated with the lives of persons important to the nation or to California's past.
3. Embody 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.
4. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history of the state or nation.

The County of San Diego also has a series of criteria to determine the significance of historical resources for inclusion on the San Diego County Local Register of Historic Resources. These guidelines closely follow those for CEQA, but are focused on resources of County significance. Historic resources are eligible for this register if they:

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

The County of San Diego RPO has a set of criteria that must be addressed for any cultural resources encountered during a survey. A significant prehistoric or historic site is defined under the RPO as sites that 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. Such locations shall include, but are not limited to:

5. Any prehistoric or historic district, site, interrelated collection of features or artifacts, building, structure, or object either:
  - a. Formally determined eligible or listed in the National Register of Historic Places by the Keeper of the National Register; or
  - b. To which the Historic Resource (“H” Designator) Special Area Regulations have been applied; or
2. One-of-a-kind, locally unique, or regionally unique cultural resources which contain a significant volume and range of data and materials; and
3. Any location of past or current sacred religious or ceremonial observances which is either:
  - a. 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 figures; or
  - b. Other formally designated and recognized sites which are of ritual, ceremonial, or sacred value to any prehistoric or historic ethnic group.

#### **2.5.1.2 *Methods***

Research included a review of institutional records and reports concerning the project area and immediate vicinity, a field survey, surface mapping, artifact collection, photographic documentation and subsurface testing to determine the extent, integrity, and constituents of site deposits. Site record forms, including updates, were prepared for submitted to the SCIC of the California Historic Resources Information System, Department of Parks and Recreation.

The evaluation of cultural resources is in conformance with the County of San Diego RPO, Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code, and CEQA. Statutory requirements of CEQA (Section 15064.5) were followed in the evaluation of the significance of the cultural resources.

#### **2.5.1.3 *Record Search Results***

Records searches within a one-mile radius of the project area were conducted at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) on April 6, 2001, and at the Museum of Man on April 9 of that year. Eleven cultural resources had been previously recorded

within the project area and 16 outside of the boundary. Four cultural resources studies covered areas within a one-mile radius of the project. Results are provided in Table 2, “Cultural Resources Identified by the Records Search,” page 13 of Appendix D.

### **2.5.2 Guidelines for the Determination of Impact Significance**

For the purpose of this EIR, the basis for the determination of significance is the County’s Guidelines for Determination of Significance, Cultural Resources, adopted December 5, 2007.

The project will have a significant impact on resources if it:

6. Causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. This shall include the destruction, disturbance or any 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.
7. Causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the State 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.
8. Disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.
9. Proposes activities or uses damaging to significant cultural resources as defined by the Resource Protection Ordinance and fails to preserve those resources

#### **2.5.2.1 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to significance**

According to CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.4(b)(3), “public agencies should, whenever feasible, seek to avoid damaging effects on any historical resource of an archaeological nature and requires the consideration of preservation in place as the preferred manner of mitigation and data recovery, only if preservation is not feasible.”

An analysis of each site is provided below along with a determination as to the significance of the site, pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and the County RPO.

*Historic Resources - Guideline 1: Causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. This shall include the destruction, disturbance or any 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.*

The records search, survey and testing results indicated that the historic component of one site is not a significant historical resource on the project site.

SDI-9537/H	<p>This site was recorded in 1982 with artifacts collected and curated. It was re-recorded in 2001 when some artifacts were collected and later curated. Based on earlier research and due to the potential impacts to the site, the County required a research design and testing program. Test excavations were conducted in 2005. These consisted of twelve 1x1 meter units ranging in depth from 20 to 80 cm and 24 Shovel Test Pits (STPs), dug to depths of 20-60 cm. (Some of each type were also related to the archaeological component of this site, discussed in the next section). A moderate scatter of historic artifacts was noted, and fifty artifacts related to the history of the site were recovered. The artifact types found on the site include largely undecorated whiteware, bottle and window glass, square nails, shovel fragments, burned wood and other materials. Tizon Brownware ceramics that may be historic were also found on the site. It was determined the site is a turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century homestead belonging to Hugh Magee.</p>
------------	---

