

3.2 Cultural Resources

Cultural resources are addressed in Section 4.4 of the EOMSP Final EIR, which concluded that impacts from Specific Plan implementation would be significant and mitigable. In response to that analysis, EOMSP Final EIR Mitigation Measure 4A has been implemented in the subsequent archaeological resources analysis. This measure states that: testing of all untested or unevaluated sites will be conducted prior to approval of any subsequent discretionary permits; sites determined to be important after testing will be preserved in open space easements or will be subject to additional testing, or both; and impacts to sites determined not to be important will be considered to be adequately mitigated after the testing phase. Based on the prior analysis, the project site and surrounding areas contain resources that require testing and evaluation.

This subchapter is based, in part, on information and conclusions reached in the previously certified EOMSP Final EIR, as well as the project-level analysis contained in the Archaeological Resources Evaluation (ARE) for Otay Crossings Commerce Park prepared by Affinis in September 2008 (revised in April 2010 and contained in Appendix G to this SEIR). The study area for the cultural resources report consisted of the project site, its immediate surroundings plus the off-site improvement areas required to implement road ROW dedications and a sewer main (as depicted in Figures 1-4, 1-5a, 1-5b, 1-6, and 1-7 in this report).

Since the EOMSP Final EIR certification in 1994, additional reports have been prepared on this topic, including the Management Plan for Otay Mesa Prehistoric Resources Technical Report (1998 Management Plan; Gallegos & Associates 1998) and the 2002 Supplement to the East Otay Mesa Cultural Resources Technical Report (County of San Diego 2002b). These reports have also been used in the completion of this subchapter. The overriding plan for the management of cultural resources on the mesa is the 1998 Management Plan, which addresses the numerous types of cultural resource sites found over the decades on the Otay Mesa. The 1998 Management Plan indicates that the predominant sites known to occur in this portion of San Diego County are sparse lithic scatters with no cultural significance or archaeological research potential (Gallegos & Associates 1998). The 1998 Management Plan addresses the long-term management of such sites and their associated resources.

The 2002 County Supplement was prepared during a County-initiated SPA process in response to the land use map and Circulation Element changes proposed eight years after the EOMSP was adopted. The County Supplement is a compilation of the numerous cultural resource studies conducted on parcels within the East Otay Mesa area since the 1994 adoption of the EOMSP, and provides identification of new and updates to previously identified cultural resources, thus updating the cultural resources information for the entire Specific Plan area. In its analysis of anticipated project impacts and recommended mitigation, the ARE prepared by Affinis for the proposed project referenced these reports as well as other surveys and reports completed in the area. As discussed in the EOMSP Final EIR and the EOMSP Cultural Resources Technical Report (Ogden Environmental and Gallegos and Associates 1993), mitigation is required for sites that have been determined significant as defined by CEQA. The proposed project would be in compliance with all cultural resources mitigation measures contained in the previously certified EIR, and such measures would continue to be implemented as applicable. Recommended mitigation from the EOMSP EIR includes the testing of all untested or unevaluated sites prior to approval of any subsequent discretionary permits, with appropriate mitigation (if any) to be determined at the time of the requested permits (County of San Diego 2006).

The ARE prepared for the proposed project identified 14 archaeological sites totally or partially within the project area (10 of which required testing, the remainder having already been tested and found not to be significant cultural resources) and 8 archaeological sites totally or partially within the off-site improvement areas (2 of which required testing), as discussed below (Affinis 2010). A summary of the report is provided herein and the report in its entirety is contained in Appendix G to this SEIR.

3.2.1 Discussion of Existing Conditions Relating to Cultural Resources

Previous On-site Archaeological Surveys

As identified in the EOMSP Cultural Resources Technical Report (Ogden Environmental and Gallegos and Associates 1993) and in the County Supplement discussed above, the Otay Crossings Commerce Park project area was included in an archaeological survey of a larger study area for a former sludge processing facility proposed on site. Portions of the property have also been surveyed for other projects, including a cultural resources survey conducted for the proposed SR-11 and Otay Mesa East POE (Kyle and Van Wormer 2001).

