

## **ATTACHMENTS**


***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **Otay Mesa Community Plan Area on City 800' Map**



***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***






 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers





**ATTACHMENT 1A**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map






 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers





**ATTACHMENT 1B**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map






 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers





**ATTACHMENT 1C**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map






 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers















**ATTACHMENT 1D**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map





 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary

Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers


154-1749	154-1761	154-1773	154-1785
 1A	 1B	 1C	 1D
 1E	 1F	 1G	 1H
 1I	 1J	 1K	 1L
130-1749	130-1761	130-1773	130-1785





**ATTACHMENT 1E**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map







 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary



**ATTACHMENT 1F**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map






 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers


154-1749	154-1761	154-1773	154-1785
1A	1B	1C	1D
146-1749	146-1761	146-1773	146-1785
1E	1F	1G	1H
138-1749	138-1761	138-1773	138-1785
1I	1J	1K	1L
130-1749	130-1761	130-1773	130-1785















**ATTACHMENT 1G**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map






 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers

154-1749	154-1761	154-1773	154-1785
 1A	 1B	 1C	 1D
 1E	 1F	 1G	 1H
 1I	 1J	 1K	 1L
130-1749	130-1761	130-1773	130-1785





ATTACHMENT 1H  
Otay Mesa Community Plan  
Area on City 800' Map






Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



**ATTACHMENT 11**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map






 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers


154-1749	154-1761	154-1773	154-1785
<b>1A</b>	<b>1B</b>	<b>1C</b>	<b>1D</b>
146-1749	146-1761	146-1773	146-1785
<b>1E</b>	<b>1F</b>	<b>1G</b>	<b>1H</b>
138-1749	138-1761	138-1773	138-1785
<b>1I</b>	<b>1J</b>	<b>1K</b>	<b>1L</b>
130-1749	130-1761	130-1773	130-1785



**ATTACHMENT 1J**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map





 Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers

154-1749	154-1761	154-1773	154-1785
<b>1A</b>	<b>1B</b>	<b>1C</b>	<b>1D</b>
<b>1E</b>	<b>1F</b>	<b>1G</b>	<b>1H</b>
138-1749	138-1761	<b>138-1773</b>	138-1785
<b>1I</b>	<b>1J</b>	<b>1K</b>	<b>1L</b>
130-1749	130-1761	130-1773	130-1785





**ATTACHMENT 1K**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map





Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary

Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



**ATTACHMENT 1L**  
 Otay Mesa Community Plan  
 Area on City 800' Map

**ATTACHMENT 2**  
**Literature Review**

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***

## ATTACHMENT 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Information from technical biological documents prepared for different ownerships within the CPU area was incorporated into this document. These reports include (but are not limited to):

- Final Draft Technical White Paper 1: Focal Species Status Update for the City of San Diego Vernal Pool Habitat Conservation Plan. Prepared by AECOM. August 2012.
- Biotechnical Report for the Candlelight Project. Project No. 40329. Prepared by Alden Environmental Inc. July 2012.
- Appendix G; Biological Studies for Otay Tijuana Cross Border Facility Development Project Draft Environmental Impact Report. Project No. 169653. Prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, Inc. June 2011.
- Otay Mesa East Initial Study. Project No. 3159. Planning and Development Review Department. July 2003.
- Draft Biological Technical Report for Approximately 99.7 Acres of the Cucumber Ranch Assemblage, South Otay Mesa, San Diego County, California. Prepared by Glen Lukos Associates, Inc. July 2004.
- Appendix E; Biological Technical Report to the Otay Mesa Trunk Sewer Final Environmental Impact Report. Prepared by PBS&J. June 24, 2004.
- Draft Year 4 Annual Report for Dennery Canyon Vernal Pool, Coastal Sage Scrub, and Mule Fat Scrub Restoration and Preservation Plan. Prepared by RECON. July 1, 2004.
- Report of General and Focused Biological Surveys for the Spring Canyon Ranch Specific Plan including Tentative Map #61549 as Part of the Otay Mesa Community Plan, South Otay Mesa, San Diego County, California. Prepared by Glen Lukos Associates, Inc.
- Biological Technical Report, East Otay Mesa Drainage, San Diego, California. Prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, Inc.
- A Biological Resources Assessment of Two Vesting Tentative Maps on South Otay Mesa Located in the City of San Diego, San Diego County, California. Prepared by Natural Resources Consultants.
- Draft Biological Technical Report for Lonestar Ridge. Prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, Inc.
- Biological Technical Report for Candlelight Villas East. Prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, Inc. July 2012.

- Judd and Dillard Otay, LP Site Letter Report. Prepared for Mr. John Dillard by REC Consultants, Inc.
- Biological Constraints for the Otay Mesa Quad Parcel. Prepared by Helix Environmental Planning, Inc.





Cultural Resources Report  
for the  
Otay Mesa Community  
Plan Update,  
City of San Diego  
Project No. 30330/304032  
SCH No. 2004651076

Prepared for  
City of San Diego  
Development Services Department  
1222 First Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Contact: Theresa Millette

Prepared by  
RECON Environmental, Inc.  
1927 Fifth Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92101-2358  
P 619.308.9333 F 619.308.9334  
RECON Number 3957-1  
August 29, 2013

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Harry J. Price".

Harry J. Price, Project Archaeologist

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Carmen Zepeda-Herman".

Carmen Zepeda-Herman, Principal Investigator

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***

**NATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA BASE INFORMATION**

Authors: Harry J. Price and Carmen Zepeda-Herman

Consulting Firm: RECON Environmental, Inc.  
1927 Fifth Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92101

Report Date: February 12, 2013

Report Title: Cultural Resources Report for the Otay Mesa Community Plan Update

Prepared for: City of San Diego

Submitted to: City of San Diego  
Development Services Department  
1222 First Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92101

Contract No.: RECON 3957-1

USGS quadrangle maps: Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa

Acreage: 9,319 acres

Keywords: Otay Mesa, recorded sites on Otay Mesa, impacted sites

**ABSTRACT**

This report evaluates the potential effect of the adoption of the proposed Otay Mesa Community Plan update (CPU) in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Regulations and the Historical Resources Guidelines.. The updated plan includes modifications to both land use and circulation. A major component of the update is the addition of two new mixed-use village areas.

All of the CPU area has been surveyed for cultural resources; many portions have been examined multiple times. There are 262 historic and prehistoric sites/structures recorded within the Community Plan area boundaries. Of the 262 recorded sites within the CPU, 136 are within areas that have been partially or completely developed. A total of 126 known sites remain within the CPU that have not been impacted by development. Of the 262 recorded cultural resources in the CPU, 180 prehistoric and historic sites/structures

## Cultural Resources Report for the Otay Mesa Community Plan Update

have not been impacted or have been only partially impacted. The CPU would facilitate future development that would have the potential for significantly impacting all, or a portion of 61 of those remaining 180 recorded sites, and any additional unrecorded sites.

A Mitigation Framework has been developed which provides steps and procedures for review of future projects associated with implementation of the CPU.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 Setting</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Physical Setting	9
2.2 Cultural Setting	11
<b>3.0 Previously Completed Historical Resource Work</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4.0 Results</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5.0 Regulatory Framework</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>6.0 Potential Impacts</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>7.0 Mitigation</b>	<b>49</b>
7.1 Mitigation Framework for Archaeological Resources	49
7.2 Mitigation Framework for Historic Buildings, Structures, and Objects	53
7.3 Mitigation Framework for Religious or Sacred Land Uses	54
7.4 Mitigation Framework for Human Remains, Including those Interred Outside Formal Cemeteries	54
<b>8.0 Certification and Project Staff</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>9.0 References Cited</b>	<b>59</b>

### FIGURES

1: Regional Location	3
2: Project Location on USGS Map	5
3A-L: Project Location on City 800' Map	7
4: Proposed Land Uses	47

### TABLES

1: Otay Mesa Land Use Distribution	2
2: Recorded Sites Within the Otay Mesa Community Plan Update Area	24

### ATTACHMENTS

1: Project Location on City 800' Scale Maps (Figures 3A-L)
2: Resumes of Key Personnel

### CONFIDENTIAL ATTACHMENTS

1: Record Search Results
2: Location of Recorded Sites within the Otay Mesa Community Plan Update Area

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***

# Acronyms

ADD	Assistant Deputy Director
AMSL	above mean sea level
BI	Building Inspector
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CM	Construction Manager
CPU	Community Plan Update
CRHR	California Register of Historic Resources
DP	Documentation Program
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
ED	Environmental Designee
GIS	geographic information system
HRB	Historical Resources Board
HRG	Historical Resources Guidelines
HRR	Historical Resources Regulations
I-805	Interstate 805
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MMC	City Mitigation Monitoring Coordination Section
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NTP	Notice to Proceed
PI	Principal Investigator
RE	Resident Engineer
SB	Senate Bill
SCIC	South Coastal Information Center
SR-905	State Route 905
WW I	World War I

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***



## 1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the potential effect of the adoption of the Otay Mesa Community Plan Update (CPU). As a result of this review it was determined that this CPU could result in a significant impact.

The CPU area encompasses extensive historical resources. Future development of the remaining undeveloped areas would impact these historical resources. This development would occur over a period of time, on a project-by-project basis. The impact of these projects on the resources must be considered at all levels of the development process. The City of San Diego has an existing set of guidelines designed to manage the historical resources found within its jurisdiction. By requiring conformance to these guidelines, impacts to historical resources resulting from the approval of the CPU would be adequately mitigated.

The CPU area covers Sections 19, 20, 29–32 of Township 18 South, Range 1 West, and Sections 5 and 6 of Township 19 South, Range 1 West on the 1965/1975 edition of the Imperial Beach, California-Baja California Norte 7.5-minute topographic map. It also covers Sections 21-23, 26–29, and 32–36 of Township 18 South, Range 1 West, and Sections 1–5 of Township 19 South, Range 1 West of the 1955/1975 edition of the Otay Mesa, California 7.5-minute topographic map (Figures 1, 2, and 3A-L).

The CPU area occupies the majority of Otay Mesa. It is bounded on the south by the international border with Mexico and on the north by the Otay River Valley. The western boundary follows Interstate 805 (I-805) from just north of Palm Avenue to just south of the State Route 905 (SR-905) intersection, then jogs east along the built up area of San Ysidro. The eastern boundary roughly follows the proposed SR-125 route, about half a mile west of Johnson Canyon.

The proposed project is a comprehensive update of the Otay Mesa Community Plan that was adopted in 1981 (see Figures 1 and 2). The update includes modifications to the various elements of the plan to incorporate current planning policies and practices in the City of San Diego, as well as to make the plan reflective of the substantial land use changes (e.g., adoption of the Multiple Species Conservation Program) that have occurred over the last 25 years. Major land use revisions include redesignating portions of the CPU area as to increase the number of allowed residential units and reduce acreage for industrial uses. New land use designations are proposed to allow the establishment of technology centers and mixed-use commercial and residential villages. Modified industrial land use designations, are also included. In doing so, the update strives to enhance and create villages, activity centers and industrial/employment centers that are planned along major transportation corridors. Table 1 illustrates the changes to land use proposed under the CPU.

**TABLE 1  
OTAY MESA LAND USE DISTRIBUTION**

Land Use	Adopted Community Plan	CPU
Open Space	2,570 acres	2,862 acres
Residential	1,269 acres/12,400 du	766 acres/7,648 du
Commercial	452 acres	300 acres
Village Area		611 acres/11,126 du
Industrial	2,839 acres	2,513 acres
Institutional	1,027 acres	1,120 acres
Parks	64 acres	113 acres
Right-of-Way	1,098 acres	1,023 acres
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,319 acres/12,400 du</b>	<b>9,326 acres/18,774 du</b>

DU = dwelling units

Circulation changes associated with the proposed Mobility Element (i.e., roadway deletions, reclassifications, and alignment modifications) would involve primarily Siempre Viva Road, Beyer Boulevard, Otay Mesa Road, Old Otay Mesa Road, Airway Road, Heritage Road (north and south of SR-905), Cactus Road, Britannia Road, La Media Road, Otay Valley Road, and Lonestar Road.

Five districts interconnected through activities and infrastructure would help to organize and form the community of Otay Mesa. The districts include:

- Northwest District, which generally is comprised of the existing development in the northwestern portion of Otay Mesa and which comprises the seven Precise Planning Area neighborhoods: California Terraces, Dennery Ranch, Hidden Trails, Remington Hills, Riviera del Sol, Robinhood Ridge, and Santee Investments.
- Southwest District, which includes the area south of SR-905 and west of Spring Canyon. This district would be primarily residential in nature, with a core mixed-use center including civic and neighborhood-serving commercial uses and services.
- Central District, which generally is the land along the Airway corridor. The Central District would be comprised of three primary land uses: Central Village, Grand Park, and Education Complex.
- Airport District, which generally is Brown Field and industrial land surrounding the airport.
- South District, which includes the existing port of entry and the uses are intended to support the international business and trade uses that are necessary for the movement of goods across the border.



M:\JOBS2\3957-1\common\_gis\fig1\_2012.mxd 1/22/2013 sab





Otoy Mesa Community Plan Boundary

**FIGURE 1**  
Regional Location of  
Otoy Mesa Community Plan Area

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***





 Project Boundary

FIGURE 2  
Otay Mesa Project on USGS Map



***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***

**Figures 3A-3L are located in Attachment 1.**

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***



## 2.0 Setting

### 2.1 Physical Setting

The Otay Mesa community planning area occupies a large part of the Otay Mesa marine terrace. Otay Mesa begins approximately 5.5 miles east of the Pacific Ocean, rising rather sharply from an elevation about 60 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) in the Tijuana River and Otay River mouths, to an elevation around 500 feet AMSL on the mesa's west end. The Otay River Valley forms Otay Mesa's northern boundary. The Otay Valley's southern slopes are steep and heavily cut by small drainages, cutting into the northern edge of Otay Mesa and emptying into the Otay River. The natural southern boundary of Otay Mesa is the Tijuana River and its tributary, Cottonwood Creek, both of which extend south of the U.S.–Mexico border. The eastern end of Otay Mesa is Otay Mountain, the west end of the San Ysidro Mountains. Otay Mountain rises to a height of 3,566 feet AMSL.

Otay Mesa is one of a series of three marine terraces, the La Jolla Terrace, Linda Vista Terrace, and Poway Terrace, which stretch along the coastline of metropolitan San Diego. Otay Mesa is part of the Linda Vista Terrace, which occurs between the elevations of 300 feet and 500 feet AMSL. In most of the planning area the top layer of this terrace is composed of the Lindavista Formation. The Lindavista Formation consists of nearshore marine and non-marine deposits dating from the early Pleistocene, and is composed a cobble conglomerate with a generally reddish-brown coarse sand matrix (Gallegos et al. 1998; Pryde 1992).

At the eastern end of the planning area the Lindavista Formation is overlain by the Otay Formation. The Otay Formation is composed of alluvial fan and fluvial deposits divided into three types: a lower conglomerate, a middle gritstone, and an upper mudstone/sandstone. The upper mudstone/sandstone, the most common in the planning area, is composed of coarse-grained, light gray sandstone with angular to subrounded metavolcanic clasts. This lower layer grades to a light, fine- to medium-grained sandstone and then to fine sandy siltstone and mudstone (Gallegos et al. 1998; Pryde 1992).

These two formations sit atop the San Diego Formation. This late Pliocene formation consists of two units, an upper conglomerate layer and a lower sandstone layer. The upper conglomerate layer is composed of rock from gravel to boulder size imbedded in a yellowish dense, clayey to silty, variably grained sand matrix. This formation is exposed in the upper walls of the canyons along the Otay River and some of the canyons that extend onto the mesa itself (Gallegos et al. 1998; Geocon 2004; Pryde 1992).

The soils that occur in the Otay Mesa Community Plan area are in the Group IV Soil Association. These are soils that develop on marine terraces and coastal foothills, and are characterized as excessively to moderately well drained nearly level to steep loamy coarse sands to clay loams. The western end of Otay Mesa is composed of Huerhuero-Stockpen Association soils, which are moderately well drained loams to gravelly clay loams. These soils have a subsoil of clay or gravelly clay. The remaining soils are in the Redding-Olivenhain Association, characterized by well drained cobbly to gravelly loams with a gravelly clay subsoil over a hardpan (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1973).

Today fallow agricultural fields and non-native grasslands cover much of the undeveloped mesa top land around and east of Brown Field. Drainages, especially along the northern edge of Otay Mesa, support coastal sage scrub vegetation. West of the airport the mesa is dissected by numerous drainages supporting native plant communities. Coastal sage scrub and maritime succulent scrub dominate in these drainages and also on the undeveloped portions of the mesa top. Prior to European settlement Otay Mesa was covered with a combination of vernal pool/perennial grassland areas interspersed with coastal sage scrub and maritime succulent scrub communities. The south slopes of the Otay River Valley and the smaller drainages would have supported moderate to dense chamise chaparral communities that extended up onto the edges of the mesa. Riparian communities such as southern willow scrub and freshwater marsh would exist in the bottoms of the larger drainages such as Spring Canyon and Moody Canyon. The Otay River Valley would have supported extensive riparian communities including southern willow scrub, possibly southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest, and potentially patches of southern coast live oak riparian forest along the lower north-facing slopes (Gallegos et al. 1998; Pryde 1992).