This resource is located in an area that is proposed for development. However, it is not a significant historical resource under Criterion 4 of the California Register of Historical Resources because there are no historic structural remains associated with the resource. It has considerable potential to contribute to our knowledge of prehistory, especially during the later Archaic Period. It is not a significant resource under the County RPO for the following reasons: 1) it has not been formally determined eligible or listed on the National Register of Historic Places by the Keeper of the National Register; 2) the Historic Resource (“H” Designator) has not been applied by Historic Resources Special Area Regulations; 3) it is not the location of past or current sacred religious or ceremonial observances; and 4) while it contains a significant volume and range of data and materials, it is not a one-of-a-kind, locally unique, or regionally unique cultural resource. It is one of 21 Pauma Complex sites noted by D.L. True (1980) recorded between the area east of the Pala Indian Reservation (as originally constitute) and west to the Rincon Indian Reservation. This is an area that has seen relatively little development in the last 30 years and most of these sites have not been disturbed by such development. In addition, this site has already been subjected to several surface collections in the past and has been partially disturbed by former olive and citrus groves. Guideline 4 is not exceeded and impacts are less than significant for the historic component. However, mitigation of the site will be required because the archaeological component has been determined to be significant (see Impact CR-2 below).



These following two historic sites were not relocated in the recent survey.

SDI-5675	SDI-5675 (Gomez Trail) was “a traditional trail route from Pauma Valley and SDI-715 to Morgan Hill (SDI-543). It was recorded in 1978 by S. Fulmer. The site form suggests that the old route is not visible and is a “new trail route” or “new road.” This trail would have crossed the peak in the northeast corner of the subject property. A careful study of this area, which has been highly disturbed, as well as an examination of adjacent areas, did not reveal the presence of the Gomez Trail.
SDI-5676	SDI-5676 (Mission Trail) was a “trail from Morgan Hill (SDI-543) to Pauma (SDI-721 and SDI-715)” according to the site form which cites local informants. It was also recorded by S. Fulmer in 1978. The trail would have skirted the northeast corner of the subject property. No portion of this trail was located during the course of the survey.

If there were portions of these two historic trails, SDI-5675 (Gomez Trail) and -5675 (Mission Trail), on the property, there are no indications of them now. They may exist outside of the subject property, but they cannot be evaluated for this project because they are not present.

*Human Remains - Guideline 3: Disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.*

No human remains were found in relation to the site. Therefore long-term and short-term direct and indirect impacts are not significant. Guideline 3 is not exceeded for human remains and impacts are not significant. No mitigation is required

*RPO - Guideline 4: Proposes activities or uses damaging to significant cultural resources as defined by the Resource Protection Ordinance and fails to preserve those resources.*

The site is not a significant resource under the County’s RPO because no further important information related to scientific research questions can be provided by the site and because no historic activities or events are associated with the site. Therefore long-term and short-term direct and indirect impacts are not significant. Guideline 4 is not exceeded for historical resources and impacts are less than significant. No mitigation is required.

*Archaeological Resources - Guideline 2: Causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5 of the State 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.*

The following five sites were assessed as part of the 2009 study.

