5.7 Historical Resources

This section addresses historical, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources associated with the San Ysidro community, and is based on the Cultural Resources Technical Report, prepared by AECOM in 2015 (Appendix G), and the Historic Context Statement provided by Page and Turnbull in 2011 (Appendix H).

5.7.1 Existing Conditions

5.7.1.1 SYCPU

San Diego County has a long cultural history that is here briefly addressed. A detailed chronology of the prehistoric and historic settlement is contained in Appendix G.

a. Historic Background

Ethnographic

San Ysidro is within the traditional territory of the Kumeyaay people. The Kumeyaay of the prehistoric and contact periods were a group of exogamous, patrilineal territorial bands who inhabited San Diego County from Agua Hedionda Lagoon in Carlsbad south into Baja California and from the Pacific Ocean east to the Salton Sea (Gifford 1918). The Kumeyaay language is from the Yuman branch of the Hokan linguistic family. They subsisted on a hunting and foraging economy, exploiting San Diego's diverse ecology throughout the year; coastal bands exploited marine resources while inland bands might move from the desert, ripe with agave and small game, to the acorn and pine nut rich mountains in the fall (Kroeber 1925; Luomala 1978; Cline 1984). Maintaining this lifestyle meant most groups, especially inland bands, moved with the seasons; this is displayed archaeologically by the prevalence of temporary campsites inland while more permanent village sites are located along the coast. Ethnographic information provided by Shipek (e.g., 1976) suggests that there were three such villages located in the area of San Ysidro (Gallegos et al. 1998); however, none of these villages have been confirmed archaeologically.

Prehistoric

As described in the Cultural Resources Technical Report, the prehistory of San Ysidro can generally be divided into three major periods: Paleoindian (also referred to as the San Dieguito complex), Archaic (or the La Jolla and Pauma complexes), and Late Prehistoric (or Cuyamaca complex).

San Dieguito Complex (10,000 to 7,000 Before Present [B.P.])

The earliest accepted archaeological manifestation of Native Americans in the San Diego area is the San Dieguito complex, dating to approximately 10,000 years ago (Warren 1967). The material culture of the San Dieguito complex consists primarily of scrapers, scraper planes, choppers, large blades, and large projectile points. The San Dieguito complex is chronologically equivalent to other Paleoindian complexes across North America, and sites are sometimes called "Paleoindian" rather than "San Dieguito". San Dieguito material underlies La Jolla complex strata at the C.W. Harris site in San Dieguito Valley (Warren, ed. 1966).
La Jolla and Pauma Complexes (7,000 to 1,500 B.P.)

The traditional view of San Diego prehistory has the San Dieguito complex followed by the La Jolla complex at least 7,000 years ago, possibly as long as 9,000 years ago (Rogers 1966). The La Jolla complex is part of the Encinitas tradition and equates with Wallace's (1955) Millingstone Horizon, also known as Early Archaic or Milling Archaic. The Encinitas tradition is generally "recognized by millingstone assemblages in shell middens, often near sloughs and lagoons" (Moratto 1984:147). "Crude" cobble tools, especially choppers and scrapers, characterize the La Jolla complex (Moriarty 1966). Basin metates, manos, discoidals, a small number of Pinto series and Elko series points, and flexed burials are also characteristic.

Warren et al. (1961) proposed that the La Jolla complex developed with the arrival of a desert people on the coast who quickly adapted to their new environment. Moriarty (1966) and Kaldenberg (1976) have suggested an in situ development of the La Jolla people from the San Dieguito. Moriarty has since proposed a Pleistocene migration of an ancestral stage of the La Jolla people to the San Diego coast. He suggested this Pre-La Jolla complex is represented at Texas Street, Buchanan Canyon, and the Brown site (Moriarty 1987).