Between approximately 7000 and 4000 years before the present (B.P.) the climate in San Diego County was slightly cooler and wetter than it is now. It is possible that during this period large populations of conifers grew on the coastal terraces, which would have included Otay Mesa (Robbins-Wade 1990).

Water sources in the planning area are intermittent, consisting of seasonally running streams and vernal pools. It is generally accepted that in prehistoric times drainages had more substantial flows and the water table was generally higher (Christensen 1989). These conditions may have resulted in water being available on the mesa for a longer percentage of the year than it is now. The Otay River, immediately to the north, would have been a more regular source of water in prehistoric times.

A variety of usable resources would have been available to prehistoric populations on Otay Mesa. The coastal sage scrub, chamise chaparral, and maritime succulent scrub communities contain many plants used by the ethnographic Kumeyaay population. Three plants in particular, manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* sp.), white sage (*Salvia apiana*), and elderberry (*Sambucus mexicana*), were used for a variety of purposes in ethnographic times. Uses for these plants included food, medicinal, ceremonial, and as a

source of wood. Animals available on the mesa would include jackrabbit, bush rabbit, cottontail rabbit, ground squirrel, woodrat, other small rodents, deer, and various small birds and reptiles.

Another resource available to prehistoric populations on Otay Mesa would be Santiago Peak Volcanics, a raw material for flaked stone tool production. This material occurs in cobble and block form throughout the Lindavista Formation and is easily obtainable as it erodes out of its matrix. Santiago Peak Volcanics also occur as bedrock outcrops on the sides of Otay Mountain.

## **2.2 Cultural Setting**

### **2.2.1 Prehistoric Background**

The most influential syntheses of the prehistory of southern California are those proposed by Wallace (1955, 1978) and Warren (1968, 1984; Warren and Crabtree 1986; Warren et al. 1993). They are interpretations and extrapolations from sparse and uneven research, and perhaps should be viewed as preliminary frameworks rather than solid concrete foundations. In general terms, these chronologies posit three or more periods: a Paleoindian, Archaic, and Late Prehistoric. The dates associated with these periods are approximate, and there seems to be considerable regional variation.

#### **2.2.1.1 Malpais Period (prior to 12,000 B.P.)**

A number of researchers posit a period that predates the PaleoAmerican period (e.g., Begole 1974; Childers 1980; Davis et al. 1980). This pre-PaleoAmerican period is now often called the Malpais period, a term that was adapted from the early work of Malcolm Rogers (1939), who used it to refer to what is now the first portion of the San Dieguito/Lake Mojave complex (see below). This posited complex is characterized by heavily patinated choppers, scrapers, and other crude, core-based tools typically found deeply embedded in desert pavements. Many researchers are skeptical of the existence of this period (see Schaefer 1994) and obtaining reliable dates has been elusive.

#### **2.2.1.2 PaleoAmerican Period (12,000 to 7,000 B.P.)**

The earliest well-documented sites in the San Diego area belong to the San Dieguito complex, thought to be something over 9,000 years old. Related materials have been found in the Mojave Desert and in the Great Basin, called the Lake Mojave Complex. The San Dieguito and Lake Mojave Complex is thought by most researchers to have an emphasis on big game hunting. The assemblage is dominated by finely made scraping and chopping tools of felsite or fine-grained basalt. Large-stemmed Lake Mojave and

Silver Lake types and leaf-shaped projectile points are relatively abundant while seed grinding technology was limited or absent (Warren 1984).

### **2.2.1.3 Archaic Period (7,000 to 1,500 B.P.)**

This period brings an apparent shift toward a more generalized economy and an increased emphasis on seed resources, small game, and shellfish. The local cultural manifestations of the Archaic Period are called the La Jollan Complex along the coast, and the Pauma Complex inland (True 1980). Pauma Complex sites lack the shell that dominates many La Jollan sites. Along with an economic focus on gathering plant resources, the settlement system appears to have been more sedentary. There appears to have been a shift away from the northern San Diego coast in the middle of the period. This is probably a response to the depletion of coastal resources and the siltation of lagoons. The La Jollan assemblage is dominated by rough, cobble-based choppers and scrapers, and slab and basin metates. Bedrock milling is absent. Projectile points are rare, but occasionally Elko series points are noted (Justice 2002).

## **2.2.2 Late Prehistoric Period (1,500 B.P. to 1769)**

The late prehistoric archaeology of the southern San Diego coast and foothills is characterized by the Cuyamaca Complex.

The Cuyamaca Complex is primarily known from the work of D. L. True at Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, some 30 miles northeast of Otay Mesa. True suggests that this Late Prehistoric Complex represents a continuous in situ development from the Archaic (La Jollan) to the ethnohistoric Kumeyaay (True 1970:53-54). This lack of a hiatus in the cultural sequence from La Jollan to the Kumeyaay and a similar situation in the Santa Barbara area (King 1981:327) leads True to suggest that the various millingstone cultures (i.e., Oak Grove, Topanga, and La Jollan) along the southern California coast may have been Hokan speakers and the direct ancestors of the Kumeyaay and Chumash. On the other hand, some researchers looking at origin myths and other ethnographic and archaeological evidence suggest that, during the early portion of the period, Yuman speakers, the ancestors of the Kumeyaay, entered southern San Diego County from the Colorado River area (Moriarty 1966, 1967).

The Cuyamaca complex is characterized by the presence of steatite arrowshaft straighteners, steatite pendants (some of these steatite items are incised with crosshatching), and steatite comales (heating stones, some of which are biconically drilled on one end). Ceramics appear for the first time in the form of Tizon Brownware pottery, ceramic figurines reminiscent of Hohokam styles, ceramic "Yuman bow pipes," ceramic rattles, and miniature pottery vessels. Stone artifacts include various cobble-based tools (e.g., scrapers, choppers, hammerstones), bone awls, manos and metates, and mortars and pestles. Projectile points consist of Desert Side-Notched and less

commonly Cottonwood Series projectile points (True 1966, 1970). These small points indicate the advent of the bow and arrow.

### **2.2.3 Ethnographic Background**

Otay Mesa is in the traditional territory of the Kumeyay (also known as Kamia, Ipai, Tipai, and Diegueño). At the time of the Spanish invasion, the Kumeyaay occupied the southern two-thirds of San Diego County. The Kumeyaay belong to the Hokan language family, which includes the lower Colorado River tribes (e.g., Quechan [Yuma], Mojave, Halchidhoma, Cocopa) and Arizona groups (e.g., Maricopa, Havasupai, Paipai) to whom they are closely related (Luomala 1978).

Traditional Kumeyay territory extended over the southern two-thirds of San Diego County, from Agua Hedionda (south of Carlsbad) south to some 20 miles below Ensenada, northern Baja California. On the west, their territory started at the Pacific Ocean and extended to the mountains of the Peninsular Range and into the desert just beyond (Cline 1984; Gifford 1931:1-2; Spier 1923:298). Kumeyaay territory included a number of ecological zones including rocky shore and sandy ocean beaches on the coast. As one moved east from the shore, there were grasslands, marshes, the coastal chaparral-covered Otay Mesa, oak groves, riparian woodlands, cypress woodland on Otay Mountain, and pine and cedar forest in the Laguna and Cuyamaca Mountains.

Subsistence for mountain and valley people focused on gathering plant foods. Acorns are thought to have been the most important dietary staple for the Kumeyaay (e.g., Luomala 1978:600; Spier 1923:334). Acorns became ripe in September and fell to the ground in October. They were stored until February, at which time they were dry enough to pound into meal in mortars. An intensive leaching process was required to remove the bitter tannic acid. Seeds from sages, grasses, and other plants were also dietary staples. They were ground into flour on metates. Agave (mescal) was an important food found along the arid eastern slopes of the Peninsular Range.

Hunting contributed to the diet in a minor way. It was focused on small game, primarily rabbits and rodents. These were taken with bow and arrow, throwing stick (macana), or nets. Hunting of large game was somewhat less important in the diet, with deer and bighorn sheep taken on occasion. Large game provided leather and sinew for clothing and crafts.

The most basic social and economic unit was the patrilocal extended family. Within the family, there was a basic division of labor based upon gender and age, but it was not rigid. Women made pottery, basketry, gathered plant resources, ground seeds and acorns, prepared meals, and so on. Men hunted, fished, helped collect and carry acorns and other heavy tasks, and made tools for the hunt. Old women were active in teaching and caring for children while younger women were busy with other tasks. Older men

were involved in politics, ceremonial life, teaching young men, and making nets, stone tools, and ceremonial paraphernalia (Bean and Shipek 1978:555).

Settlement system typically consisted of two or more seasonal villages with temporary camps radiating away from these central places. For example, the Kwaaymii Band which spent summers at Mount Laguna, migrated downslope to Vallecitos to spend the winter in the desert (Cline 1984).

Primary ethnographic sources on traditional Kumeyaay lifeways are provided in the ethnographic work of Cline (1984), Gifford (1918, 1931), Kroeber (1925), and Spier (1923).

## **2.2.4 History**

San Diego was first settled by the Spanish military, and Franciscan friars in A.D. 1769, when the Mission San Diego de Alcalá and Presidio de San Diego were founded. The major land use during the Spanish period (1769–1820) was cattle grazing. Missions were major population centers and mission cattle roamed freely over open range. The arrival of the Spanish substantially and pervasively stressed the social, political, and economic fabric of aboriginal culture (Shipek 1986). Missionary influence eroded traditional religious and ideological institutions, while Spanish development of coastal areas for crops and livestock severely impacted traditional subsistence practices (Shipek 1991). Disease, starvation, and a general institutional collapse caused emigration, birth rate declines, and high adult and infant mortality levels for the aboriginal groups all along the coastal strip of California (Hurtado 1988:23) and in San Diego County (Carrico 1987). During the Spanish period there were no family owned ranchos on Otay Mesa, the mesa being part of the Mission San Diego de Alcalá.

During the Mexican period (1820–1848), the missions were secularized and their vast land holdings were broken up into private land grants or ranchos. In 1829, Dona Magdalena Estudillo, was granted the 6,657-acre Rancho Otay (City of Chula Vista 1986). Rancho Otay, which included the Otay River Valley, was primarily a cattle ranch, but some horses were raised and crops were grown for use at the ranch. The practice of using open range for grazing cattle and sheep is typical of early San Diego County ranching and continued well into the American period (Pourade 1961).

After the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848 (beginning of the American period), the population in San Diego County more than tripled (Pourade 1963). By the late 1800s, development in the county was well under way with the beginnings of a recognizable downtown San Diego area and the gradual development of a number of outlying communities, many of which were established around previously defined ranchos and land grants. Otay Mesa developed slowly until the 1870s. In 1869 a stage route to Yuma was opened that ran across the mesa. Farming developed through the 1870s, and by 1879 most of the mesa was under intensive agriculture. Even though the area under

cultivation was large, only about a dozen families lived on the mesa. The most widely grown crops grown on the mesa were wheat, barley, corn, tomatoes, and beans. Water for crops and household use was obtained from nearby streams, wells, and catchment basins, and by the early 1900s an extensive system of dams had developed to store runoff water.

The late 1880s land boom in San Diego County affected Otay Mesa, in spite of its' relative distance from the town of San Diego. By 1887 there were 40 households on Otay Mesa, with a population of approximately 140 people (City of San Diego 2008).

Otay Mesa followed a particular rural community cultural pattern that developed in San Diego County from approximately 1870 to 1930. These communities were composed of an aggregate of people who lived within well-defined geographic boundaries, shared common bonds, and cooperated to solve common problems (Collett and Wade 1991). They lived, not in small towns or villages, but on farmsteads tied together through a common school district, church, post office, and country store (Hector and Van Wormer 1987). The Alta School District was started in 1886, and the Alta schoolhouse was constructed at that time (City of San Diego 2008). The schoolhouse, originally just east of Brown Field, was moved east to preserve it. By 1890 Otay also had a store, post office, blacksmith shop, and a Lutheran church. The population of Otay Mesa fluctuated over the early 1900s due to drought and, in the 1930s the Great Depression.

Aviation has also played a significant part in the history of Otay Mesa. In 1883 John J. Montgomery made the first flight in a fixed wing glider in the United States from a hill on Otay Mesa. Just before the United States entered World War I (WW I) in 1918, the fledgling Army Air Corps established an air field along Otay Mesa Road. The air field was established as an advanced training facility for pilots that had completed their basic training at the Army's Rockwell Field on North Island (City of San Diego 2008). After WW I the airfield was not actively used by the Army and switched to caretaker status. In the 1920s the Navy began to use the field as a practice landing field, and in 1928 they leased 320 acres for use as an auxiliary airfield attached to the Naval Air Station San Diego on North Island (City of San Diego 2008). In 1935 the airfield was officially transferred to Navy ownership. In 1940 and 1942, the Navy improved the facilities at the now named Naval Auxiliary Air Station Otay Mesa, and by 1943 three standard 2,000 foot long runways had been completed. The Air Station, renamed Brown Field in 1943, continued to grow during World War II with the addition of numerous new buildings and an enlarged main runway. After World War II Navy activity at the Air Station dropped dramatically and in 1946 the Navy leased Brown Field to the City of San Diego.

Ranching and farming continued to be the main occupation of residents in and around the project area through most of the twentieth century. Over the past decades, large tracts of this formerly open land have been developed for light industrial, and more recently, residential projects. The result has been a dramatic change of the region from a sparsely populated rural area to expansive suburb.

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***



### 3.0 Previously Completed Historical Resource Work

Otay Mesa has been subjected to numerous historical resource evaluations from surveys through data recovery programs in the past 30 plus years. The entire Otay Mesa Community Plan area has been surveyed at least once, beginning in 1983, when the County of San Diego surveyed the area for the original community plan. Much of the project area has been surveyed two or more times, as a result of numerous proposed projects with different, often overlapping boundaries. The South Coastal Information Center lists 249 reports for surveys and mitigation projects within the project area.

Mary Robbins-Wade (1990), who has conducted one of the most comprehensive comparative works for Otay Mesa to date, reports that there are nearly 200 archaeological sites in the Otay region. Gallegos & Associates produced the Otay Mesa Management Plan for Prehistoric Resources (Gallegos et al. 1998) in which they report that over 50 percent of their study area (12,576 hectares) had been surveyed. A total of 365 prehistoric sites had been recorded at that time. Both of these study areas encompassed the entire mesa east to Otay Mountain, a larger area than the community plan area. The record search completed for this community plan shows there are 263 previously recorded historical resources in the study area (Confidential Attachments 1 and 2).

The recording of these sites largely resulted from historical resources surveys required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Although a wide range of definitions and descriptions of prehistoric sites occurs on the site record forms, they can be grouped into a few basic categories of sites following the site typology of the Otay Mesa prehistoric resources management plan for (Gallegos et al. 1998).

**Habitation:** A habitation site contains a variety of artifacts that may include flaked lithics, ground stone, ceramics, and faunal material, and possibly bedrock milling in a late prehistoric site. The presence of some or all of these artifact types, and possibly features, suggests that more than one activity occurred at the site. Habitation sites contain a midden deposit indicating either repeated seasonal or semi-permanent occupation. This site type is sometimes referred to as a village site.

**Temporary Camp:** A temporary camp site is similar to a habitation site in that it has a variety of artifact types indicating more than one activity occurred at the site. However, it is different from a habitation site since it has little or no midden, a less complex assemblage, and fewer artifacts overall. These attributes indicate that the site was occupied for a short period of time. The Otay Mesa prehistoric resources management plan suggests that temporary camps exist on a continuum of assemblage complexity and site density with artifact scatters and lithic scatters. In their review, they are

reluctant to distinguish among these site types because of the uneven quantity and quality of previous research. A site, of any type, must have more than three lithic items within a 10x10-meter area or a 0.03 density ratio (cultural items/10-meter area) (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-29).

**Artifact scatters:** Artifact scatters are defined as a surface scatter of two or more artifact types, such as flaked lithic, tools, ground stone, and ceramics, with no subsurface deposit. Faunal material such as bone and shell can also occur on this type of site. An artifact scatter may represent a stopping place on a journey, an area where a task was completed, or a special purpose site. An artifact scatter must have three cultural items (artifacts or ecofacts) within a 10x10-meter area or a 0.03 density ratio (cultural items/10-meter area) (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-29).

**Lithic Scatter:** A scatter of debitage, cores, bifaces, and other flake- and core-based tools that is temporally non-diagnostic. A lithic scatter must have three lithic items within a 10x10-meter area or a 0.03 density ratio (lithics/10 meter area) (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-29). Lithic scatters with a lower density ratio are considered noise and not recorded under the Otay Mesa prehistoric resources management plan (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-10, 3-45).

**Lithic Reduction Concentration:** Generally, a lithic reduction concentration is a dense concentration of debitage and cores within a localized area (e.g., four square meters). These are small one-episode sites or loci, and although tools may be present, the majority of the material probably came from only one or two cores.