SDI-246	<p>This site was recorded in 1954 as a “small camp or temporary village” with shallow bedrock mortars and small quartz projectile points. The site was resurveyed in 2001. No obvious midden was noted. The site is within a grove of trees and construction of the grove may have removed or covered both the midden and/or surface deposits. An existing dirt road passes through the north portion of the site, but there are no plans to improve this road.</p>
SDI-266	<p>This site was recorded in 1947 and 1954 as a “village site with bedrock stones and evidence of fire [that] was bulldozed in 1951 for a house site.” And was re-surveyed for the current report, artifacts were collected and curated. Surface collection over time produced 71 artifacts which include metavolcanic and quartz pieces, fire-altered rock, mortars, fragments of a stone bowl, and a fragment of a scallop shell, and other stone fragments.</p>
SDI-714	<p>This site was excavated in 1953, when it was used to define the San Luis Rey I and 160 artifacts were curated at that time, including 61 points, 30 manos, 6 portable mutates, 5 pestles, among other artifacts. This site was recorded in 1960 as a small village [with] heavy mound or deposit containing shells, animal bones, and other refuse that indicates the site of a human settlement. It also contained pieces of bedrock, shells and other rock fragments. Quartz and metavolcanic materials, fire-altered rock, and other stone fragments were present. Due to potential impacts from a proposed pad, twenty-five STPs ranging from 20 to 40 cm were excavated, five of which were positive. As a result, the pas was moved out of the area and a 10 to 15 meter buffer zone was included.</p>
SDI-731	<p>The site was recorded in 1960 and excavations were conducted in 1968. The site was recorded as a “camp or village [of the] San Luis Rey Type I” in 1986. A collection of 412 artifacts were curated. The 2001 survey found 15 bedrock milling outcrops and two discrete areas of mound or deposit containing flakes and milling features, and other refuse that indicates the site of a human settlement.</p>
SDI-9906	<p>This site was initially recorded in 1984 and consists of two bedrock milling outcrops with six “cup” rock fragments, one slick, and 4-5 pestles.</p>

These sites are all located in areas that are proposed for open space protection. Because these sites will be avoided and protected by easement, significance testing

was not required. As a result, the sites are assumed to be CEQA and RPO significant. Guideline 1 is exceeded and mitigation is required (**Impact CR-1**).

The following archaeological component of SDI-9537/H was assessed:

SDI-9537/H	This site was first noted in 1948 and mapped and recorded in 1982 with artifacts collected and curated, although the collection seems to have been lost. It is a large habitation site with a moderate to dense scatter of archaeological and historic artifacts. The site was recorded in 2001 and extensively studied in 2005. The artifact types found on the site include quartz and metavolcanic flakes, core fragments, and fire-altered rock, and some Brownware shards suggesting a Late Prehistoric presence. Research concluded that the site was an important habitation site dating to the later Archaic period (about 1250-700 BC), which may have been reoccupied during the Later Prehistoric period (after 1659 AD). It was perhaps a seasonal residential base with a major focus on the procurement and processing of deer.
------------	---

This site is located in an area that is proposed for development. The archaeological component of this site is a significant resource under Criteria 1, 2 or 3 of the California Register of Historical Resources, and therefore, under CEQA. Guideline 2 is exceeded and impacts are significant. Mitigation that includes a Data Recovery program is required. (**Impact CR-2**).

The following sites were previously recorded and were not relocated in the recent survey.

SDI-715	This site was recorded by D.L. True in 1960 and is described as “remains of a small village or camp. San Luis Rey II. Some midden, chipping wasted, etc.” It consisted of bedrock mortars with “pottery, manos and mutates left on site [probably] picked up by previous owners.” True stated that the “area had been leveled for a building site and for all practical purposes has been destroyed.”
SDI-722	This site was also recorded by D.L. True in 1960. It was described as “storage shelter in boulders...pottery cache site.” He noted the presence of “pottery fragments...may represent parts of several jars.” The site is a kind of cache cave in a large boulder pile; burned deer antler, several charred but unmodified sticks, and a number of potsherds were collected. It may have been a part of nearby SDI-751 site. No trace of this site was found during the present survey.
SDI-723	This site was recorded by True in 1960 as well. He describes the site as a “camp or...scattered chipping waste...no apparent midden...” A bedrock metate is present but no artifacts are noted. This site is viewed as Pauma Complex site. It could not be relocated; however, the metate may have been outside the project area, an area to which

	the survey crew did not have access.
--	--------------------------------------

These sites have apparently been destroyed by the expansion of orchards on the property back in the late 1960s. Since these sites were not relocated in the recent survey, these sites are not significant because they have been destroyed. If buried remnants of these sites remain, they will not be impacted by the project as the site locations are within proposed open space.