Various authors (see Bull 1987; Gallegos 1987) have proposed that the San Dieguito, La Jolla, and Pauma complexes are manifestations of the same culture, with differing site types "explained by site location, resources exploited, influence, innovation and adaptation to a rich coastal region over a long period of time" (Gallegos 1987:30). The classic "La Jolla" assemblage is one adapted to life on the coast and appears to continue through time (Robbins-Wade 1986, 1988; Winterrowd and Cárdenas 1987). Inland sites adapted to hunting contain a different tool kit, regardless of temporal period (Cárdenas and Van Wormer 1984).

Other archaeologists argue that an apparent overlap among assemblages identified as "La Jolla," "Pauma," or "San Dieguito" does not preclude the existence of an Early Milling period culture in the San Diego region, separate from an earlier culture (Cook 1985; Gross and Hildebrand 1998; Warren 1998). One perceived problem is that many site reports in the San Diego region present conclusions based on interpretations of stratigraphic profiles from sites at which stratigraphy cannot validly be used to address chronology or changes through time. The subsurface deposits at numerous sites are the result of such agencies as rodent burrowing, insect activity, and other bioturbative factors (Bocek 1986; Erlandson 1984; Gross 1992; Johnson 1989).

Cuyamaca Complex (1,500 B.P. to 1769)

The Late Prehistoric period is represented by the Cuyamaca complex in the southern portion of San Diego County and the San Luis Rey complex in the northern portion of the county. The Cuyamaca complex is the archaeological manifestation of the Yuman forebears of the Kumeyaay people. The San Luis Rey complex represents the Shoshonean predecessors of the ethnohistoric Luiseño. The name Luiseño derives from Mission San Luis Rey de Francia and has been used to refer to the Indian people associated with that mission, while the Kumeyaay people are also known as Ipai, Tipai, or Diegueño (named for Mission San Diego de Alcalá). Agua Hedionda Creek is often described as the division between the territories of the Luiseño and the Kumeyaay people (Bean and Shipek 1978; Luomala 1978; White 1963).
Historic

There are three general eras in California history: the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods.

The Spanish Period (1769 to 1821)

Although colonial contact was first made two centuries earlier, the recognized historic period in San Diego begins when the Spanish founded the Royal Presidio of San Diego in 1769. The Mission San Diego de Alcalá was constructed in its current location five years later. The Spanish Colonial period lasted until 1821 and was characterized by religious and military institutions bringing Spanish culture to the area and attempting to convert the Native American population to Catholicism. Due to its distance from the Mission, San Ysidro was left relatively undeveloped during this time.

The Mexican Period (1821 to 1848)

The Mexican period lasted from 1821, when California became part of Mexico, to 1848, when Mexico ceded California to the United States under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo at the end of the Mexican-American War. Following secularization of the missions in 1834, mission lands were given as large land grants, called ranchos, to Mexican citizens as rewards for service to the government. In 1829, Santiago Arguello Moraga, commandant of the Presidio, was gifted Rancho Tia Juana, which included present day Tijuana and San Ysidro (Hughes 2009). The society made a transition from one dominated by the church and the military to a more civilian population, with people living on ranchos or in pueblos. The Pueblo of San Diego was established during this period, and transportation routes were expanded. Cattle ranching prevailed over agricultural activities.

The American Period (1848 to the Present)

The American period began in 1848, when the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ceded California to the United States and defined the modern international border between America and Mexico. The territory of California became a state in 1850. The transition of land rights according to the Treaty was difficult to follow in practice and the Homestead Act of 1851, which was adopted as a means of validating and settling land ownership claims throughout the state, compounded the problem. Few of the large Mexican ranchos remained intact, due to legal costs and the difficulty of producing sufficient evidence to prove title claims. Much of the land that once constituted rancho holdings became available for settlement by immigrants to California. The end of the Civil War and the discovery of gold led to an influx of people to California and to the San Diego region. Other factors that made San Diego appealing were the availability of free land through passage of the Homestead Act, and later, the importance of the county as an agricultural area supported by roads, irrigation systems, and connecting railways. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, rural areas of San Diego County developed small agricultural communities centered on one-room schoolhouses. Such rural farming communities consisted of individuals and families tied together through geographical boundaries, a common schoolhouse, and a church. Farmers living in small rural communities were instrumental in the development of San Diego County. They fed the growing urban population and provided business for local markets. Rural farm school districts represented the most common type of community in the county from 1870 to 1930.