Current Study

The follow-up resource evaluation conducted by Affinis determined that a total of 14 archaeological sites are recorded totally or partially within the proposed project site (see Table 3.2-1). Eight additional archaeological sites have been recorded outside of the project site, in areas that may be affected by the off-site improvements (i.e. roadways and sewer main) associated with the proposed project (with one of these sites, CA-SDI-8078, occurring within both the project site and a proposed off-site sewer alignment). Prior to the survey, Affinis obtained and reviewed records from the South Coastal Information Center and previous reports addressing the project area. In addition, historic maps and aerial photographs were evaluated to determine the possibility for historic archaeological resources.

In addition to obtaining institutional records and reports, methodologies employed in the evaluation of this project include relocating previously recorded sites, surface mapping, artifact collection, photographic documentation, historic assessment, and excavation of shovel test pits to determine the extent, integrity, and constituents of site deposits. Updated site record forms were prepared and submitted to the South Coastal Information Center.

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. Requirements of the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5) were followed in evaluating the significance of the cultural resources.

On-site Resources

The cultural resource evaluation program evaluated the significance of fourteen sites located within the project area: CA-SDI-8076/8079, CA-SDI-8078, CA-SDI-8080, CA-SDI-8652, CA-SDI-10,299, CA-SDI-11,793, CA-SDI-11,794, CA-SDI-11,799H, CA-SDI-11,800, CA-SDI-11,801, CA-SDI-11,802H, CA-SDI-15,872, CA-SDI-15,873 and CA-SDI-15,875. As noted above, four of these (CA-SDI-8076/8079, CA-SDI-8080, CA-SDI-8652, and CA-SDI-11,794) had already been tested and found not to be significant cultural resources. All of the remaining sites were tested and

determined not to be significant, with the exception of sites CA-SDI-11,799H, CA-SDI-11,801, and CA-SDI-11,802H.

CA-SDI-11,799H was not tested due to the presence of burrowing owl. It was identified as a cistern into which lumber and other materials had been bulldozed. Materials associated with this site suggested that a house or other structure was probably demolished on the site. The site may extend further into the Tentative Map area and the ROW for the proposed Airway Road. Subsequent to the field work conducted for the proposed project, a testing program was completed on the portion of CA-SDI-11,799H that lies on the adjacent property to the south. The site was determined to be significant under CEQA during this investigation, although it was concluded not to be significant under the County of San Diego RPO guidelines (Smith and Associates 2006, refer to Appendix G).

CA-SDI-11,801 was originally recorded as a small, light scatter of marine shell, but was not relocated and was determined to be not significant based on the prior survey and paucity of material present at the time of that survey; therefore, the ARE concluded that no further work was required.

CA-SDI-11,802H is the location of the Peter and Lucy Beckley homestead. No structures remain and the only feature encountered during the testing program was a cistern filled with modern debris. Although determined to be less than significant, the ARE concluded that this site has the potential for buried resources to be present.

Testing determined that the remaining sites (CA-SDI-8078, CA-SDI-10,299, CA-SDI-11,793, CA-SDI-11,800, CA-SDI-15,872, CA-SDI-15,873, and CA-SDI-15,875) were classified primarily as lithic scatters that fit the lithic scatter profile of the 1998 Management Plan (Gallegos et al. 1998), and, therefore, are not significant resources.

Off-site Resources

Eight sites located within the off-site improvement areas (road and sewer) were analyzed (CA-SDI-8078, CA-SDI-8081, CA-SDI-10,081, CA-SDI-11,798, CA-SDI-12,337, CA-SDI-12,872, CA-SDI-12,886, and CA-SDI-12,888H). Five of these (CA-SDI-8078, CA-SDI-11,798, CA-SDI-12,337, CA-SDI-12,872, and CA-SDI-12,886) had been previously tested and determined not to be significant. CA-SDI-10,081 had been destroyed by previous construction, so no further work was required. CA-SDI-12,888H and CA-SDI-8081 were evaluated for significance as part of the project investigation and documented in the ARE, as summarized below.