**Bedrock Milling:** These are features located on large boulders or bedrock outcrops that contain one or more milling features, such as mortars, basin metates, or milling slicks. Bedrock milling sites are specific task sites. In some cases surface and/or subsurface deposit of artifacts may be present around the bedrock. Bedrock milling features can occur as part of habitation or temporary camp sites.

**Shell Concentration/Shell Midden:** A shell concentration may or may not have a subsurface deposit. If testing identifies a subsurface deposit and ground stone implements are present, then the site may be a temporary camp or habitation site, depending on the complexity of the assemblage. A shell midden site without a complex assemblage or extensive milling equipment represents a place where intensive processing of shellfish resources was the main activity.

**Quarry:** This is a place where the principal activity consisted of procuring raw lithic material for tools. Quarry sites may be extensive and involve actual mining of lithic outcrops for tool stone material. This is what the Otay Mesa Management Plan for Prehistoric Resources refers to as true quarries (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-10). Quarry sites do not usually contain a complex artifact assemblage such as that associated with

habitation sites, e.g., pottery, bedrock milling, tools, or faunal material, although an occasional formal artifact or ecofact may be noted.

**Non-sites:** In contrast to true quarries, there are extensive areas where cobbles available on the ground surface were tested for suitability as tool stone (Wilke and Schroth 1989). This might be thought of as a series of highly dispersed quarries or quasi-quarries. On Otay Mesa, this dispersed lithic sampling activity has resulted thousands of acres of very sparse scatters of waste flakes and cobbles with few flake removals (limited-use cores). The Otay Mesa prehistoric resources management plan argues that these quasi-quarry areas are non-sites and should be ignored as archaeological noise. These non-sites are characterized by a lack of a subsurface deposit and less than three lithic items within a 10x10 meter area (i.e., a 0.03 density ratio or 3 lithics/10-meter area) (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-10, 3-45).

**Isolates:** The Otay Mesa Management Plan for Prehistoric Resources suggests that isolated flakes and limited-use cores are considered noise or non-sites and not recorded (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-10, 3-45). Isolated tools and tool clusters that do not meet the threshold for another site type (three cultural items within a 10x10-meter area) are recorded as isolated finds (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-29). In the Otay Mesa area some isolates have been given state of California site numbers.

**Research Models:** The Otay Mesa area was brought into the land development process relatively late, when compared with many other areas of the county. Generally speaking, the study area maintained a rural appearance through the middle 1970s. By the time that land development for the region began in earnest, environmental policies were in place, which required assessment of historical resources for development proposals. As a result, there are numerous historical resource survey reports which in combination cover Otay Mesa.

While the large regional archival base for Otay Mesa is somewhat unusual, there are inherent limitations, which have been created by the circumstances surrounding these studies. The work of collecting the information pertaining to the general region encompasses nearly 20 years of effort by many individuals with different research orientations and methodological idiosyncrasies. The combined effect is a data set, which is not necessarily internally comparable because of the differing methods of data collection and analysis. There are vast differences in lithic and site type definitions, which have resulted in different descriptive views regarding site categorization.

In spite of the above-mentioned limitations, a general prehistoric settlement/resource pattern for Otay Mesa is discernible. As mentioned above, the work of Robbins-Wade (1990) and Gallegos et al. (1998) provide reliable summary information.

The model of site types used by Robbins-Wade is based on a system introduced by Binford (1980). Briefly, the identification of site types within this system is based on

interpretations of archaeologically recognizable remains, which are used to infer the activities that were undertaken by site occupants. In this model the creation of sites is tied with the strategies of food and utilitarian product acquisition practiced by a culture group.

Robbins-Wade (1990) looked at the site record forms and formed a different set of site types than the ones used above. She categorized the sites into three principle types for the forager/gatherer subsistence mode, which was practiced prehistorically in the study region. These are residential base, field camp, and location. Locations are defined by the remnants of specific activities associated with processing or extractive tasks. A “kill site” or a shell midden would be considered examples of the location site type. The range of artifacts at the location is predicted to be associated with specific task events. There would be a limited amount and diversity of domestic refuse at these sites and the placement of a location site is predicted to be associated with a situation that is favorable to the planned activity or to be associated with resources that are needed for the activity or task.

Field camps and residential bases are predicted to be more elaborate than locations in their archaeological manifestations. A field camp is a temporary working and living area created by gathering groups while they are away from their residential base. While field camps may show some similarities with the previously mentioned locations, they are distinctive because of a significantly higher percentage of domestic debris as well as by an artifact assemblage that is more diverse. It is also proposed that field camps would exhibit preserved features such as hearths.

Residential bases represent the most elaborate of the site types in this model. These sites are seen as the settlement hub of both forager and gatherer settlement systems. These are sites that are predicted to produce the most diverse artifact and ecofact collections and to be settlements where a larger number and diversity of features are expected. Additionally, the location of residential bases is generally close to other sites and near necessary resources.

Of the 164 sites in her Otay study population, Robbins-Wade identified 12 residential bases, 21 field camps, and the remainder (131) classified as locations. These sites are believed to represent the Early Period or events occurring at least 1,500 years or more before the present. However, it is important to note that only 13 of the sites in the Robbins-Wade study have radiocarbon dates. This highlights the fact that the temporal sequence for this region is based on general temporal inferences rather than on verified absolute or even relative dating techniques.

The Otay Mesa management plan for prehistoric resources was developed as an outgrowth of negotiations between Caltrans and the Office of Historic Preservation to provide consistent site definitions and a management strategy for the kinds of resources present on Otay Mesa. This plan begins with a discussion of recorded site types using

information drawn from site record forms. Habitation sites, temporary camps, lithic scatters, quarry, shell middens, and non-sites are resource types defined for the baseline study area. The types of sites in the management planning area were stratified based on geologic and landform information.

After the initial discussion of recorded site types on the mesa, Gallegos et al. (1998) combine a few of the types and determined that three site types dominate Otay Mesa: habitation sites, artifact scatters/temporary camps, and lithic scatters. The site types defined above for the current study are derived from the work of Gallegos et al. (1998)

**Habitation site:** Gallegos identified 14 loci from nine suites as falling within this category. Sites were placed in this category if they had a subsurface artifact density of 100 artifacts per square meter or greater. Of the 14 identified habitation sites, eight had been destroyed, one had been preserved, four were intact, and one was partially intact. Four of the habitation sites had features (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-29). Most of the sites had chert, obsidian, or chalcedony, most contained ground stone implements, and almost all had shell in sufficient quantity for conducting radiocarbon dating.

**Temporary camp/artifact scatter:** Gallegos documented eleven temporary camps/artifact scatters. This category was based on surface artifact density, and/or the presence of a substantial amount of faunal material combined with a lack of a subsurface component, (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-29). These sites represent short-term habitation periods, not of sufficient duration for a substantial midden to develop. Of the eleven sites in this category, nine had been destroyed, one was intact, and one was partially intact. No features were found at any of the sites in this category.

**Non-sites:** Seventy-two sites on Otay Mesa fell into this category. Non-sites are defined by a lack of a substantial subsurface deposit and a surface artifact density of less than 0.03 artifacts per square meter (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-45). They noted that some 5,057,397 square meters of what they categorized as non-site had been recorded in their study area. These non-site or quasi-quarry areas contained some 5,824 artifacts of which some 68 percent or 3,947 were waste flakes. A total of 1,859 tools were also noted. The total artifact density was 0.0009 artifacts/square meter, or 1 artifact/3,000 meters (Gallegos et al. 1998:3-45). Gallegos felt that some of the sites in this category could be redefined as activity area or temporary camps with additional effort.

Gallegos et al. suggest that much of the effort to date on Otay Mesa has been wasted on these sparse lithic scatters, which have little or no research potential. This is made worse because they have been recorded and/or tested one small piece at a time as each parcel is developed. Research on these low density lithic scatters wastes precious research resources and has yielded virtually no meaningful insights into prehistory. They assert that these low density lithic scatters should be treated as archaeological noise and not recorded in future research, because they get in the way of more productive research. Work in the future should be concentrated on the few habitation

sites that remain, since they would provide information to answer research questions concerning settlement patterns, chronology, lithic technology, trade, and diet.

Both Robbins-Wade and Gallegos et al. discussed settlement patterns on Otay Mesa. In both analyses the most complex sites, residential bases for Robbins-Wade and habitation sites for Gallegos, were almost always found at canyon heads and rims, canyon benches, or in canyon floors. These areas are often the intersection of two or more biotic communities and in close proximity to a water source. Since different biotic communities would have different types of resources to exploit, situating habitation sites at the intersection of communities would increase resources while keeping effort to obtain the resources as low as possible.

This pattern also held true for the second type of sites in both studies (field camps for Robbins-Wade and temporary camps/artifact scatters for Gallegos). The preference to optimize the types of resources available played a factor in even these smaller areas of short-term usage. There were a few of these sites in the flat mesa tops, away from canyon rims. These sites could have been situated in particular areas to exploit specific resources in a single biotic community.

The third type of site in Robbins-Wade was labeled locations. She found this site type situated across the Otay Mesa area. These sites occurred on the mesa top, canyon slopes, and canyon rims. Even in the case of these sites, Robbins-Wade found over half of the locations in her study were located on canyon rims or the juncture of the mesa and the eastern foothills. Gallegos et al. found what they referred to as non-sites on the mesa. Some of these might fall into the category of locations in the Robbins-Wade recording scheme.

## 4.0 Results

A record search was conducted in May 2011 at the South Coastal Information Center, the San Diego County office of the California Historical Resources Information System. There are 262 prehistoric and historic sites/structures recorded within the Otay Mesa Community Plan boundaries (Table 2). In the case of sites with multiple loci each locus is counted separately. The vast majority of these sites have been given a trinomial designation and a primary number by the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC). Isolated artifacts and some structures are given only a primary number. Included in the 262 sites in this evaluation are 25 sites with primary numbers. These P-number sites are either buildings associated with the Navy development and occupation of Brown Field, farmstead locations without existing structures, or road segments. Both trinomial designated and primary number designated sites are types of historical resources that could potentially be determined to be a significant historical resource under CEQA or City of San Diego guidelines. This would mean that project generated impacts to these resources would be a significant impact under CEQA and the City of San Diego.

In addition to the 262 prehistoric and historic sites/structures discussed, there are 56 isolates with a P-number and 12 with trinomial numbers filed at SCIC. These isolates consist of one or two prehistoric artifacts. These isolates are not considered significant historical resources under City of San Diego or CEQA criteria and are not included in the discussion of potential impacts.

Seven of the recorded structures/sites within the CPU have been designated as Historical Landmarks by the San Diego Historical Resources Board (HRB). Five of these are the five buildings that comprise P-37-018246, the proposed Auxiliary Naval Air Station Brown Field Historic District (The tower and four nose-end hangars). These have the HRB Numbers 405-409 (Facility 10, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005). P-37-018246 is also on the NRHR. The sixth structure is P-37-018256, the Auxiliary Naval Air Station Brown Field latrine (Facility 2044). It has been given the HRB Number 410. The last site, with the HRB Number 411, is the Alta School site, CA-SDI-10628. Although CA-SDI-10628 is within the Auxiliary Naval Air Station Brown Field boundary, it predates the navy facility. CA-SDI-10628 was tested in 1996 by Gallegos and Associates and contained both a historic and prehistoric component.

Of the 262 recorded prehistoric and historic sites/structures within the CPU, 136 have been partially or completely destroyed by development. Of these 136 sites, 83 have been completely destroyed and 53 have been impacted to some extent. A total of 126 known sites remaining within the CPU have not been impacted by development..

**TABLE 2  
RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-013724		Historic, Japanese farm workers building complex		Not significant	Yes	
P-37-015980		Historic	Location based on 1903 USGS for homestead in junkyard now	Undetermined	Partial	Yes
P-37-015981		Historic	Location based on 1903 USGS possible Piper farmstead and 1928, now junkyard	Undetermined	Partial	Yes
P-37-015982		Historic	Location based on 1903/1928 aerial, between runways in Brown field	Undetermined	No	Yes
P-37-015983		Historic	Location based on 1903 USGS possible Lampe farmstead, developed	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-015987		Historic	Location of homestead based on 1903 and 1928 USGS, developed	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-015988		Historic	Location of church and cemetery, church demolished, possible unmoved graves. South end destroyed, most in agriculture	Undetermined	Partial	Yes
P-37-018246		Historic	Auxiliary NAS Brown Field Historic District 5 building, all still standing	NRHP 35,eligible	No	
P-37-018247		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018248		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 2 buildings, both demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018249		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 2 buildings, 1 demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Partial	Yes
P-37-018250		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 2 buildings, both demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	



**TABLE 2  
RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA  
(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-018251		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 1 building, still standing	Not eligible for NRHP	No	Yes
P-37-018252		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 1 building, demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018253		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 1 building, demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018254		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 1 building, demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018255		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 2 buildings, both demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018256		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 1 building, demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018257		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 1 building, demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018258		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 1 building, still standing	Not eligible for NRHP	No	Yes
P-37-018259		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 1 building, demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018260		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion, 1 building, demolished	Not eligible for NRHP	Demolished	
P-37-018261		Historic	Other auxiliary NAS Brown Field WW II era buildings not eligible for inclusion1 building, still standing	Not eligible for NRHP	no	Yes

**TABLE 2**  
**RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**  
**(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-031491		Historic	Historic Otay Mesa Road, portions still remain	Undetermined	Partial	Yes
P-37-031954		Historic	WW II era runway and taxiway, portions within current Brown field disturbed but visible	Not significant	Partial	Yes
P-37-001077	CA-SDI-1077	Isolate	destroyed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-006699	CA-SDI-6699	Lithic Scatter	Tested and mitigated late 1980s, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941A	Artifact Scatter	Mitigated for Cal Terraces1987 development	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941B	Artifact Scatter	Mitigated for Cal Terraces1987 development	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941C	Artifact Scatter	Mitigated for Cal Terraces1987 development	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941D	Habitation	Mitigated for Cal-Terraces1987 development, part in vernal pool preserve	Mitigated	Partial	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941E	Artifact Scatter	Mitigated for Cal Terraces1987 development	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941F	Habitation	Mitigated 1995 for Otay Mesa Rd widening, part of site developed	Mitigated	partial	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941G	Artifact Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941H	Artifact Scatter	Tested in 1996 for Otay Mesa Rd widening	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941I	Artifact Scatter	Tested in 1996 for Otay Mesa Rd widening	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941J	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941K	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941L	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	Yes
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941M	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941N	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941O	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941P	Artifact Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941Q	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	Yes

**TABLE 2**  
**RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**  
**(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941R	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941S	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941T	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	Yes
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941U	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941V	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941W	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-006941	CA-SDI-6941X	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-007208	CA-SDI-7208	Lithic Scatter	Portions mitigated for various projects 1988, 1997. Combined with CA-SDI-7857, -10245, -10734, -11424, -14082, and -10963. Much developed, some small portions undeveloped	Undeveloped portions undetermined	Partial	Yes
P-37-007604	CA-SDI-7604	Temp Camp	Mitigated 1987, 1997 developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-007857	CA-SDI-7857	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1993 mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-007983	CA-SDI-7983/7984	Lithic Scatter/ Processing	Tested 1987 mitigated, most developed, north end undeveloped	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-007985	CA-SDI-7985	Lithic Scatter	No record of test or mitigation, developed	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-008083	CA-SDI-8083	Lithic Scatter	Mitigation date not known, area developed	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-008640	CA-SDI-8640	Artifact Scatter	Tested 1987, 1988, mitigated, undeveloped	Mitigated	No	Yes
P-37-008641	CA-SDI-8641	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1988 mitigated, undeveloped	Mitigated	No	Yes
P-37-008642	CA-SDI-8642	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1988, mitigated, undeveloped	Mitigated	No	Yes
P-37-008643	CA-SDI-8643	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1988, mitigated, undeveloped	Mitigated	No	Yes
P-37-008644	CA-SDI-8644	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1988, mitigated, undeveloped	Mitigated	No	Yes
P-37-008645	CA-SDI-8645	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1988, mitigated, undeveloped	Mitigated	No	Yes
P-37-008750	CA-SDI-8750	Lithic Scatter	No record of testing, currently undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-008751	CA-SDI-8751	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, currently undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-008752	CA-SDI-8752	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, currently undeveloped	Undetermined	No	