The growth and decline of towns occurred in response to boom and bust cycles in the 1880s, including the birth of Tia Juana City, a border town subdivision of San Diego along the California Southern Railroad. Floods forced residence of Tia Juana City to move to higher ground in the 1890s.
and the new town was christened San Ysidro by resident George Smythe in 1909. San Ysidro was primarily an agricultural community from 1909 to 1964; during this time the community of Little Landers’ Colony No. 1 (known simply as the Little Landers’ Colony) was established at the Belcher Ranch site in the Tia Juana River Valley within San Ysidro by William Smythe in 1908. Little Landers’ Colony was created as a cooperative farming utopia, an idea common in the early 20th century, which consisted of joint small residential lots and one-acre agricultural lots. Irrigation difficulties led to bankruptcy and the colony failed by 1919. Despite this, agriculture and dairies remained the primary economic pursuit of San Ysidro residents until the 1960s, when many lots were subdivided and developed.

b. Historical Resources

Archaeological Resources

Overall, twenty-nine previous cultural resource investigations have been conducted within the community of San Ysidro, including nineteen surveys, four monitoring programs, three constraint-level analyses, two evaluation reports, and one historic building survey (see Appendix E, Table 1). These investigations recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological deposits. Nine archaeological resources have been previously recorded within the community of San Ysidro; of these, seven are prehistoric and two are historic. The prehistoric resources include three lithic quarry sites, three lithic scatters, and one temporary camp site. The historic resources consist of one refuse deposit and one cattle feed lot with building foundations and walls and a debris scatter (Table 5.7-1, Recorded Archaeological Sites).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-37-004571</td>
<td>Lithic quarry</td>
<td>Recorded and sample collected in 1976, agricultural area</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-004934</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Recorded in 1976, revised in 1990, limited testing, fully developed</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-005555</td>
<td>Lithic quarry</td>
<td>Recorded in 1978, revised in 1992, no record of mitigation, fully developed</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-010206</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Recorded in 1984, revised in 2005, no record of mitigation, near developed area</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-010613</td>
<td>Lithic scatter</td>
<td>Recorded in 1986, mitigated, disturbed</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-010614</td>
<td>Lithic quarry</td>
<td>Recorded in 1986, no record of mitigation, development level unknown</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-011079</td>
<td>Temporary camp</td>
<td>Recorded in 1988, no record of mitigation, development level unknown</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-012962</td>
<td>Historic refuse deposit</td>
<td>Recorded in 1992, limited testing, disturbed and out of context, mostly developed</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-031175</td>
<td>Historic cattle feed lot and debris scatter</td>
<td>Recorded in 2010, no mitigation recorded, highly disturbed, undeveloped</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historical Resources

The community of San Ysidro was intensively surveyed by the City of San Diego in 1989. A total of 128 buildings were surveyed; of these, four were found to be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), two were found to be potentially eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), and 24 were found to be eligible for the San Diego Register. Today, three buildings within the SYCPU area are listed on the San Diego Historic Register as determined by the City of San Diego Historic Resources Board (HRB): the El Toreador Motel (HRB Site #236), the San Ysidro Public Library (HRB Site #451), and the Harry and Amanda Rundell House (HRB Site #820). The U.S. Customs House located on the international border is listed in the NRHP for its architecture and its political role.

Religious or Sacred Uses

In accordance with Senate Bill 18, the City contacted the NAHC in June 2011. The NAHC verified that there are sacred lands within the vicinity of the SYCPU area, and provided a list of tribal entities and other contacts to be consulted. Following the development of the preliminary draft of the Cultural Resources Report, the NAHC was contacted again in October 2014 for updated tribal contact information. The draft report was distributed to the tribal contacts on October 15, 2014. In addition, the City of San Diego submitted a second request for consultation to the NAHC. Letters were distributed to all tribal groups identified by the NAHC with a potential interest in the SYCPU on October 15, 2014. Each representative was also emailed in November 2014 as a follow up. Carmen Lucas of the Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians requested that qualified archaeologists be retained by the city for survey and monitoring efforts. No other responses were received by the submittal of the Cultural Resources Report.

Human Remains

There are no known human remains in the SYCPU area. There is a potential, however, for human remains to exist below the ground surface within the SYCPU area.

5.7.1.2 SYHVSP

a. Historical Background

Ethnographic

As a neighborhood within the larger community of San Ysidro, El Pueblito Viejo Village was also within the traditional territory of the Kumeyaay people, whose ethnographic background is described in Section 5.7.1.1.

Prehistoric

As a neighborhood within the larger community of San Ysidro, the prehistoric background of the SYHVSP is the same as that of the SYCPU as detailed in Section 5.7.1.1.
Historic

As a neighborhood within the larger community of San Ysidro, the general historic background of the SYHVSP is the same as that of the SYCPU as detailed in Section 5.7.1.1. El Pueblito Viejo was a locus of activity from the establishment of San Ysidro and currently houses a number of extant buildings from the American Period.

b. Historical Resources

Archaeological Resources

None of the nine archaeological resources identified within the SYCPU occur within the SYHVSP area.

Historical Resources

The three buildings now listed on the San Diego Historic Register: the El Toreador Motel (HRB Site #236), the San Ysidro Public Library (HRB Site #451), and the Harry and Amanda Rundell House (HRB Site #820), are all located within the SYHVSP area.

Religious or Sacred Uses

The NAHC verified that there are sacred lands within areas of the SYCPU but did not specify which areas are considered sacred. Therefore, the SYHVSP area potentially includes land sacred to the Kumeyaay people. There is also potential that new subsurface sacred lands could be uncovered during future development.

Human Remains

As with the SYCPU, there are no known human remains in the SYHVSP area. There is a potential, however, for human remains to exist below the ground surface within the SYHVSP area.

5.7.1.3 Regulatory Setting/Historic Preservation Plans, Policies and Standards

a. Federal

National Register of Historic Places

Federal criteria are those used to determine eligibility for the NRHP. The NRHP was established by the National Historic Preservation Act (1966). The NRHP is the official lists of sites, buildings, structures, districts, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service. Nominations to the NRHP may come from the various State Historic Preservation Offices, Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, local governments, and from private individuals and organizations. The NRHP 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 of our history;
b. Are associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

c. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values; or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d. Have 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.

Native American Involvement

Native American involvement in the development review process is addressed when an undertaking under federal law triggers environmental review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This often occurs when a project is funded by a federal agency or is being proposed by a federal agency and requires review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA) ensures that Native American human remains and cultural items are treated with respect and dignity during all phases of project evaluation.

b. State

California Register of Historic Resources/California Environmental Quality Act

Similar to the NRHP, the CRHR program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archaeological, and cultural significance; identifies resources for planning purposes; determines eligibility of state historic grant funding; and provides certain protections under CEQA. State criteria are those listed in CEQA and used to determine whether an historic resource qualifies for the CRHR. A resource may be listed in the CRHR if it is significant at the federal, state, or local level under one or more of the four criteria listed below.

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history and cultural heritage of California or the United States.

2. Is 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 was amended in 1998 to define "historical resources" as a resource listed in or determined eligible for listing on the CRHR, a resource included in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in a historical resource survey that meets certain requirements, and any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant.

For the purposes of CEQA, a significant historical resource is one which qualifies for the CRHR or is listed in a local historic register or deemed significant in a historical resource survey, as provided under Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code. A resource that is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the CRHR, not included in a local register of historic resources, or not deemed significant in a historical resource survey may nonetheless be historically significant for purposes of CEQA (Section 15064.5 and CEQA Statutes Section 21083.2).

The City's determination of significance of impacts on historical and unique archaeological resources is based on the criteria found in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. 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).

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

Native American Involvement

Native American involvement in the development review process is addressed by several state laws. The most notable of the state laws is SB 18 which includes detailed requirements for local agencies to consult with identified California Native American Tribes early in the planning and/or development process. The California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (2001), like the federal act ensures that Native American human remains and cultural items are treated with respect and dignity during all phases of the archaeological evaluation process in accordance with CEQA and any applicable local regulations.

c. Local

Historical Resources Regulations

The Historical Resources Regulations (HRR) are part of the San Diego Municipal Code (Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2: Purpose of HRR or Sections 143.0201-143.0280). The HRR have been developed to implement applicable local, state, and federal policies and mandates. Included in these are the General Plan, CEQA, and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966.

Part of the HRR consists of a Development Review Process for all projects in the City. This review process is composed of two parts: implementation of the HRR and a determination of impacts and mitigation under CEQA. The implementation of the HRR begins with the determination of the need for a survey of the project site. The need for a survey is based on historical resource information and the date and results of any previous surveys of a project site. Surveys are required if more than five years have elapsed since the last survey and the potential for resources exists. A historic
property (built environment) survey is required if the structure/site is over 45 years old, may meet one or more criteria for designation, and appears to have integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Surveys must be conducted according to criteria in the Historical Resource Guidelines (HRG). If the survey results are negative, the review process is complete and no mitigation is required.

Historical resources, in the HRR context, include 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 of 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 2001).

In addition to direct and indirect impacts, cumulative impacts must also be addressed during the CEQA review process. 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 2001).

**Historical Resources Guidelines**

The City's Historical Resources Guidelines amended in April 2001 are designed to implement the Historical Resources Regulations contained in Chapter 14, Division 3, Article 2 of the LDC. If any resources have been recorded on the property, those resources must be evaluated for significance/importance in accordance with criteria listed in the Historical Resources Guidelines. Resources determined to be significant/important must either be avoided or a data recovery program for important archaeological sites must be developed and approved prior to permit issuance in order to assure adequate mitigation for the recovery of cultural and scientific information related to the resource's significance/importance.

**General Plan Historic Preservation Element**

The Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan sets a series of goals for the City for the preservation of historic resources. The first of these goals is to preserve significant historical resources. These goals would be realized through implementation of policies that encourage the identification and preservation of historical resources. Specific policies are shown in Table 5.7-2, General Plan Historic Preservation Element Policies.
### TABLE 5.7-2
GENERAL PLAN HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HP-A.1</td>
<td>Strengthen historic preservation planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-A.2</td>
<td>Fully integrate the consideration of historical and cultural resources in the larger land use planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-A.3</td>
<td>Foster government to government relationships with the Kumeyaay/Diegueño tribes of San Diego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-A.4</td>
<td>Actively pursue a program to identify, document, and evaluate the historical and cultural resources in the City of San Diego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-A.5</td>
<td>Designate and preserve significant historical and cultural resources for current and future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-B.1</td>
<td>Foster greater public participation and education in historical and cultural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-B.2</td>
<td>Promote the maintenance, restoration, and rehabilitation of historical resources through a variety of financial and development incentives. Continue to use existing programs and develop new approaches as needed. Encourage continued private ownership and utilization of historic structures through a variety of incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-B.3</td>
<td>Develop a historic preservation sponsorship program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-B.4</td>
<td>Increase opportunities for cultural heritage tourism. Additional discussion and policies can be found in the Economic Prosperity Element, Section I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of San Diego General Plan 2008.

### 5.7.2 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 SYCPU 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.
5.7.3 Issue 1: Historical or Archaeological Impacts

Would the proposed SYCPU or SYHVSP 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?

5.7.3.1 SYCPU

a. Impacts

As indicated earlier, the San Ysidro community includes known historical and archaeological resources. Future build-out pursuant to the SYCPU could impact these resources as well as subsurface cultural resources which have not been identified by previous studies. Given the lack of information regarding where future development may occur, impacts to specific resources within the community cannot be predicted in this PEIR.

While unable to guarantee that impacts to archaeological and historic resources would not occur with future development, the Historic Preservation Element of the SYCPU contains the following policies which would reduce potential impacts.

9.1.1 Conduct subsurface investigations at the project level to identify potentially significant archaeological resources.

9.1.2 Protect and preserve significant archaeological resources. Refer significant sites to the Historical Resources Board for designation.

9.1.3 Ensure adequate data recovery and mitigation for adverse impacts to archaeological and Native American sites at the project level. In order to determine ethnic or cultural significance of archaeological sites or landscapes to the Native American community, meaningful consultation is necessary.

9.1.4 Include measures during new construction to monitor and recover buried deposits from the historic periods and address significant research questions related to pre-history.

9.1.5 Identify, designate, preserve, and restore historical buildings in San Ysidro and encourage their adaptive reuse.

9.1.6 Catalogue and preserve historic street lighting and furniture. Maintain and preserve other non-structural features of the historic and cultural landscape, such as sidewalk scoring and coloring, sidewalk stamps, and landscaping.

9.1.7 Encourage the reuse of materials and the adaptation of historically significant structures to help sustain the community character.

9.1.8 Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural, or aesthetic value.

9.1.9 Promote the preservation of buildings and features that provide continuity with the past.
9.1.10 Encourage new building to express a variety of architectural styles, but to do so with full awareness of and respect for, the height, mass, articulation, and materials of the surrounding historic buildings and culturally significant resources.

9.1.11 Look to historic buildings for design, architectural ideas, and inspiration.

9.1.12 Complete an intensive-level survey of the potential Little Landers Historic District to determine whether or not the area is eligible for designation as a historic district, either as proposed or in a modified form depending upon the results of the survey.

9.1.13 Complete an intensive-level survey of the potential San Ysidro Community Park Cultural Landscape to determine whether or the area is eligible for designation as a cultural landscape with specific focus on the influence of Mexican culture on the physical environment.

The San Ysidro Historic Context Statement (Appendix H) contains two recommendations for future study within the SYCPU area. One would be to perform a San Ysidro Community Park Cultural Landscape Study, focusing on the San Ysidro Community Park and surrounding area as a cultural landscape with specific focus on the influence of Mexican culture on the physical environment. The other would be to perform a study of the potential Little Landers Historic District. This residential district would be centered on the San Ysidro Community Park and encompass the area between Pepper Street, Seaward Street, Alverson Street, and San Ysidro Boulevard. Based upon initial mapping of potential resources within this area, the potential historic district may not be viable due to integrity issues; however, a smaller district may exist encompassing as little as one or two street blocks.

b. Significance of Impacts

Given the presence of known and potential historical and archeological resources within the community, future development pursuant to the SYCPU could have a significant impact on important historical or archeological resources.

c. Mitigation Framework

Archaeological Resources

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce impacts on archaeological resources.

HIST-1: Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources. Prior to issuance of any permit for a future development project implemented in accordance with the SYCPU area 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 prehistoric 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 may conduct a site visit, as needed. 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, archaeological 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 Archaeological 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 archaeological research in similar areas, models that predict site distribution, and archaeological, 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 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., AB 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.

**Historical Resources**

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce impacts to historical resources.

**HIST-2: Historic Buildings, Structures, and Objects.** Prior to issuance of any permit for a future development project implemented in accordance with the SYCPU 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 is historically significant. The evaluation of historic architectural resources shall 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 shall be 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 shall include, but are not limited to:

- a. Conducting a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Record (HAER);
- b. Preparing a historic resource management plan;
- c. 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);
- d. Repairing damage according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation;
e. 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;

f. Shielding historic properties from noise generators through the use of sound walls, double glazing, and air conditioning; and

g. 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.

d. Significance after Mitigation

Archaeological Resources

Implementation of actions pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIST-1, combined with SYCPU policies promoting the identification and preservation of significant resources and compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation, would reduce impacts to archaeological or tribal cultural resources to less than significant for future development.