Similar to the sites within the boundaries of the proposed project site, superficial examination of the large CA-SDI-8081 site revealed it fit the sparse, lithic scatter pattern identified in the 1998 Management Plan (Gallegos et al. 1998). Consistent with County guidance, a testing program was conducted to assess the portion of CA-SDI-8081 located within the proposed sewer alignment along Alta Road and Siempre Viva Road. No cultural material was observed during the walk over by the archaeological crew during the November 2006 field work. Fifteen shovel test pits (STPs) were then excavated parallel to Alta Road, and five were excavated parallel to Siempre Viva Road, and excavated soils were passed through mesh rocker screens. No cultural material was recovered from the STPs. Based on this, the site appears to be located entirely to the west of Alta Road in this area. Thus, although the remaining (untested) portion of this site is potentially significant under CEQA, CA-SDI-8081 would not be affected by the project or by off-site improvements. Given the paucity of cultural material, the site is not RPO significant.

CA-SDI-12,888H was not tested due to the presence of burrowing owl. Previous studies (Ogden and Gallegos and Associates 1993) describe the site as fragments of porcelain, aqua glass, purple glass, and white ware ceramics in the “same location as a structure that was seen in the historic map check for 1880.” In the absence of testing, the ARE determined this site to be CEQA significant because it has the potential to yield information. Based on available information, however, the ARE states that the site does not meet the criteria of RPO significance.

3.2.2 Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

The following guidelines are based on the Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, approved by DPLU on September 26, 2006. Project impacts to cultural resources would be significant if:

1. The proposed project, as designed, causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.
2. The proposed project, as designed, causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.
3. The proposed project, as designed, disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.
4. The proposed project is inconsistent with the County RPO relative to prehistoric and historic sites.

3.2.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance

3.2.3.1 *Historic Resources (Guideline 1)*

Although historic resources (structures) were evident during the records search and literature review, prior studies indicate that no structures were present during those evaluations. In addition, no structures were encountered during the evaluation of resources for this project. Therefore, no impact to historic resources would occur.

3.2.3.2 *Archaeological Resources (Guideline 2)*

Twenty-one archaeological resources (CA-SDI-8076/8079, CA-SDI-8078, CA-SDI-8080, CA-SDI-8081, CA-SDI-8652, CA-SDI-10,081, CA-SDI-10,299, CA-SDI-11,793, CA-SDI-11,794, CA-SDI-11,798, CA-SDI-11,799H, CA-SDI-11,800, CA-SDI-11,801, CA-SDI-11,802H, CA-SDI-12,337, CA-SDI-12,872, CA-SDI-12,886, CA-SDI-12,888H, CA-SDI-15,872, CA-SDI-15,873, and CA-SDI-15,875) within or adjacent to the Otay Crossings Commerce Park project (including the off-site improvement areas) were identified (with portions of CA-SDI-8078 occurring within both the project site and one of the proposed off-site sewer alignments). All sites were evaluated and determined less than significant except for sites CA-SDI-11,799H, CA-SDI-11,802, and CA-SDI-12,888H. A detailed discussion of each site can be found in the cultural resources study (Appendix G).

CA-SDI-11,799H and CA-SDI-12,888H

CA-SDI-11,799H (on site) and CA-SDI-12,888H (in an off-site improvement area) were not tested due to the presence of burrowing owl, although off-site portions of CA-SDI-11,799H were tested under an unrelated investigation and determined to be significant under CEQA as previously noted (Smith and Associates 2006). In absence of testing, significance is also assumed for CA-SDI-12,888H; therefore, both CA-SDI-11,799H and CA-SDI-12,888H are determined CEQA significant. Based on the information available in prior studies (Robbins-Wade and Gross 1990; Ogden and Gallegos and Associates 1993) that identifies them as an historic cistern and surface debris deposit, as well as the noted investigation for off-site portions of CA-SDI-11,799H, these two sites do not qualify as RPO significant because they do not meet the definition of "Significant Historic Site" pursuant to Article II of the RPO. These sites have the potential for the presence of buried resources.

