3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section describes the environmental and regulatory setting for cultural resources. It also describes impacts on cultural resources that would result from implementation of the proposed project and mitigation for significant impacts, where feasible.

3.5.1 Existing Conditions

3.5.1.1 Regulatory Setting

Federal

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires federal agencies, or those they fund or permit, to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties. Historic properties are defined by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) regulations (36 CFR Part 800) for implementing Section 106 as follows:

- Historic property means any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) maintained by the Secretary of the Interior. This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization that meet the National Register criteria. (36 CFR Part 800.16[l])

- To determine whether an undertaking could affect NRHP-eligible properties, cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, and architectural properties) must be inventoried and evaluated for listing in the NRHP.

For projects involving a federal agency, cultural resource significance is evaluated in terms of eligibility for listing in the NRHP. For a property to be considered for inclusion in the NRHP, it must be at least 50 years old and meet the criteria for evaluation set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.4, as follows:

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 design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and:

- That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

- That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

- That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master or that possess high artistic values or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
• That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

If a particular resource meets one of these criteria, it is considered as an eligible historic property for listing in the NRHP. Among other criteria considerations, a property that has achieved significance within the last 50 years is not considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP unless certain exceptional conditions are met.

State

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA requires public agencies to evaluate the implications of their project(s) on the environment and includes significant historical resources as part of the environment. According to CEQA, a project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource has a significant effect on the environment ([CCR] 14 Section 15064.5; [PRC] Section 21098.1). CEQA defines a substantial adverse change as follows:

• Physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired (CCR 14 Section 15064.5[b][1]).

CEQA guidelines state that the significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project results in the following:

• Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the [California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR)]; or

• Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to PRC Section 5020.1(k) or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g), unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

• Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the [CRHR] as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA (CCR 14 Section 15064.5[b][2]).

Historical Resources

The term historical resource includes, but is not limited to any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of PRC (PRC Section 5020.1[j]). Historical resources may be designated as such through three different processes.

1. Official designation or recognition by a local government pursuant to local ordinance or resolution (PRC Section 5020.1[k]).
2. A local survey conducted pursuant to PRC Section 5024.1(g).

3. The property is listed in or eligible for listing in the [NRHP] (PRC Section 5024.1(d)(1)).

The process for identifying historical resources is typically accomplished by applying the criteria for listing in the CRHR, which states that a historical resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following four criteria. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of:

1. California’s history and cultural heritage.

2. It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

3. It 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.

4. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (CCR 14 Section 4852).

To be considered a historical resource for the purpose of CEQA, the resource must also have integrity, which is the authenticity of a resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance. Resources, therefore, must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which a resource is eligible for listing in the CRHR. (CCR 14 Section 4852(c)).

**Unique Archeological Resources**

The PRC also requires the lead agency to determine whether or not the proposed project would have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources (PRC Section 21083.2(a)).

The PRC defines a unique archaeological resource as follows:

- An archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:
  - Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
  - Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
  - Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person (PRC Section 21083.2).
In most situations, resources that meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource also meet the definition of historical resource. As a result, it is current professional practice to evaluate cultural resources for significance based on their eligibility for listing in the CRHR.

**Madera Oversight Coalition, Inc. v. County of Madera**

In the past, it was common practice for many CEQA practitioners to provide performance-based mitigation for cultural resources, stipulating that further evaluation and treatment of resources would be performed in the future. The 2011 decision from the Madera Oversight Coalition, Inc. v. County of Madera (2011) (199 Cal. App.4th 48) case held this practice to be unacceptable under CEQA and required evaluation of cultural resources subject to CEQA at a level sufficient to characterize the resources prior to EIR certification, not during pre-construction or construction stages of a project.

**Discovery of Human Remains**

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code (CHSC) states the following in regard to the discovery of human remains.

a) Every person who knowingly mutilates or disinters, wantonly disturbs, or willfully removes any human remains in or from any location other than a dedicated cemetery without authority of law is guilty of a misdemeanor, except as provided in Section 5097.99 of the [California Public Resources Code (PRC)]. The provisions of this subdivision shall not apply to any person carrying out an agreement developed pursuant to subdivision (l) of Section 5097.94 of the [PRC] or to any person authorized to implement Section 5097.98 of the [PRC].

b) In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlap adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the [California Government Code (CGC)], that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the [CGC] or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the [PRC]. The coroner shall make his or her determination within two working days from the time the person responsible for the excavation, or his or her authorized representative, notifies the coroner of the discovery or recognition of the human remains.

c) If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the [NAHC] (CHSC Section 7050.5).
Of particular note to cultural resources is subsection (c), requiring the coroner to contact the NAHC within 24 hours if discovered human remains are determined to be Native American in origin. After notification, NAHC will follow the procedures outlined in PRC Section 5097.98, which include notification of most likely descendants (MLDs), if possible, and recommendations for treatment of the remains. The MLD will have 24 hours after notification by the NAHC to make their recommendation (PRC Section 5097.98). In addition, knowing or willful possession of Native American human remains or artifacts taken from a grave or cairn is a felony under State law (PRC Section 5097.99).

Local

City of Lancaster General Plan 2030

The City of Lancaster General Plan 2030 Plan for Active Living includes specific goals, objectives, policies, and specific actions related to the protection and conservation of historic and archeological resources. Policies that apply to the proposed project are listed below:

**Goal 12:** To promote community appreciation for the unique history of the Antelope Valley and the City of Lancaster and to promote community involvement in the protection, preservation, and restoration of the area’s significant cultural, historical, or architectural features.

**Objective 12.1:** Identify and preserve and/or restore those features of cultural, historical, or architectural significance.

**Policy 12.1.1:** Preserve features and sites of significant historical and cultural value consistent with their intrinsic and scientific values.

**Specific Actions 12.1.1(a):** As part of the CEQA review process, require site-specific historical, archaeological, and/or paleontological studies when there exists a possibility that significant environmental impacts might result or when there is a lack of sufficient documentation on which to determine potential impacts.

**Specific Actions 12.1.1(b):** Include a condition of approval on all development projects that addresses State and Federal regulations with respect to the disposition of cultural resources.

**Specific Actions 12.1.1(c):** Process requests for inclusion in state and federal historic registers those historic and prehistoric sites and features which meet state or federal criteria.

**Specific Actions 12.1.1(d):** Prior to permitting demolition of any historic structure, require that an evaluation of the condition of the structure, potential adaptive reuse of the structure, and the cost of rehabilitation be undertaken.

**Policy 19.3.4:** Preserve and protect important areas of historic and cultural interest that serve as visible reminders of the City’s social and architectural history.

**Specific Actions 19.3.4(a):** Through the development review process, apply Community Design guidelines that incorporate site-sensitive building design techniques into developments that shall integrate harmoniously into the community to preserve areas of historic and cultural interest.
3.5.2 Environmental Setting

An overview of the environmental setting is provided below. This information is provided as context within which to interpret the cultural resources identified in the project area. The following is summarized from the Cultural Resources Assessment report prepared for the proposed project in 2014 by BCR Consulting LLC. In addition, supplemental reviews were completed by Stantec in 2014. These documents are available in Appendix D.

Prehistory

Throughout prehistory many groups have occupied the Mojave Desert. Their territories often overlap spatially and chronologically resulting in mixed artifact deposits. Due to dry climate and capricious geological processes, these artifacts rarely become integrated in-situ. Lacking a milieu hospitable to the preservation of cultural midden, Mojave chronologies have relied upon temporally diagnostic artifacts, such as projectile points, or upon the presence/absence of other temporal indicators, such as groundstone. Such methods are instructive, but can be limited by prehistoric occupants’ concurrent use of different artifact styles, or by artifact re-use or re-sharpening, as well as researchers’ mistaken diagnosis, and other factors.

*Paleoindian (12,000 to 10,000 Before Present [BP]) and Lake Mojave (10,000 to 7,000 BP) Periods.* The Paleoindian Period has been loosely defined by isolated fluted (such as Clovis) projectile points, dated by their association with similar artifacts discovered in-situ in the Great Plains. Some fluted bifaces have been associated with fossil remains of Rancholabrean mammals approximately dated to ca. 13,300 to 10,800 BP near China Lake in the northern Mojave Desert. The Lake Mojave Period has been associated with cultural adaptations to moist conditions, and resource allocation pointing to more lacustrine environments than previously. Artifacts that characterize this period include stemmed points, flake and core scrapers, choppers, hammerstones, and crescentics. Projectile points associated with the period include the Silver Lake and Lake Mojave styles. Lake Mojave sites commonly occur on shorelines of Pleistocene lakes and streams, where geological surfaces of that epoch have been identified.

*Pinto Period (7,000 to 4,000 BP).* The Pinto Period has been largely characterized by desiccation of the Mojave. As formerly rich lacustrine environments began to disappear, the artifact record reveals more sporadic occupation of the Mojave, indicating occupants’ recession to the more hospitable fringes. Pinto Period sites are rare, and are characterized by surface manifestations that usually lack significant in-situ remains. Artifacts from this era include Pinto projectile points and a flake industry similar to the Lake Mojave tool complex.

*Gypsum Period (4,000 to 1,500 BP).* A temporary return to moister conditions during the Gypsum Period is postulated to have encouraged technological diversification afforded by the relative abundance of resources. Concurrently a more diverse artifact assemblage reflects intensified reliance on plant resources. The new artifacts include milling stones, mortars, pestles, and a proliferation of Humboldt Concave Base, Gypsum Cave, Elko Eared, and Elko Cornernotched dart points. Other artifacts include leaf shaped projectile points, rectangular-based knives, drills, large scraper planes, choppers, hammer stones, shaft straighteners, incised stone pendants, and drilled slate tubes. The bow and arrow appears around 2,000 BP, evidenced by the presence of, the Rose Spring point.
**Saratoga Springs Period (1,500 to 800 BP).** During the Saratoga Springs Period Basketmaker III (Anasazi) pottery and obsidian artifacts begins to appear, along with turquoise mining in the eastern Mojave Desert. Influences from Patayan/Yuman assemblages are apparent in the southern Mojave, and include buff and brown wares often associated with Cottonwood and Desert Side notched projectile points. More structured settlement patterns are evidenced by the presence of large villages, and three types of identifiable archaeological sites (major habitation, temporary camps, and processing stations) emerge.

**Shoshonean Period (800 BP to Contact).** The Shoshonean period is the first to benefit from contact-era ethnography as well as be subject to its inherent biases. During the Shoshonean Period continued diversification of site assemblages, and reduced Anasazi influence both coincide with the expansion of the Numic, Takic, and Hopi. Hunting and gathering continued to diversify, and the diagnostic arrow points include desert side-notch and cottonwood triangular. Ceramics continue to proliferate, though are more common in the southern Mojave during this period. Trade routes have become well established across the Mojave, particularly the Mojave Trail, which transported goods and news across the desert via the Mojave River, to the west of the project site. Trade in the western Mojave was more closely related to coastal groups than others.

**Ethnographic Setting**

The Uto-Aztecan “Serrano” people occupied the western Mojave Desert periphery. The generic term “Serrano” has been applied to four groups, each with distinct territories: the Kitanemuk, Tataviam, Vanyume, and Serrano. Only one group, in the San Bernardino Mountains and West-Central Mojave Desert, ethnically claims the term Serrano. The Vanyume, an obscure Takic population, was found along the Mojave River at the time of Spanish contact. The Kitanemuk lived to the north and west, while the Tataviam lived to the west. The Serrano lived mainly to the south. All may have used the western Mojave area seasonally.

The ethnographic group that is believed to have inhabited this part of the Mojave Desert is the Kitanemuk. The Kitanemuk are a Takic-speaking branch of the Northern Uto-Aztecan language family. This group lived primarily in the Antelope Valley area, south of the south slope of the Tehachapi Mountains, north of the San Gabriel Mountains, and as far west as Grapevine Canyon. People belonging to the Kitanemuk tribes were recorded at the location destined to become Fort Tejon in 1850 and later at the Tule Reservation.

Like other Takic groups the Kitanemuk were patrilineal and each village had an organizational structure with a chief (kíka'y), a ceremonial manager (paka'), messengers, shamans, and diviners. The Kitanemuk had a hunter-gather economy and had trade relationships with the coastal Chumash and the Kawaiisu to the north.

Rhyolite was the preferred stone tool material for the Antelope Valley tribes and a substantial rhyolite quarry utilized by Kitanemuk lies west of the project site. Obsidian traded from the Owens Valley Paiute and cherts from the extensive quarries to the east are also found at sites within the Antelope Valley. Matates manufactured from shist collected from the San Gabriel Mountains and the Tehachapi Mountains have also been recorded.
Historic Setting

Historic-era California is generally divided into three periods: the Spanish or Mission Period (1769 to 1821), the Mexican or Rancho Period (1821 to 1848), and the American Period (1848 to present).

Spanish Period. The first European to pass through the project area is thought to be a Spaniard called Father Francisco Garces. Having become familiar with the area, Garces acted as a guide to Juan Bautista de Anza, who had been commissioned to lead a group across the desert from a Spanish outpost in Arizona to set up quarters at the Mission San Gabriel in 1771 near what today is Pasadena. Garces was followed by Alta California Governor Pedro Fages, who briefly explored the western Mojave region in 1772. Searching for San Diego Presidio deserters, Fages had traveled north through Riverside to San Bernardino, crossed over the mountains into the Mojave Desert, and then journeyed westward to the San Joaquin Valley.

Mexican Period. In 1821, Mexico overthrew Spanish rule and the missions began to decline. By 1833, the Mexican government passed the Secularization Act and the missions, reorganized as parish churches, lost their vast land holdings and released their neophytes.

American Period. The American Period, 1848–Present, began with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The Gold Rush had attracted huge numbers of American settlers and in 1850 California was accepted into the Union. The cattle industry reached its greatest prosperity during the first years of the American Period. Mexican Period land grants had created large pastoral estates in California, and demand for beef during the Gold Rush led to a cattle boom that lasted from 1849–1855. Due to the import of sheep, a series of disastrous floods in 1861–1862, followed by a significant drought diminished the economic impact of local ranching. This decline combined with ubiquitous agricultural and real estate developments of the late 19th century, set the stage for diversified economic pursuits that have continued to proliferate to this day.

Local Sequence. Lancaster grew up around the Southern Pacific Railroad during 1876. The railroad brought speculators that used artesian wells to found an early local agricultural and horticultural economy. Parcels within the new town were originally settled near today’s I Street and the Sierra Highway. Although farming was initially successful, it was also subject to the caprices of desert rainfall that varied dramatically and caused a downturn during the early 20th century. Continued well drilling managed to revive local agriculture and by the teens and 1920s local mining and the continued influence of the railroad resulted in a local economic resurgence. Municipal advancements included paved streets in 1916, the formation of a local Los Angeles County Waterworks district in 1919, a fire department in 1921, and electric service brought by SCE in 1923. Although the economy slowed again during the depression and World War II, the founding of the Muroc Lake Bombing and Gunnery Range (now Edwards Air Force Base) in 1933 compensated somewhat for the losses, while mining and alfalfa farming remained locally viable. The post war years brought an economic boom to Lancaster, which was locally punctuated by the opening of the first local ready-mix plant, the Antelope Valley Freeway plan, and eventually resulted in the local population expanding to 40,609 by 1970. Lancaster finally incorporated in 1977 and has since developed into a bedroom community, in addition to remaining a hub for farming, mining, and transportation.
3.5.3 Environmental Impacts

This section analyzes the proposed project’s potential to result in significant impacts to cultural resources. When an impact is determined to be significant, mitigation measures were identified that would reduce or avoid that impact.

Methodology for Analysis

This evaluation of cultural resources is based on professional standards and information cited throughout the section. The work was completed pursuant to CEQA, the PRC Chapter 2.6, Section 21083.2, and CCR Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5. The key effects were identified and evaluated based on the presence and nature of cultural resources within the project area and the magnitude, intensity, and duration of activities related to the construction and operation of the proposed project.

Records Search and Archival Research

Prior to fieldwork, a records search was requested from the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) for the project site and vicinity (within a 1 mile radius). An updated records search (RS No. 14517) for the three additional gen-tie alignments was conducted at the SCCIC on November 3, 2014. These searches entailed a review of all previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, as well as a review of all known cultural resources survey reports, excavation reports, and regional overviews.

The purpose of the records searches was to determine the extent of previous cultural resources studies and the location of previously recorded cultural resources within the search area. Additional resources reviewed included the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), the California Register, and documents and inventories published by the California Office of Historic Preservation. These include the lists of California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, Listing of National Register Properties, and the Inventory of Historic Structures. Limited research was also conducted for the project site through local and regional repositories, internet resources, and a vertebrate paleontology resources report through the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.

Data from the SCCIC revealed that 57 previous cultural resource studies have taken place and 34 cultural resources have been recorded within one mile of the project site. Of the 57 previous studies, 16 have previously assessed portions of the project site, and 18 cultural resources (all historic-period) have been previously recorded within its boundaries. The records search is summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USGS 7.5 Minute Quad</th>
<th>Cultural Resources Within One Mile of the Project Site</th>
<th>Cultural Resource Studies Within One Mile of the Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Del Sur</td>
<td>P-19-1334: Prehistoric artifact scatter</td>
<td>LA-1472, 1810, 1812, 1920**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5-1: Cultural Resources and Reports within One Mile of the Project Site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USGS 7.5 Minute Quad</th>
<th>Cultural Resources Within One Mile of the Project Site</th>
<th>Cultural Resource Studies Within One Mile of the Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-1830: Prehistoric lithic scatter</td>
<td>4141, 6602, 7285, 7286**,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-3119: Historic-period refuse scatter</td>
<td>7288, 7289, 7290**,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-3310*: Historic-period building foundation</td>
<td>7991**, 8037, 8168,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-3477*: 1952 Antelope Substation</td>
<td>8189, 8190, 8426, 8925,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-3479*: Historic-period refuse scatter</td>
<td>9393, 9693, 9705**, 9762**,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-3690*: Historic-period water distribution site</td>
<td>9764, 9795, 9792, 9793,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9997**, 10175, 10210, 10211,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10551, 10634**, 10758**,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10859, 10142, 10156, 11168,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11230, 11824, 11849,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11850, 11976, 11980,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12006, 12273, 12503,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12527**, 12528*, 12547**,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12565, Cultural Resources Assessment of the Lancaster Highlands Project** (Not on file at the SCCIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-3983: Historic-period refuse scatter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4154H: California Aqueduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4244: Historic-period refuse scatter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4245*: Historic-period road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4247: Historic-period dirt road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4249*: Historic-period dirt road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4250*: Historic-period dirt road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4251*: Historic-period dirt road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4252*: Historic-period dirt road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4253*: Historic-period dirt road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4254*: Historic-period dirt road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4255*: Historic-period dirt road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4257: Historic-period dirt road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4272: Historic-period refuse scatter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4318: Historic-period refuse scatter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-4319*: Historic-period refuse scatter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100632: Isolated prehistoric chert scraper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100818: Isolated prehistoric chert flake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100819: Isolated prehistoric volcanic flake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100919*: Isolated historic-period can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100920: Isolated historic-period can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100921: Isolated historic-period can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100922: Isolated historic-period can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100925: Isolated historic-period can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100926: Isolated historic-period can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-100927*: Two historic-period cans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-186876*: Historic-period transmission line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-189425: Historic-period transmission line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-19-189437*: Historic period residence and barn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Native American Consultation

On July 29, 2014, a request was submitted to the NAHC for a Sacred Lands File records search for the project site and vicinity. The NAHC reply stated that the Sacred Lands File had no record of any Native American cultural resources within or adjacent to the project site. Included in the reply was contact information for Native American individuals and organizations that may be able to provide information about unrecorded Native American resources on the project area and vicinity. Certified letters were sent to all contacts provided requesting information on possible unrecorded Native American resources in the project area, and also inquiring as to whether or not they have any concerns regarding sacred sites or traditional cultural properties in the project vicinity that might be affected by the proposed project. Follow-up phone calls were made to each contact to ensure that they received the initial letter and to solicit further comments. Native American individuals and groups contacted regarding the proposed project either had no comments or did not respond.

Field Survey

Between July 3 and July 24, 2014, an intensive pedestrian survey of the entire project site was conducted. The survey was conducted by walking parallel transects spaced approximately 15 meters apart across a 30 percent sample of areas subject to recent cultural resources assessment. The remainder of the project site was fully surveyed (see Figure 3.5-1). Although no definitive probability models have been developed for archaeological sites in the western Mojave Desert, the 30 percent sample focused on areas that contain (or contained) natural waterways or water sources, and on areas that exhibited relatively low levels of modern or historical disturbance.

Supplementing the original survey, a second intensive pedestrian survey was conducted of Gentle Routes 4 through 6. This pedestrian survey was conducted on November 6 and 7, 2014. The survey was conducted by walking 15 meter wide transects parallel to and within the 60 meter wide buffer surrounding each proposed gen-tie alignment. Per the California Office of Historic Preservation guidelines (1995), surface and subsurface exposures such as rodent burrows and cut banks were examined for physical manifestations of human activity greater than 45 years in age. Documentation included field notes and photographs. The extent of the survey coverage was recorded with a Trimble Juno 5, hand-held global positioning system (GPS) unit, with between 2 to 4 meter horizontal accuracy, with the Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM), North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 83), Zone 11, meters, as the spatial reference.
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Photographs were taken with a Canon PowerShot A530 digital camera to document the built environment within the Project Area. The extent of the survey coverage was drawn on the Del Sur, CA (1974) USGS 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangle.

Preparation for the field surveys involved a thorough review of modern and historic aerial photos and topographic maps, field checks and updates for previously identified cultural resources, and a preliminary windshield survey of roads throughout and surrounding the project site to confirm suspected potential for cultural resource sensitivity. All cultural resources encountered during the surveys were recorded using California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 series forms, approved by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Resources were photographed, mapped using a handheld survey grade GPS receiver, and sketched as necessary.

The pedestrian cultural resources surveys were intended to locate and document previously recorded and new cultural resources, including archaeological sites, features, isolates, and historic buildings, that exceed 45 years in age within defined project boundaries. The ground surface was examined for evidence of cultural deposits, and the general morphological characteristics of the ground surface were inspected for indications of subsurface deposits that may be manifested on the surface, such as circular depressions and ditches.

During the initial field survey, the records for 13 previously recorded resources located within the project site were updated and new records were created for seven previously unrecorded resources. In the second survey, archaeologists updated the records of four previously documented historic period resources and documented one historic period refuse deposit and three isolated prehistoric finds within the proposed gen-tie routes. A complete description of each cultural resource follows.

**P-19-3310:** This resource was originally recorded in 2004 as a post-1921 poured concrete building foundation (sill). Archaeologists revisited the resource in July 2014 and found that the resource remained in place as originally recorded.

**P-19-3311:** This resource was originally recorded in 2004 as three sides of a post-1921 poured concrete building foundation (sill). Archaeologists revisited the resource in July 2014 and found that the resource remained in place as originally recorded.

**P-19-3477/Antelope Substation:** This resource was originally recorded in 2005 (also updated in 2013) as the Antelope Substation. This resource was constructed in 1952 and consists of the substation buildings and associated equipment operated by SCE. The Antelope Substation connects to the Del Sur Substation (approximately 14 miles to the northeast) via the Saugus-Del Sur 66 kV Transmission line (designated P-19-189425), which is outside the current study area. It also connects with the Mesa substation in Monterey Park, California via a 118 mile 220kV electrical transmission line. The Antelope Substation was revisited and based on aerial photos and external assessment appears to be intact as recorded. However, the interior of the site was not accessible and as a result detailed recording of individual components was not possible.

**P-19-3690:** This resource was originally recorded in 2007 as a historic period water tank and associated pipes, accompanied by a scatter of old lumber. Archaeologists revisited the
resource and found that the water tank had been removed. A 14-inch diameter vertical well pipe was noted in its place. The scatter of old lumber remained in place as described.

**P-19-4245:** This resource was originally recorded in October 2011 as a pair of historic-period dirt roads. Archaeologists revisited the resource and found both roads in place as described during the original recording.

**P-19-4249:** This resource was originally recorded in October 2011 as a pre-1945 asphalt road. Archaeologists revisited the resource and found it in place as described during the original recording.

**P-19-4250:** This resource was originally recorded in October 2011 as a pre-1945 asphalt road. Archaeologists revisited the resource and found it in place as described during the original recording.

**P-19-4251:** This resource was originally recorded in October 2011 as a pre-1945 asphalt road. Archaeologists revisited the resource and found it in place as described during the original recording.

**P-19-4252 (115th Street West):** This resource consists of a historic road alignment and was initially documented in October 2011. Archaeologists revisited this resource and found it to be accurate as described during the original recording.

**P-19-4253:** This resource consists of a historic road alignment running perpendicular to Avenue J West and was initially documented in October 2011. Archaeologists revisited this resource and found it to be accurate as described in 2011.

**P-19-4254 (120th Street West):** This resource consists of a historic road alignment and was initially documented in October 2011. Archaeologists revisited this resource and found it to be accurate as described in 2011.

**P-19-4255 (125th Street West):** This resource consists of a historic road alignment and was initially documented in October 2011. Archaeologists revisited this resource and found it to be accurate as described in 2011.

**P-19-4319:** This resource was originally recorded in March 2011 as a historic-era refuse scatter. The debris included steel cans and fragments of steel cans, a glass bottle, a rusted metal bolt, and a juice glass fragment. A date range of 1929-1954 was offered for the glass bottle, but no specific date for the deposit was determined. Archaeologists attempted to relocate the resource using a Global Positioning System and were unsuccessful. The entire area had been subject to recent grading and the resource is considered destroyed.

**P-19-100919:** This resource was originally recorded in March 2011 as a single isolated historic-period sanitary can. Archaeologists relocated the resource using a GPS. It had moved from its original location approximately 40 meters to the northeast.

**P-19-100927:** This resource was originally recorded in March 2011 as two historic-period church-key opened beer or soda cans. Archaeologists attempted to relocate the resource using a Global Positioning System and were unsuccessful.
P-19-186876: This resource was originally recorded in July 2010 as a “118-mile single-circuit 220kV electrical transmission line connecting the Antelope and Mesa substations”. The line comprised vertical A-frame structures with battered legs and a T-shaped cross-arm to hold transmission cables in a horizontal array across the top of the tower. Towers are typically 78 feet tall, with concrete footings approximately 24 feet apart. Spacing between towers varies. The alignment was constructed between 1949 and 1951, with additions and alterations continuing to the present. Archaeologists revisited a segment of the alignment located within the project site. The alignment and components are in place as described during the original recording.

P-19-189437: This resource was originally recorded in 2010 as a 1920s deteriorated home accompanied by a demolished barn and water tank. Archaeologists revisited the resource in July 2014 and found that all previously recorded surface components had been removed, leaving only two concrete foundations.

SPO1402-I-1: This is an isolated dark grey chert primary flake. It is a distal fragment with some cortex and scarring visible on the dorsal surface, measuring 1.34 by 0.98 by 0.39 inches. No other archaeological materials were found in the vicinity. Local disturbances are significant and include modern trash dumping, surface erosion, and some vegetation growth.

SPO1402-I-2: This is an isolated unfinished obsidian projectile point with visible cortex on one side (virtually flat) and with one edge more finely serrated than the other. The item measures 2.0 by 0.7 by 0.3 inches. No other archaeological materials were found in the vicinity. Local disturbances are significant and include trash dumping, surface erosion, and some vegetation growth.

SPO1402-I-3: This resource consists of a small portion of a concrete/cobble building footing accompanied by a historic-period refuse scatter. The building footing is six inches wide and four feet long. The refuse includes 30+ sun-colored amethyst glass bottle fragments, 50+ brown glass bottle fragments, 15+ aqua glass bottle fragments, two brown glass bottle finishes (screw-top with seam through finish), 150+ sanitary cans (non-diagnostic), and 15+ non-diagnostic ceramic and porcelain fragments. One brown bottle base was embossed with “Federal Law Prohibits Sale or Reuse of this Bottle”. Temporally diagnostic items include sun-colored amethyst glass (manufactured 1880-1916), seam through finish bottle fragments (after 1903), and the federal prohibition label (common between 1932 and 1964). The resource condition is poor and it is located in sandy silt surrounded by Russian thistle and seasonal grasses. It is oriented east/west and measures approximately 60 by 33 feet. Disturbances include mechanical excavation, erosion, and vegetation growth. The ages of the items in the deposit differ considerably and, in combination with the high level of surface disturbance, make information potential negligible. The number of dumping episodes and a specific age range are impossible to pinpoint for the deposit, though it likely occurred before the late 1960s. Finally, any association between the refuse scatter and the building footing is unknown.

SPO1402-I-4: This resource consists of a former well site and irrigation system. The remnants include an earthen reservoir containing a feeder pipe in its southern wall surrounded by 12 concrete stand-pipes and three wooden utility poles. The well was located immediately to the south of the reservoir. It was in place by 1954 along with four farm buildings (no longer present) immediately to the north. The irrigation system and buildings were still in use in 1974, but had been abandoned by 2005. The utility poles indicate that the well used a pump to fill the
reservoir, and the associated piping watered alfalfa fields to the east. Although the reservoir occupies its original footprint (approximately 150 by 130 feet), the overall condition of the system is poor due to demolition and erosion. Seasonal grasses surround the reservoir and tamarisk bushes are growing along its western boundary.

**SPO1402-I-5:** This resource consists of an abandoned concrete reservoir, measuring 25 by 25 feet and four feet deep. There is a ramp on the north side; vertical steel poles embedded in the concrete walls and a scatter of milled lumber suggest that the reservoir was covered. A reservoir has occupied the same footprint since prior to 1954. It is in fair condition. Alterations include demolition of the roof and disconnection from an integrated irrigation system. Seasonal grasses and Russian thistle are growing around and inside the reservoir.

**SPO1402-I-6:** This resource consists of a defunct earthen reservoir with three concrete standpipes, a steel water tank, a small concrete foundation, and a small concrete box. The reservoir was in use by 1954 and irrigated the fields to the east until it was abandoned sometime between 1974 and 2005. Although the reservoir still occupies its original footprint (approximately 60 by 110 feet), the overall condition of the system is poor due to demolition, erosion, and modern trash dumping. Seasonal grasses are growing around and within the reservoir. A modern pump house has been installed near the northeast corner of the reservoir, and likely provides water to a house and several outbuildings outside the study area to the east.

**SPO1402-I-7:** This is an isolated obsidian projectile point base fragment. It is too fragmentary to attribute a type. This item shows varying patina indicating either retouch or breakage that occurred long after it was originally flaked. Its shape suggests possible reuse as a drill, but shows no such use-wear. The item measures 0.78 by 0.65 by 0.24 inches. No other archaeological materials were found in the vicinity.

**Isolated finds ISO-VH1, ISO-VH2, and ISO-VH3:** Three isolated finds comprised of prehistoric artifacts were documented during the second survey. ISO-VH1 is a dark brown chert, tertiary flake fragment, measuring 1.22 inches in length, 1.06 inches in width, and 0.16 inches in thickness. ISO-VH1 was identified approximately 30 feet west of 110th Street West between two wood pole structures. ISO-VH2 is a white, chalcedony core fragment identified within a cleared area on the north side of an existing steel-tower structure, and immediately south of Avenue I. This biface fragment measures 2.2 inches in length, 2.05 inches in width, and 1.57 inches in thickness. This isolated find was partially buried in a cleared area of the tower access route. ISO-VH3 is a gray, chalcedony biface fragment found on the south side of Avenue J. This distal biface fragment measures approximately 0.94 inches in length, 0.90 inches in width, and 0.28 inches in thickness. The fragment exhibits a pronounced break with inclusions which were noted along the break margin and the inclusions may have been the cause of the breakage.

**AL-1:** Resource AL-1 is a small, light, historic-period refuse deposit comprised of approximately 11 partially buried sanitary cans, and four clear glass bases. One is a round glass bottle base with a maker’s mark depicting letter “L” within an oval or circle, which was used by the Latchford Glass Company of Los Angeles since 1957. Two other clear glass bases with letter “L” embossed in the base indicate most likely products manufactured by the earlier Latchford Glass Company between 1925 and 1957. The fourth broken bottle is a kidney shaped liquor bottle base with an “I-in-an-O” and the words Liquor Bottle embossed in base suggesting it was manufactured by the Owens-Illinois Company of Toledo, Ohio between 1954 to present. The site appears to be
very small and measures approximately 33 feet (north-south) by 33 feet (east-west). The site is located on a small rise bordered to the north and east by a large, intermittent drainage.

**Significance Evaluations**

During the field survey, 28 historic-period resources were identified. CEQA (PRC Chapter 2.6, Section 21083.2 and CCR Title 145, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5) calls for the evaluation and recordation of historic and archaeological resources. The criteria for determining the significance of impacts to cultural resources are based on Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and Guidelines for the Nomination of Properties to the California Register. Properties eligible for listing in the California Register and subject to review under CEQA are those meeting the criteria for listing in the California Register, National Register, or designation under a local ordinance.

**California Register Evaluations.** Evaluations are summarized in Table 3.5-2 below, and (excluding isolated artifacts) are explained in detail on a site-by-site basis in the section that follows.

### Table 3.5-2: California Register Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>California Register Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-19-3310</td>
<td>Historic-period building foundation</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-3311</td>
<td>Historic-period building foundation</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-3477</td>
<td>1952 Antelope Substation</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-3690</td>
<td>Historic-period water distribution site</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-4245</td>
<td>Two historic-period roads</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-4249</td>
<td>Historic-period road</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-4250</td>
<td>Historic-period road</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-4251</td>
<td>Historic-period road</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-4252</td>
<td>Historic-period road</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-4253</td>
<td>Historic-period road</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-4254</td>
<td>Historic-period road</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-4255</td>
<td>Historic-period road</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-4319</td>
<td>Historic-period refuse scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-100919*</td>
<td>Isolated historic-period can</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-100927*</td>
<td>Two historic-period cans</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>California Register Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-186876</td>
<td>Historic-period transmission line</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-189437</td>
<td>Historic period residence and barn</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO1402-I-1*</td>
<td>Prehistoric obsidian flake</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO1402-I-2*</td>
<td>Prehistoric projectile point</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO1402-I-3</td>
<td>Historic-period building foundation/refuse scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO1402-I-4</td>
<td>Historic-period reservoir</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO1402-I-5</td>
<td>Historic-period reservoir</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO1402-I-6</td>
<td>Historic-period reservoir</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO1402-I-7*</td>
<td>Prehistoric projectile point</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO1402-I-10</td>
<td>Historic period refuse scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO-VH1*</td>
<td>Prehistoric chert flake</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO-VH2*</td>
<td>Prehistoric chalcedony core</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO-VH3*</td>
<td>Prehistoric chalcedony biface</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site AL1</td>
<td>Historic period refuse scatter</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *These are isolated artifacts, which have limited data potential and are not considered eligible for the California Register. They do not require further evaluation.

Source: BCR Consulting LLC 2014; Stantec 2014; Chambers Group 2013

**P-19-3310 and P-19-3311**: Substantial research has been conducted regarding the project site and recommends that the building foundations, P-19-3310 and P-19-3311, are not associated with important events (California Register Criterion 1), or important persons (California Register Criterion 2). The foundations do not exhibit distinctive characteristics (California Register Criterion 3), and their data potential is considered exhausted (California Register Criterion 4). Due to failure to meet any of the above criteria, it is recommended that these building foundations are not potentially eligible for the California Register, and therefore are not considered historical resources under CEQA.

**P-19-3477/Antelope Substation**: The substation was originally constructed in 1952, and has undergone substantial alterations including component upgrades, and maintenance activities. As a result of these activities the substation has lost some integrity of design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. However, access to the property was limited and the extent of changes to all historic-period components is not currently clear. BCR Consulting LLC did not complete a full evaluation of the Antelope Substation and recommended the resource as potentially eligible for the California Register.
However, in May 2013, Chambers Group did a complete evaluation of P-19-3477/Antelope Substation. The Chambers Group found that the Antelope Substation did not appear to meet the formal definitions of a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource as defined by CEQA. The site is comparatively recent (mid-twentieth century) and has little potential for yielding additional data. It did not appear to be associated with significant historical events or persons (Criteria A and B), to embody the distinctive characteristics of a period (Criterion C), or to be likely to yield information important in history (Criterion D). This resource was therefore recommended ineligible for listing in the CRHR. (Chambers Group 2013)

P-19-3690: Very little remains of this historic-period water distribution site. It does not retain any integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. As a result it is recommended that the resource it is not potentially eligible for the California Register, and therefore is not a historical resource under CEQA.

P-19-4245, P-19-4249, P-19-4250, P-19-4251, P-19-4252, P-4253, P-19-4254, and P-19-4255: Substantial research has been conducted regarding the project site and it is recommended that the following historic-period roads, P-19-4245, P-19-4249, P-19-4250, P-19-4251, P-19-4252, P-19-4253, P-19-4254, and P-19-4255, are not associated with important events (California Register Criterion 1), or important persons (California Register Criterion 2). These roads are ubiquitous and do not exhibit distinctive characteristics (California Register Criterion 3), and their data potential is considered exhausted (California Register Criterion 4). As a result, these historic roads are not eligible under CEQA.

P-19-4319: This historic-period refuse scatter has been destroyed, and as a result is not a historical resource under CEQA.

P-19-186876: This resource was studied comprehensively and was recommended not eligible for listing in the California Register. Based on a review of the previous study, and on the field assessment of the small segment of the resource within the project site boundaries, no evidence has been found to contradict this recommendation. As a result, it is recommended that the segment of the transmission alignment within the project site is not potentially eligible for the California Register and therefore is not a historical resource under CEQA.

P-19-189437: Very little remains of this historic-period barn and water tank. It does not retain any integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. As a result, it is recommended that the resource is not potentially eligible for the California Register, and therefore is not a historical resource under CEQA.

SPO1402-I-3: Substantial research has been conducted regarding the project site and it is recommended that this building foundation and historic-period refuse scatter are not associated with important events (California Register Criterion 1) or important persons (California Register Criterion 2). The foundation and refuse scatter do not exhibit distinctive characteristics (California Register Criterion 3), and the data potential is considered exhausted (California Register Criterion 4). Due to the failure to meet any of the above criteria, it is recommended that this refuse scatter and building foundation are not potentially eligible for the California Register, and therefore are not considered a historical resource under CEQA.
SPO1402-I-4: Substantial research has been conducted regarding the project site and it is recommended that the physical remains of this historic-period well site and irrigation system are not associated with important events (California Register Criterion 1) or important persons (California Register Criterion 2). They do not exhibit distinctive characteristics (California Register Criterion 3) and data potential is considered exhausted (California Register Criterion 4). Because of the failure to meet any of the above criteria, it is recommended that this well site and irrigation system are not potentially eligible for the California Register, and therefore are not considered a historical resource under CEQA.

SPO1402-I-5: Substantial research has been conducted regarding the project site and it is recommended that the physical remains of this historic-period concrete reservoir are not associated with important events (California Register Criterion 1) or important persons (California Register Criterion 2). It does not exhibit distinctive characteristics (California Register Criterion 3) and its data potential is considered exhausted (California Register Criterion 4). Because of its failure to meet any of the above criteria, it is recommended that this concrete reservoir is not potentially eligible for the California Register, and therefore is not considered a historical resource under CEQA.

SPO1402-I-6: Substantial research has been conducted regarding the project site and it is recommended that the physical remains of this historic-period reservoir and associated features are not associated with important events (California Register Criterion 1) or important persons (California Register Criterion 2). They do not exhibit distinctive characteristics (California Register Criterion 3) and all data potential is considered exhausted (California Register Criterion 4). Because of the failure to meet any of the above criteria, it is recommended that this historic-period reservoir and associated features are not potentially eligible for the California Register, and therefore are not considered a historical resource under CEQA.

Site AL-1: Site AL-1 is a small and light, historic period refuse deposit comprised of approximately 11 sanitary cans and four broken bottle fragments. The site does not appear to retain any integrity of location, setting, design, workmanship, feeling and association. The refuse appears highly disturbed and most likely in secondary or tertiary deposition. Based on archival research and data obtained in the field, the site does not appear to be associated with important events (Criterion 1) or important individuals (Criterion 2). The resource fails to exhibit any distinctive characteristics, and its recordation exhausts its research potential (Criteria 3 and 4, respectively). Thus, the resource is not a historical resource under CEQA.

Findings

Previously Recorded Cultural Resources. The results of the SCCIC records search revealed that 34 cultural resources have been recorded within one mile of the project site and 18 cultural resources (all historic-period) have been previously recorded within the project area. All 18 of the historic period cultural resources are recommended not eligible for the California Register. Therefore, as all resources are recommended not eligible, no resources require further evaluation.

Newly Recorded Cultural Resources. During the field surveys, archaeologists recorded 11 previously unrecorded resources identified within the project area. Six of the 11 resources were isolated prehistoric artifacts, which have limited data potential and are not considered eligible
for the California Register. The other five previously unrecorded resources were historic period and are recommended not eligible for the California Register. Therefore, no newly recorded cultural resources are eligible for the California Register and do not require further evaluation.

**Thresholds of Significance**

According to the CEQA Guidelines’ Appendix G Environmental Checklist, the following questions were analyzed and evaluated to determine whether impacts to cultural resources are significant. Would the proposed project:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Significance Criteria California Register of Historical Resources**. The California Register criteria are based on National Register criteria. For a property to be eligible for inclusion on the California Register, one or more of the following criteria must be met:

1. It is associated with the events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the U.S.;
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or U.S. history;
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, represents the work of a master, possesses high artistic values; and/or
4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, the California Register requires that sufficient time has passed since a resource’s period of significance to “obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resources.” (CCR 4852 [d][2]). The California Register also requires that a resource possess integrity. This is defined as the ability for the resource to convey its significance through seven aspects: location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

**3.5.3.1 Project Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures**

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the proposed project and provides mitigation measures where necessary.
Historic Resource

Impact CR-1 The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

Impact Analysis

Twenty eight cultural resources are within the project area. All 28 of the cultural resources are recommended not eligible for the California Register. Therefore, as all resources are recommended not eligible, no resources require further consideration.

Because the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, impacts to historical resources would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

Archaeological Resource

Impact CR-2 The proposed project could potentially cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.

Impact Analysis

During the field survey, archaeologists recorded five historic period resources and three isolated prehistoric finds. These eight cultural resources are not considered eligible for the California Register. Therefore, as the eight cultural resources are recommended not eligible these resources do not require further consideration.

However, the potential exists for encountering previously unrecorded prehistoric or historic-period archaeological (subsurface) resources during proposed project construction. Any previously unrecorded archaeological resource encountered would be potentially California Register eligible, thus a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. In that situation, the proposed project would have potential to cause a substantial adverse change in its significance, thereby resulting in an impact on a historical resource. This impact is considered potentially significant, but would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing Mitigation Measure CR-1.
Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially Significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM CR-1: If buried cultural resources such as chipped or groundstone, historic debris, or building foundations, are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work shall stop in that area and within a 100 feet radius of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop a response plan, with appropriate treatment measures, in consultation with the City of Lancaster, State Historic Preservation Officer, and other appropriate agencies. Preservation in place shall be the preferred treatment method per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b) (avoidance, open space, capping, easement). Data recovery of important information about the resource, research, or other actions determined during consultation, is allowed if it is the only feasible treatment method.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

Paleontological Resource or Geologic Feature

| Impact CR-3 | The proposed project could potentially directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. |

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would permanently develop 1,085 acres and temporarily disturb 7 acres during project construction. It would also involve excavating foundations for a switching station and trenching for the gen-tie(s). As described under Section 3.6, Geology and Soils, most of the site contains geologic rock from the Cretaceous period. The Cretaceous period produced geologic rock formations that are known to contain vertebrate and other fossils associated with marine flora and fauna and that may be considered a significant paleontological resource. According to conclusions of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles report, excavations in the exposures of plutonic igneous rocks will not uncover any fossils. Surface grading or very shallow excavations of older Quaternary fan deposits or younger Quaternary Alluvium on the project site are unlikely to encounter significant vertebrate fossils. Deeper excavations in the latter areas that extend down into older deposits, however, may uncover significant fossil vertebrate remains. The project grading and excavation, therefore, have the potential to destroy paleontological resources (fossils) if they are present, which would be a significant impact. Implementing Mitigation Measures CR-2 and CR-3 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially Significant Impact.
Mitigation Measures

**MM CR-2:** The applicant shall provide training to all construction personnel to ensure that they can recognize fossil materials in the event any are discovered during construction. The training shall be conducted by a paleontologist. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the importance of paleontological specimens that might be recovered.

**MM CR-3:** A qualified paleontologist shall conduct a pre-construction training of all construction personnel involved in any ground disturbing construction activity for the entire proposed project. Construction personnel shall be informed of the possibility of buried paleontological resources within the project site and the protocol to be followed if a paleontological resource is encountered.

If any paleontological resources (i.e., fossils) are found during project construction, construction shall be halted immediately in the subject area and the applicant shall be immediately notified. A qualified paleontologist shall be retained to evaluate the find and recommend appropriate treatment of the inadvertently discovered paleontological resources. The appropriate treatment of inadvertently discovered paleontological resources shall be implemented to ensure that the impacts to these resources are avoided.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Less Than Significant Impact.

**Human Remains**

**Impact CR-4** The proposed project could potentially disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

**Impact Analysis**

No human remains are known to be located in or near the project area. However, the possibility always exists that unmarked burials may be unearthed during project construction. This impact is considered potentially significant, but would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing Mitigation Measure CR-4.

**Level of Significance Before Mitigation**

Potentially Significant Impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

**MM CR-4:** If human skeletal remains are encountered, ground-disturbing activities shall be stopped within a 100 foot radius of the discovery. The county coroner shall be contacted immediately and is required to examine the discovery within 48 hours. If the county coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist (QA) should also be contacted immediately. The coroner is required to notify and seek out a treatment recommendation of the NAHC-designated MLD.
• If NAHC identifies an MLD, and the MLD makes a recommendation, and the landowner accepts the recommendation, then ground-disturbing activities may resume after the QA verifies and notifies the County that the recommendations have been completed.

• If NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, or the MLD makes no recommendation, or the landowner rejects the recommendation, and mediation per PRC 5094.98(k) fails, then ground-disturbing activities may resume, but only after the QA verifies and notifies the County that the landowner has completely reinterred the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property, and ensures no further disturbance of the site per PRC 5097.98(e) by county recording, open space designation, or a conservation easement.

If the coroner determines that no investigation of the cause of death is required and that the human remains are not Native American, then ground-disturbing activities may resume, after the coroner informs the County of Los Angeles of such determination. According to State law, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

3.5.4 Cumulative Impacts

The geographic scope of the potential cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resources is usually limited to areas within the physical footprint of a project site. With the implementation of the mitigation measures described herein, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on historic resources, archaeological resources, and human remains. Simultaneous construction of other projects in the vicinity could potentially result in significant impacts on historic resources, archaeological resources, and human remains should they be present within the other project sites or the vicinity of the other project sites. However, compliance with CEQA, including identified mitigation measures, would result in a less than significant impact on cultural resources and avoidance of adverse cumulative effects.