Historical Resources

Implementation of actions pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIST-2 would reduce impacts to historic buildings, structures, and objects. However, the ability of this measure to adequately protect significant historic structures cannot be assured at the program level. Thus, potential significant impacts to important historical resources are considered unavoidable at the program level.

5.7.3.2 SYHVSP

a. Impacts

As discussed earlier, three structures within the SYHVSP are designated as historically significant. Future development which may alter these structures would result in a historical impact. Similarly, as with the SYCPU, subsurface archaeological resources may be present within the specific plan area. If present, future development could impact these resources.

b. Significance of Impacts

Given the presence of known and potential historical and archaeological resources within the community, future development pursuant to the SYHVSP could have a significant impact on important historical or archaeological resources.
c. Mitigation Framework

Archaeological Resources

Mitigation Measure HIST-1 would be applicable to future development within the SYHVSP.

Historical Resources

Mitigation Measure HIST-2 would be applicable to future development within the SYHVSP.

d. Significance after Mitigation

Archaeological Resources

Implementation of actions pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIST-1, combined with SYCPU policies promoting the identification and preservation of significant resources and compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation, would reduce impacts to archaeological or tribal cultural resources to less than significant for future development.

Historical Resources

Implementation of actions pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIST-2 would reduce impacts to historic buildings, structures, and objects. However, the ability of this measure to adequately protect significant historic structures cannot be assured at the program level. Thus, potential significant impacts to important historical resources are considered unavoidable at the program level.

5.7.4 Issue 2: Religious or Sacred Impacts

Would the proposed SYCPU or SYHVSP result in any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the SYCPU area?

5.7.4.1 SYCPU

a. Impacts

As discussed earlier, important religious or sacred resources are anticipated to occur within the SYCPU area. Thus, future development could impact religious or sacred sites.

b. Significance of Impacts

Given the presence of known sacred lands within the community, future development pursuant to the SYCPU could have a significant impact on religious or sacred sites. Due to the sensitive nature of sacred and religious places, any impacts associated with future projects would be considered significant.

c. Mitigation Framework

Mitigation Measure HIST-1 would be applicable to reducing impacts to religious or sacred sites.
d. Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of actions pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIST-1, combined with SYCPU policies promoting the identification and preservation of significant resources and compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation, would reduce impacts to less than significant.

5.7.4.2 SYHVSP

a. Impacts

As with the SYCPU, development within the SYHVSP could impact religious or sacred sites located within the specific plan area.

b. Significance of Impacts

Due to the sensitive nature of sacred and religious places, any impacts associated with future projects within the SYHVSP would be considered significant.

c. Mitigation Framework

Mitigation Measure HIST-1 would be applicable to reducing impacts to religious or sacred sites.

d. Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of actions pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIST-1, combined with SYCPU policies promoting the identification and preservation of significant resources and compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation, would reduce impacts to less than significant.

5.7.5 Issue 3: Human Remains

Would the SYCPU or SYHVSP result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

5.7.5.1 SYCPU

a. Impacts

If human remains are present within future development areas, impacts to human remains could occur.

b. Significance of Impacts

Given the possibility of encountering subsurface human remains, any impact to human remains during future development pursuant to the SYCPU would be considered significant.
c. Mitigation Framework

Mitigation Measure HIST-1 contains specific guidance regarding actions to be taken in the event human remains are encountered.

d. Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of actions pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIST-1, combined with SYCPU policies promoting the identification and preservation of significant resources, would reduce impacts to less than significant.

5.7.5.2 SYHVSP

a. Impacts

If human remains are present within future development areas with the specific plan area, impacts to human remains could occur.

b. Significance of Impacts

Given the possibility of encountering subsurface human remains, any impact to human remains during future development pursuant to the SYHVSP would be considered significant.

c. Mitigation Framework

Mitigation Measure HIST-1 contains specific guidance regarding actions to be taken in the event human remains are encountered.

d. Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of actions pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIST-1, combined with SYCPU policies promoting the identification, would reduce impacts to less than significant.