The proposed project will grade sites CA-SDI-11,799H and CA-SDI-12,888H. This direct impact could significantly affect buried resources associated with these sites (CI-1).

CA-SDI-11,802H

CA-SDI-11,802H is identified as an historic cistern associated with the Peter Beckley homestead. The evaluation of this site included subsurface testing in the form of the excavation of twenty backhoe trenches. Material recovered from the excavation was modern and no diagnostic materials were recovered. This site was determined to be less than significant according to CEQA and the RPO criteria because it lacks the potential to further answer questions related to understanding the prehistory of the area and, thus, is not a culturally significant resource as defined by CEQA and the County of San Diego guidelines. However, the site does have the potential for buried resources to be present.

The Otay Crossings Commerce Park project will directly impact site CA-SDI-11,802H during grading proposed as part of this project. This direct impact could significantly affect buried resources associated with this site (CI-2).

Balance of Sites

Sites CA-SDI-8076/8079, CA-SDI-8078, CA-SDI-8080, CA-SDI-8081, CA-SDI-8652, CA-SDI-10,081, CA-SDI-10,299, CA-SDI-11,793, CA-SDI-11,794, CA-SDI-11,798, CA-SDI-11,800, CA-SDI-11,801, CA-SDI-12,337, CA-SDI-12,872, CA-SDI-12,886, CA-SDI-15,872, CA-SDI-15,873, and CA-SDI-15,875 are identified as an occupation site (CA-SDI-10,299), a small shell scatter (CA-SDI-11,801) and sparse or moderate lithic scatters (16 remaining sites). The current and prior evaluations of these sites included subsurface testing in the form of excavation of shovel test pits and standard (one meter square) test units. These sites were determined to be not significant according to CEQA and the RPO criteria because they lack the potential to further answer questions related to understanding the prehistory and history of the area and, thus, are not culturally significant resources as defined by CEQA and the County of San Diego guidelines. The lack of a significant subsurface deposit or the absence of a subsurface component all together, combined with the exhaustive recording of surface artifacts, indicates that these sites are not likely to yield additional information important to understanding the history/prehistory of San Diego County. Since these cultural resources are evaluated as not significant, no impacts would be incurred during the implementation phase of the proposed project.

3.2.3.3 *Human Remains (Guideline 3)*

No evidence of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, was discovered during the records search, literature review, or site testing and evaluation. There is no indication that the project site was used by Native Americans for religious, ritual, or other special activities and, therefore, impacts to Native American burial sites are not expected. However, if human remains are discovered, the County Coroner would 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, would be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.

3.2.3.4 *RPO Significant Cultural Resources (Guideline 4)*

Cultural sites were discovered during the records search and literature review. Testing and evaluation of the cultural resources determined that none are RPO significant. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed project would not cause an impact to a significant cultural resource pursuant to RPO.

3.2.4 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 (i.e., documentation) and test excavations. Significant sites that are placed in open space easements avoid impacts to cultural resources and also preserve the data found within those sites. Significant sites that are not placed within open space easements preserve the information through recordation, test excavations, and data recovery programs that would be presented in reports and filed with the County of San Diego and the South Coastal Information Center. The artifact collections from any potentially significant sites would also be curated at the San Diego Archaeological Center and would be available to other archaeologists for further study.