The following four new sites are characterized as small bedrock milling sites.

SDI-17501	The site was first recorded in 2001 and remapped with some alterations to the boundary in 2005. Four STPs were excavated to a depth of 20 cm, all of which were negative. SDI-17501 consists of two bedrock milling outcrops with five milling features. No deposit or surface artifacts are associated with the features. Due to a project redesign, the site is just outside the project area.
SDI-17502	This site consists of two bedrock outcrops 2.5 meters apart in an orange grove. Three STPs were excavated in 2005, all of which were negative. One outcrop contains a 6-cm deep mortar with an adjacent slick and the other contains only one slick. No midden deposit or surface artifacts are present.
SDI-17503	Two STPs were excavated in 2005. This site is located south of SDI-17501 and consists of a single bedrock milling outcrop with two saucer mortars. No subsurface deposit or surface artifacts are present.
SDI-18368	This small bedrock milling site is an isolated find situated away from the known sites on the property and no artifacts are present. This site has been disturbed by vehicular traffic and the site's useful information has already been recorded (such as location, milling outcrop size, milling feature dimensions, etc.), this site is not a significant historical resource under CEQA or the County's RPO.

The significance of these sites was investigated using a series of two to four shovel test pits (STPs) at each of these small bedrock milling sites to confirm that no subsurface cultural deposit was present. All of the STPs were negative confirming the absence of subsurface cultural material.

Therefore, sites SDI-17501, SDI 17502, SDI-17503 and SDI-18368 are not significant archaeological resources impacted under Criterion 4 of the California Register of Historical Resources, and therefore under CEQA. In addition they are also not important resources under the County's RPO or under Significance Guideline 2, and no mitigation is required.

*Human Remains - Guideline 3: Disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.*

No human remains were found during the survey and testing of the sites discussed above. Often archaeological resources (artifacts, features or human remains) are buried, covered by extensive alluvial deposition, and not found during the survey and subsurface testing. Finding these resources could result in a significant impact; therefore a professional archaeologist shall monitor grading during all earth disturbing activities required by the project (**Impact CR-3**).

*RPO - Guideline 4: Proposes activities or uses damaging to significant cultural resources as defined by the Resource Protection Ordinance and fails to preserve those resources.*

The sites discussed above do not contain evidence of significant habitation, human remains, grave goods, obvious ceremonial areas, sacred objects, or other unique resources that might make it significant under the County’s RPO definition of “significant prehistoric or historic sites.” Guideline 4 is not exceeded and impacts are less than significant.

### **2.5.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis**

According to CEQA, the importance of cultural resources comes from the research value and the information that they contain. Therefore the issue that must be explored in a cumulative analysis is the cumulative loss of that information. For sites considered less than significant, the information is preserved through recordation, test excavations and preservation of artifacts. Significant sites that are placed in protected open space easements avoid direct impacts to these cultural resources as well as preservation of their potential research data. Significant sites that are not placed within open space easements and directly impacted by the project preserve the information through recordation, test excavations, and data recovery programs that would be presented in reports and filed with the County and SCIC. The artifact collections from any potentially significant site would be curated at a federally approved curation facility such as the San Diego Archaeological Center and would be available to researchers for further study. Because cultural resources are non-renewable in nature, it is critical that information obtained through excavation is appropriately retained and utilized.

A cultural resources cumulative study area is identified based on potential future research questions that could be developed within the context of subsistence and settlement models for the project area. Major east-west drainages were the travel corridors utilized by prehistoric occupants in their seasonal rounds. The confluences of drainages are often major habitation site locations, with associated temporary camps and resource procurement stations established on surrounding tributaries and on adjacent uplands.

For this project the cumulative study area was defined over a segment of the San Luis Rey River Valley that encompasses areas from the Palomar Mountain foothills to the San Luis Rey River, and takes in the major population centers in the area, Pala and Pauma.

This area was selected to capture developmentally active areas near population centers. It also encompasses a range of topographical and biological environments, including foothills, alluvial areas, oak woodland, and water courses, where settlement patterns may have been established in the past.

Based on SCIC records, Heritage Resources archives, and PDS records, eleven cultural resources had been previously recorded within the project area, and 16 outside the boundary. Four cultural resources studies covered areas within a one-mile radius of the project. The results of the records search are provided in Table 2 of Appendix D. A total of 23 development projects are known to have been processed or are currently being processed in the County PDS. Figure 1-6, “Cumulative Projects,” shows the locations of the cumulative projects, and Table 1-1, “Cumulative Projects,” presents information on these projects gathered from PDS records. Five projects were projected to have a significant impact to cultural resources. These are:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
TM 5499, Club Estates 48.31 acres, 32 residential lots	Cultural, potential to disturb resources during grading	Cultural , Monitoring during grading
GPA 03-044, Campus Park 420 acres, mixed uses	Human remains discovered	Avoidance and monitoring
GPA 05-003, Campus Park West, 118.5 acres, residential, office, and commercial uses	No resources present but potential for buried resources	Avoid resources, record and monitor during grading
GPA 04-002, Meadowood, 389.5 acres, residential uses, school and park	Human remains and resources present	Avoid resources and monitoring
GPA 06-009, Warner Ranch, residential uses	Resources present on site	<u>Cultural Resources</u> : Record, test, archive impacted resources. Monitoring and fencing during construction and open space protection. Curation of any resources found

This project has incorporated grading monitoring and/or data recovery programs to ensure that if buried resources are present, they would be identified, assessed for significance and proper recordation, avoidance, and data-recovery measures would be undertaken. The Proposed Project’s potentially significant impacts to cultural resources would be reduced below a level of significance by recordation, mapping, data recovery and archaeological monitoring by a County-approved archaeologist and a monitor representing the local Tribes during grading of both on- and off-site grading activities. Similarly, impacts to any undiscovered or buried potentially significant cultural resources located within the cumulative projects’ boundaries would be reduced below a level of

significance by using similar measures. Thus, all archaeological impacts associated with the related cumulative projects are expected to be less than significant and/or fully mitigated.

Future development within the cumulative study area would be subject to similar analysis and mitigation requirements pursuant to CEQA and RPO. Based on the compliance of the Proposed Project and related projects within the cultural resources cumulative study area with CEQA and RPO, and implementation of the project monitoring measures presented in Section 2.5.2, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant contribution to cumulative impacts for the issue of cultural resources and impacts would be less than significant.

**2.5.4 Significance of Impact Prior to Mitigation**

- CR-1 Five archaeological sites (SDI-246, -266, -714, -731, and -9906) were identified, and because significance testing was not conducted, these five sites are assumed to be significant.
- CR-2 The archaeological component of SDI-9537/H was evaluated and determined to be significant pursuant to CEQA criteria. The resource is located within the development footprint and will be directly impacted by the project.
- CR-3 The project has the potential to create direct impacts to buried archaeological resources (including human remains) during all grading/excavation activities..

**2.5.5 Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize the Significant Effects**

- M-CR- 1a Open Space Easements:  
 Sites SDI-246, -266, -714, -731, and -9906 shall be placed in protected open space.
- M-CR-1b Temporary Fencing for Archaeological Sites:  
 A temporary fencing plan for the protection of archaeological sites CA-SDI-246, CA-SDI-266, CA-SDI-714, CA-SDI-731, and CA-SDI-9906, will be prepared and implemented during any grading activities within one hundred feet (100’) of any archaeological site within open space as shown on the site plan exhibit of the archaeological study dated December 16, 2013. The fencing plan shall be prepared in consultation with a County approved archaeologist, to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. The fenced area should include a buffer sufficient to protect the archaeological sites. The fence shall be installed under the supervision of the approved archaeologist prior to commencement of grading or brushing and be

removed only after grading operations have been completed. A Native American monitor shall be present during the installation of the fencing.

M-CR-2

Data Recovery:

Direct impacts to the archaeological component of SDI-9537/H will be mitigated through data recovery excavations that implement a written research design (Refer to the Data Recovery Program, Attachment C to this DEIR and mitigation measure below). Any site destruction grading will be monitored by both a County certified archaeologist and a Native American Observer to check for the presence of unusual features and/or human remains. All artifacts recovered from the site will be analyzed and reported on, then curated at the San Diego Archaeological Center.

*Data Recovery Excavations as Mitigation*

Implement, to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS, the research design detailed in the archaeological extended study, Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation of a 286-Acre Parcel in Pauma Valley, The Shadow Run Ranch, North of State Route 76, San Diego County, California prepared by Professional Archaeological Services dated June 15, 2009. The implementation of the research design constitutes mitigation for the proposed destruction of archaeological site CA-SDI-9537H. The research design includes, but is not limited to the following performance standards:

1. A County-approved archaeologist will be contracted with to implement the research design. Verification of the contract shall be presented in a letter from the Project Archaeologist to the Director of PDS and shall include the requirement of a Native American Observer.
2. Phase 1 of the fieldwork program will include mechanical trenching and a 2.5 percent hand excavated sample of the two subsurface artifact concentrations.
3. At the completion of Phase 1, a letter report will be submitted to the Director of PDS. The letter report will evaluate the issues of site integrity, data redundancy, spatial and temporal patterning, features, and other relevant topics in order to assess the adequacy of the initial 2.5 percent sample. Based on this assessment, the letter report shall recommend the need for and scope of a second phase of field investigations, not to exceed a total site hand excavated sample of 5 percent of the two subsurface artifact concentrations.
4. Implement Phase 2 of fieldwork, as necessary.

5. Artifact analysis, including lithics analysis, ceramics analysis, faunal analysis, floral analysis assemblage analysis, and radiocarbon dating will be conducted, as detailed in the archaeological extended study, "Data Recovery Research Design for Mitigation of Prehistoric Archaeological Site SDI-9537/H" prepared by Philip de Barros, dated June 15, 2009.
6. Evidence will be provided to the satisfaction of the Director PDS that all archaeological materials recovered during both the significance testing and data recovery phases have been curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
7. Final Technical Report will be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.

M-CR-3

Grading Monitoring Program for Archaeological Resources:

A professional archaeologist shall be contracted to implement a grading monitor program to monitor all grading and subsurface excavation activities related to the development of the Shadow Run Ranch project. The below mitigation measure details the steps to be taken in the event subsurface archaeological deposits are uncovered, including human remain and significant features. All phases of the monitoring program shall include a Native American representative.

A County approved archaeologist shall be contracted with to implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS. Verification of the contract shall be presented in a letter from the Project Archaeologist to the Director of PDS. This program shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions:

1. The County approved archaeologist/historian and Native American Observer shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program. The Department of PDS shall approve all persons involved in the monitoring program prior to any pre-construction meetings. The consulting archaeologist shall contract with a Native American Observer to be involved with the grading monitoring program.
2. During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) and Native American Observer shall be

onsite full-time to perform periodic inspections of the excavations. The frequency of inspections will depend on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features.

3. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field and the monitored grading can proceed.
4. In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the archaeologist shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The archaeologist shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with County staff archaeologist, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional methods. If any human bones are discovered, the County Coroner shall be contacted. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
5. Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The archaeological monitor(s) and Native American Observer shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis.
6. In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, all cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curating.
7. In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, a report documenting the field and analysis results and

interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms.

8. In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to the Director of PDS by the consulting archaeologist that the grading monitoring activities have been completed.
9. Prior to rough grading inspection sign-off, the archaeological monitor shall provide evidence that the grading monitoring activities have been completed to the satisfaction of the Director of PDS.

M-CR-4 Curating of Archaeological Collections:

Evidence will be provided to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego, Director of PDS that all archaeological materials recovered during the Professional Archaeological Services archaeological investigations of the property, including all significance testing, data recovery, and grading monitoring activities, have been curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curating facility within San Diego County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curating.

**2.5.6 Conclusion**

An update of the 2001/2005 historical and archaeological surveys of the site was conducted in 2009. Native American representatives with the Native Ground Monitoring and Research served as Native American monitors from the Pauma Indian Reservation.

A total of 15 sites and eight isolates were evaluated and recorded, re-recorded or not relocated as a result of the 2009 survey. Five sites previously identified could not be relocated during the 2001-2009 work. Four archaeological sites were determined to be not significant.

Five archaeological sites were assumed to be significant and will be protected in open space. Because the sites could extend beyond currently defined boundaries into areas proposed for grading, monitoring of all grading activity is required. Appropriate support funding will be required.

The historical component of SDI-9537/H was extensively tested, mapped, recorded and artifacts recovered; no additional research potential for this aspect of the site appears to

remain. Impacts are not considered significant. The archaeological component of SDI-9537/H was determined to be CEQA significant through extensive testing; project impacts were found to be significant because research potential remains. Mitigation entails a data recovery research program that includes curation of any artifacts found, and monitoring during site grading. This will be effective because it preserves the research value of the site and allows a fuller understanding of the resource to be developed under controlled circumstances. Cumulative impacts were evaluated using a study area that takes in major population centers and varied topographic and biological areas. The Proposed Project and the one project in the area both fully mitigate impacts with monitoring, recovery of any important data, and curation of all resources. Cumulative impacts are not significant because all research and cultural heritage value in these two sites will be preserved for future study.

Site No.	Site Description	Date Recorded
<b>Sites Located Within Or Partially Within Project Boundaries</b>		
SDI-246	Small camp or temporary village: shallow mortars, proj. points	1954
SDI-266	Village site: bedrock mortars, points, manos, shell	1947
SDI-714	Small Village, heavy midden: Stone ball, proj. points, shell ornaments, etc.	1960
SDI-715	Small Village or Camp: midden, chipping waste, pottery manos & metates	1960
SDI-722	Pottery cache in boulders: pottery fragments	1960
SDI-723	Camp: scattered chipping waste, bedrock metate or small mortar	1960
SDI-731	Camp or Village area, SLR I: light midden, metates, mortars, points scrapers, chipping waste	1960
SDI-5675	Gomez Trail: Trail from Pauma Valley to Morgan Hill	1978
SDI-5676	Mission Trail: Trail from Morgan Hill to Pala Assistencia	1978
SDI-9537/H	Artifact Scatter, Pauma Complex: manos, metates, hammerstones	1982
SDI-9906	Bedrock Mortars	1984
<b>Sites Outside Project Boundaries But Within a One-Mile Radius</b>		
SDI-243	Bedrock Mortar Site: 14 Mortars, 1 slick	1984
SDI-247	Camp site or temporary village: bedrock mortars, some quartz chips	1954
SDI-267	Milling site: metates, manos	1953
SDI-505	Type Site for the Pauma Complex: manos, metate, scraper planes	1958
SDI-510	Campsite: points, scraper, metates, manos	1954
SDI-624	Bedrock milling features	1952
SDI-720	Village or Camp site, SLR I: midden, points, knives, burnt bone,	1960
SDI-721	Village Site, SLR II: heavy midden, projectile points, pottery, arrow straightener, metates.	1960
SDI-726	Camp or Chipping station: scattered chipping waste.	1960
SDI-727	Bedrock mortars	1960
SDI-734	Bedrock metate	1960
SDI-739	Bedrock mortars	1960
SDI-740	Bedrock mortars	1960
SDI-5675	Gomez Trail: Trail from Pauma Valley to Morgan Hill	1978
SDI-5676	Mission Trail: Trail from Morgan Hill to Pala Assistencia	1978
SDI-9905	Bedrock mortars	1984