**TABLE 2**  
**RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**  
**(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-008753	CA-SDI-8753	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, currently undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-009098	CA-SDI-9098	Habitation	Data recovery 1983, developed	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-009099	CA-SDI-9099	Artifact Scatter	No recorded work, area developed	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-009100	CA-SDI-9100	Lithic Scatter/Historic	No testing recorded, currently undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-009541	CA-SDI-9541	Temporary camp	No recorded work, currently undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-009974	CA-SDI-9974	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, combined with CA-SDI-12337	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010055	CA-SDI-10055	Lithic Scatter	Destroyed by residential complex per 2010 site form	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-010056	CA-SDI-10056	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1990 mitigated, area developed	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-010057	CA-SDI-10057	Lithic Scatter	Not relocated 1999, area developed	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-010058	CA-SDI-10058a	Village/Base Camp	Tested 1990 developed	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-010058	CA-SDI-10058b	Village/Base Camp	Tested 1990 developed	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-010058	CA-SDI-10058c	Village/Base Camp	Tested 1990 developed	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-010059	CA-SDI-10059	Lithic Scatter	Partially destroyed	Unknown	Partial	
P-37-010060	CA-SDI-10060	Lithic Scatter/Historic Features	Tested/Mitigated 1992, East half Developed	Unknown	Partial	
P-37-010072	CA-SDI-10072	No description	Combined w/other sites new #CA-SDI-12337, area developed	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-010081	CA-SDI-10081		No information no original site form	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-010185	CA-SDI-10185	Habitation	Mitigated 1987,1988 developed	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-010186	CA-SDI-10186	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Mitigated 1987,1989 part in MSCP preserve, mostly destroyed by highway construction per 2011 site form	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-010187	CA-SDI-10187	Temporary Camp	Tested mitigated 1997, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010188	CA-SDI-10188	Temporary Camp	Tested 1990-Junkyard & road widening heavily impacted	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-010189	CA-SDI-10189	Temporary Camp/ Special processes	Tested 1987 -area developed, mitigated	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-010190	CA-SDI-10190	Temporary Camp/ Special processes	Tested 1987 -area developed, mitigated	Mitigated	Yes	

**TABLE 2  
RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA  
(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-010191	CA-SDI-10191	Sparse Lithic Scatter/ Plant Processing	Tested 1987 –south half destroyed, northern half still exists	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-010192	CA-SDI-10192	Sparse Lithic Scatter/ Processing	Tested 1987-mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010193	CA-SDI-10193	Sparse Lithic Scatter/ Processing	Tested 1987 most now in biological preserve, some impacts	Not significant	No	
P-37-010194	CA-SDI-10194	Sparse Lithic Scatter/ Processing	Tested 1987 mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010195	CA-SDI-10195	Sparse Lithic Scatter/ Processing	Tested 1987 mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010196	CA-SDI-10196	Temp. Camp	Tested in 1986 per 2011 site form, in Dennery Preserve area, heavily disturbed	Unknown	Partial	
P-37-010197	CA-SDI-10197	Temp. Camp	Tested 1987 mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010198	CA-SDI-10198	Base Camp	Tested 1987, mitigated, most now in Dennery Preserve, some impacts	Not significant	Partial, VP	
P-37-010199	CA-SDI-10199	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, developed	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-010200	CA-SDI-10200	Lithic Scatter/ Processing	Tested 1987, mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010201	CA-SDI-10201	Temp. Camp	Not tested, area currently in MHPA open space in Dennery Preserve.	Unknown	No	
P-37-010202	CA-SDI-10202	Sparse Lithic Scatter/ Processing	Tested 1987, mitigated, part developed, part in revegetation area	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-010203	CA-SDI-10203	Processing Site	Tested 1987 mitigated area developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010204	CA-SDI-10204	Artifact Scatter/no form	Tested in 1987, mitigated, in open space preserve	Not significant	No	
P-37-010205	CA-SDI-10205	Sparse Lithic Scatter/ Processing	Tested 1987 mitigated in MHPA, open space preserve	Mitigated	No	
P-37-010206	CA-SDI-10206	Lithic Scatter (Gallegos)	Currently undeveloped	Unknown	No	Yes
P-37-010207	CA-SDI-10207	Lithic Scatter (Gallegos)	Currently undeveloped	Unknown	No	
P-37-010208	CA-SDI-10208	Quarry/Workshop	Tested 1987 mitigated, most in undeveloped area, east end developed	Not significant	Partial	

**TABLE 2**  
**RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**  
**(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-010209	CA-SDI-10209	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Not relocated 1999, area tested nothing found, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010210	CA-SDI-10210	Temp Camp	Tested 1990/1999 mitigated in MHPA open space; not relocated in 2010	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-010245	CA-SDI-10245	Lithic Scatter	Tested mitigated for SR-905, 90% of site developed	Mitigated	Partial	
P-37-010285	CA-SDI-10285	Lithic Scatter	Work unknown in MHPA, open space, some impacts	Unknown	No	
P-37-010286	CA-SDI-10286	Sparse Lithic Scatter/ Processing	Tested 1987 mitigated, undeveloped	Undetermined	Partial, VP	
P-37-010511	CA-SDI-10511	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1994 mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010512	CA-SDI-10512	Lithic Scatter	Undeveloped area, no known testing	Undetermined	No	
P-37-010513	CA-SDI-10513	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Currently undeveloped area, no known testing	Undetermined	No	
P-37-010514	CA-SDI-10514	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP Consulting, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-010515	CA-SDI-10515	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Currently undeveloped area, no known testing	Undetermined	No	
P-37-010516	CA-SDI-10516	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP Consulting, undeveloped	Not significant	No	
P-37-010517	CA-SDI-10517	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Currently undeveloped, no known testing	Undetermined	No	
P-37-010518	CA-SDI-10518	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Currently undeveloped, no known testing	Undetermined	No	
P-37-010519	CA-SDI-10519	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Currently undeveloped, no known testing	Undetermined	No	
P-37-010520	CA-SDI-10520	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Currently undeveloped, no known testing	Undetermined	No	
P-37-010521	CA-SDI-10521	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Currently undeveloped, no known testing	Undetermined	No	
P-37-010522	CA-SDI-10522	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested in 1990 by ASM Affiliates, mitigated, undeveloped	Mitigated	No	Yes
P-37-010523	CA-SDI-10523	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Currently undeveloped, no known testing	Undetermined	No	Yes
P-37-010524	CA-SDI-10524	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP Consulting, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-010525	CA-SDI-10525	Sparse lithic scatter	Tested 1994, mitigated, site developed	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-010526	CA-SDI-10526	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1994 mitigated, site developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010527	CA-SDI-10527	Sparse lithic scatter	Tested 1994, mitigated, undeveloped	Not significant	No	

**TABLE 2  
RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA  
(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-010608	CA-SDI-10608	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1995 area not yet mitigated, in Brown Field	Not significant	Partial, Brown Field	
P-37-010616	CA-SDI-10616a	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1986, mitigated, undeveloped	Not significant	No	
	CA-SDI-10616b	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1986, mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010617	CA-SDI-10617	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1986 mitigated, area not developed	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-010618	CA-SDI-10618	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1986, area developed. Mitigated	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010619	CA-SDI-10619	Habitation Area	Data recovery 1987, undeveloped	Significant	No	
P-37-010620	CA-SDI-10620a	Habitation Area	Tested 1986 in open space	Significant	No	
P-37-010620	CA-SDI-10620b	Quarry	Tested 1986 in open space	Significant	No	
P-37-010621	CA-SDI-10621a	Workshop/Habitation	Data recovery 1987 mitigated, area developed	Significant	Yes	
	CA-SDI-10621b	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Collected 1987 mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
	CA-SDI-10621c	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Collected 1987 mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
	CA-SDI-10621d	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Collected 1987 mitigated	Not significant	Partial, VP	
	CA-SDI-10621e	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Collected 1987 mitigated	Not significant	Partial, VP	
	CA-SDI-10621r	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Collected 1987 mitigated, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010622	CA-SDI-10622	Lithic Scatter	Currently undeveloped area, no known testing	Not significant	No	
P-37-010623	CA-SDI-10623	Temporary Camp	Southern half developed, north undeveloped, no testing recorded	Undetermined	Partial	
P-37-010628	CA-SDI-10628/H	Historic site of Alta School	CA-SDI-10608 combined w/ this site, tested 1995, not developed	Undetermined	Partial, Brown Field	
P-37-010649	CA-SDI-10649	Lithic Scatter	No record of testing currently in MHPA open space	Not determined	No	
P-37-010650	CA-SDI-10650	Lithic Scatter	No record of testing currently in MHPA open space		No	
P-37-010734	CA-SDI-10734	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested mitigated for SR-905, not developed	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-010735	CA-SDI-10735A	Lithic Scatter/ Processing	No record of testing, combined into CA-SDI-12337, developed	Undetermined	Yes	
	CA-SDI-10735B	Lithic Scatter/ Processing	No record of testing, currently undeveloped, combined into CA-SDI-12337	Undetermined	Yes	

**TABLE 2**  
**RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**  
**(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
	CA-SDI-10735C	Lithic Scatter/ Processing	No record of testing, combined into CA-SDI-12337, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	Yes
P-37-010738	CA-SDI-10738	Lithic Scatter	No record of testing, destroyed by housing	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-010739	CA-SDI-10739	Temporary Camp	No record of test or mitigation., east half developed, west half undeveloped	Unknown	Partial	
P-37-010748	CA-SDI-10748	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1987, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-010783	CA-SDI-10783	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 1987, portion inside CPU developed, large portion outside CPU destroyed.		Yes	
P-37-010800	CA-SDI-10800	Habitation Site	Tested in past, data recovery, mitigation necessary, undeveloped	Significant	No	
P-37-010801	CA-SDI-10801	Habitation Site	Tested in 1987, data recovery, mitigation necessary, undeveloped	Significant	No	
P-37-010802	CA-SDI-10802	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1987, data recovery, currently not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-010803	CA-SDI-10803	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1987, data recovery, currently not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-010804	CA-SDI-10804	Habitation Site	Tested 1987, needs data recovery, mitigation, not developed	Significant	No	
P-37-010805	CA-SDI-10805	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1987, mitigated, currently not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-010806	CA-SDI-10806	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1987, mitigated, currently not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-010807	CA-SDI-10807	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1987, mitigated, currently not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-010808	CA-SDI-10808	Habitation Site	Tested 1987, needs data recovery, currently not dev. But heavy ORV impacts	Significant	No	
P-37-010809	CA-SDI-10809	Habitation Site	Tested 1987, needs data recovery, part destroyed by road.	Significant	Partial	
P-37-010810	CA-SDI-10810	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP Consulting, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes



**TABLE 2**  
**RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**  
**(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-010811	CA-SDI-10811	Habitation Site	Tested 1987, data recovery, mitigation, undeveloped	Significant	No	
P-37-010963	CA-SDI-10963	Sparse Lithic Scatter and historic	Tested in 1988, 2003, 2004, 2005; no determination, developed	Western part, including building - not significant	Yes	
P-37-011049	CA-SDI-11049	Two metates	Nothing known	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-011065	CA-SDI-11065	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1986 mitigated developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-011079	CA-SDI-11079	Habitation	Gallegos says needs mitigation, tested 1994 no indication of mitigation, developed	Significant	Yes	
P-37-011080	CA-SDI-11080	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 1988 by Westec, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-011210	CA-SDI-11210	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1989 mitigated not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-011211	CA-SDI-11211	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1989 mitigated west end developed	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-011212	CA-SDI-11212	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1989,1992,1999, mitigated, not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-011213	CA-SDI-11213	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1989,1992,1999, mitigated, not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-011214	CA-SDI-11214	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1989,1992, mitigated, not developed	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-011215	CA-SDI-11215	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1989,1992, mitigated, not developed; combined with CA-SDI-11216	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-011216	CA-SDI-11216	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1989,1992, mitigated, not developed; combined with CA-SDI-11215	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-011217	CA-SDI-11217	Lithic Scatter/ Historic Features	Tested in 1989,1992, and 2005, not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-011218	CA-SDI-11218	Lithic Scatter/ Historic Features	Tested in 1989,1992, and 2005, not developed	Not significant	No	
P-37-011219	CA-SDI-11219/H	Lithic Scatter/ Historic Features	Tested in 1989,1992, and 2005, not developed	Not significant	No	

**TABLE 2**  
**RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**  
**(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-011220	CA-SDI-11220	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1989,1992,2002, mitigated, in vernal pool mitigation area, some impacts	Not significant	Partial, VP	
P-37-011221	CA-SDI-11221	Historic	Tested 1989 by Smith, not developed	Undetermined	No	
P-37-011363	CA-SDI-11363	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1989,1992,2002, mitigated, east undeveloped, west in vernal pool mitigation area, some associated impacts	Not significant	Partial, VP	
P-37-011367	CA-SDI-11367/ 11368	Sparse lithic scatter	Tested, west undeveloped, east end developed, north half outside CPU	Not significant	Partial	Yes
P-37-011423	CA-SDI-11423	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1997 mitigated, north half destroyed, south half undeveloped	Not significant	Partial	Yes
P-37-011424	CA-SDI-11424	Habitation	Tested 1997 data recovery, part developed for SR 905, part still undeveloped.	Significant	Partial	Yes
P-37-011672	CA-SDI-11672	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, not developed, in Brown Field old runway, disturbed	Undetermined	Partial, Brown Field	
P-37-011673	CA-SDI-11673	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1991 not known if mitigated, not developed	Undetermined	Partial, Brown Field	Yes
P-37-011674	CA-SDI-11674/H	Temp Camp/Historic (WWII bunkers)	Combined with CA-SDI-12229H, Tested in 1996 by Ogden, CA-SDI-111674 developed, CA-SDI-12229 undeveloped	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-011680	CA-SDI-11680	Lithic Scatter	No testing or other work recorded, not developed, heavy ORV activity	Undetermined	No	
P-37-011821	CA-SDI-11821/H	Piper Ranch Complex	Tested in 1995 by Gallegos and Associates; developed	Mitigated	Yes	
P-37-011822	CA-SDI-11822	Artifact Scatter	Tested 1990 not known if mitigated, graded no houses	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-011944	CA-SDI-11944	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1990 mitigated in open space, undeveloped	Not significant	No	
P-37-011951	CA-SDI-11951	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1990,1992,1999 mitigated, west end developed, most undeveloped	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-011969	CA-SDI-11969	Quarry	Tested 1990 mitigated in open space, undeveloped	Not significant	No	

**TABLE 2**  
**RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**  
**(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-012229	CA-SDI-12229H	Artifact Scatter/ Historic	No testing recorded. SDI-12229, undeveloped area	Undetermined	Partial	Yes
P-37-012257	CA-SDI-12257	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded developed	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-012258	CA-SDI-12258	Sparse Lithic Shatter	No testing recorded south part destroyed by border road	Undetermined	Partial	Yes
P-37-012259	CA-SDI-12259	Sparse Lithic Shatter	No testing recorded, not developed	Undetermined	Partial	Yes
P-37-012273	CA-SDI-12273H	Historic	Tested 1992,1994 mitigated, majority destroyed by SR 125	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-012337	CA-SDI-12337	Lithic Scatter	Combined several sites/ tested 1978,1992, 1994,1996, almost all of site within CPU developed	Not significant	Partial	Yes
P-37-013532	CA-SDI-13532	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1994, mitigated, site developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-019024	CA-SDI-13719	Shell and lithic scatter	No testing recorded	On CPU boundary	No	
P-37-014282	CA-SDI-14081	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1995 mitigated for road widening, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-014283	CA-SDI-14082	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1995 for Otay Mesa Rd. Widening, That portion mitigated and developed. Combined with SDI-7208.	Not significant	Partial	Yes
P-37-014284	CA-SDI-14083	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No record of testing, developed	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-014285	CA-SDI-14084	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No record of testing, in MHPA Preserve, some impacts. by preserve vegetation, south half destroyed by Otay Mesa Rd	Undetermined	Partial	
P-37-014286	CA-SDI-14085H	Historic	Tested 1995 mitigated. Undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-014287	CA-SDI-14086H	Historic	Mitigated for SR-905, undeveloped	Not significant	No	
P-37-014288	CA-SDI-14087	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Mitigated for SR-905, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-014289	CA-SDI-14088	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, developed	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-014290	CA-SDI-14089	Artifact Scatter	Undeveloped area, no known testing	Undetermined	Partial	
P-37-014291	CA-SDI-14090	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped, heavy ORV activity	Undetermined	No	Yes
P-37-014292	CA-SDI-14091	Artifact Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	Partial	
P-37-014293	CA-SDI-14092	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded undisturbed area	Undetermined	No	
P-37-014294	CA-SDI-14093	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, developed area	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-014295	CA-SDI-14094	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	

**TABLE 2  
RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA  
(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-014547	CA-SDI-14180	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped area	Undetermined	Partial	
P-37-014549	CA-SDI-14182	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped area	undetermined	No	
P-37-014577	CA-SDI-14210	Historic	No testing recorded, undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	
P-37-014605	CA-SDI-14238	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	
P-37-014606	CA-SDI-14239	Lithic Scatter	No testing, in Vernal pool mitigation area	Not significant	No	
P-37-014608	CA-SDI-14241	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1996 mitigated, undeveloped area	Not significant	No	
P-37-014613	CA-SDI-14246	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1996,1999, undeveloped area	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-014615	CA-SDI-14248	Lithic Scatter	Tested 1996,1999, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-014617	CA-SDI-14250H	Historic Scatter	Tested 1996, not mitigated, undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	
P-37-014619	CA-SDI-14252	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1996, not mitigated, undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	
P-37-015976	CA-SDI-14559	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested 1996, not mitigated, undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	
P-37-016185	CA-SDI-14728	Artifact Scatter	Tested 1996, not mitigated, undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	
P-37-016186	CA-SDI-14729	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded in undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	
P-37-016188	CA-SDI-14731	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded in undeveloped area of Brown field	Undetermined	No	
P-37-024525	CA-SDI-16264H	Historic	Mitigated 2002, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-024754	CA-SDI-16397	Lithic Shatter/Shell	Tested 2002, data recovery necessary, undeveloped area	Significant	No	
P-37-024755	CA-SDI-16398	Lithic Shatter/Shell	No testing recorded, undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	
P-37-025140	CA-SDI-16652	Lithic Scatter	Tested by RBR & Associates in 1987, developed	Undetermined	Yes	
P-37-025212	CA-SDI-16704	Sparse Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped area	Undetermined	No	Yes
P-37-025213	CA-SDI-16705	Artifact Shatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP Consulting, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-025214	CA-SDI-16706	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP Consulting, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-025707	CA-SDI-17100	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Considered non site by Otay Mesa Management Plan, developed	Not significant	Yes	

**TABLE 2**  
**RECORDED PREHISTORIC AND HISTORIC SITES WITHIN THE OTAY MESA COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE AREA**  
**(continued)**

Primary No.	Site Number	Site Type	Status	Significance	Developed	Impacted by CPU
P-37-025708	CA-SDI-17101	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Considered non site by Otay Mesa Management Plan, undeveloped, in Brown field	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-025709	CA-SDI-17102	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Considered non site by Otay Mesa Management Plan, undeveloped	Not significant	No	
P-37-025710	CA-SDI-17103	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Considered non site by Otay Mesa Management Plan, undeveloped	Not significant	No	
P-37-025711	CA-SDI-17104	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Considered non site by Otay Mesa Management Plan, undeveloped	Not significant	Partial	
P-37-025712	CA-SDI-17105	Sparse Lithic Scatter	Considered non site by Otay Mesa Management Plan, undeveloped	Not significant	No	
P-37-026729	CA-SDI-17517	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-026730	CA-SDI-17518	Artifact scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP, undeveloped	Significant	No	Yes
P-37-026731	CA-SDI-17519	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP, undeveloped	Not significant	No	
P-37-026732	CA-SDI-17520	Lithic scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-026733	CA-SDI-17521	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-026734	CA-SDI-17522	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-026735	CA-SDI-17523	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-026736	CA-SDI-17524	Lithic Scatter	Tested in 2005 by ECORP, undeveloped	Not significant	No	Yes
P-37-026987	CA-SDI-17668	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped	Undetermined	No	
P-37-031373	CA-SDI-19921	Shell Scatter	No testing recorded, developed	Unknown	Yes	
P-37-031948	CA-SDI-20226	Shell and Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-031949	CA-SDI-20227	Shell Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped, in Brown field	Not significant	Partial, Brown Field	Yes
P-37-031950	CA-SDI-20228	Shell and Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped, in Brown field	Not significant	Partial, Brown field	Yes
P-37-031951	CA-SDI-20229	Shell Scatter	No testing recorded, developed	Not significant	Yes	
P-37-031952	CA-SDI-20230	Shell Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped, in Brown field	Not significant	Partial, Brown field	Yes
P-37-031953	CA-SDI-20231	Lithic Scatter	No testing recorded, undeveloped, Brown field	Not significant	Partial, Brown field	Yes

Of the 126 sites that have not been impacted to any degree, 64 have been tested or otherwise evaluated for significance under CEQA and City guidelines and determined to not be significant resources. Ten sites have been evaluated and determined significant under CEQA or City guidelines. A total of 54 sites have been impacted to some extent by development.

These numbers are based on a list generated in the Arcview geographic information system (GIS) from available archaeological site map data. Digitized site locations were superimposed on a current aerial photograph of Otay Mesa, and those sites that fell within what appeared to be developed land were considered developed. If the site fell completely within a developed area, it was considered destroyed. If only part of the site was within a developed area it was considered partially developed. Six sites that fall within vernal pool preserves are considered partially developed because the extent of disturbance cannot be determined by examining aerial photographs. Vernal pool preserves are often graded to some extent to recontour the surface to insure ponding, but only part of the site may be physically displaced or destroyed. Six sites within Brown Field are in areas that look heavily impacted in aerial photographs but were recorded after the impacts took place. These sites are considered not developed as they were found after impacts had occurred. This method of determining site impacts is somewhat imprecise due to two factors. The first is the accuracy of the digitization of the site area. Error can creep in during digitization from the hard copy site record maps at SCIC. If this process is not done accurately the site location is incorrect. The second area of potential error is the interpretation of what is developed land when looking at an aerial photograph. Some land may have been scraped to an extent that no cultural material remains but only look plowed on the aerial. Other land may only be plowed but look graded. The result of this is that the designation of destroyed and partially impacted sites is open to some error. As the Community Plan area is developed, all areas that are not covered by buildings or other structures should be surveyed to determine the actual extent of impacts and the presence or absence of cultural materials.

The Native American Heritage Commission was contacted by the City of San Diego in accordance with Senate Bill (SB) 18 requirements for community plan updates. A reply from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) indicated that they had no record of Native American religious or sacred sites within the CPU area boundaries. A Native American contact list was provided by the NAHC, and contact letters were sent by the City to the listed parties on February 26, 2007. The City did not receive comments from any of the contacted parties within the 90-day period recommended by the NAHC.

## 5.0 Regulatory Framework

### 5.1 Determination of Significance

Three criteria are used to evaluate the significance of a historic resource: federal, state, and local.

#### 5.1.1 Federal

Federal criteria are those used to determine eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). These criteria state that the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns our history;
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Certain properties are usually not considered for eligibility for the NRHP. These include ordinary cemeteries, birthplaces or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved or reconstructed, properties primarily commemorative in nature, or properties that have become significant within the last 50 years. These types of properties can qualify if they are an integral part of a district that does meet the criteria, or if they fall within certain specific categories relating to architecture, or association with historically significant people or events. The vast majority of archaeological sites that qualify for listing do so under Criterion D, research potential.

## 5.1.2 State

State criteria are those listed in CEQA guidelines and used to determine whether a historic resource qualifies for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). CEQA, in addition to including resources determined to be eligible for the National Register, also recognizes resources listed in a local historic register or deemed significant in a historical resource survey. Some resources that do not meet these criteria may still be historically significant for the purposes of CEQA.

A resource may be listed in the CRHR if it is significant at the federal, state, or local level under one of more of the four criteria listed below.

1. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns 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. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history of the state or nation.

CEQA sections 15064.5 and 21083.2(g) defines the criteria for determining the significance of historical resources. Archaeological resources are considered "historical resources" for the purposes of CEQA. Most archaeological sites which qualify for the CRHR do so under Criterion 4, i.e., research potential.

Native American involvement in the development review process is addressed by several State and Federal laws. The most notable of these are the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (2001) and the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990). These acts ensure that Native American human remains and cultural items be treated with respect and dignity. In addition, Senate Bill (SB) 18 spells out requirements for local agencies to consult with identified California Native American Tribes during the development process.

Since resources that are not listed or determined eligible for the state or local registers may still be historically significant, their significance shall be determined if they are affected by a project. The significance of a historical resource under Criterion 4 rests on its ability to address important research questions.



### 5.1.3 City

The City of San Diego has established a set of criteria as a baseline to be used for determining significance under CEQA. City significance criteria for historical resources are outlined in the General Plan and Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). These criteria reflect a more local perspective of historical, architectural, and cultural importance for inclusion on the Historical Resources Register. The resource can meet one or more of the following criteria:

- A. Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's, a community's, or a neighborhood's historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping, or agricultural development.
- B. Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history.
- C. Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or crafts.
- D. Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist, or craftsman.
- E. Is listed or has been determined eligible by National Park Service for listing on the NRHP or is listed or has been determined eligible by the State Historical Preservation Office for listing on the State Register of Historic Resources.
- F. Is a finite group of resources related to one another in a clearly distinguishable way or is a geographically definable area or neighborhood containing improvements which have a special character, historical interest, or aesthetic value, or which represent one or more architectural periods or styles in the history and development of the city.

Under the City of San Diego HRG, certain types of resources are typically considered insignificant for planning purposes, such as isolates, sparse lithic scatters, isolated bedrock milling features, shellfish processing stations, and sites and buildings less than 45 years old (City of San Diego 2011a:39).

In the City Guidelines, an archaeological site is defined as at least three associated artifacts/ecofacts within a 40-square-meter area, or a single feature and be at least 45 years old (City of San Diego 2011a:13). It should be pointed out that this site definition differs from the Otay Mesa Management Plan for Prehistoric Resources. A 40-square-meter area measures approximately 6.32 meters on a side, while the Otay Mesa Management Plan for Prehistoric Resources defines a site as three artifacts within a 10x10-meter area, which encompasses 100 square meters. Unless demonstrated otherwise, archaeological sites with only a surface component are not typically

considered significant. The determination of an archaeological site's significance depends on a number of factors specific to that site, including size, type, integrity; presence or absence of a subsurface deposit, soil stratigraphy, features, diagnostic artifacts, or datable material; artifact/ecofact density; assemblage complexity; cultural affiliation; association with an important person or event; and ethnic importance. According to the City's Guidelines, all archaeological sites are considered potentially significant (City of San Diego 2011a:13).

Significance for historic buildings, structures, objects, and landscapes is based on age, location, context, integrity, and association with an important person or event.

For a site to have ethnic significance it must be associated with a burial or cemetery; religious, social, or traditional activities of a discrete ethnic population; an important person or event as defined within a discrete ethnic population; or the mythology of a discrete ethnic population (City of San Diego 2011a:13).

When a historical resource has been identified on a project and would be impacted, that resource must be mitigated prior to the project implementation. The optimum alternative for mitigation is avoidance or preservation in place. If this option is not feasible, the alternative is to implement a Research Design and Data Recovery Program. This program is subject to CEQA standards (Section 21083.2) and approval from the City Environmental Designee.

### **5.1.3.1 Historical Resources Guidelines**

The City of San Diego HRG addresses the identification, and mitigation of impacts to historical resources in the city. These HRG ensure compliance with local, state, and federal regulations for the management of historical resources. The term "historical resources" in the guidelines includes both prehistoric and historic sites. These guidelines are stated in the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Regulations (HRR). The HRR has been developed to implement applicable local, state, and federal policies and mandates. Included in these are the City's General Plan, CEQA of 1970, and Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966. The City guidelines cover all properties (historic, archaeological, landscapes, traditional, etc.) that are eligible or potentially eligible for the NRHP. It also covers those same properties that may be significant under state and local laws and registration programs, such as the CRHR and the City of San Diego Historical Resources Register.

According to the City Guidelines, historical resources include all properties (historic, archaeological, landscapes, traditional, etc.) that are eligible or potentially eligible for the NRHP. It also covers those same properties that may be significant under state and local laws and registration programs, such as the CRHR and the City of San Diego Historical Resources Register. Historical resource, in the City Register context, includes "site improvements, buildings, structures, historic districts, signs, features (including

significant trees or other landscaping), places, place names, interior elements and fixtures designated in conjunction with a property, or other objects historical, archaeological, scientific, educational, cultural, architectural, aesthetic, or traditional significance to the citizens of the city.” These include structures, buildings, archaeological sites, objects, districts, or landscapes having physical evidence of human activities. These are usually over 45 years old, and they may have been altered or still be in use (City of San Diego 2011a).

The HRR (Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2 of the San Diego Municipal Code) authorizes promulgation and publishing of the HRG. These guidelines are incorporated in the San Diego Municipal Code Land Development Code. These guidelines set up a Development Review Process to review projects in the city. This process is composed of two aspects: the implementation of the HRR and the determination of impacts and mitigation under CEQA.

Compliance with the HRR begins with the determination of the need for a site-specific survey for a project. Section 143.0212(b) of the HRR requires that historical resource sensitivity (HRS) maps be used to identify properties in the city that have a probability of containing archaeological sites. These maps are based on records maintained by the South Coastal Information Center of the California Historic Resources Information System and San Diego Museum of Man, and site-specific information in the City’s files. If records show an archaeological site existing on or immediately adjacent to the subject property, the City would require a survey. In general, archaeological surveys are required when the proposed development is on previously undeveloped parcel, if a known resource is recorded on the parcel or within a one-mile radius, or if a qualified consultant or knowledgeable City staff member recommends it. Surveys would also be required if more than five years have elapsed since the last survey and the potential for resources exists. A historic property (built environment) survey would be required on a project if the properties are over 45 years old and appear to have integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

The HRR says that if a property-specific survey is required, it should be conducted according to criteria in the HRG (Section 143.0212(d)). Using the survey results and other available applicable information, the City determines whether a historical resource exists, whether it is eligible for designation as a designated historical resource, and precisely where it is located. The resources eligibility is determined in accordance with Chapter 12, Article 3, Division 2 of the Land Development Code. If there are no historical resources present, a Neighborhood Development Permit or Site Development Permit is not required.

Resource eligibility is determined through a historical resource evaluation process. This process is applied when, as a result of the survey, new resources are identified, if previously recorded resources relocated during the survey have not already been evaluated, or if previously recorded resources were not relocated but there is the

likelihood the resource still exists. If an existing resource has been evaluated for CEQA or National Register significance within the last five years, it does not need to be reevaluated unless there has been a change in the conditions that contributed to its determination of significance or eligibility.

### **5.1.3.2 Significance Determination Thresholds**

Historical resources significance determination, pursuant to the City of San Diego's Significance Determination Thresholds, consists first of determining the sensitivity or significance of identified historical resources and, secondly, determining direct and indirect impacts that would result from project implementation.

Based on the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, impacts related to historical resources would be significant if the proposed project would:

1. Result in the alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic building (including an architecturally significant building), structure, or object or site;
2. Result in any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area; or
3. Result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

## 6.0 Potential Impacts

The CPU is intended to serve as a guide for future public and private development (Figure 4). Of the 262 recorded prehistoric and historic sites in the CPU area there are 180 remaining historical resources that have not been impacted or have been partially impacted by development. The CPU would facilitate future development that would have the potential for significantly impacting all, or a portion of 61 of the remaining 180 recorded sites, and any additional unrecorded sites (see Table 2). Because of the number and density of historical resources in the remaining undeveloped areas of the CPU area, any future development implemented in accordance with the CPU has the potential to result in significant impacts to historical resources.

Criteria for evaluating impacts from the future projects can be found in the City's 2011 HRG and 2011 Significance Determination Thresholds. Impacts to a historical resource are any actions that would cause damage to the resource. Impacts can be direct, indirect, or cumulative. Direct impacts include, but not restricted to:

- Mass grading;
- Permanent and temporary road construction;
- Excavation for sewer and water pipelines and appurtenances;
- Staging;
- Access roads;
- Demolition, grading, and excavation activities;
- Deterioration due to neglect;
- Alterations or repairs of a historic structure;
- Inappropriate and/or unauthorized repairs;
- New addition;
- Relocation from its original site;
- Isolation of a resource from its setting, when that setting contributes to its significance;
- Soil stockpiling;
- Construction of trails in open space; or
- Increased awareness or exposure of a resource (City of San Diego 2011b:39).

Indirect impacts in the built environment include the introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric effects that are out of character with the resource or alter its setting, when the setting contributes to its significance. Examples of indirect impacts in this

environment include, but are not limited to, the construction of a large-scale building, structure, object, or public works project that has the potential to cast shadow patterns on the historic property, intrude into its viewshed, generate substantial noise, or substantially increase air pollution or wind patterns (City of San Diego 2011b:39). Increased accessibility to a resource resulting in the potential for an increase in vandalism and site destruction is also considered an indirect impact.


In addition to direct and indirect impacts, cumulative impacts shall also be addressed for a project. Cumulative impacts are a result of individually minor but collectively significant projects occurring over a period of time. Data recovery may be considered a cumulative impact due to the loss of a portion of the resource data base. Cumulative impacts also occur in districts, when several minor changes to contributing properties, their setting or landscaping, eventually results in a significant loss of integrity (City of San Diego 2011b:10).

Impact thresholds for archaeological resources and buildings/structures/districts/objects are based on whether the resource is important enough to qualify as a historical resource. Evaluation of a historical resource based on the federal, state, or City criteria outlined in the Regulatory Framework section above will determine if it has character-defining qualities that make it eligible for the NRHP, CRHR, or HRR. Once these qualities are established it must be determined how the project would affect those character-defining qualities that qualify the resource for eligibility. Once the project-related effects on the resource are known, it is possible to determine if those impacts are adverse. Projects can result in no effect, no adverse effect, or an adverse effect. Knowledge of the project effects makes it possible to develop a mitigation program to avoid, minimize, and mitigate for those impacts.

In response to a request by RECON in November 2006, the Native American Heritage Commission verified that there is no finding of a sacred site or burial within or immediately adjacent to the CPU area. As a result of the negative records check by the NAHC and the lack of response from the listed contacts, impacts due to implementation of the CPU would be less than significant.

No known human remains have been identified in the CPU area, but there is a potential for burials to be encountered during future ground disturbing activities. There are many areas in the City where pre-historic human remains have been uncovered during grading, thus, the potential for encountering human remains during construction activities is possible and impacts to human remains may occur. Any impacts to human remains would be considered a significant impact.





M:\JOBS2\13957-1\common\_gis\fig4\_arctec.mxd 8/29/2013 fmm

Otay Mesa Community Plan Boundary  
 Not A Part

**Proposed Land Use Plan**

**Open Space, Parks, Institutional**

- Open Space
- Parks
- Institutional

**Village Centers**

- Community Village
- Neighborhood Village

**Residential**

- Low
- Low Medium
- Medium
- Medium High

**Commercial - Residential Prohibited**

- Community Commercial
- Regional Commercial
- Heavy Commercial

**Industrial**

- Business Park - Office Permitted
- Business and International Trade
- Light Industrial
- Heavy Industrial
- Business Park - Residential Permitted

**Other**

- Right-of-Way



**FIGURE 4**  
Proposed Land Uses

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***



## 7.0 Mitigation

Future projects shall be subject to the requirements of the City combined with the federal, state, and local regulations described above provide a framework for developing project-level historical resources mitigation measures for future discretionary projects. The City's process for the evaluation of discretionary projects includes environmental review and documentation pursuant to CEQA as well as an analysis of those projects for consistency with the goals, policies, and recommendations of the General Plan. Included here are detailed measures that are currently applied to projects that could impact historical resources. It should be noted that at the time of this writing, these measures are generally considered to be adequate mitigation. However, in the future, mitigation measures may be periodically updated. Future projects would be subject to site-specific measures in effect at the time the projects are processed.

### 7.1 Mitigation Framework for Archaeological Resources

Prior to issuance of any permit for a future development project within the CPU that could directly affect an archaeological resource; the City shall require the following steps be taken to determine: (1) the presence of archaeological resources and (2) the appropriate mitigation for any significant resources which may be impacted by a development activity. Sites may include, but are not limited to, residential and commercial properties, privies, trash pits, building foundations, and industrial features representing the contributions of people from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Sites may also include resources associated with pre-historic Native American activities.

#### Initial Determination

The environmental analyst will determine the likelihood for the project site to contain historical resources by reviewing site photographs and existing historic information (e.g., Archaeological Sensitivity Maps, the Archaeological Map Book, and the City's "Historical Inventory of Important Architects, Structures, and People in San Diego") and conducting a site visit. If there is any evidence that the site contains archaeological resources, then a historic evaluation consistent with the City Guidelines would be required. All individuals conducting any phase of the archaeological evaluation program must meet professional qualifications in accordance with the City Guidelines.

#### Step 1:

Based on the results of the Initial Determination, if there is evidence that the site contains historical resources, preparation of a historic evaluation is required. The

evaluation report would generally include background research, field survey, archeological testing and analysis. Before actual field reconnaissance would occur, background research is required which includes a record search at the SCIC at San Diego State University and the San Diego Museum of Man. A review of the Sacred Lands File maintained by the NAHC must also be conducted at this time. Information about existing archaeological collections should also be obtained from the San Diego Archaeology Center and any tribal repositories or museums.

In addition to the record searches mentioned above, background information may include, but is not limited to: examining primary sources of historical information (e.g., deeds and wills), secondary sources (e.g., local histories and genealogies), Sanborn Fire Maps, and historic cartographic and aerial photograph sources; reviewing previous archeological research in similar areas, models that predict site distribution, and archeological, architectural, and historical site inventory files; and conducting informant interviews. The results of the background information would be included in the evaluation report.

Once the background research is complete, a field reconnaissance must be conducted by individuals whose qualifications meet the standards outlined in the City Guidelines. Consultants are encouraged to employ innovative survey techniques when conducting enhanced reconnaissance, including, but not limited to, remote sensing, ground penetrating radar, and other soil resistivity techniques as determined on a case-by-case basis. Native American participation is required for field surveys when there is likelihood that the project site contains prehistoric archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties. If through background research and field surveys historical resources are identified, then an evaluation of significance must be performed by a qualified archaeologist.

## **Step 2:**

Once a historical resource has been identified, a significance determination must be made. It should be noted that tribal representatives and/or Native American monitors will be involved in making recommendations regarding the significance of prehistoric archaeological sites during this phase of the process. The testing program may require reevaluation of the proposed project in consultation with the Native American representative which could result in a combination of project redesign to avoid and/or preserve significant resources as well as mitigation in the form of data recovery and monitoring (as recommended by the qualified archaeologist and Native American representative). An archaeological testing program will be required which includes evaluating the horizontal and vertical dimensions of a site, the chronological placement, site function, artifact/ecofact density and variability, presence/absence of subsurface features, and research potential. A thorough discussion of testing methodologies, including surface and subsurface investigations, can be found in the City Guidelines.

The results from the testing program will be evaluated against the Significance Thresholds found in the Guidelines. If significant historical resources are identified within the Area of Potential Effect, the site may be eligible for local designation. At this time, the final testing report must be submitted to Historical Resources Board staff for eligibility determination and possible designation. An agreement on the appropriate form of mitigation is required prior to distribution of a draft environmental document. If no significant resources are found, and site conditions are such that there is no potential for further discoveries, then no further action is required. Resources found to be non-significant as a result of a survey and/or assessment will require no further work beyond documentation of the resources on the appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site forms and inclusion of results in the survey and/or assessment report. If no significant resources are found, but results of the initial evaluation and testing phase indicates there is still a potential for resources to be present in portions of the property that could not be tested, then mitigation monitoring is required.

**Step 3:**

Preferred mitigation for historical resources is to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm shall be taken. For archaeological resources where preservation is not an option, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program is required, which includes a Collections Management Plan for review and approval. The data recovery program shall be based on a written research design and is subject to the provisions as outlined in CEQA, Section 21083.2. The data recovery program must be reviewed and approved by the City's Environmental Analyst prior to draft CEQA document distribution. Archaeological monitoring may be required during building demolition and/or construction grading when significant resources are known or suspected to be present on a site, but cannot be recovered prior to grading due to obstructions such as, but not limited to, existing development or dense vegetation.

A Native American observer must be retained for all subsurface investigations, including geotechnical testing and other ground-disturbing activities, whenever a Native American Traditional Cultural Property or any archaeological site located on City property or within the Area of Potential Effect of a City project would be impacted. In the event that human remains are encountered during data recovery and/or a monitoring program, the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 5097 must be followed. These provisions are outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) included in the environmental document. The Native American monitor shall be consulted during the preparation of the written report, at which time they may express concerns about the treatment of sensitive resources. If the Native American community requests participation of an observer for subsurface investigations on private property, the request shall be honored.

**Step 4:**

Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared by qualified professionals as determined by the criteria set forth in Appendix B of the Guidelines. The discipline shall be tailored to the resource under evaluation. In cases involving complex resources, such as traditional cultural properties, rural landscape districts, sites involving a combination of prehistoric and historic archaeology, or historic districts, a team of experts will be necessary for a complete evaluation.

Specific types of historical resource reports are required to document the methods (see Section III of the Guidelines) used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources; to identify the potential impacts from proposed development and evaluate the significance of any identified historical resources; to document the appropriate curation of archaeological collections (e.g. collected materials and the associated records); in the case of potentially significant impacts to historical resources, to recommend appropriate mitigation measures that would reduce the impacts to below a level of significance; and to document the results of mitigation and monitoring programs, if required.

Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared in conformance with the California Office of Historic Preservation "Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format" (see Appendix C of the Guidelines), which will be used by Environmental Analysis Section staff in the review of archaeological resource reports. Consultants must ensure that archaeological resource reports are prepared consistent with this checklist. This requirement will standardize the content and format of all archaeological technical reports submitted to the City. A confidential appendix must be submitted (under separate cover) along with historical resources reports for archaeological sites and traditional cultural properties containing the confidential resource maps and records search information gathered during the background study. In addition, a Collections Management Plan shall be prepared for projects which result in a substantial collection of artifacts and must address the management and research goals of the project and the types of materials to be collected and curated based on a sampling strategy that is acceptable to the City. Appendix D (Historical Resources Report Form) may be used when no archaeological resources were identified within the project boundaries.

**Step 5:**

For Archaeological Resources: All cultural materials, including original maps, field notes, non-burial related artifacts, catalog information, and final reports recovered during public and/or private development projects must be permanently curated with an appropriate institution, one which has the proper facilities and staffing for insuring research access to the collections consistent with state and federal standards. In the event that a prehistoric and/or historic deposit is encountered during construction monitoring, a Collections Management Plan would be required in accordance with the project MMRP. The

disposition of human remains and burial related artifacts that cannot be avoided or are inadvertently discovered is governed by state (i.e., Assembly Bill 2641 and California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 2001) and federal (i.e., Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) law, and must be treated in a dignified and culturally appropriate manner with respect for the deceased individual(s) and their descendants. Any human bones and associated grave goods of Native American origin shall be turned over to the appropriate Native American group for repatriation.

Arrangements for long-term curation must be established between the applicant/property owner and the consultant prior to the initiation of the field reconnaissance, and must be included in the archaeological survey, testing, and/or data recovery report submitted to the City for review and approval. Curation must be accomplished in accordance with the California State Historic Resources Commission's Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collection (dated May 7, 1993) and, if federal funding is involved, 36 Code of Federal Regulations 79 of the Federal Register. Additional information regarding curation is provided in Section II of the Guidelines.

## **7.2 Mitigation Framework for Historic Buildings, Structures, and Objects**

Prior to issuance of any permit for a future development project within the CPU that would directly or indirectly affect a building/structure in excess of 45 years of age, the City shall determine whether the affected building/structure meets any of the following criteria: (1) NRHP-listed or formally determined eligible, (2) CRHR-listed or formally determined eligible, (3) San Diego Register-listed or formally determined eligible, or (4) meets the CEQA criteria for a historical resource. The evaluation of historic architectural resources would be based on criteria such as: age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, or structural integrity, as indicated in the Guidelines.

Preferred mitigation for historic buildings or structures is to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm to the resource shall be taken. Depending upon project impacts, measures can include, but are not limited to:

- a. Preparing a historic resource management plan;
- b. Designing new construction which is compatible in size, scale, materials, color and workmanship to the historic resource (such additions, whether portions of existing buildings or additions to historic districts, shall be clearly distinguishable from historic fabric);

- c. Repairing damage according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation;
- d. Screening incompatible new construction from view through the use of berms, walls, and landscaping in keeping with the historic period and character of the resource;
- e. Shielding historic properties from noise generators through the use of sound walls, double glazing, and air conditioning; and
- f. Removing industrial pollution at the source of production.

Specific types of historical resource reports, outlined in Section III of the HRG, are required to document the methods to be used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources, to identify potential impacts from a proposed project, and to evaluate the significance of any historical resources identified. If potentially significant impacts to an identified historical resource are identified, these reports will also recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance. If required, mitigation programs can also be included in the report.

### **7.3 Mitigation Framework for Religious or Sacred Land Uses**

The NAHC verified in November 2006 that there is no finding of a sacred site or burial within or immediately adjacent to the CPU area. As a result of the negative records check by the NAHC and the lack of response from the NAHC and the lack of response from the listed contacts, impacts due to implementation of the CPU would be less than significant and no mitigation is necessary.

### **7.4 Mitigation Framework for Human Remains, Including those Interred Outside Formal Cemeteries**

Although no human remains have been found within the CPU, there is a potential for the discovery of human remains during project grading. It is not possible to mitigate for impacts on human remains. It is preferable to avoid impacting human remains, but this is not always possible given the possibility of uncovering undocumented human remains during project grading or other ground-disturbing activities. When a data recovery program of an archaeological site is required, all possible pre-excavation planning should be implemented to reduce the possibility of the accidental discovery of human remains. Historic era burial locations can often be identified with background research.

Forensic dogs can be used to identify human remains, especially in cases where scattered cremation remains are present. Non-destructive ground penetrating procedures such as ground penetrating radar can be used to identify subsurface anomalies that may indicate the presence of inhumations. Since data recovery programs never recover all the data from an archaeological site, similar procedures implemented during project implementation would be helpful in reducing the potential for discovery of unanticipated human remains.

If human remains are found, existing laws and protocols are required to be followed before proceeding with any project action that would further disturb the remains. Provisions set forth in California PRC Section 5097.98 and State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would be implemented in consultation with the Most Likely Descendant identified by the NAHC.



***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***


## 8.0 Certification and Project Staff

This report was prepared in compliance with CEQA (Section 21083.2 of the Statutes and Appendix K of the Guidelines) and with policies and procedures of the City of San Diego. To the best of our knowledge, the statements and information contained in this report are accurate.



---

Carmen Zepeda-Herman, Principal Investigator  
Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA)



---

Harry J. Price, Project Archaeologist

Resumes for key personnel are included in Attachment 2. The following individuals participated in the field tasks or preparation of this report.

Carmen Zepeda-Herman	Principal Investigator
Harry J. Price	Project Archaeologist
Sean Bohac	GIS Analyst
Vince Martinez	Graphic Designer/Cartographer
Stacey Higgins	Production Specialist

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***

## 9.0 References Cited

Bean, Lowell John and Florence C. Shipek

- 1978 Luiseño. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 8, William G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Begole, Robert S.

- 1974 Archaeological Phenomena in the California Desert. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 10(2):51–70.

Binford, L. R.

- 1980 Willow Smoke and Dog's Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation. *American Antiquity* 45:4-22.

Carrico, Richard L.

- 1987 *Strangers in a Stolen Land. American Indians in San Diego 1850-1880*. Sierra Oaks Publishing, Newcastle, California.

Childers, W. Morlin

- 1980 Evidence of Early Man Exposed at Yuha Pinto Wash. *American Antiquity* 45(2):297-307.

Cline, Lora L.

- 1984 *Just Before Sunset*. J and L Enterprises, Jacumba, California.

Christensen, Lynn E.

- 1989 The late Prehistoric Yuman People of San Diego County, California: their Settlement and Subsistence System. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Dept. of anthropology, Arizona State University.

Collett, Russell O., and Sue A. Wade

- 1991 Cultural Resource Survey and Significance Testing of Site SDi-12,122H Sorrento Hills Phase I Cultural Development Area, City of San Diego, California. RECON. San Diego.

Davis, Emma Lou, Kathryn H. Brown, and Jacqueline Nichols

- 1980 Evaluation of Early Human Activities and Remains in the California Desert. Prepared for the Desert Planning Staff, Bureau of Land Management, Riverside, California, by the Great Basin Foundation, San Diego.

Gallegos, D., and R. Carrico

- 1984 Windsong Shores Data Recovery Program for Site W-131, Carlsbad, California. Manuscript on file with the City of Carlsbad.

Gallegos, Dennis R., Carolyn Kyle, Adella Schroth, and Patricia Mitchell

- 1998 *Management Plan for Otay Mesa Prehistoric Resources, San Diego, California*. Coyote Press, Salinas, California

Geocon Inc.

- 2004 Otay Mesa Community Plan Update, San Diego, California; EIR Level Geotechnical Report. Unpublished manuscript on file at Geocon.

Gifford, Edward W.

- 1918 Clans and Moieties in Southern California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 14(2):155-219. Berkeley.
- 1931 The Kamia of Imperial Valley. *Bulletin of the Bureau of American Ethnology* 97:1-94. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Hector, Susan M., and Stephen R. Van Wormer

- 1987 Historical And Architectural Assessment of the Piper Homestead Otay Mesa, City of San Diego. Unpublished manuscript on file at RECON. San Diego.

Hurtado, Albert L.

- 1988 *Indian Survival on the California Frontier*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Justice, Noel D.

- 2002 *Stone Age Spear and Arrow Points of California and the Great Basin*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

King, Chester D.

- 1981 *The Evolution of Chumash Society: A Comparative Study of Artifacts Used in Social System Maintenance in the Santa Barbara Channel Region before A.D. 1804*. Doctoral dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

Kroeber, A. L.

- 1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 78. Washington, D.C.

Luomala, K.

- 1978 Tipai and Ipai. In *Handbook of North American Indians*, edited by R. F. Heizer, pp.592-609. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Meighan, Clement W.

- 1954 A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10:215-227.

Moriarty, James R., III

- 1966 Cultural Phase Division Suggested by Typological Change Coordinated with Stratigraphically Controlled Radiocarbon Dating in San Diego. *Anthropological Journal of Canada* 4(4):20-30.

- 1967 Transitional Pre-desert Phase in San Diego County. *Science* 155(3762):553-555.

Pourade, Richard F.

- 1961 *Time of the Bells*. The History of San Diego. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego, California.

- 1963 *The Silver Dons*. The History of San Diego. Union-Tribune Publishing, San Diego, California.

Pryde, Philip R.

- 1992 *San Diego: An Introduction to the Region*. Kendall/Hunt, Dubuque, Iowa.

Robbins-Wade, Mary Judith

- 1990 Prehistoric Settlement Patterns of Otay Mesa, San Diego, California. Unpublished master's theses, San Diego State University, California.

Rogers, Malcolm J.

- 1939 Early Lithic Industries of the Lower Basin of the Colorado River and Adjacent Desert Areas. *San Diego Museum of Man Papers* 3.

San Diego, City of

- 2011a Historical Resource Guidelines.

- 2011b *Significance Determination Thresholds, California Environmental Quality Act*. Development Services Department. January.

Schaefer, Jerry

- 1994 The Challenge of Archaeological Research in the Colorado Desert: Recent Approaches and Discoveries. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 16(1):60-80.

Shipek, Florence C. (editor)

- 1986 The Impact of Europeans upon Kumeyaay Couture. In *The Impact of European Exploration and Settlement on Local Native Americans*. Cabrillo Festival Historical Seminar, PP. 13-25. San Diego: Cabrillo Historical Association.

Shiple, William F.

- 1978 Native Languages of California. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 80-90. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Spier, Leslie

- 1923 Southern Diegueno Customs. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 20(16):295-358. Berkeley.

True, Delbert L.

- 1966 *Archaeological Differentiation of Shoshonean and Yuman Speaking Groups in Southern California*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- 1970 *Investigation of a Late Prehistoric Complex in Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, San Diego County, California*. Department of Anthropology Publications, University of California, Los Angeles.
- 1980 The Pauma Complex in Northern San Diego County: 1978. *The Journal of New World Archaeology* 3(4):1-39.

U.S. Department of Agriculture

- 1973 Soil Survey, San Diego Area, California. Edited by Roy H. Bowman. Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service. December

Wallace William J.

- 1955 A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11(3):214-230.
- 1978 Post-Pleistocene Archeology, 9000 to 2000 B.C. In *California*, edited by R. F. Heizer. *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 8, William G. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Warren, Claude N.

- 1966 The San Dieguito Type Site: M. J. Rogers 1938 Excavation on the San Dieguito River. *San Diego Museum of Man Papers* 5.



- 1968 Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. In *Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States*, edited by C. Irwin-Williams. *Eastern New Mexico Contributions in Anthropology* 1(3):1-14. Portales.
- 1984 The Desert Region. In *California Archaeology*, edited by Michael J. Moratto, pp. 339-430. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Warren, Claude N. and Robert H. Crabtree
- 1986 Prehistory of the Southwestern Area. In Warren L. D'Azevedo (ed.), *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol.11, Great Basin. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., pp.183-193.
- Warren, Claude N., Gretchen Siegler, and Frank Dittner
- 1993 Paleoindian and Early Archaic Periods. In *Historic Properties Background Study for the City of San Diego Clean Water Program*. On file with City of San Diego Clean Water Program and Mooney Associates, San Diego.
- Waugh, M. Georgie
- 1986 *Intensification and Land-use: Archaeological Indication of Transition and Transformation in a Late Prehistoric Complex in Southern California*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles.

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **Project Location on City 800' Scale Maps**

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***





0 Feet 800

Project Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book

FIGURE 3A  
Project Location on City 800' Map





Project Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book


**FIGURE 3B**  
Project Location on City 800' Map





Project Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book

**FIGURE 3C**  
Project Location on City 800' Map





 Project Boundary



Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book


**FIGURE 3D**  
Project Location on City 800' Map





Project Boundary



Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book


FIGURE 3E  
Project Location on City 800' Map





Project Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book


FIGURE 3F  
Project Location on City 800' Map





Project Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book

**FIGURE 3G**  
Project Location on City 800' Map





Project Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book


**FIGURE 3H**  
Project Location on City 800' Map





 Project Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book


**FIGURE 31**  
Project Location on City 800' Map





 Project Boundary


Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book


**FIGURE 3J**  
Project Location on City 800' Map





Project Boundary



Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book

FIGURE 3K  
Project Location on City 800' Map





 Project Boundary

Locator Map with City 800 Page numbers



Map Source: City of San Diego, Engineering and Development Department, February 1978 Supplement, City 800' Map Book

**FIGURE 3L**  
Project Location on City 800' Map



**ATTACHMENT 2**  
**Resumes of Key Personnel**

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***

---

# Harry Price

## Archaeologist/Architectural Historian

---

### Experience Highlights

- ü Field surveying, excavation, and monitoring
- ü Experience evaluating properties for the NRHP

### Experience

37 years

### Education/Registrations

BA, Anthropology, San Diego State University, 1976

### Certifications/Permits

California BLM Cultural Resource Use Permit CA-11-11

City of San Diego  
Qualified Archaeological  
Principal Investigator

County of Riverside  
Cultural Resources  
Consultants List

County of San Diego  
CEQA Consultants List  
Archaeology & Historic  
Resources

### Training

Archaeological Field  
Training at Bancroft  
Ranch House and San  
Diego Presidio

Riverside County Cultural  
Sensitivity Training  
Course, Register No. 241

Mr. Price is an experienced archaeologist in the areas of excavation, site mapping, soil profiling, column sampling, surface collection, and field reconnaissance. He serves as field crew supervisor, conducts field surveys, provides illustration of artifacts, and prepares maps of archaeological sites.

Mr. Price's archaeological duties include organizing personnel and equipment for work in the field, daily assignment of duties to field crew, daily field notes on progress and results, site sampling strategy (i.e., shovel tests, 1x1-meter units, trenching), placement of sample units, and site mapping. Mr. Price has experience in Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) documentation for historic structures. He has performed historic building evaluations and archival research for many historic structures in the San Diego area and is familiar with the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility requirements. Mr. Price is on the County of San Diego's Qualified Consultants List for the fields of Historic Resources and Archaeology.

---

### Cultural Resource Significance Testing of Archaeological Site HS-1 (CA-SDI-16661) on the Holly Springs Property, Carlsbad, CA

Mr. Price was the field director and co-author of the Significance Testing program for a small two-loci Late Prehistoric site north of Agua Hedionda Creek. Responsibilities included developing the data recovery research design, directing the field crew, overseeing cataloging and analysis in the lab, and co-authoring the report presenting findings and recommendations for the site.

### Construction Monitoring for a 230-kV Transmission Line on BLM Lands, Imperial Valley to the US/Mexico Border, CA

Mr. Price participated in archaeological field surveys, significance testing, and monitoring for the construction of two 230-kV transmission lines in Imperial County. As a project monitor, he was present for the drilling of the tower footings, cement form setup, cement pouring, and initial lattice assembly.

### Archstone Mission Gorge Redevelopment EIR, San Diego, CA

Project Archaeologist responsible for conducting record search, directing the field effort, and writing the technical report with

---

---

mitigation recommendations for this 395-acre redevelopment project in Mission Gorge. Included the relocation and evaluation of several segments of the Old Mission Flume, a city, state, and federally listed historical resource.

#### **Mission to San Miguel Substation 230-kV Transmission Line #2, San Diego County, CA**

Mr. Price conducted a cultural resources survey for this 230-kV transmission line access road. The route follows existing transmission lines within an existing SDG&E utility easement for approximately 35 miles and extends through the cities of El Cajon, Santee, and San Diego, and a portion of the U.S. Marine Corps Air Station Miramar. The cultural resource investigation was undertaken to satisfy the conditions of project approval, regarding cultural resources, as requested by the California Public Utilities Commission and as identified in CEQA.

#### **Wal-Mart/Escondido Union School District Planned Development Project EIR, Escondido, CA**

Archival photographic research on history of a half round metal building constructed by the Escondido Water Districts to determine its significance under CEQA and City of Escondido Guidelines.

#### **Cultural Resource Survey for the Navy SERE Remote Training Site, Warner Springs, CA**

Mr. Price participated in a Class II sample survey for the proposed expansion of the U.S. Navy Remote Training Site, Warner Springs. The survey covered approximately 6,400 acres of the total 12,544 acre project area. This property is owned and/or managed by the BLM, US Department of the Interior, US Forest Service, and Vista Irrigation District requiring effective coordination and communication among all parties. He compiled the Department of Parks and Recreation forms for 125 cultural resources identified during the survey.

#### **Archaeological Survey of Selected BLM Road Closures in the Yuha Desert and East Mesa, Imperial County, CA**

Served as project archaeologist responsible for conducting pedestrian surveys on 228 acres on road segments slated for closure and revegetation by the BLM in western Imperial Valley. Mr. Price authored the report of findings and recommendations dealing with the numerous prehistoric sites identified during the surveys.

#### **La Cresta Test Excavations, San Diego, CA**

Mr. Price participated in the survey, testing and recordation for this project. Testing of the site consisted of ten STP and eight soil profiles. The purpose of the STPs was to identify the presence or absence of cultural material and thus determine if any cultural resources had been disturbed during the flood

---

control activities conducted by the County of San Diego Department of Public Works.

#### **Historic Building Survey of Four Buildings on South Orange Avenue, Escondido, CA**

Project Architectural Historian for this redevelopment project in Escondido. Responsible for background research, on-site current conditions survey, and buildings evaluation report with mitigation recommendations for these four buildings (three residences and an outbuilding) built between 1930 and 1960. The evaluation included archival, aerial photography, and architectural research following CEQA and City of Escondido Guidelines.

#### **Data Recovery Excavations at CA-SDI-11569 and -11570, Carlsbad, CA**

Mr. Price was the field director and co-author of the data recovery efforts on two small Late Prehistoric sites above San Marcos Creek. Responsibilities included developing the data recovery research design, directing the field crew, overseeing cataloging and analysis in the lab, and co-authoring the report presenting findings and recommendations.

#### **Borrego Valley Airport Improvement Sites, San Diego, CA**

For this County of San Diego project, Mr. Price served as project archaeologist responsible for conducting a pedestrian survey on an approximately 18-acre parcel located immediately west of the Borrego Valley Airport and five airport improvement locations within the airport. Mr. Price also conducted the construction monitoring, and wrote the monitoring report.

#### **Hauser Mountain Fuels Project, San Diego County, CA**

Co-authored and participated in a Class III Cultural Resources Survey for the Hauser Mountain Fuels Project of 310 acres in eastern San Diego County. Project was for a plan to reduce fire hazards by clearing, grazing, and prescribed fires.

#### **Jacumba Airport Project, San Diego, CA**

Mr. Price completed the survey of a 12-acre lot proposed for a new building and the perimeter of the airport in order to determine the impacts of the installation of a security fence. The purpose was to give guidance in project design and citing of projects at the airport. Two previously recorded sites and two newly recorded sites were identified. A footprint location for the new building to avoid impacts to the cultural resources and construction monitoring for the building and the fence installation were recommended.

#### **Ocotillo Airstrip Extension, Imperial County, CA**

The project consists of extending the existing Ocotillo Airstrip, located in the western portion of Imperial County, approximately one mile northwest of the community of Ocotillo.

---

The proposed extension is approximately 2,203 feet long and an area of approximately 45 acres was surveyed for cultural resources. The project goal of the project is to provide enough runway length to enable safer operations for student pilots or for emergency landings.

#### **Alvarado Apartments MND, San Diego, CA**

Cultural resource survey of 9.9-acre developed property for redevelopment of apartment complex. Project included survey and report of negative findings.

#### **Mount Laguna Air Force Station National Register Eligibility Evaluation, San Diego County, CA**

Mr. Price co-authored a National Register of Historic Places eligibility evaluation of the Mount Laguna Air Force Station (MLAFS) located in the Cleveland National Forest. The evaluation for potential eligibility for inclusion on the National Register involved a building-by-building inspection of the remaining 23 buildings and the development of a historic context of MLAFS to use in the evaluation process. In addition, a cultural resources survey of the 140 acres of MLAFS was also conducted.

#### **Imperial Solar Energy Center (CSOLAR) South and West Projects, Imperial County, CA**

Mr. Price conducted a cultural resource survey for two utility-scale solar energy projects in western Imperial County. The two project sites consist of a photovoltaic solar field and associated transmission lines and cover over 2,000 acres of both private lands and BLM lands in Imperial County.

#### **Cultural Resources Survey for the Coyne Ranch Development Project, Imperial County, CA**

Mr. Price conducted the pedestrian survey and wrote the report for the 129-acre parcel proposed for a residential development near the community of Seeley, in the Imperial County. No cultural resources were found on the parcel originally used for farming.

#### **Fallbrook Community Airpark, County of San Diego, CA**

Mr. Price participated in the pedestrian survey of the 33-acre Fallbrook airport for the County of San Diego. The survey was for proposed improvements recommended for addressing operational safety and efficiency in the context of future airport demands. An additional element consists of a proposed Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Preserve along the western boundary area. Mr. Price also co-authored the survey report.

#### **Cultural Resource Survey for the Alliance Regional Center, City of Imperial, CA**

Mr. Price conducted the pedestrian survey of the 25-acre parcel proposed for a development to include a hotel, retail

---

space, restaurants, and two office buildings. A segment of the Imperial Irrigation District canal system, consisting of a portion of the Dahlia Drain, was identified as an historic resource and appropriate DPR forms completed and submitted to the SCIC.

### **Representative Projects**

Monitoring for the San Dieguito Lagoon Restoration Project, Del Mar, City of San Diego, CA

Monitoring for the Arbor Terrace Project, North Park, City of San Diego, CA

Monitoring for a Portion of the West Clusters Development Grading, Black Mountain Ranch, San Diego, CA

Monitoring for the Veterinary Specialty Hospital Grading, Sorrento Valley, San Diego, CA

Monitoring for AAA Office, Mission Valley, San Diego, CA

Monitoring for Camino Del Sur and Lusardi Creek Bridge Grading, Black Mountain Ranch, San Diego, CA

Monitoring for the Egyptian Condominiums, San Diego, CA

Monitoring for Construction at MILCON P-634, MCB Camp Pendleton, CA

230 kV Transmission Corridor from Imperial Valley Substation to the International Border, CA

Cultural Resources Survey for BLM Dulzura Fuel Break, Dulzura, CA

Cultural Resources Survey of a Portion of the Golf Training Area, MCB Camp Pendleton, CA

Cultural Resource Survey of the Archstone Mission Gorge Development Project, Mission Gorge, City of San Diego, CA

Cultural Resource Survey of the River Park Equestrian Center, Del Mar, City of San Diego, CA

Cultural Resources Survey for Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan EIR, Chula Vista, CA

Cultural Resources Survey for Santee Town Center Specific Plan Amendment, Santee, CA

Cultural Resource Survey and Building Evaluation of the AMCAL Multi-housing Project, El Centro, CA

Evaluation of the Ivey Ranch House at the Ivey Ranch Park, Oceanside, CA

Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Documentation of Six Base End Stations in the White's Point Reservation, Los Angeles County, CA

Evaluation and Documentation of the Alta Loma Heights Citrus Association Packing House, Rancho Cucamonga, CA.

---

Cultural Resource Surveys of Portions of Eight County Parks,  
San Diego, CA

Cultural Resource Evaluation and Determination of National  
NRHP Eligibility for Two Sites on MCB Camp Pendleton, CA

Data Recovery Excavations for the Western Portion of CA-SDI-  
13,727 in Valley Center, CA

Test Excavations of Site at Highway 94 and Jamacha Junction,  
San Diego, CA

Dry Lakes Data Recovery at 4-IMP-5620 for the Bureau of  
Land Management, Imperial County, CA

Testing at 9 Sites in The Villages and The Ranch at Stallions  
Crossing, San Diego, CA

Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed Lake Murray,  
Cowles Mountain, and Fortuna Mountain Regional Park, San  
Diego, CA

Data Recovery of Nine Archaeological Sites at La Costa North  
Lake and Golf Course Complex, Carlsbad, CA

Data Recovery at Campus Point, San Diego, CA

Cultural Resource Survey for the Hieatt-Jett Property,  
Carlsbad, CA

Archaeological Testing of Six Sites at the Proposed North City  
West, Seventh Development Unit, City of San Diego, CA

Extended Initial Studies at Mira Costa Estates, San Diego, CA

Cultural Resource Survey for Areas VII and VIII of The El  
Sobrante Landfill Expansion, Riverside County, CA

Archaeological Field Survey of Saint William of York Property,  
San Diego, CA

Cultural Resource Survey for the El Corazon Property,  
Oceanside, CA

Cultural Resource Survey for Los Peñasquitos Canyon  
Preserve, San Diego, CA

Data Recovery at Ten Archaeological Sites at Westwood  
Valley, San Diego, CA

Data Recovery at Santee Greens Development, El Cajon, CA

Excavations at Los Peñasquitos (Johnson Taylor) Ranch  
House, San Diego, CA

Testing of Archaeological Sites at Travertine Material Site, San  
Diego, CA

Testing of Sites for a Portion of State Route 52/Interstate 15,  
San Diego, CA

Cultural Resource Survey of the Shawnee Grantville



Redevelopment Project, Mission Gorge, City of San Diego, CA

Cultural Resource Survey of the Sunshine Beradini Fields  
Development Plan Property, San Diego, CA

Cultural Resource Survey of the Robertson's Oceanside,  
Concrete Facility, City of Oceanside, CA

Cultural Resource Survey for the BLM Hauser Mountain Fuel  
Break, San Diego County, CA

Cultural Resource Survey for the BLM Beauty Mountain Fuel  
Break, San Diego and Riverside Counties, CA



---

# Carmen Zepeda-Herman, RPA

## Principal Investigator

---

### Experience Highlights

- ü Register of Professional Archaeologists
- ü California BLM Cultural Resource Use Permit

### Experience

12 years

### Education/Registrations

BA, Anthropology,  
University of California,  
Berkeley, 1993

MA, Anthropology, San  
Diego State University,  
1999

Registered Professional  
Archaeologist, 15119

### Certifications/Permits

Arizona BLM Cultural  
Resource Use Permit  
AZ-000458

California BLM Cultural  
Resource Use Permit  
CA-11-11

City of San Diego  
Qualified Archaeological  
Principal Investigator

County of Riverside  
Cultural Resources  
Consultants List

County of San Diego  
CEQA Consultants List  
Archaeology

### Training

Riverside County Cultural  
Sensitivity Training  
Course

Ms. Zepeda-Herman is certified by the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) and is responsible for leading and conducting field surveys, test excavations, data recovery excavations, and construction monitoring for cultural resource studies. She conducts background research, site records maintenance, and assembles crews for completion of projects. Ms. Zepeda-Herman regularly works with a range of regulatory and assessment frameworks including National Historic Preservation Act, National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, and CEQA.

---

### San Diego National Wildlife Refuge Cultural Resources Review, San Diego, CA

Ms. Zepeda-Herman completed a cultural resources review to assist the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in completing a Comprehensive Conservation Plan and an accompanying environmental assessment for the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge. The purpose of this cultural resources review was to provide the BLM with a reasonable foundation for future management decisions at the Refuge. The review included a thorough record and literature search. Information gaps were noted and two research topics and questions were discussed that could be used for future research designs.

### City of San Diego On-Call Cultural Resources, San Diego, CA

Ms. Zepeda-Herman is the project manager for this on-call contract to provide cultural resource services. Ms. Zepeda-Herman coordinates with Native American Monitors, the City Mitigation Monitoring Coordinator, and contractors for various undergrounding utility projects.

### Valley Center Road Widening Data Recovery Program, San Diego, CA

For this County of San Diego project, Ms. Zepeda-Herman served as project archaeologist responsible for completing a research design report for the data recovery program and served as project supervisor during excavation. The data recovery program was recommended as mitigation for impacts resulting from the road widening.

### Pump Stations 28, 29, and 45, Historic Assessment, San Diego, CA

Ms. Zepeda-Herman completed an on-foot survey and archival research at local historical societies and the public library for Pump Stations 28, 29, and 45. The three pump stations were evaluated for significance at the local and state level. Pump Station 45 was determined not eligible for listing at any level.

---

Pump Station 28 and Pump Station 29 were determined not eligible for listing on the California Register but were found significant at the local level due to their association with Camp Callan established during World War II.

#### **Ancient Lake Cahuilla Shoreline, Target Area 101, Naval Air Facility El Centro, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman participated in the cultural resource survey for this project involving a cultural resources inventory of 2,000 acres along a portion of the ancient Lake Cahuilla shoreline at Naval Air Facility El Centro.

#### **NEPA EA for Proposed Historic District Demolitions, Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA**

The purpose of this research design is to provide Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, Detachment Fallbrook with a reasonable foundation for future management decisions regarding cultural resources studies on Detachment Fallbrook property. Ms. Herman co-authored the research design. Relevant research issues included settlement systems and subsistence economy, land use and distribution in particular with the bedrock milling features and their spatial relations. Historic themes included ranching, transportation, and military history.

#### **Matagual Creek Surveys and Mapping, San Diego, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman conducted background research and compiled record searches. She performed a cultural resources survey and maintained site records.

#### **Kenwood Drive Improvements Archaeological Monitoring and Data Recovery Program, San Diego, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman was the lead archaeologist for this County of San Diego project. She was responsible for implementing the archaeological monitoring program, including coordinating with Native American monitors. She served as project supervisor during the data recovery excavation and assisted in the consultation with the local Native American tribe in regards to the discovery of human remains and their associated goods.

#### **La Cresta Test Excavations, San Diego, CA**

Ms. Zepeda led this cultural resources investigation for the County of San Diego Department of Public Works. The purpose of the cultural resources test excavations was to evaluate whether the existing and proposed emergency watershed protection activities conducted by the County have disturbed or would disturb the cultural resources identified within the property.

#### **Cultural Resource Survey for the Navy SERE Remote Training Site, Warner Springs, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman participated in a Class II sample survey for the proposed expansion of the U.S. Navy Remote Training Site, Warner Springs. The survey covered approximately 6,400 acres

---

---

of the total 12,544-acre project area. This property is owned and/or managed by the BLM, U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Forest Service, and Vista Irrigation District requiring effective coordination and communication among all parties. She compiled the Department of Parks and Recreation forms for 125 cultural resources identified during the survey.

#### **YWCA Sewer Test Excavations, San Diego, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman served as project archaeologist responsible for cultural resource test excavations. The purpose of the test excavation was to evaluate whether the proposed undertaking would adversely affect significant historic properties. Monitoring and data documentation was recommended. The project was undertaken to satisfy the County of San Diego responsibility under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

#### **Meadowlark Reservoir Heritage Resources Survey, San Marcos, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman conducted a heritage resources survey of the 2.77-acre project area for Meadowlark Reservoir. The project involves the removal of a 1.25-million-gallon steel water tank and the construction of a 2.8-million-gallon steel water tank. She described her methods and findings in a letter report to the client, Vallecitos Water District.

#### **Silver Strand Training Complex Archaeological Testing and NEPA EIS, San Diego, CA**

RECON conducted test excavations at seven prehistoric archaeological sites at the Silver Strand Training Center. Ms. Zepeda-Herman participated as field crew during the excavations and prepared maps for the final report.

#### **San Elijo Lagoon Nature Center Project, San Diego County, CA**

As lead archaeologist for this County of San Diego project, Ms. Zepeda-Herman is responsible for archaeological monitoring for the removal of the existing one-story visitor center, trailer, and storage shed and replacement of the center with a new, two-story nature center complex. She served as project supervisor during the hearth feature excavation. This monitoring and feature excavation effort supported the County's responsibilities under CEQA to incur no significant impacts to cultural resources in the implementation of the proposed project.

#### **Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge Cultural Resources Review for Comprehensive Conservation Planning, Seal Beach, CA**

Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge is located in Orange County and is managed by the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge Complex (SDNWFC). A cultural resources review was prepared to assist the SDNWFC in completing a Comprehensive Conservation Plan and accompanying environmental

assessment. Ms. Herman was a co-author for the review. She compiled record search data and reviewed previous cultural resource investigations. She helped identify any data gaps and areas of archaeological sensitivity with the refuge.

#### **Santee Lakes Trails Phase 4 Record Search for Padre Dam Municipal Water District, San Diego, CA**

For this County of San Diego project, Ms. Zepeda-Herman served as project archaeologist responsible for completing a research design report for the data recovery program and served as project supervisor during excavation. The data recovery program was recommended as mitigation for impacts resulting from the road widening.

#### **Eastern San Diego County RMP and EIS, San Diego, CA**

In support of the Resources Management Plan, Ms. Zepeda-Herman conducted a site analysis and review for 25,000 acres of BLM lands within the Eastern San Diego Management Plan area. She created a site attribute table for over 600 sites using site forms and a GIS database. The data was incorporated into BLM's cultural resources database with standardized attribute values that can be easily queried.

#### **SDG&E Mountain Empire Training Facility, San Diego, CA**

The project is located on a 19-acre site and consists of a graded training yard, classroom trailer, fenced area, access road, and parking. Ms. Zepeda-Herman completed a cultural resources survey for the SDG&E Mountain Empire Training Facility project in accordance with the requirements of the County of San Diego and CEQA to identify any impacts to significant cultural resources. She also completed a record search and coordinated with the Native American monitor.

#### **Otay Valley Regional Park Trails Project, San Diego, CA**

RECON implemented a monitoring program for the Otay Valley Regional Park trail system improvements project to satisfy the County's cultural review requirements in accordance with CEQA. As archaeology monitor, Ms. Zepeda-Herman performed monitoring during the excavation for the wetland mitigation site, three staging areas, four river crossings, and the bridge at Poggi Creek; grading for trails; and digging for fence post holes. She coordinated closely with the contractor and the Native American monitor.

#### **Agua Caliente Pool and Campsite Improvements Archaeological Monitoring and Test Excavations, San Diego, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman is serving as project supervisor for this County of San Diego Department of Parks and Recreation project in the Anza-Borrego Desert Recreation Area. She is responsible for coordinating the archaeological and Native American monitoring and test excavations. The project was

---

---

undertaken as a mitigation measure in accordance with the requirements of the County to avoid significant impacts to cultural resources under CEQA.

#### **South Bay Substation Relocation Project, PEA Technical Studies, San Diego, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman completed a cultural resources survey and report for the substation and three associated locations. She developed mitigation measures to reduce adverse impacts to significant historical resources. The purpose of the study was to assess impacts to cultural resources that may potentially occur as a result of project implementation in accordance with CEQA.

#### **Haymar Sewer Segment Replacement Project, Oceanside, CA**

The City of Oceanside's Haymar Sewer Segment Replacement project is a proposed 420-foot replacement pipeline located north and adjacent to Buena Vista Creek and south of State Route 78. The site is constrained with significant cultural resources, wetlands, and sensitive species. Ms. Zepeda-Herman served as principal investigator for the cultural resources survey and main author of the technical report.

#### **Cultural Resource Evaluation of Site CA-SDI-7240, Sycamore Canyon, BLM South Coast/Palm Springs Field Office, CA**

RECON completed fieldwork involving documentation and significance testing of a large Late Prehistoric archaeological site near the community of Dulzura. A portion of the site had been inadvertently graded during fire suppression activities and was re-examined to determine its eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Zepeda-Herman completed a record search and summarized previous investigations of the immediate project area.

#### **Knight and Sun Properties Mitigation Site for the Black Canyon Road Bridge Replacement Project, San Diego, CA**

RECON conducted a survey of the proposed mitigation area and implemented a monitoring program for the project to satisfy Caltrans and the County's cultural review requirements in accordance with Section 106 and CEQA. As project supervisor, Ms. Zepeda-Herman conducted the survey and performed monitoring during the excavation for the wetland mitigation site. She coordinated closely with the contractor and the Native American monitor.

#### **Dulzura Fuel Break Project, BLM Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office, CA**

RECON completed a contract with BLM to provide environmental review services in support of BLM's fuels management program. Ms. Zepeda-Herman conducted record searches for the Beauty Mountain, Dulzura, Gavilan Hills,



---

Hauser Mountain, and El Potrero fuels projects. She participated as field crew during the surveys for three of these projects. She authored the final report with resource evaluation and mitigation measures for the Dulzura Fuel Break.

#### **SDG&E Wood-to-Steel Pole, TL 6931 Focused Environmental Impact Assessment, San Diego, CA**

The proposed project includes the replacement of 49 wooden poles with steel poles between the city of Boulevard and Campo Indian Reservation in southeast San Diego County. Ms. Zepeda-Herman conducted a record search and field survey to obtain new field data on the presence/absence of archaeological sites within pole locations and access routes to the poles. The results were provided in a craft technical report.

#### **Sweetwater River Phase III Trail Project, San Diego, CA**

The proposed project is a multi-use trail (pedestrian, equestrian, and bicycle) approximately one mile in length that will be part of the planned trail system extending east from Interstate 805 to a loop trail around the Sweetwater Reservoir. The current trail project is located within the Sweetwater Valley Regional Park. Ms. Zepeda-Herman performed a cultural resources survey in accordance with the requirements of the County of San Diego and CEQA to identify any potential impacts to significant cultural resources. This entailed review of archival information from the South Coastal Information Center at San Diego State University and completion of a pedestrian survey along the existing trail.

#### **Emery Road Realignment, County of San Diego, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman completed a cultural resource survey of approximately 0.14 mile of Emery Road with a 100-foot buffer. One new cultural resource was recorded within the area of potential effect and as result of proposed impacts, a test excavation program was implemented in order to determine the significance of the archaeological site. Ten shovel test pits were excavated and the area of potential effect was surface collected. Based on the results of the excavations, the site was determined to be significant and data recovery program was recommended to mitigate the impacts of the project.

#### **Collett Avenue Extension Cultural Resources Survey, Riverside, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman served as the principal investigator for the Collett Avenue Extension project. Two new archaeological sites were identified during the cultural resources survey. One was a prehistoric bedrock milling site and the other was a historic water tank with associated cement irrigation pipes circa 1900s. Three of the irrigation pipes were within the project's area of potential effect. This cultural resource was recommended eligible for the California Register of Historic Places under criteria 1 and 3 and as a City of Riverside Landmark under Title 20. Mitigation measures included scaled photographs and sketches of the



three irrigation pipes within the project and avoidance during construction for the other 13 irrigation pipes outside the project.

#### **Jacumba Airport Project, San Diego, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman completed the survey of a one-acre lot proposed for a new building and the perimeter of the airport in order to determine the impacts of the installation of a security fence. The purpose was to give guidance in project design and citing of projects at the airport. Two previously recorded sites and two newly recorded sites were identified. A footprint location for the new building to avoid impacts to the cultural resources and construction monitoring for the building and the fence installation were recommended.

#### **Hauser Mountain Fuels Project, San Diego County, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman managed a Class III Cultural Resources Survey for the Hauser Mountain Fuels project on over 300 acres in eastern San Diego County. The project was for a plan to reduce fire hazards by clearing, grazing and prescribed fires. As a result of the survey, RECON recorded some 83 new heritage resources.

#### **San Vicente Road Improvements Project, San Diego, CA**

The County of San Diego Department of Public Works is proposing to make improvements to an approximate two-mile segment of San Vicente Road located south of the community of Ramona, California. Ms. Zepeda-Herman conducted the cultural resources survey and test excavations for this project.

#### **Jamacha Boulevard Widening Project, Phases I and II, San Diego County, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman surveyed the project area with a 300-foot buffer around the centerline of Jamacha Boulevard. One cultural resource recorded within the project area was not relocated but had been tested numerous times and determined not to have a subsurface deposit and not significant under CEQA. One historic rock feature was recorded and determined not significant under CEQA. There were no associated artifacts to date the site. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to cultural resources.

#### **Ocotillo Airstrip Extension, Imperial County, CA**

The project consists of extending the existing Ocotillo Airstrip, located in the western portion of Imperial County, approximately one mile northwest of the community of Ocotillo. The proposed extension is approximately 2,203 feet long and an area of approximately 45 acres was surveyed for cultural resources under the direction of Ms. Zepeda-Herman.

---

### **Pinto Basin Road EA and BA, Joshua Tree National Park, Riverside County, CA**

This project involves the reconstruction and rehabilitation of approximately 23.5 miles of Pinto Basin Road located within Joshua Tree National Park. In support of the NEPA EA, Ms. Zepeda-Herman assisted the National Park Service with determining the assessment of effect for Section 106 consultation and made recommendations to avoid adverse effects to historic properties.

### **Imperial Solar Energy Center (CSOLAR) South and West Project, Imperial County, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman served as principal investigator for the Imperial Solar Energy Centers South and West projects in Imperial Valley within a portion of the Yuha Desert. The project consists of two utility-scale solar energy project sites (photovoltaic solar field and associated transmission lines) covering over 3,000 acres of both private and BLM lands. As part of this effort she conducted a record search and cultural resources survey pursuant to Section 106 and CEQA guidelines. Additionally, Ms. Zepeda-Herman presented data from surveys at a tribal consultation meeting and conducted three site visits with a member of Cocopah, a member from the San Pasqual Band of Indians, a member of the Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians, and a member of the Quechan Indian Nation.

### **Mount Laguna Air Force Station National Register Eligibility Evaluation, San Diego County, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman managed a National Register of Historic Places eligibility evaluation of the Mount Laguna Air Force Station located in the Cleveland National Forest. The evaluation for potential eligibility for inclusion on the National Register involved a building-by-building inspection of the remaining 23 buildings and the development of a historic context of the Mount Laguna Air Force Station to use in the evaluation process. In addition, a cultural resources survey of the 140 acres of the Mount Laguna Air Force Station was also conducted.

### **Pio Pico State Historic Park, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman assisted with historic structure recordation, including photographing, written description, and sketching. She monitored during the demolition phase of restoration project. She excavated the foundation for reconstructed adobe rooms and tested cobble foundation for support posts for the porch. She participated in geophysical testing, assisted with testing inside adobe rooms and trash pits, catalogued artifacts into an Access database, and wrote sections of the final report.

### **Sepulveda Adobe Restoration, Malibu Creek State Park, CA**

Ms. Zepeda-Herman conducted historic structure recordation, including photographing, written description, and sketching. She

monitored during demolition phase of restoration project, excavated footings for structural supports for the building, catalogued artifacts into an Access database, and wrote the final report.





**CONFIDENTIAL ATTACHMENTS**

**Are not for public review**

***THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.***