Prehistoric and historic settlement patterns can be very broad, therefore it is prudent to consider a large study area when evaluating cumulative impacts. The cumulative impact study area for the Otay Crossings Commerce Park project is virtually all of Otay Mesa, as it includes the City of San Diego's Otay Mesa Community Plan Update, as well as 24 other projects in the City and 24 projects within the County's jurisdiction. Almost 300 cultural resource sites and loci have been recorded within this large study area, including prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, as well as historic structural resources. Within the cumulative impact study area, a single site (CA-SDI-8654) has been determined to be both a CEQA and RPO significant cultural resource because of its potential to provide important information about scientific research questions. A small historic district has been identified at Brown Field. This historic district (consisting of five buildings) is National Register eligible, so it is both CEQA and RPO significant as well. Six sites (the prehistoric component of CA-SDI-10,297/H; CA-SDI-10,298; CA-SDI-11,799H; CA-SDI-12,707; CA-SDI-12,710; and CA-SDI-17,963) have been assessed as CEQA significant but not significant under RPO. An additional 19 sites have been determined to be significant resources under CEQA, but RPO significance was not addressed, as these sites are within City of San Diego jurisdiction.

The cumulative projects in the vicinity of the Otay Crossings Commerce Park project are listed in Table 1-5 and are shown on Figure 1-12, *Cumulative Projects*. Two projects within the County portion

of the cumulative study area contain significant cultural resources. Within the City portion of the cumulative study area, individual projects were difficult to break out; however, in the overall Community Plan Update area, there are six significant sites, a National Register eligible historic district (buildings), and 63 sites and loci for which significance has not been determined or information was not available as to site significance. Testing would need to be completed to determine whether the sites are significant. The remaining cultural resources in the vicinity of the project area (almost 200 sites) were determined not to be significant cultural resources. The following is a discussion of the significant and potentially significant cultural sites within the cumulative project boundaries.

The vast majority of archaeological sites on Otay Mesa are lithic scatters. The Management Plan for Otay Mesa Prehistoric Resources noted:

Raw materials from both the Lindavista and the Otay formations, which provided a source of readily-available excellent surface cobble material for making stone tools, covers the mesa. Extensive research, that includes survey and testing programs, has been conducted on the sparse lithic scatters. This work has identified this resource as a surface manifestation that contains no subsurface deposition, no ecofacts, no diagnostic artifacts, and no artifact diversity. Given this, tests of this site type have repeatedly shown this resource to lack research potential, lack Native American concerns, and lack the qualities that would make it eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. Because of the agricultural activity over the past 100 years and the absence of temporal placement and an intact subsurface deposit, these sites simply represent a smear or background noise, as opposed to the significant sites which provide information to address important research questions [Gallegos et al. 1998:vi].

The significant sites that have been identified on Otay Mesa are habitation sites with intact subsurface deposits. These sites are generally located at or near the heads of canyons, such as Dennery Canyon, Wruck Canyon, and Spring Canyon, or sometimes on benches in the canyons. Although some Late Prehistoric material has been identified at sites on Otay Mesa, in general, radiocarbon dates and diagnostic material (both of which are limited) point to extensive use of the mesa during the Early Archaic period. Impacts to significant sites within the cumulative impact study area have generally been mitigated through data recovery programs, although a few of the sites are in open space areas, including the City of San Diego's Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Capping was recommended to avoid impacts to significant deposits at CA-SDI-8654 in conjunction with the National Enterprises Storage and Recycling Facility. Data recovery programs have been undertaken at that site and for other projects in the past.

The proposed project's impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels through mitigation measures that include monitoring of grading by an archaeologist and a Native American monitor, data recovery, curation of artifacts obtained during the testing and data recovery programs, and recordation of all sites within the on-site and off-site project footprint. As outlined above, the impacts to cultural resources located within the cumulative projects would be mitigated through the implementation of data recovery programs and construction monitoring, as well as capping at CA-SDI-8654.

Because the proposed project and those projects identified within the cumulative impact study area are mitigated through the placement of cultural resources within open space easements, data recovery, curation, and/or reporting, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to cultural resources.

3.2.5 Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize the Significant Effects

The following mitigation measures are proposed to reduce impacts to cultural resources to less than significant:

CM-1a To mitigate for direct impacts to CA-SDI-11,799H and CA-SDI-12,888H, the applicant shall implement a data recovery program prior to the approval of any grading permits or improvement plans, or prior to the recordation of the final map, whichever occurs first. The data recovery program shall include the following requirements:

Implement, to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use, the research design detailed in the archaeological extended study, ARE, prepared by Affinis for the proposed project and dated April 2010. The research design shall include, but is not limited to, the following performance standards:

- a. The presence of a Native American monitor shall be required for the duration of the excavation portion of the data recovery program.
- b. Phase I data recovery shall include mechanical trenching of sites CA-SDI-11,799H and CA-SDI-12,888H to identify cultural features such as privy pits, root cellars, building foundations, and trash deposits. All trench sidewalls shall be examined, as well as trench spoils as they are removed. Soil shall be screened through 1/8-inch mesh screen. Any features encountered shall require the expansion of the trench to uncover the feature. The feature shall be documented, drawn, and photographed.
- c. At the completion of Phase I, a letter report shall be submitted to the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use. 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 mechanical trenching. Based on this assessment, the letter report shall recommend the need for and scope of a second phase of field investigations.
- d. Implement Phase II of fieldwork, as necessary.
- e. Conduct artifact analysis, using historical archaeological analytical techniques such as artifact function patterning, bottled products pattern analysis and ceramic economic indexing. Additional historic research shall be conducted as necessary to aid in analyzing and explaining the significance of patterns.

Prior to recordation of the final map, the applicant shall:

- f. Complete and submit the Final Technical Report from the Principal Investigator to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use.

CM-1b Provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use that all archaeological materials recovered during significance testing, data recovery phases, and grading monitoring have been curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. 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. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.

CM-2 To mitigate for direct impacts to CA-SDI-11,802H and to mitigate for the possible uncovering of buried archaeological and historical resources during the extensive grading of the on-site and off-site project areas, prior to approval of grading or improvement plans, the subdivider shall take the following action related to the archaeological grading monitoring program to mitigate potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use:

Provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use that a County certified archaeologist has been contracted to implement an archaeological grading monitoring program. A letter from the Principal Investigator shall be submitted to the Director of Planning and Land Use. The letter shall include the following guidelines:

- a. The project archaeologist shall contract with a Native American monitor to be involved with the grading monitoring program as outlined in the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Guidelines (2006).
- b. The County certified archaeologist/historian and Native American monitor shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program as outlined in the County of San Diego Report Format and Content Guidelines (2006).
- c. The project archaeologist shall monitor all areas identified for development including off-site improvements.
- d. An adequate number of monitors (archaeological/historical/Native American) shall be present to ensure that all earth-moving activities are observed and shall be on site during all grading activities for areas to be monitored.
- e. During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) and Native American monitor(s) shall be on site full time to perform full-time monitoring. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Native American monitor. Monitoring of cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Principal Investigator.

- f. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field and the monitored grading can proceed.
- g. In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the archaeological monitor(s) shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The Principal Investigator shall contact the County Archaeologist at the time of discovery. The Principal Investigator, 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 Principal Investigator and approved by the County Archaeologist, then carried out using professional archaeological methods.
- h. If any human bones are discovered, the Principal Investigator shall contact the County Coroner. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native America origin, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted by the Principal Investigator in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.
- i. Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The Principal Investigator shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis.
- j. In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, all cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated at a San Diego facility that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and, therefore, would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. 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. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility identifying that archaeological materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.
- k. Monthly status reports shall be submitted to the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use starting from the data of notice to proceed to termination of implementation of the grading monitoring program. The reports shall briefly summarize all activities during the period and the status of progress on overall plan implementation. Upon completion of the implementation phase, a final report shall be submitted describing the plan compliance procedures and site conditions before and after construction.
- l. 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 Planning and Land Use prior to the issuance of any building permits. The

report shall include Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms.

- m. In the event that no cultural resources are discovered, a brief letter to that effect shall be sent to the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use by the consulting archaeologist that the grading monitoring activities have been completed.

3.2.6 Conclusion

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to archaeological or historical resources, or resources considered significant under RPO. Although significant impacts are not expected, data recovery will be completed prior to earth disturbing activities in areas adjacent to and covering sites CA-SDI-11,799H and CA-SDI-12,888H, and grading monitoring shall be conducted over the entire site (including CA-SDI-11,802) and off-site improvement areas to mitigate any potential impacts to unknown subsurface historic and/or archaeological features that could occur to less than significant levels, in accordance with the EOMSP Final EIR.

On-site (Wholly or Partially)				
Site Number	Site Description	Previously Tested?	Comments	Significant?
CA-SDI-8076/8079	Lithic scatter	Yes	Originally determined significant; later testing determined site not significant (McDonald et al. 1998)	No
CA-SDI-8078	Moderate lithic scatter with flakes, cores, and tools	No	Mainly outside the project area, to the south. Testing required for portion within project area	No
CA-SDI-8080	Lithic scatter	Yes	Not significant (Kyle and Van Wormer 2001)	No
CA-SDI-8652	Lithic scatter	Yes	Originally determined significant; later testing determined site not significant (McDonald et al. 1998)	No
CA-SDI-10,299	Habitation site	No	Mainly outside the project area, to the north. Testing required for portion with project area	No
CA-SDI-11,793	Light density lithic scatter with debitage and cores	No	Testing required	No
CA-SDI-11,794	Light to moderate density lithic scatter with debitage and cores	Yes	Not significant (Kyle and Van Wormer 2001)	No

**Table 3.2-1 (cont.)
CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN PROJECT STUDY AREA**

On-site (Wholly or Partially) cont.				
Site Number	Site Description	Previously Tested?	Comments	Significant?
CA-SDI-11,799H	Historic -- cistern into which lumber and other materials have been bulldozed	No	Historic background research and testing required	Not tested, due to nesting burrowing owls; site retains potential for unknown subsurface historic features
CA-SDI-11,801	Small shell scatter	No	Testing required	No
CA-SDI-11,802H	Historic -- home site marked by construction debris and household trash	No	Historic background research and testing required	No, but site retains potential for unknown subsurface historic features
CA-SDI-15,872	Lithic scatter with possible cobble quarry	No	Testing required	No
CA-SDI-15,873	Lithic scatter	No	Testing required	No
CA-SDI-15,875	Lithic scatter	No	Testing required	No
Off-site Improvement Areas				
CA-SDI-12,337	Large lithic scatter (over 700 acres) with debitage, cores, and flaked stone tools	Yes	Not significant; no further work required (Russell et al. 2002)	No
CA-SDI-12,872	Habitation site with flakes, flaked stone tools, and some milling tools	Yes	Not significant; no further work required (Russell et al. 2002)	No
CA-SDI-12,886	Light lithic scatter of debitage and one tool	Yes	Not significant; no further work required (Russell et al. 2002)	No
CA-SDI-12,888H	Fragments of glass, porcelain and ceramics	No	Testing required	Not tested, due to nesting burrowing owls; site retains potential for unknown subsurface historic features

**Table 3.2-1 (cont.)
CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN PROJECT STUDY AREA**

Off-site Improvement Areas cont.				
CA-SDI-8078	Moderate lithic scatter with flakes, cores, and tools	Yes; portion within proposed sewer alignment	Portion within proposed sewer alignment not significant; no further work required there (Smith 2006).	No
CA-SDI-8081	Habitation site with flakes, cores, and tools	No	Testing required	Portion of site outside of the off-site improvement areas is potentially significant
CA-SDI-10,081	No site record	No	Site destroyed; no further work required (Russell et al. 2002)	No
CA-SDI-11,798	Moderate lithic scatter with flakes, cores, and tools	Yes	Not significant; no further work required there (Smith 2006).	No

Source: Affinis 2010.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK