

4.5 Cultural Resources

This section describes the environmental and regulatory settings and discusses the impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed Valley–Ivyglen 115-kilovolt (kV) Subtransmission Line Project (proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project) and the proposed Alberhill System Project (proposed Alberhill Project) with respect to cultural and paleontological resources. The microwave dish antennas that would be installed on existing structures at the Santiago Peak Communications site and Serrano Substation as part of the proposed Alberhill Project would have no impact on cultural or paleontological resources; therefore, these components are not discussed further in this section. During scoping for both of the proposed projects, a number of commenters, including those representing the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians (Soboba Band) and Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians (Pechanga Tribe), stated that the proposed projects could impact cultural resources. Commenters stated that Native American resources in the area include petroglyphs, grinding holes, and rocks that have been cordoned off by government agencies. These comments have helped inform the analysis in this section.

The cultural resources discussed in this section may be described as historic resources, archaeological resources, Native American resources, or paleontological resources:

- **Historic Resources:** As defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), historic resources are those resources that are listed on, or determined to be eligible for listing on, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) or a local register, or are otherwise determined to be historic pursuant to CEQA or the CEQA Guidelines (Public Resources Code [PRC] § 21084.1 or Code of Regulations, title 14, § 15064.5, respectively). An historic resource, for example, may be an object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that is historically significant or significant in terms of California’s architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural records. Typically, historic resources are more than 50 years old.
- **Archaeological Resources:** Archaeological resources may be considered historic resources or, if not, archaeological resources may be determined to be “unique” as defined by CEQA (PRC § 21083.2). Unique archaeological resources are artifacts, objects, or sites that can be demonstrated to (1) contain information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; (2) have a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or (3) be directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person. Non-unique archaeological resources are not typically addressed in environmental impact reports (EIRs).
- **Native American Resources:** Native American cultural resources that may include historical or archaeological resources, rock art, and prominent topographical areas, features, habitats, plants, animals, or minerals that contemporary Native Americans value and consider important for the preservation of Native American traditions.
- **Paleontological Resources:** For the purposes of this EIR, paleontological resources refer to fossilized plant and animal remains of prehistoric species. They are valued for the information they yield about the history of the earth and its past ecological settings. Paleontological resources represent a limited, non-renewable, and impact-sensitive scientific and educational resource. Fossil remains such as bones, teeth, shells, and leaves are found in the geologic deposits (rock formations). Paleontological resources, in general, include fossils as well as the collecting localities and the geologic formations that contain those fossils.

4.5.1 Environmental Setting

The discussion of the setting presented in the following prehistory, ethnography and ethnohistory, and history sections is based on the cultural resources sections of the Proponent’s Environmental Assessment submitted by the applicant for the proposed Alberhill Project (SCE 2011) and the 2009 Draft EIR and 2014 Amended Petition for Modification for the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project (CPUC 2009, SCE 2014), unless otherwise cited.

Methodology

Records Search

Alberhill Project

Cultural resources technical reports completed for the proposed projects, documentation for projects in proximity to components of the proposed projects, and California Department of Parks and Recreation forms for cultural resources sites and isolate finds were reviewed (Brodie 2011a, 2011b, 2011c; Chmiel and Cooley 2008, Cooley and Craft 2008, Cotterman and Chandler 2008, 2009, Craft and Cooley 2008, Glentis 2011a, 2011b, McLean and Brodie 2012, Miller 2013, Pollock n.d., SCE 2011). Cultural resources records searches were conducted by the applicant and the CPUC at the Eastern Information Center, located at the University of California, Riverside, to determine the extent of previous cultural resources investigations completed within a 1-mile radius of the proposed Alberhill Substation site and 0.5 miles of the proposed 500-kV transmission and 115-kV subtransmission line routes. Materials reviewed as part of the records searches included archaeological site records, historic maps, and listings of resources on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), National Historic Landmarks, California Register, California Points of Historical Interest, and California Landmarks. Records searches were also conducted by SCE on June 17, 18, and 23, 2015, for the proposed Alberhill Project. The results from those searches, which include a 0.25-mile buffer around the proposed Alberhill Project, are incorporated into this analysis.

Valley–Ivyglen Project

The basic information sources and materials listed above for the proposed Alberhill Project were also consulted for the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project. Cultural resources technical reports and Department of Parks and Recreation forms for cultural resources sites and isolate finds were reviewed (Brodie 2011b, 2011c, 2012, Glentis 2011, McLean and Brodie 2012, Pollock n.d., SCE 2011). Cultural resources records searches were conducted by the applicant (Lerch and Gray 2006) and the CPUC at the Eastern Information Center to determine the extent of previous cultural resources investigations completed within 0.5 miles of components of the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project. Records searches were also conducted by SCE on June 17, 18, and 23, 2015, for the proposed Valley-Ivyglen Project. The results from those searches, which include a 0.25-mile buffer around the proposed Valley-Ivyglen Project, are incorporated into this analysis.

Surveys

Alberhill Project

A cultural resources survey of the proposed Alberhill Substation site was conducted by Cotterman and Chandler (2008). Approximately the western 35 percent of the proposed substation area was occupied by a horse ranch, which was developed in the 1970s and 1980s. Facilities at the horse ranch were demolished as described in Section 2.4.4.1, “Demolition of Horse Ranch Facilities and Weed Abatement.” Demolition of the facilities is further discussed under Impact CR-1 (ASP). The proposed substation site was surveyed in transects with 20-meter intervals except in areas too steep to safely navigate by foot.

1 The proposed 500-kV transmission line routes were surveyed in 2009 by Cotterman and Chandler.
2 Changes in the proposed 500-kV line routes necessitated a new survey in 2011 (Brodie 2011). Most of the
3 500-kV transmission line routes are occupied by rocky ridges with steep slopes. The steepest slopes were
4 not surveyed in transects. Instead, they were viewed from safe positions located either above or below the
5 survey area. For the proposed Alberhill Project’s 115-kV subtransmission lines, field survey reports
6 completed for preparation of the original Valley–Ivyglen Draft EIR were reviewed because the field
7 survey reports cover the same general geographic area and because the proposed projects overlap
8 geographically¹; therefore, the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project reports also provide relevant information
9 about the cultural setting for the proposed Alberhill Project (CPUC 2009, Lerch and Gray 2006). Fenced
10 private-property was not surveyed. As project details were clarified or changed, additional surveys were
11 conducted (Chmiel and Cooley 2008; Cooley and Craft 2008; Craft and Cooley 2008).

12
13 ***Valley–Ivyglen Project***

14 The original cultural resource surveys for the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project were completed in 2006
15 by Lerch and Gray. This survey covered “a 200-foot-wide (60-m-wide) corridor on either side of the
16 proposed or existing power lines” and was conducted by two three-person crews who surveyed the area in
17 20-meter transects (Lerch and Gray 2006). Developed areas and private property for which no entry
18 permissions could be obtained were left unsurveyed. This initial survey covered the applicant’s preferred
19 route for the proposed project, seven alternative route segments, and a 133-acre area adjacent to the
20 preferred route. Additional surveys were conducted to cover new or modified elements of the proposed
21 project (Brodie 2011b, 2011c, 2012; Glentis 2011a, 2011b; McLean and Brodie 2012; Pollock n.d.).

22
23 Reconnaissance-level surveys were conducted for disturbed areas that had previously been developed
24 (e.g., paved roadways, areas subject to mining activities, and developed residential areas).
25 Reconnaissance-level surveys were also completed for areas with No Trespassing signs or areas unsafe or
26 otherwise unavailable for pedestrian access (e.g., areas adjacent to Interstate 15 and areas with fences,
27 guards, and surveillance cameras). For the reconnaissance-level surveys, a two-person crew of surveyors
28 walked parcel perimeters and the perimeters of areas with restricted access. Intensive-level surveys that
29 include standardized transects of the entire subject area were not completed. Surveyors recorded
30 observations of subject areas from public access points near landforms, soils, and other easily identifiable
31 features. Binoculars were not used. The surveyors found that in most cases, the development activities
32 had substantially modified the landforms observed. Surveys did not observe midden soils² or historic
33 deposits during the reconnaissance-level surveys completed for the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project
34 (Miller 2013).

35
36 ***Native American Consultation³***

37 Native American consultation was conducted by the applicant and the CPUC for both the proposed
38 projects. Consultation for the original Valley–Ivyglen Draft EIR is also discussed here, since the results
39 of consultation are relevant to the analysis for this EIR because the concerns raised in consultation are

¹ The two projects would be constructed along the same right-of-way (ROW) for approximately 6.5 miles (see 115-kV Segments VIG4 and VIG5 and 115-kV Segment ASP2 shown on Figures 2-2a through 2-2b).

² The term *midden soils* refers to soils that have been organically enriched through human occupation of the area in which they occur. Waste from plant and animal processing, as well as human excrement, can contribute to this organic enrichment, resulting in sediments that are noticeably darker than surrounding soils or sediments.

³ Assembly Bill 52 recently amended CEQA through, in relevant part, adding section 21084.2 to the PRC. PRC section 21084.2 establishes that a substantial adverse effect on the significance of a tribal cultural resource may have a significant effect on the environment. The amendment does not apply to projects for which an NOP was issued prior to July 1, 2015 (A.B. 54. (Cal. 2014). The NOP for the proposed projects was issued on May 6, 2015; therefore, the amendments to CEQA per AB 52 do not apply to the proposed projects.

1 | relevant to the Native American resources and cultural importance of the general geographic area of the
 2 | proposed projects. Correspondence with Native American groups for the proposed projects is documented
 3 | in Appendix I. During initial cultural resources assessments for the proposed projects, the applicant
 4 | contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in 2005 for the Valley-Ivyglen Project
 5 | (for information to include in application materials for the original Valley-Ivyglen EIR) and in 2008 for
 6 | the Alberhill Project. The NAHC provided contact lists of local tribal representatives and information
 7 | regarding sacred lands located in the areas of the proposed Alberhill Substation site, 500-kV transmission
 8 | line routes, and Valley-Ivyglen and Alberhill 115-kV subtransmission line routes. Information requested
 9 | included prehistoric, ethnohistoric, and historic land use and sites of Native American traditional or
 10 | cultural value that may exist within the areas of the proposed projects as depicted in the Sacred Lands
 11 | Inventory File. In response to the information requests, the NAHC indicated that no documented
 12 | resources are recorded in the NAHC Sacred Lands Inventory File in proximity to components of the
 13 | proposed projects (NAHC 2005, 2008). In 2009, the applicant sent letters to the Native American groups
 14 | included on the contact lists provided by the NAHC for the proposed Alberhill Project. The applicant
 15 | most recently contacted the NAHC on June 19, 2015, to request a Sacred Lands Inventory File search and
 16 | an updated Native American Contact List for the proposed projects. The NAHC responded on July 15,
 17 | 2015 and indicated that there were still no resources documented in the NAHC files for the areas of the
 18 | proposed projects.

19 |
 20 | The CPUC ~~has~~ contacted several tribes through distribution of Notices of Preparation (NOPs) for both
 21 | proposed projects. In January 2008, a NOP document for the proposed Valley-Ivyglen Project EIR was
 22 | circulated to the public by the CPUC. Three tribes responded to the NOP: the Soboba Band; the Pala
 23 | Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pala Reservation, California; and the Pechanga Tribe. The
 24 | Soboba Band and the Pechanga Tribe both indicated that they wished to consult with the CPUC regarding
 25 | the proposed projects because the projects are located within the traditional use areas of the respective
 26 | tribes. The Pala Band declined to participate in further consultation with the CPUC regarding the
 27 | proposed projects as the projects are not located within the Pala Indian Reservation or within the
 28 | boundaries of the area the tribe considers its traditional use area.

29 |
 30 | ~~In and in~~ April 2010, a NOP for the proposed Alberhill Project EIR was circulated (Section 1.3.2, “Public
 31 | Scoping”). The Pechanga Tribe responded to this NOP in May 2010, reiterating its desire to continue to
 32 | consult with the CPUC regarding the project. In July 2011, a second NOP was circulated by the CPUC
 33 | for the proposed Alberhill Project. The second NOP was circulated following an amendment to the
 34 | Proponent’s Environmental Assessment submitted by the applicant. A third NOP was circulated in May
 35 | 2015. The Pechanga Tribe responded to this NOP, re-stating its desire to consult with~~third NOP covered~~
 36 | the CPUC regarding~~proposed Alberhill project and the proposed Valley-Ivyglen project.~~

37 |
 38 | The CPUC held meetings regarding the proposed modifications to the Valley-Ivyglen Project evaluated
 39 | in this EIR with the Soboba Band on June 10, 2013 and Pechanga Tribe on June 11, 2013. Cultural sites
 40 | data provided by both groups during these 2013 meetings were verified by the CPUC and are
 41 | incorporated into the analysis presented in this EIR.

42 |
 43 | A third NOP was circulated in May 2015. The third NOP covered the proposed Alberhill project and the
 44 | proposed Valley-Ivyglen project. The Pechanga Tribe indicated, in separate responses for each project
 45 | covered by the joint NOP, that it wanted to consult with the CPUC regarding the projects. The Pechanga
 46 | Tribe has provided comments as part of the CEQA process for the proposed Alberhill and Valley-Ivyglen
 47 | projects, and the CPUC consulted with the tribe regarding potential impacts on cultural resources. The
 48 | views expressed by the Pechanga Tribe in the comments and discussion were documented by the CPUC
 49 | and are reflected in the analysis presented in the EIR.

50 |
 51 | _

1
2 **Paleontological Resources**

3 A paleontological resources literature review and records search was conducted at the Division of
4 Geological Sciences of the San Bernardino County Museum. The records search was conducted to
5 determine the extent and results of previous paleontological investigations within a one-mile radius of
6 components of the proposed Alberhill Project. The search also covered the Valley–Ivyglen Project’s 115-
7 kV Segments VIG3 through VIG5 and parts of 115-kV Segments VIG1, VIG2, and VIG6. The purpose of
8 the records search was to determine whether paleontological sites or resources have been previously
9 identified in the areas of the proposed projects. Materials reviewed as part of the records search included
10 geological mapping and a search of the Regional Paleontologic Locality Inventory.

11
12 **Regional Setting**

13 The cultural history of Riverside County can be divided chronologically into three periods: (1) prehistory
14 (more than 500 to 600 years ago but up to and including the 1700s depending on the amount of contact
15 between native groups and Spanish and European settlers); (2) ethnohistory (roughly, the mid 1500s
16 through the early 1800s); and (3) history (roughly, the mid to late 1700s to present). Native American
17 cultures predominate in the prehistoric and ethnohistoric periods of the County’s cultural history.

18
19 **Prehistory**

20 The prehistory of Riverside County consists of five separate time periods:

- 21
- 22 • **San Dieguito/Lake Mojave Complexes (10,000 years to 7,000 years before present [BP]):** These
23 are the earliest, widely accepted archaeological materials in Southern California (Warren 1967,
24 Sutton et al. 2007). Tools associated with these assemblages include a range of scrapers and
25 stemmed points. It is thought that hunting played an important part in the lives of these people.
26 Starting about 8,500 years ago, there were marked changes in subsistence patterns. The changes
27 visible in the archaeological record include a reduced number of projectile points, scrapers, and
28 choppers and an increased number of ground stone artifacts.
 - 29 • **Millingstone Horizon (7,000 to 3,500 years BP):** Cultures from this time period are well
30 described and much better understood than cultures from the preceding period. Pauma sites in the
31 Peninsular Ranges and inland valleys are described as reflecting a relatively sedentary lifestyle
32 and a greater reliance on gathering, when compared to the earlier San Dieguito sites. Artifacts
33 associated with Pauma sites include large, leaf-shaped points and knives, milling implements in
34 large numbers, and items such as beads, pendants, and charm stones. Projectile points used
35 throughout the middle Holocene are relatively large and are associated with atlatl-and-dart
36 weapons. The presence of deep-basined concave surfaces on stone blocks from this period
37 indicates a heavy reliance on seeds, probably from various grasses, sages, and wheat.
 - 38 • **Latter Middle Holocene (3,000 to 1,500 years BP):** People broadened their subsistence base, as
39 indicated by the appearance of the mortar and pestle in the archaeological record. The
40 introduction of such innovations suggests an intensification of food production and a concurrent
41 increase in population. In many areas of southern California, the Millingstone cultures survived
42 into the early part of the late Holocene, although by the year 500, there had been several
43 distinctive changes in material culture. For example, there was a shift to the bow-and-arrow as the
44 primary weapon system.
 - 45 • **San Luis Rey I Phase (600 to 250 years BP) and San Luis Rey II Phase (250 years BP to**
46 **present):** San Luis Rey I is distinguished from San Luis Rey II based on the absence of ceramics,
47 cremation urns, and rock paintings during this phase. It was later proposed that three relatively
48 distinct settlement patterns marked the San Luis Rey period. The first pattern was characterized

1 by scattered temporary sites, thus suggesting a somewhat mobile population. A shift to more
2 sedentary settlements, located where streams emerged from canyons, took place in the late San
3 Luis Rey I or early San Luis Rey II period. During the latter part of late prehistoric or
4 protohistoric times, the “one village per drainage” pattern shifted to a more complex,
5 consolidated village pattern. This last shift was probably stimulated by contact with missionaries
6 and other settlers and by factors such as drought and resource competition. At that time, the
7 subsistence patterns of the San Luis Rey culture began to incorporate nonnative plants and
8 animals and to focus less on coastal resources. This final village-based settlement pattern appears
9 to be similar to ethnohistorically-documented Luiseño settlements.

10 11 ***Ethnography and Ethnohistory***

12 At the time of Spanish contact, the uplands between Temescal Canyon and Perris Valley, to the east, were
13 occupied by several autonomous lineages of Luiseño Indians who divided the valley and surrounding
14 hillsides into tracts of land identified with specific village territories. The Luiseño are part of the Cupan
15 group of the Takic subfamily of the Uto-Aztecan language family. Other members of the Cupan group
16 include the Cupeño, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino (Bean and Shipek 1978).

17
18 The Luiseño shared elements of social and philosophical structure with their Takic-speaking neighbors.
19 Some differences were: “(1) extensive proliferation of social statuses, (2) clearly defined ruling families
20 that interlocked various rancherias within the ethnic nationality, (3) a sophisticated philosophical structure
21 associated with the taking of hallucinogenics (*datura*), and (4) elaborate ritual paraphernalia including
22 sand paintings symbolic of an avenging sacred being named Chinigchingish” (Bean and Shipek 1978).

23
24 Luiseño villages were sedentary and autonomous, each with areas for extraction of resources in various
25 ecological settings. In Inland areas, villages were often found along streams in valley bottoms. Village
26 territories contained numerous named places, each place being associated with particular resources of
27 sacred beings (Bean and Shipek 1978).

28 29 ***History***

30 The historic era in western Riverside County can be divided into three distinct periods: the Spanish
31 Mission period, the Mexican Rancho period, and the Anglo-American period:

- 32
33 • ***Spanish Mission Period (1769–1821)***: This period can be defined by the Spanish settlement of
34 the area beginning in 1769 and the establishment of the San Diego Presidio and the Missions San
35 Diego, San Luis Rey (1798), and San Juan Capistrano (1776). The inland area remained relatively
36 unexplored. In 1774, an expedition led by Juan Bautista de Anza’s entered California and the San
37 Jacinto Valley. The end of the period occurred when Mexico gained independence from Spain in
38 1821. The subsequent Secularization Act of 1833 marked the end of the Mission period and the
39 return of the secularized mission lands to Mexico’s citizenry in the form of land grants or
40 “ranchos.” There were 16 ranchos in Riverside County, including Ranchos Temescal, La Laguna
41 (Lake Elsinore), San Jacinto Nuevo y Portrero (Perris), and Temecula.
- 42 • ***Mexican Rancho Period (1821–1848)***: Secularized mission lands were returned to Mexico’s
43 citizenry in the form of ranchos. In Riverside County, the period began with the establishment of
44 Leandro Serrano’s Rancho Temescal, on which he built a succession of three adobe structures;
45 planted a garden with fruit trees; and raised oxen, cattle, and horses. The period ended after
46 California was ceded to the United States after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed in
47 1848.

- 1 • ***The Anglo-American Period (1848–present):*** The Anglo-American period was marked by
2 unprecedented growth and industry. In Riverside County, several trends emerged: increased
3 settlement, the growth of commercial resource extraction, and the development of transportation.
- 4 - ***Temescal Valley:*** The westernmost portion of the proposed project area consists of Temescal
5 Valley and Glen Ivy Hot Springs. As early as 1860, the sulfur springs at Temescal were
6 advertised as public baths. In 1884, the bathhouse resort building burned to the ground. A few
7 years later, rebuilt and billed as the Glen Ivy Hot Sulfur Springs, the resort re-opened under
8 new proprietorship. More than 100 years later, the springs still attract guests.
- 9 - ***Lake Elsinore:*** In September 1883, La Laguna Rancho, which spread over 12,000 acres, was
10 purchased by Franklin H. Heald, Donald M. Graham, and William Collier. By 1884, Elsinore
11 railway station was operational a few miles northwest of the town of Elsinore but was later
12 moved to the town of Elsinore. In 1887, the Crescent Bathhouse was constructed in Elsinore
13 for use as a public bath. The town soon became a resort community furnishing visitors with
14 hot mud baths. In 1895, C. H. Alber purchased 135 acres of William Collier’s land and began
15 a successful olive operation. The town was becoming a Mediterranean-style resort
16 community in the exotic olive grove setting. After the turn of the century, Lake Elsinore
17 became a popular getaway destination for Hollywood motion picture actors.
- 18 - ***Alberhill:*** The Alberhill area, located about 8 miles north of Elsinore, is named for C. H.
19 Alber and James and George Hill, although Alberhill never officially became a town. Coal
20 was first discovered in the vicinity in 1883. Mineral resource activities, including clay
21 mining, are currently ongoing in Alberhill.

22 **Records Searches, Field Surveys, Consultation Results, and Area Sensitivity**

23 This section discusses results of the records searches, field surveys, and Native American consultation.
24 General sensitivity of the areas is described in the context of all data gathered. More specific information
25 is provided for the areas within 0.1 miles (about 500 feet) of components for the proposed projects since
26 these areas would be subject to disturbance while resources beyond 0.1 miles from components for the
27 proposed projects would not be impacted.

28 **115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8**

29 Records search and survey results identified the following cultural resources sites within 0.5 miles of
30 these proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project components:

- 31 • Twenty-seven prehistoric archaeological sites
- 32 • Five prehistoric isolates
- 33 • Forty-six historic archaeological sites
- 34 • Nineteen historic buildings or building complexes
- 35 • Two railroads

36 Historic resources located within 0.1 miles of 115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8 are listed in Table
37 4.5-1.

Table 4.5-1 Historic Resources Located at or within 0.1 Miles of 115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8

Resource	Distance (miles)	Description	Eligibility
P33-003352/ CA-RIV-3352H	0	Good Hope Mine	Recommended as eligible for the California Register in 2006, but site forms indicate almost nothing remains at the site
P33-006883/ CA-RIV-5785H	0	Heavy scatter of historic trash with many automotive components	Recommended not eligible
P33-015353/ CA-RIV-8109	0	Structure foundations	Recommended not eligible
P33-015354/ CA-RIV-8110/ SRI-102H	0	Concrete risers for irrigation system	Recommended not eligible
P33-015355	0	Historic refuse scatter	Recommended not eligible
P33-015367	0	Residence	Not evaluated
P33-17016	0	Alberhill community, structures, foundation, refuse	Eligible for the California Register; potentially eligible for the National Register
P33-017028	0	Wooden building moved to current location in 1988	Recommended not eligible
P33-017890/ CA-RIV-9439	0	Concrete pipeline and canal	Evaluated, recommended not eligible
2007CW125-1	<0.1	Concrete foundation or retaining wall	No information available
P33-003832/ CA-RIV-3832H	<0.1	Santa Fe Railroad grade	Recommended not eligible
P33-012195	<0.1	Residence and commercial structure	No information available
P33-012196	<0.1	Ranch buildings	No information available
P33-014757/ CA-RIV-9439	<0.1	Perris to Temescal irrigation ditch and pipeline	Recommended not eligible
P33-014758	<0.1	Building foundation	Recommended not eligible on site form
P33-014761	<0.1	Stream gauging station	Recommended not eligible on site form
P33-015352/ CA-RIV-8108	<0.1	Structure foundations	Recommended not eligible
P33-015356	<0.1	Livestock watering bowl	Recommended not eligible
P33-015357	<0.1	Foundation	Recommended not eligible
P33-015358	<0.1	Stock tank	Recommended not eligible
P33-015366	<0.1	Residence	Recommended not eligible
P33-015368	<0.1	Residence	Not evaluated
P33-015369	<0.1	Residence	Recommended not eligible
P33-015370	<0.1	Residence	No information available
P33-015371	<0.1	Residence	Recommended not eligible
P33-015372	<0.1	Residence	Recommended not eligible
P33-015421	<0.1	Residence	Recommended not eligible
P33-015422	<0.1	Concrete pipe	Not evaluated
P33-015426	<0.1	House built in 1928	Recommended not eligible
P33-017106	<0.1	Reservoir	Not evaluated
P33-017021	<0.1	Residence	Recommended not eligible
P33-017022	<0.1	Concrete foundations	Recommended not eligible
P33-020456/ CA-RIV-10357	<0.1	Road segment	No information available
P33-020457/ CA-RIV-10358	<0.1	Road segment	No information available

Table 4.5-1 Historic Resources Located at or within 0.1 Miles of 115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8

Resource	Distance (miles)	Description	Eligibility
P33-020458/ CA-RIV-10359	<0.1	Road segment	No information available
P33-020515/ CA-RIV-10416	<0.1	Road segment	No information available
P33-020517	<0.1	Road segment	No information available
P33-020642/ CA-RIV-10546	<0.1	Road segment	No information available
P33-021016/ CA-RIV-10886	<0.1	Foundation and eucalyptus trees	No information available
P33-015349	0.1	Prospecting trenches	Recommended not eligible
P33-015350	0.1	Prospecting trenches	Recommended not eligible
P33-015351/ CA-RIV-8107	0.1	Brick and refuse scatter	Recommended not eligible
P33-015373	0.1	Residence	Not evaluated
P33-015374	0.1	Residence	Recommended not eligible
P33-015424	0.1	Concrete pad and debris pile	Recommended not eligible
P33-015425	0.1	Refuse scatter	Recommended not eligible
P33-016642	0.1	Concrete foundation	Not evaluated
P33-017571	0.1	Concrete reservoir and curb	Recommended not eligible
P33-020454	0.1	Road	No information available
P33-020455	0.1	Road segment	No information available
P33-020459	0.1	Road segment	No information available
P33-020516	0.1	Road segment and utility pole	No information available
P33-020660	0	Road segment	No information available
P33-020661	0	Road segment	No information available
P33-021016	<0.1	Trees and foundation	No information available
P33-024127	<0.1	Road segment	No information available

Sources: SCE 2013, 2014

1
2
3
4
5
6

Prehistoric sites located within 0.1 miles of 115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8 are listed in Table 4.5-2.

Table 4.5-2 Prehistoric Resources Located at or within 0.1 Miles of 115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8

Resource	Distance (miles)	Description	Eligibility
P33-000657/ CA-RIV-657	0	Bedrock milling slicks	Recommended not eligible
P33-000714/ CA-RIV-714	0	Habitation site with rock art	Yes
P33-001655/ CA-RIV 1655	0	Bedrock milling	Not evaluated
P33-000641/ CA-RIV-641	0	Bedrock milling and debitage; could not be relocated; possibly destroyed by highway construction or mapped incorrectly	Not evaluated
P33-023880	0	Isolated flake	Not eligible
P33-000658/ CA-RIV-658	<0.1	Bedrock milling slick	No information available
P33-001078/ CA-RIV-1078	<0.1	Bedrock milling slicks	Recommended not eligible
P33-001652/ CA-RIV-1652	<0.1	Rock cairn and artifacts	Not evaluated
P-33-001698/ CA-RIV-1698	<0.1	Bedrock milling slicks	No information available
P-33-008912	<0.1	Isolated mano	No information available
P33-011503/ CA-RIV-6857	<0.1	Bedrock milling	No information available
P33-013802	<0.1	Isolated mano	No
P33-015347/ CA-RIV-8103	<0.1	Bedrock milling	Recommended not eligible
P33-015416	<0.1	Milling site	Recommended not eligible
P33-015417/ CA-RIV-8129	<0.1	Milling site	Recommended not eligible
P33-015418/ CA-RIV-8130	<0.1	Milling site	Recommended not eligible
P33-015419/ CA-RIV-8131	<0.1	Milling site	Recommended not eligible
P33-000630/ CA-RIV-630	0.1	Prehistoric artifact scatter	Potentially eligible but not evaluated
P33-000640	0.1	Bedrock milling and debitage	No information available
P33-000642	0.1	Bedrock milling	No information available
P33-017024	0.1	Isolated flake	Not eligible
P33-000643/ CA-RIV-643	0.1	Artifact scatter and midden deposit	Potentially eligible but not evaluated
P33-002041	0.1	Bedrock mortars and stones	No information available
P33-002288/ CA-RIV-2288	0.1	Bedrock milling	No information available
P33-002855/ CA-RIV-2855	0.1	Bedrock milling	No information available
P33-005312/ CA-RIV-5312	0.1	Bedrock milling	No information available
P33-014760/ CA-RIV-7857	0.1	Lithic scatter	No information available
P33-014811	0.1	Lithic scatter	No information available

Source: Lerch and Gray 2006

1 Both the Pechanga Tribe and the Soboba Band expressed concerns about possible impacts to Native
2 American resources because the VIG Project, while located outside of the tribes' reservation lands, is
3 located within each of the tribes' traditional use areas (Miranda 2008, Hill 2008). Both the Pechanga
4 Tribe and the Soboba Band specifically expressed concerns about possible impacts to resource P-33-
5 000714 (E & E 2013a, 2013b).

6
7 The California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) reviewed documentation for Resource P-33-
8 000714. In its review, the California SHPO indicated that Resource P-33-000714 is a multi-component
9 archaeological site that is comprised of prehistoric archaeological features and ruins of a historic-era
10 house with associated artifacts. While the site appears to retain physical integrity, the presence of an
11 existing 500-kV transmission line immediately south of the site and numerous homes and trailers
12 surrounding or within the boundary of site P-33-000714 has resulted in visual effects that diminish the
13 integrity of setting and feeling for the site. This site is considered eligible for listing on the National
14 Register and the California Register under criterion C/3 and D/4 (Roland-Nawi 2014).

15
16 The Pechanga Tribe also expressed concern for resource about a traditional cultural property that includes
17 the area where site P-33-000630. Resource P-33-000630 is a prehistoric archaeological site comprised of
18 prehistoric archaeological remains. The site is considered potentially eligible for listing on the California
19 Register (Cooley and Craft 2008). This site is located. This is the location of the ethnographic village of
20 Paxivxa and. The site is very important to the people of Pechanga, and is considered sensitive by the
21 Pechanga Tribe (E & E 2013b).

22
23 Based on the above information, the~~The~~ archaeological sensitivity of the alignment would be moderate to
24 high because of the presence of prehistoric archaeological sites in proximity to the proposed alignment
25 and presence of nearby traditional use areas. ~~cultural properties.~~

26 27 ***Alberhill Substation and 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5***

28 The records search identified the following cultural resources sites within 1.0 miles of the proposed
29 Alberhill Substation site and 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5. These consist of:

- 30
31
- Six prehistoric-age archaeological sites
 - 32 • One prehistoric-age isolated find
 - 33 • Five historic-age archaeological sites
 - 34 • Ten historic-age buildings or groups of buildings
 - 35 • One historic-age bridge
- 36

37 Historic resources located at or within 0.1 miles of the substation site or 115-kV Segments ASP1 and
38 ASP1.5 are listed in Table 4.5-3. The only historic resources located on the substation site or within 0.1
39 miles were previously unrecorded and include a concrete reservoir and curb (P-33-17571) and a small
40 residence (P-33-17572) (Cotterman and Chandler 2008, 2009). Both resources have been demolished
41 since they were located during site surveys, as described in the Project Description (see Section 2.4.6.1).
42 Some elements (e.g., foundation) of the residence remain, as visible on aerial imagery from 2014 (Google
43 Earth 2014). The California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred with the applicant that
44 the residence, when intact, and the concrete reservoir were not significant pursuant to California Register
45 criteria (Stratton 2011). What remains of the historic residence is therefore presumed not to be significant
46 pursuant to California Register criteria. Five additional historic sites are located outside of but within 0.1
47 miles of the project components, as shown in Table 4.5-3.

48

1 No archaeological resources were located on or within 0.1 miles of the substation site or 115-kV
 2 Segments ASP1 and ASP 1.5. ~~During discussions with representatives of the Pechanga Tribe at the~~
 3 ~~Pechanga Indian Reservation, additional sensitive cultural places were identified. The tribal~~
 4 ~~representatives identified Paayoxeh, a village complex located about 0.6 miles from the proposed~~
 5 ~~Alberhill Substation site. The complex is associated with the death of the cultural hero Wuyóot (also~~
 6 ~~Wiyot or Quiot) (DuBois 1908). The red coloring of the clay is said to be from where he bled as he died.~~
 7 ~~Lake Elsinore was important in the Luiseño creation story. Not only did Wuyóot die near the lake,~~
 8 ~~staining the ground red with his blood, it is the place that the people of San Juan Capistrano say the~~
 9 ~~Luiseño were created out of the mud of the lake.~~ Although no previously recorded prehistoric
 10 archaeological resources were located within the substation site or adjacent 115-kV alignments, the
 11 archaeological sensitivity of the area would be moderate to high because of the presence of prehistoric
 12 archaeological sites in proximity to the proposed substation site and the presence of a nearby traditional
 13 cultural property (Cotterman and Chandler 2008, 2009). Further, the presence of alluvial wash deposits at
 14 the proposed substation site indicate that buried archaeological materials may be found.
 15

Table 4.5-3 Historic Resources Located at or within 0.1 Miles of the Substation site or 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5

Resource	Distance (miles)	Description	Eligibility
N/A	0	Temescal Valley Road (currently Temescal Canyon Road)	Recommended not eligible
P33-17571/ CWA18-2	0	Concrete reservoir and curb	No
P33-17572/ CWA18-1	0	Small residence	No
P33-15426	0.1	House (1928)	No
P22-15428	0.1	House (1920)	Not evaluated

16
 17 **500-kV Transmission Lines (ASP)**

18 Records searches and field surveys for the proposed 500-kV transmission line routes identified the
 19 following cultural resources sites within 0.5 miles of the routes:
 20

- 21 • One prehistoric archaeological site
- 22 • One prehistoric isolated find
- 23 • Ten historic archaeological sites
- 24 • Six historic buildings or building complexes
- 25 • One historic railroad ROW

26
 27 Historic resources located within 0.1 miles of the 500-kV transmission line routes are listed in Table
 28 4.5-4. Three of these historic resources are located along the 500-kV transmission line routes, consisting
 29 of a road (Temescal Valley Road [currently Temescal Canyon Road]), a culvert (RIV-10914), and a well
 30 and cobble wall (Cotterman and Chandler 2008, 2009; Cunningham et al. 2013). These resources were
 31 located during site surveys; the road and the culvert were recommended not eligible for the National
 32 Register or the California Register and the well and cobble wall were not evaluated for eligibility. Four
 33 additional historic sites are located outside of the project boundary but within 0.1 miles of the project
 34 components, as shown in Table 4.5-4.
 35

1

Table 4.5-4 Historic Resources Located at or within 0.1 Miles of the 500-kV Transmission Lines

Resource	Distance (miles)	Description	Eligibility
N/A	0	Temescal Valley Road (currently Temescal Canyon road)	Recommended not eligible
CWA60-3	0.1	Abandoned house and shed	Not evaluated
P33-17571/ CWA18-2	0.1	Historic period residence	No
P33-15426/ CWA18-1	0.1	House (1928)	No
P33-021067/ CA- RIV-10912	<0.1	Rock wall	Not evaluated
P-33-021068/ CA- RIV-10913	0	Culvert	Recommended not eligible
P-33-021069/ CA- RIV-10914	0	Well and cobble wall	Not evaluated

Source: Cotterman and Chandler 2008, 2009; Cunningham, et al. 2013

2

3 No known prehistoric archaeological sites are located within 0.1 miles of the 500-kV transmission line
4 routes. Given the limited archaeological resources within 0.1 miles of the proposed 500-kV transmission
5 line routes, the lack of traditional cultural properties, and the steep terrain in the area, the prehistoric
6 archaeological sensitivity of the area around most the 500-kV alignment would be low. The prehistoric
7 archaeological sensitivity around the two towers proposed at the Alberhill Substation site, however, is
8 moderate to high for the same reasons previously discussed for the substation site.

9

10 **115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8**

11 The records search and survey results show that the following cultural resources were previously
12 documented within 0.5 miles of the proposed 115-kV subtransmission line routes ASP2 through ASP8:

13

- 14 • Six prehistoric-age archaeological sites
- 15 • Eight prehistoric-age isolated finds
- 16 • Three historic-age archaeological sites
- 17 • Three historic-age buildings or building complexes
- 18 • One historic-age isolated find
- 19 • One historic railroad ROW
- 20 • One historic bridge

21

22 Historic resources located within 0.1 miles of 115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8 are listed in Table
23 4.5-5. One of these historic resources is located along the 115-kV transmission line route segments ASP2
24 through ASP8, consisting of a highway bridge (P33-021126) (Chmiel and Cooley 2008, Cooley and Craft
25 2008, Craft and Cooley 2008, Lerch and Gray 2006). This resource was located during a site survey and
26 was previously determined not eligible for the National Register or the California Register. Five
27 additional historic sites are located outside of the project boundary but within 0.1 miles of the project
28 components, as shown in Table 4.5-5.

29

1

Table 4.5-5 Historic Resources Located at or within 0.1 Miles of 115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8

Resource	Distance (miles)	Description	Eligibility
P33-06883, CA-RIV-5785H	0.04	Trash scatter with automotive components	No
P33-17016	0.05	Alberhill community and industrial buildings	Yes
P33-03832	<0.1	Railroad right-of-way	No
P33-14891	<0.1	Ranch building complex; demolished by 2009	No
CWA60-2	<0.1	Irrigation pump and motor	Not evaluated
P33-021126	0	Highway bridge	No

Sources: Chmiel and Cooley 2008, Cooley and Craft 2008, Craft and Cooley 2008, Lerch and Gray 2006

2

3 One prehistoric isolate is located within 0.1 miles of 115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8. P33-14712
4 is an isolated mano that was identified about 0.05 miles from the alignment. It is not eligible for the
5 California or National Registers.

6

7 **AB 52 Resources**

8 In 2014, Assembly Bill 52 amended CEQA through, in relevant part, adding section 21084.2 to the Public
9 Resources Code. Public Resources Code section 21084.2 establishes that a substantial adverse effect on
10 the significance of a “tribal cultural resource” [as defined in Pub. Resources Code § 21074(a)] may have a
11 significant effect on the environment. The amendment does not apply to projects for which an NOP was
12 issued prior to July 1, 2015 (Assembly Bill 52 (Cal. 2014), § 11(c) [“This act shall only apply to a project
13 that has a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration filed
14 on or after July 1, 2015.”]). The NOP for the proposed projects was issued on May 6, 2015; therefore, the
15 amendments to CEQA per AB 52 do not apply to the proposed projects. However, during the course of
16 the CPUC’s consultations with various tribes, including the Soboba Band and the Pechanga Tribe, the
17 tribes shared information with the CPUC regarding certain “tribal cultural resources” cognizable under
18 AB 52 (referred to collectively as “AB 52 Resources”) that might be impacted by the proposed projects.

19

20 Though impacts to these AB 52 Resources are not discussed in the impact analyses in Section 4.5.4
21 below, AB 52 Resources are discussed here for general information. Mitigation measures to be
22 implemented to address impacts to cognizable resources under the pre-AB 52 framework would likely
23 have the incidental effect of reducing impacts to some resources identified by the Pechanga Tribe and the
24 Soboba Band.

25

26 **115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8**

27

28 The Pechanga Tribe has noted that the general project area is rich in cultural resources and sacred sites
29 (Hill 2008) and that the VIG alignment traverses through a traditional cultural property. The Pechanga
30 Tribe also noted that the VIG Project is located less than 0.75 miles from the Tribe’s Trust Lands located
31 in Meadowbrook, which are formal, non-contiguous reservation lands (Hoover 2015a). During
32 discussions with representatives of the Pechanga Tribe at the Pechanga Indian Reservation in 2016, the
33 Pechanga Tribe expressed concerns about the potential visual impacts of the VIG Project on cultural
34 resources and areas of cultural sensitivity that are of significance to the Tribe, including individual
35 resources, traditional cultural properties and traditional cultural landscapes comprised of locations of

1 cultural sensitivity to the tribe because of their historical, cultural, traditional, and religious significance to
2 the Tribe (Appendix I).⁴ In particular, the Pechanga Tribe's traditional cultural properties and traditional
3 cultural landscapes are defined in part by the physical and visual connections of their contributing
4 elements (archaeological sites, resource gathering, and process areas, etc.) to places specifically and
5 definitively associated with the Pechanga's creation story. The Pechanga Tribe further affirmed that
6 maintaining physical and visual connections to places of historical, cultural, traditional, and religious
7 significance that are specifically and definitively associated with the Pechanga Tribe's creation story are a
8 defining feature of the Pechanga's past and current traditional and religious beliefs, are recognized in the
9 traditional cultural properties and traditional cultural landscapes, and continue to be important to the
10 Pechanga today (Appendix I).⁵

11
12 Alberhill Substation, 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5 and 500-kV Transmission Lines
13 (ASP)

14
15 Both the Pechanga Tribe and the Soboba Band expressed concerns about possible impacts to Native
16 American resources because the Project (which would include the Alberhill Substation site and the 115-
17 kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5), while located outside of the tribes' reservation lands, is located within
18 each of the tribes' traditional use areas. During discussions with representatives of the Pechanga Tribe at
19 the Pechanga Indian Reservation in 2013, additional sensitive cultural places were identified. The tribal
20 representatives identified *Paayoxch*, a village complex located about 0.6 miles from the proposed
21 Alberhill Substation site.⁶ The complex is associated with the death of the cultural hero Wuyóot (also
22 Wiyot or Ouiot) (DuBois 1908). The red coloring of the clay is said to be from where he bled as he died.
23 Lake Elsinore is also important in the Luiseño creation story. Not only did Wuyóot die near the lake,
24 staining the ground red with his blood, it is the place that the people of San Juan Capistrano say the
25 Luiseño were created out of the mud of the lake (Hoover 2010, 2011).

26
27 The Pechanga Tribe noted that the ASP Project (which would include the Alberhill Substation site and the
28 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5) traverses through a traditional cultural property, may impact over
29 15 cultural sites, and will visually impact several more sites that are located within a close vicinity. They
30 also noted that the ASP Project (which would include the Alberhill Substation site and the 115-kV
31 Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5) is located less than 0.75 miles from the Tribe's Trust Lands located in
32 Meadowbrook, which are formal, non-contiguous reservation lands (Appendix I). The Pechanga Tribe's
33 traditional cultural properties and traditional cultural landscapes are defined in part by the physical and
34 visual connections of their contributing elements (archaeological sites, resource gathering and process
35 areas, etc.) to places specifically and definitively associated with the Pechanga's creation story. The

⁴ Note that while all of the resources in Appendix I are of interest to the Tribe, most of the resources are not
eligible for listing under the pre-AB 52 framework, and those that are eligible or have the potential to be impacted
according to pre-AB 52 methodologies of cultural impact assessment have already been analyzed in the impacts
section of this EIR.

⁵ Appendix I includes a Draft Cultural-Visual Impact Assessment (CVIA) Report that was prepared to analyze
visual impacts on tribal resources in order to document views for the Tribe's records; however, visual impacts
would not result in a significant impact under the pre-AB 52 framework unless the resources were determined to
be eligible for listing on the CRHR and the project caused a substantial adverse change in the significance of the
resource. Therefore, none of the impacts associated with resources in the CVIA Report would be considered
impacts under the pre-AB 52 framework. Note that the CPUC reached out to the Tribe, and the Tribe did not
provide feedback after several attempts at contact. Therefore, the CVIA Report could not be completed.

⁶ Note that sites of concern to the Pechanga are related to Tribal religious and cultural beliefs, and such resources
do not necessarily contain significant features that would render them eligible for listing on the CRHR under the
pre-AB 52 framework. In addition, these sites would not be impacted by the project under the pre-AB 52
methodology of assessing cultural resources impacts.

1 Pechanga Tribe further affirmed that maintaining physical and visual connections to places of historical,
2 cultural, traditional, and religious significance, which are specifically and definitively associated with the
3 Pechanga Tribe’s creation story, are a defining feature of the Pechanga’s past and current traditional and
4 religious beliefs, are recognized in the traditional cultural properties and traditional cultural landscapes,
5 and continue to be important to the Pechanga today (Appendix I).
6

7 The Soboba Band indicated that the Project location (which would include the Alberhill Substation site
8 and the 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5), is in close proximity to known village sites and is a shared
9 use area that was used in ongoing trade between the Luiseño and Cahuilla tribes. Therefore it is regarded
10 as highly sensitive to the Soboba Band (Ontiveros 2009).
11

12 115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8

13
14 During the course of discussion with representatives of the Pechanga Tribe at the Pechanga Indian
15 Reservation in 2013, several sensitive cultural places in proximity to the proposed 115-kV
16 subtransmission lines were identified. These include:

- 17
18 • The Audie Murphy complex, which is located more than 0.1 miles from proposed 115-kV
19 segments. Although recorded as a number of different sites, the Tribe considers them to be part of
20 a village complex. Sites that make up the complex, according to the Tribe, continue beyond the
21 limits of the Audie Murphy Ranch (E & E 2011).
- 22 • *Taawila* (Ringing Rock Complex)—a granite boulder that sits on other boulders and has cupules
23 (small pits) ground into it (Hillinger 1991) and is more than 0.1 miles from proposed 115-kV
24 segments. In the past it was used by the Tribe to call people to gather for meetings or burial
25 ceremonies. It is considered to be culturally important by the Tribe (E & E 2011).
- 26 • *Pii’iv*—The Tribe indicated that this place is located near Skylark Field Airport, within 0.1 miles
27 of the Skylark Substation. The exact nature of the place is not certain, but the location is
28 important to the Tribe (E & E 2011).
- 29 • *Paayoxch*—Previously discussed under “Alberhill Substation and 115-kV Segments ASP1 and
30 ASP1.5,” the village complex is more than 0.1 miles from all proposed 115-kV segments.
31

32 The archaeological sensitivity of the areas around these proposed 115-kV segments would be moderate to
33 high because of the presence of prehistoric archaeological sites in proximity to the proposed 115-kV lines
34 and presence of nearby archaeological sites or culturally traditionally important locations/properties.
35

36 ***Native American Consultation Summary Results***

37 ***Pechanga Tribe***

38 The Pechanga Tribe responded to the applicant’s letter regarding the proposed Alberhill Project, which
39 was sent to all Native American groups on the NAHC contact list in 2009 (see Appendix I). The Tribe
40 stated that, although the components of the proposed Alberhill Project would not be located within the
41 Tribe’s present reservation, they would be located within the Tribe’s traditional use areas. The Pechanga
42 Tribe requested consultation with the applicant concerning the proposed Alberhill Project; participation
43 by Native American monitors in any additional surveys, archaeological excavations, and ground-
44 disturbing construction activities; return of any prehistoric artifacts that are recovered to the appropriate
45 tribe after they have been analyzed by archaeologists; the right to inspect sites where human remains are
46 discovered and to determine the treatment and disposition of the remains; and copies of all site records,
47 survey reports, or other environmental documents.
48

1 In response to two NOPs (January 2008 Valley–Ivyglen and 2010 Alberhill), the Pechanga Tribe
2 ~~previously~~ submitted comment letters that outlined concerns regarding cultural resources and traditional
3 cultural properties (see Appendix I). The Pechanga Tribe submitted a similar comment letter in response
4 to the second Alberhill Project NOP (July 2011 Alberhill) (see Appendix I). The CPUC held a meeting
5 with representatives of the Pechanga Tribe in December 2011 and follow-up meeting by telephone in
6 2012 to discuss the proposed Alberhill Project and tribal concerns about cultural resources in the
7 proposed project area. Two areas are considered by the Tribe to be traditional properties. These include
8 the Audie Murphy Ranch archaeological site complex and an area south of the proposed Alberhill
9 Substation site associated with the death of Wuyóot, as discussed in the previous section. The Pechanga
10 Tribe expressed concern about cultural site P-33-000714 along 115-kV Segment VIG1 during the June
11 2013 meetings. Pechanga also expressed concerns about P-33-000630 as well as the recording of P-33-
12 000641 and P-33-000643. The tribe requested formalization of a Native American monitoring program
13 and continued inclusion in project processes (E & E 2013a, 2013b). In response to the third NOP (May
14 2015), which covers the proposed projects, the Pechanga Tribe submitted a comment letter expressing
15 concern about impacts on cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities; requested involvement in
16 future surveys, site visits, and excavations; and provided suggested mitigation plans and measures to
17 lessen or avoid impacts on cultural resources.

18
19 The Pechanga Tribe also submitted comments during the CEQA process and requested an additional
20 meeting to discuss their concerns. The CPUC met in-person and via telephone with the Pechanga Tribe
21 several times between September 2016 and January 2017 to discuss the tribe’s concern regarding
22 potential visual impacts of the proposed projects and to prepare a cultural visual impact assessment
23 (Appendix I). Due to the report’s focus on undisclosed tribal resources, the report could not be completed
24 without input from the Tribe, and none of the impacts disclosed in the draft report are considered impacts
25 under the pre-AB 52 methodology of impact assessment.

26 27 *Soboba Band*

28 The Soboba Band responded to the applicant’s letter regarding the Alberhill Project, which was sent to all
29 Native American groups on the NAHC contact list. The Band stated that, although the components of the
30 proposed Alberhill Project would not be located within its present reservation, they would be located
31 within the Band’s traditional use areas. The Band requested consultation with the applicant concerning
32 the proposed Alberhill Project; participation by Native American monitors in any additional surveys,
33 archaeological excavations, and ground-disturbing construction activities; return of any prehistoric
34 artifacts that are recovered to the appropriate tribe after they have been analyzed by archaeologists; the
35 right to inspect sites where human remains are discovered and to determine the treatment and disposition
36 of the remains; and copies of all site records, survey reports, or other environmental documents. The
37 Soboba Band made similar requests regarding the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project. The applicant met
38 with a Soboba Band representative in February 2010. The representative expressed concern regarding
39 Native American resources present within the areas of the proposed projects and requested that ground-
40 disturbing activities be monitored by a qualified archaeologist. It was also requested that a tribal
41 representative be allowed to visit project sites as necessary during construction and that the Soboba Band
42 be notified when resources are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities.

43
44 In response to two NOPs (January 2008 Valley–Ivyglen and 2010 Alberhill), the Soboba Band submitted
45 comments requesting involvement with consultation activities for the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project.
46 The Band expressed concern about cultural site P-33-000714 along 115-kV Segment VIG1 during the
47 June 2013 meetings. Soboba also expressed concern about sites P-33-001655 (located in the Valley–
48 Ivyglen alignment) and P-33-000630 (located 0.1 miles from the Valley–Ivyglen alignment). The Band
49 requested formalization of a Native American monitoring program and continued inclusion in project
50 processes (E & E 2013a, 2013b).

1 **Cahuilla Band of Indians**

2 The Cahuilla Band of Indians responded to the applicant’s letter, which was sent to all Native American
3 groups on the NAHC contact list. The letter stated that, although the components of the proposed
4 Alberhill Project would not be located within the Band’s present reservation, they would be located
5 within its traditional use areas. The Cahuilla Band requested that copies of cultural resources documents
6 and reports be provided to the Tribe for their archives (see Appendix I).:-

7
8 **Pala Band of Mission Indians**

9 The Pala Band of Mission Indians responded to the applicant’s letter, which was sent to all Native
10 American groups on the NAHC contact list. The Pala Band stated that components of the proposed
11 Alberhill and Valley-Ivyglen projects would not be located within their reservation or ancestral territory,
12 and that they have no objection to the continuation of the proposed projects without their participation
13 (see Appendix I).:-

14
15 **Paleontology Background and Records Search Results**

16 Riverside County has been inventoried for geologic formations known to potentially contain
17 paleontological resources. The County has an extensive record of fossil life starting 150 million years ago
18 in the Jurassic period (County of Riverside 2008). The components of the proposed projects would be
19 located within the Peninsular Ranges. The local geology provides a diverse assemblage of igneous,
20 sedimentary, and metamorphic rocks that are exposed both as bedrock and in alluvial fan deposits
21 throughout the region.

22
23 The Pleistocene-age Quaternary alluvium deposits in the area of the proposed projects are known to have
24 the potential to yield significant fossils (Scott 2009, City of Lake Elsinore 2011, CPUC 2009).
25 Throughout the Inland Empire region, which includes much of western Riverside County, Quaternary
26 older alluvium (Pleistocene age) has been reported to yield significant fossils of extinct animals from the
27 Ice Age and fossilized plant remains (Anderson et al. 2002, Lander 2008, Scott 2009). In addition, coal
28 seams, lignite beds, and clay deposits of the Silverado Formation (Paleocene age, approximately 66 to
29 55 million years old) within the areas of the proposed projects have the potential to yield significant
30 fossils. The Silverado Formation is considered highly sensitive for invertebrate and plant
31 material. The fossil plants from this geologic unit have been studied for more than half a
32 century (City of Lake Elsinore 2011). Search results indicated that no paleontological resource localities
33 are recorded within 1 mile of areas that would be impacted by construction or operation of the proposed
34 project (Lander 2008, Scott 2009). Table 4.5-6 details the results of the record search and literature/data
35 review.
36

Table 4.5-6 Paleontological Resources and Sensitivity

Component	Record Search and Literature Review
Alberhill Substation	Geologic mapping indicates that the proposed substation site is located on young (Holocene and latest Pleistocene) and old (late to middle Pleistocene) Quaternary alluvial deposits (USGS 2004). The remains of an extinct horse and extinct rabbit, rodent, mastodon, camel, and bison were found at fossil sites located a few miles northwest of the proposed substation site in fine-grained older Quaternary alluvium (Lander 2008). Although the uppermost layers of alluvium deposits (less than 5 feet in depth) may be less likely to contain fossils, younger Quaternary alluvium is typically underlain by older Quaternary deposits that may yield significant vertebrate fossils (Jefferson 1989, Lander 2008, Scott 2009).
ASP 500-kV Transmission Lines	The lower elevations of the proposed 500-kV transmission line routes would be constructed on young (Holocene and latest Pleistocene) and old (Late to middle Pleistocene) Quaternary alluvial deposits and Estelle Mountain volcanic rock (USGS 2004). As described for the proposed Alberhill Substation site, older Quaternary deposits may yield significant vertebrate fossils. Igneous rock, such as Estelle Mountain volcanic rock, is less likely to yield fossils.

Table 4.5-6 Paleontological Resources and Sensitivity

Component	Record Search and Literature Review
115-kV Segment ASP1, ASP1.5	The older Quaternary deposits along this 115-kV segment may yield significant fossils, as described for the Alberhill Substation. The fossilized remains of an extinct deer were found northwest of the proposed substation site. The find was located in young fine-grained Quaternary alluvium deposits and indicates that these segments may also contain fossils at shallow depths (Lander 2008).
115-kV Segment ASP2	The older Quaternary deposits along this 115-kV segment may yield significant fossils, as described for the Alberhill Substation. The fossilized remains of an extinct deer were found northwest of the proposed substation site. The find was located in young fine-grained Quaternary alluvium deposits and indicates that this segment may contain fossils at shallow depths (Lander 2008). The coal seams and clay Pleistocene-age deposits of the Silverado Formation are known to contain significant fossils (City of Lake Elsinore 2006, CPUC 2009). It is possible that fossils may be found underground or at the surface along sections of this 115-kV segment.
115-kV Segment ASP3	Based on information recovered for adjacent segments (ASP2, VIG3, and VIG4), there is a possibility for fossils to be found on this segment.
115-kV Segment ASP4	Areas along this segment may yield fossils at surface levels (City of Lake Elsinore 2011). The remains of an extinct mammoth were found at a fossil site located on the Lake Elsinore floodplain in proximity to this segment. The find was located in young fine-grained Quaternary alluvium deposits, indicating that this segment may also contain fossils at shallow depths (Lander 2008).
115-kV Segment ASP5	The older Quaternary deposits along this 115-kV segment may yield significant fossils, as described for the Alberhill Substation. Areas along this segment may also yield fossils at surface levels (City of Lake Elsinore 2011). The remains of an extinct mammoth were found at a fossil site located on the Lake Elsinore floodplain in proximity to this segment. The find was located in young fine-grained Quaternary alluvium deposits, indicating that this segment may also contain fossils at shallow depths (Lander 2008).
115-kV Segment ASP6	The older Quaternary deposits along this 115-kV segment may yield significant fossils, as described for the Alberhill Substation. Areas along this segment may also yield fossils at subsurface levels at depths of 4 feet or below (City of Lake Elsinore 2011).
115-kV Segment ASP7	Areas along this segment may yield fossils at subsurface levels at depths of 4 feet or below (City of Lake Elsinore 2011).
115-kV Segment VIG1, VIG2	The older Quaternary deposits along this 115-kV segment may yield significant fossils, as described for the Alberhill Substation.
115-kV Segment VIG3	Areas along this segment may yield fossils at surface levels (City of Lake Elsinore 2011).
115-kV Segment VIG4	The coal seams and clay Pleistocene-age deposits of the Silverado Formation are known to contain significant fossils (City of Lake Elsinore 2006, CPUC 2009). It is possible that fossils may be found underground or at the surface along sections of this 115-kV segment.
115-kV Segment VIG5	It is possible that fossils may be found underground or at the surface along sections of this 115-kV segment (City of Lake Elsinore 2011). The older Quaternary deposits along this 115-kV segment may yield significant fossils, as described for the Alberhill Substation. The coal seams and clay Pleistocene-age deposits of the Silverado Formation are known to contain significant fossils (City of Lake Elsinore 2006, CPUC 2009).
115-kV Segment VIG6, VIG7	The older Quaternary deposits along this 115-kV segment may yield significant fossils, as described for the Alberhill Substation. Areas along this segment may yield fossils at surface levels (City of Lake Elsinore 2011).
115-kV Segment VIG8	It is possible that fossils may be found underground or at the surface along sections of this 115-kV segment (City of Lake Elsinore 2011). The older Quaternary deposits along this 115-kV segment may yield significant fossils, as described for the Alberhill Substation. The coal seams and clay Pleistocene-age deposits of the Silverado Formation are known to contain significant fossils (City of Lake Elsinore 2006, CPUC 2009).

1
2

4.5.2 Regulatory Setting

4.5.2.1 Federal

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) set historic preservation as a national policy and also began a multifaceted program to encourage the achievement of preservation goals at the federal, state, and local levels. The NHPA established the National Register, defined the position of SHPO and a system of state-level review boards, provided assistance to Native American Tribes in preserving their cultural resources, and established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). Each State Office of Historic Preservation together with the SHPO implements the policies of the NHPA at the state level.

The basis for determining significance of impacts to cultural resources for projects with a federal nexus is Section 106 of the NHPA. Sections of the proposed projects may require a permit from the United States Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Section 4.4, “Biological Resources”) for potential impacts to waters of the United States. Issuance of such a permit would require federal agency compliance with provisions of Section 106 of the NHPA. To comply with Section 106, the federal agency must consider effects of the proposed project on historic properties that are on, or eligible for listing on, the National Register. In addition, the ACHP must be given the opportunity to comment on the proposed project and its potential effects on historic properties. Section 106 requires public input in the decision making process. Section 106 compliance would be triggered during the federal permitting process, and the federal permitting agency would be responsible for SHPO and Native American consultation pursuant to Section 106. Because Section 106 compliance is a federal requirement and would be completed separate from the CEQA environmental review documented in this EIR, compliance with Section 106 is not discussed further in this document.

National Register of Historic Places

The NHPA established the National Register as “an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment” (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] § 60.2). The National Register recognizes both historic period and prehistoric archaeological properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels. To be eligible for listing on the National Register, a resource must be considered significant according to the National Register listing criteria defined in CFR, title 36, section 60.4:

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
2. It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past.
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represents the work of a master; possesses high artistic values; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
4. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Unless the property possesses exceptional significance, it must be at least 50 years old to be eligible for listing. In addition to meeting the significance criteria, a property must have integrity. The National Register recognizes seven qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. To retain historic integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, of these seven aspects. The seven factors that define integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historic figures; properties owned by religious institutions or used

1 for religious purposes; structures that have been moved from their original locations; reconstructed
2 historic buildings; and properties that are primarily commemorative in nature are not considered eligible
3 for the National Register unless they satisfy certain conditions.

4 5 **4.5.2.2 State**

6 7 ***California Office of Historic Preservation and State Historic Preservation Officer***

8 The State of California implements the NHPA through its statewide comprehensive cultural resources
9 surveys and preservation programs. The California Office of Historic Preservation implements the
10 policies of the NHPA on a statewide level. The Office of Historic Preservation also maintains the
11 California Historic Resources Inventory. The SHPO is an appointed official who implements historic
12 preservation programs within the state's jurisdictions. The California Office of Historic Preservation
13 maintains the California Register under the direction of the SHPO and the State Historical Resources
14 Commission.

15 16 ***California Register of Historical Resources***

17 The California Register is an authoritative listing and guide to be used by State and local agencies, private
18 groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historic resources of the State and to indicate which
19 resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change
20 (California PRC § 5024.1(a)). The criteria for eligibility for the California Register are based on National
21 Register criteria (California PRC § 5024.1(b)):

- 22
23 1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of
24 California's history and cultural heritage.
- 25 2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
- 26 3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or
27 represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
- 28 4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

29
30 It is possible, however, that resources that do not retain sufficient integrity to meet National Register
31 listing criteria are still eligible for listing on the California Register. Certain resources are determined by
32 the statute to be automatically included in the California Register, including California properties that
33 were formally determined eligible for or were listed in the National Register.

34 35 ***California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines***

36 Section 21084.1 of the PRC establishes that a substantial adverse effect on an historical resource may
37 have a significant effect on the environment.⁷ CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5 recognizes that an
38 historical resource includes: (1) a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical
39 Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register; (2) a resource included in a local register of
40 historical resources; and (3) any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a
41 lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering,

⁷ See Footnote No. 3 for more information on AB 52. ~~Assembly Bill 52 recently amended CEQA through, in relevant part, adding section 21084.2 to the PRC. PRC section 21084.2 establishes that a substantial adverse effect on the significance of a tribal cultural resource may have a significant effect on the environment. The amendment does not apply to projects for which an NOP was issued prior to July 1, 2015 (A.B. 54. (Cal. 2014)). The NOP for the proposed projects was issued on May 6, 2015; therefore, the amendments to CEQA per AB 52 do not apply to the proposed projects.~~

1 scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California
2 by the lead agency, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light
3 of the whole record. In some cases, an archaeological resource may be considered an historical resource.
4 CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) establishes mitigation guidelines for effects on historical resources
5 and historical resources of an archaeological nature.

6
7 CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(c) states that if an archaeological resource does not meet the criteria
8 for an historical resource contained in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, then the resource may be
9 treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC section 21083.2 if it is a "unique" archaeological
10 resource. CEQA is contained in the California PRC as sections 21000 et seq. Section 21083.2 of CEQA
11 provides for the protection of "unique archaeological resources" as defined in subsection (g) of section
12 21083.2. If it can be demonstrated that a project would cause damage to a unique archaeological resource,
13 the lead agency may require reasonable efforts to preserve in place or avoid the resources. This section
14 also establishes mitigation requirements for the excavation (data recovery) of unique archaeological
15 resources.

16
17 If an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor historical resource, effects of a
18 proposed project on the resource would not be considered a significant effect.

19 20 ***Additional State Laws Regarding Archaeological and Native American Cultural*** 21 ***Resources***

22 California law extends additional protections to Native American cultural resources:

- 23
24 • California PRC sections 5097.91 through 5097.991 pertain to the establishment and authorities of
25 the NAHC. These sections also prohibit the acquisition or possession of Native American
26 artifacts or human remains taken from a Native American grave or cairn, except in accordance
27 with an agreement reached with the NAHC, and provide for Native American remains and
28 associated grave artifacts to be repatriated. Subsections 5097.98(b) and (e) require a landowner
29 on whose property Native American human remains are found to limit further development
30 activity in the vicinity until conferring with the most likely descendants (as identified by the
31 NAHC) to consider treatment options. Because of the importance of human remains to the Native
32 American community, Health and Safety Code (HSC) sections 7050 through 7054 make the
33 disturbance and removal of human remains felony offenses. Provision is made in PRC section
34 65092 for the notification of California Native American tribes who are on the contact list
35 maintained by the NAHC about construction projects.
- 36 • California PRC sections 5097.993 through 5097.994 make it a misdemeanor crime for the
37 unlawful and malicious excavation, removal, or destruction of Native American archaeological or
38 historical sites on public or private lands.
- 39 • Penal Code section 622 establishes as a misdemeanor the willful injury, disfiguration,
40 defacement, or destruction of any object or thing of archaeological or historical interest or value,
41 whether situated on private or public lands.
- 42 • California PRC section 6254(r) protects Native American graves, cemeteries, and sacred places
43 maintained by the NAHC by protecting records of such resources from public disclosure under
44 the California Public Records Act.

45 46 **4.5.2.3 Local**

47 The CPUC has sole and exclusive state jurisdiction over the siting and design of the proposed Project.
48 Pursuant to General Order No. 131-D, Section XIV.B, "Local jurisdictions acting pursuant to local
49 authority are preempted from regulating electric power line projects, distribution lines, substations, or

1 electric facilities constructed by public utilities subject to the CPUC's jurisdiction. However, in locating
2 such projects, the public utilities are directed to consider local regulations and consult with local agencies
3 regarding land use matters." Consequently, public utilities are directed to consider local regulations and
4 consult with local agencies, but the county and cities' regulations are not applicable as the county and
5 cities do not have jurisdiction over the proposed projects. Accordingly, a discussion of local land use
6 regulations is provided in the following subsections for informational purposes only.

8 **County of Riverside**

9 The County of Riverside General Plan establishes the following policies that are relevant to the protection
10 of cultural and paleontological resources:

- 11 • *Policy OS 19.1: Cultural resources (both prehistoric and historic) are a valued part of the*
12 *history of the County of Riverside.*
- 13 • *Policy OS 19.5: Exercise sensitivity and respect for human remains from both prehistoric and*
14 *historic time periods and comply with all applicable laws concerning such remains.*

17 **County of Orange**

18 The County of Orange General Plan establishes the following goals that are relevant to the protection of
19 cultural and paleontological resources:

- 20 • *Cultural-Historic Resources Goal 2: To encourage through a resource management effort the*
21 *preservation of the county's cultural and historic heritage.*
- 22 • *Cultural-Historic Resources Goal 3: To preserve and enhance buildings, structures, objects,*
23 *sites, and districts of cultural and historic significance.*

26 **City of Lake Elsinore**

27 The City of Lake Elsinore General Plan establishes the following goals and policies that are relevant to
28 the protection of cultural and paleontological resources:

- 29 • *Goal 6: Preserve, protect, and promote the cultural heritage of the City and surrounding region*
30 *for the education and enjoyment of all City residents and visitors, as well as for the advancement*
31 *of historical and archeological knowledge.*
- 32 - *Policy 6.1: Encourage the preservation of significant archeological, historical, and other*
33 *cultural resources located within the City.*
- 34 • *Goal 8: Preserve paleontological resources occurring within the City.*
- 35 • *Goal 9: Assure the recognition of the City's heritage through preservation of the City's*
36 *significant historical sites and structures.*
- 37 • *Goal 10: Encourage the preservation, protection, and restoration of historical and cultural*
38 *resources.*

41 **City of Perris**

42 The City of Perris General Plan establishes the following goals and policies relevant to the protection of
43 cultural and paleontological resources:

- 44 • *Goal IV: Protection of historical, archaeological and paleontological sites.*

- *Policy IV.A: Comply with state and federal regulations and ensure preservation of significant historical, archaeological and paleontological resources.*
- *Goal VII: Protection of significant landforms.*
 - *Policy VII.A: Preserve significant hillsides and rock outcroppings in the planning areas.*

City of Menifee

The City of Menifee General Plan (City of Menifee 2013) establishes the following goals and policies relevant to the protection of cultural and paleontological resources:

- *Goal OSC-3: Undisturbed slopes, hillsides, rock outcroppings, and other natural landforms that enhance the City's environmental setting and rich cultural and historical past and present.*
 - *Policy OSC-3.4: Support the preservation of natural vegetation and rock outcroppings during and after the construction process.*
- *Goal OSC-5: Archaeological, historical, and cultural resources are protected and integrated into the City's built environment.*
 - *Policy OSC-5.1: Preserve and protect archaeological and historic resources and cultural sites, places, districts, structures, landforms, objects and native burial sites, traditional cultural landscapes and other features, consistent with state law and any laws, regulations or policies which may be adopted by the City to implement this goal and associated policies.*
 - *Policy OSC-5.3: Preserve sacred sites identified in consultation with the appropriate Native American tribes whose ancestral territories are within the City, such as Native American burial locations, by avoiding activities that would negatively impact the sites, while maintaining the confidentiality of the location and nature of the sacred site.*

City of Wildomar

At the time of preparation of this EIR, the city of Wildomar has not adopted a general plan. The city was incorporated in 2008 and adopted all County of Riverside ordinances at that time. County ordinances remain in effect until the city enacts ordinances superseding them. Policies listed above under the Riverside County General Plan also apply to the City of Wildomar.

4.5.3 Methodology and Significance Criteria

To determine whether cultural or paleontological resources have been previously identified within the areas of the proposed projects, published scientific documents and technical and survey reports regarding areas in proximity to components of the proposed projects and general plan and policy documents were reviewed, as previously described. In addition, database searches, field studies, and Native American consultations were completed, and Native American group comments were reviewed. For paleontological resources, literature reviews and database searches were conducted to identify previously recorded paleontological resources in the areas of the proposed projects. In addition, the geology of the proposed Alberhill Substation site and 500-kV and 115-kV transmission line routes was reviewed for paleontological sensitivity (Lander 2008, Scott 2009).

Impacts on cultural resources were evaluated according to the following significance criteria. The criteria are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed projects would cause a significant impact on cultural resources if they would:

- 1 a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in
2 CEQA section 15064.5;
- 3 b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to
4 CEQA section 15064.5;
- 5 c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature;
6 or
- 7 d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

8
9 **4.5.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Valley–Ivyglen Project)**

10
11 **4.5.4.1 Project Commitments (Valley–Ivyglen Project)**

12
13 The applicant has committed to the following as part of the design of the proposed Valley–Ivyglen
14 Project. See Section 2.6, “Project Commitments,” for a complete description of each project commitment.

- 15
- 16 • **Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan.** Prior to construction of the
17 proposed projects, a Worker Environmental Awareness Plan would be developed based on final
18 engineering designs, the results of preconstruction surveys, project commitments, and mitigation
19 measures imposed by the California Public Utilities Commission. A presentation would be
20 prepared by the applicant and shown to all site workers prior to their start of work. A record of all
21 trained personnel would be kept with the construction foreman. In addition to the instruction for
22 compliance with any site-specific biological or cultural resource protective measures and project
23 mitigation measures, all construction personnel would also receive the following:
 - 24 - A list of phone numbers of the applicant's personnel with the (archeologist, biologist,
25 environmental compliance coordinator, and regional spill response coordinator);
 - 26 - Instruction on the South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 for control of dust;
 - 27 - Instruction on what typical cultural resources look like, and if discovered during construction,
28 to suspend work in the vicinity of any find and contact the site foreman and archeologist or
29 environmental compliance coordinator;
 - 30 - Instruction on individual responsibilities under the Clean Water Act, the Storm Water
31 Pollution Prevention Plan for the projects, site-specific Best Management Practices, and the
32 location of Material Safety Data Sheets for the projects;
 - 33 - Instructions to notify the foreman and regional spill response coordinator in case of hazardous
34 materials spills and leaks from equipment or upon the discovery of soil or groundwater
35 contamination;
 - 36 - A copy of the truck routes to be used for material delivery; and
 - 37 - Instruction that noncompliance with any laws, rules, regulations, or mitigation measures
38 could result in being barred from participating in any remaining construction activities
39 associated with the projects.

4.5.4.2 Impacts Analysis (Valley-Ivyglen Project)

Impact CR-1 (VIG): Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archaeological resource.
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION

Construction

There are known prehistoric- and historic-age historical resources along the 115-kV VIG segments. The isolated mano (P33-013802) and isolated flakes (P33-017024, P33-023880) are not eligible for the California or National Registers and do not otherwise qualify as historical resources under the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, there would be no impact related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource if any of these three resources are affected by the Valley-Ivyglen Project.

There is one known-eligible prehistoric resource (P33-000714/CA-RIV-714) and one historic resource (P33-17016) that are known to be eligible for either the California or the National Registers. The applicant plans to construct access roadways within the mapped boundaries of P33-000714/CA-RIV-714. The access roads are in locations found to be non-contributing to the resource; SHPO has concurred with this conclusion (Roland-Nawi 2014). Effects to any contributing element of the resource, which are located close to access roads, could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of the resource as a result of damage to the resource. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require preparation of a Worker Environmental Awareness Plan (WEAP). Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources; however, this would not reduce impacts to less than significant because it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to resources. MM CR-6 would require that the applicant completely avoid any effects to the resource by constructing access roads only in accordance with SHPO’s concurrence letter dated October 7, 2014. There would be no substantial adverse change to the significance of P33-000714/CA-RIV-714 with 17016 with implementation of MM CR-6.

Substantial adverse effects to P33-17106 could result in a significant impact, given that the resource is eligible for the California Register and potentially eligible for the National Register. Substantial adverse effects could include damage or destruction of the resource. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources; this would not reduce impacts to less than significant because it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to resources. MM CR-1b would require a plan to avoid this resource. Implementation of MM CR-1b would prevent any change in the significance of P33-17106.

Numerous other known resources within 0.1 miles of the project area have been evaluated and recommended not eligible, have not been evaluated, or have no eligibility information, as categorized in Tables 4.5-14 and 4.5-25. SHPO has not concurred on the eligibility of these resources. Adverse effects to these resources, which could include damage or destruction of the resource, could therefore result in significant effects if the affected resource is determined to be eligible by the SHPO. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources; this would not reduce impacts to less than significant because it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to resources. MM CR-1b would require avoidance of known resources. Implementation of MM CR-1b would prevent any change in significance of the resources.

There is a potential for discovery of previously unknown prehistoric-age and historic-age cultural resources and unique archaeological resources during construction activities. Cultural resources sensitivity along the alignment range from moderate to high due to the presence of prehistoric archaeological sites and traditional cultural properties in proximity to the proposed alignment. Construction impacts could potentially include physical damage or alteration, change in visual elements

1 of a resource, and destruction of a resource. Impacts to previously unknown cultural resources, including
2 historic resources and unique archaeological resources would be significant if the resources are
3 considered historic resources and if the impacts are substantial and adverse. SCE has proposed Project
4 Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on
5 recognition of cultural resources and when to suspend work if a cultural resource is encountered. Impacts
6 would still be potentially significant after implementation of Project Commitment B because the measure
7 would not prevent substantial adverse changes to the significance of a discovered resource. MM CR-1a
8 outlines survey requirements to ensure all work areas and staging areas have been surveyed prior to
9 construction. MM CR-1b outlines a plan that would contain the procedures to be followed in the event
10 that a previously-unknown resource is discovered during construction activities. MM CR-2 outlines
11 monitoring requirements, including involvement of Native American tribes and groups to determine
12 Native American monitoring locations. ~~MM CR-3 describes procedures to be followed on-site if a~~
13 ~~previously unknown resource is discovered.~~ Impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources
14 (including historical and unique archaeological resources) would be less than significant with
15 implementation of MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b, and MM CR-2, and MM CR-3.
16

17 **Operation and Maintenance**

18 Operation and maintenance activities on proposed Valley-Ivyglen Project components would all occur
19 within areas disturbed during construction of the project or within or along facilities erected during
20 construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed areas would occur
21 during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential to affect known or previously unknown
22 historic-age or prehistoric-age historical resources or unique archaeological resources during operation
23 and maintenance. As a result, there would be no impact to these resources. ..
24

25 **Mitigation Measures**

26 **MM CR-1a: Ensure preconstruction survey coverage of all work areas and staging areas.** Prior to
27 construction, the applicant shall compare the limits of the work areas and staging areas to project maps
28 that show where areas have been previously surveyed for cultural resources at the Intensive Cultural
29 Resources Inventory level. The applicant shall verify the proposed work areas and staging areas have
30 been surveyed at the Intensive Cultural Resources Inventory level. An Intensive Cultural Resources
31 Inventory level of survey is defined here as consisting of pedestrian surveys with transects spaced no
32 farther apart than 15 meters except where field conditions such as exceptionally dense vegetation or steep
33 slopes make walking transects difficult. In order to rely upon a prior survey for a work area, all areas that
34 can be reasonably covered by transect surveys within such work area shall have been surveyed.
35

36 If such a prior survey has been completed in the proposed work area or staging area, work can commence
37 as follows:

- 39 • If no known resources are located in the work area or staging area, work or staging can proceed in
40 the area. Previously unknown resources that are discovered during work activities shall be subject
41 to MM CR-1b.
- 42 • If known resources are located in the work area or staging area, they must be ~~handled~~avoided
43 pursuant to MM CR-1b. Previously unknown resources that are discovered during work activities
44 shall be subject to MM CR-1b.
45

46 If such a prior survey has not been completed in the proposed work area or staging area, then work may
47 not commence until an Intensive Cultural Resources Inventory has been completed by a CPUC-approved
48 archaeologist or cultural resources specialist and Native American tribal monitor(s) and reviewed and

1 approved by the CPUC. If a resource is found during the survey, the applicant shall adhere to MM CR-1b
2 procedures for unanticipated resources.

3
4 **MM CR-1b: Avoid impacts to known and undiscovered historic resources and unique**
5 **archaeological resources (except for site P33-000714).** SCE shall prepare a Cultural Resources
6 Monitoring and Treatment Plan (CRMTP) for known and unknown resources that are eligible or
7 potentially eligible for the California Register or are unique archaeological resources, except P33-000714,
8 which is subject to MM CR-6. The CRMTP shall be reviewed and approved by the CPUC prior to the
9 start of construction. To implement MM CR-1b SCE shall:

- 10
11 • Retain a qualified archaeologist; who shall; prepare the CRMTP; oversee archaeological and
12 Native American monitors; and; evaluate discoveries; and prepare Evaluation and Data Recovery
13 Plans and subsequent reports. This archaeologist shall, at the minimum, meet the Secretary of
14 Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology and be approved by the CPUC.
- 15 • Provide Native American Tribes that have expressed interest in the projects (Soboba and
16 Pecharanga) the opportunity to consult with the qualified archaeologist and provide input on the
17 draft CRMTP during its preparation, including the Evaluation Plan and Data Recovery Plan.
18 Upon completion of the draft CRMTP, Native American Tribes shall be given at least 30 days to
19 provide input on the draft CRMTP. Evidence of consultation with the Tribes shall be submitted to
20 the CPUC.
- 21 • Prepare the CRMTP, which shall include the following.
- 22 - **Mapping.** The ~~CRMTP~~CRMPT shall map all known California Register eligible or
23 potentially eligible resources in and within 100 feet of work areas. Maps shall be updated as
24 necessary to incorporate any new information obtained pursuant to MM CR-1a.
 - 25 - **Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) Delineation.** The CRMTP should describe how
26 California Register eligible or potentially eligible resources will be delineated and avoided as
27 ESAs during construction. ESAs containing cultural resources shall not be identified on the
28 ground or on maps to be used by anyone other than the qualified archaeologist, Native
29 American monitors, cultural resource monitors, or other cultural resource professionals, ~~as~~
30 ~~being cultural resources.~~ They shall be labeled on maps and with signage in the field as
31 “environmentally sensitive areas.” The ~~sole preferred~~ method of mitigation in the CRMTP for
32 known resources shall be total avoidance of the resource (preservation in place), per CEQA
33 Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(A). The preferred method of mitigation in the CRMTP for
34 unanticipated resources shall be total avoidance (preservation in place). If avoidance is
35 determined to be infeasible, the applicant shall prepare a Data Recovery Plan.
 - 36 - **Unanticipated resource discovery.** The ~~CRMTP~~CRMPT shall contain a description of
37 procedures to be used if unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during construction.
38 The ~~CRMTP~~CRMPT shall require that work shall be temporarily halted within 100 feet of
39 the resource, appropriate temporary protective barriers shall be installed along with signage
40 identifying the area only as an “environmentally sensitive area” and forbidding entry into the
41 area by all but authorized personnel, and the qualified archaeologist and the CPUC shall be
42 notified. No work will resume in the area until the qualified archaeologist and the CPUC
43 agree to an appropriate buffer or until mitigation has been completed. The preferred method
44 of mitigation in the CRMTP shall be total avoidance of the resource (preservation in place),
45 per CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(A). If the resource can be completely avoided,
46 no additional mitigation is necessary. If the resource cannot be completely avoided, the
47 qualified archaeologist shall then follow the procedures delineated for resources where it is
48 not known whether the resource is historical. If an unanticipated resource is avoided, it shall

1 nonetheless be recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms and
2 filed at the Eastern Information Center.

- 3 - **Determination if a resource is an historical resource.** The qualified archaeologist, in
4 consultation with the CPUC, shall determine if there is a potential for the resource to be an
5 historical resource. If there is no potential for the resource to qualify as an historical resource,
6 work shall resume after CPUC concurrence. The CRMTP shall include a framework for
7 evaluating cultural resources. If there is a potential for the resource to be an historic resource,
8 the qualified archaeologist shall prepare an Evaluation Plan.
- 9 - **Evaluation Plan.** The resource-specific Evaluation Plan shall detail the procedures to be used
10 to determine if the discovery is an historical resource. The Evaluation Plan shall include
11 sufficient discussion of background and context to allow the evaluation of the resource
12 against the historic resource criteria. It shall include a description of procedures to be used in
13 the gathering of information to allow the evaluation. These techniques may include (but are
14 not limited to): excavation, written documentation, interviews, and/or photography. For
15 archaeological resource testing, the Evaluation Plan should describe the archaeological
16 testing procedures, including, but not limited to: surface collection (if surface artifacts are
17 discovered), test excavations (including type, number, and location of test pits and/or
18 trenches), analysis methods, and reporting procedure. The Evaluation Plan shall be submitted
19 to CPUC for review. Once approved, the Evaluation Plan shall be implemented in the field.
20 The report resulting from this work shall include evaluation of the discovery, based on the
21 significance criteria set forth in the Evaluation Plan, indicating if it is an historic resource. If
22 the discovery is not found to be an historic resource, and CPUC concurs with that
23 determination, protective barriers may be removed, and work may proceed in the area of the
24 discovery. If the discovery is determined to be an historic resource, SCE shall prepare a Data
25 Recovery Plan.
- 26 - **Data Recovery Plan.** Data recovery plans for historic resources that cannot be fully avoided
27 shall be prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(C) and PRC
28 section 21083.2, as applicable. The Data Recovery Plan shall outline how the recovery of
29 data from the resource will mitigate impacts to that resource to below a level of significance.
30 The Data Recovery Plan shall describe the level of effort, including numbers and kinds of
31 excavation units to be dug, excavation procedures, laboratory methods, samples (e.g., pollen,
32 sediment, as appropriate) to be collected and analyzed, analysis techniques that will yield
33 information relevant to the aspects of the site that make it an historic resource, and reporting
34 procedure. This plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval. Once
35 approved, the applicant shall implement the approved plan. Once the data recovery field work
36 is complete, a Data Recovery Field Memo shall be prepared.
- 37 - **Data Recovery Field Memo.** Following implementation of the Data Recovery Plan, the Data
38 Recovery Field Memo shall be prepared. The Data Recovery Field Memo shall briefly
39 describe the data recovery procedures in the field and summarize (at a field catalog level) the
40 materials recovery. The Data Recovery Field Memo shall also identify the number and kind
41 of samples recovered that are appropriate for special analyses, including radiocarbon dating,
42 obsidian sourcing, pollen analysis, microbotanical analysis, and others, as applicable. The
43 Data Recovery Field Memo shall be submitted to CPUC for review and approval. Once the
44 Data Recovery Field Memo has been approved, protective barriers may be removed, and
45 work may proceed in the area of the discovery. If the Data Recovery Field Memo concerns
46 Native American resources or archaeological or prehistoric resources, the Data Recovery
47 Field Memo shall also be submitted to the Native American Tribe per the procedures outlined
48 in the Data Recovery Plan. A Data Recovery Report shall then be prepared.

- 1 - **Data Recovery Report.** Within 90 days of submittal of the Data Recovery Field Memo, a
2 Data Recovery Report shall be prepared. The Data Recovery Report shall present~~presenting~~
3 the results of the data recovery program, including a description of field methods, location
4 and size of excavation units, analysis of materials recovered (including results of any special
5 analyses conducted), and conclusions drawn from the work. The Data Recovery Report shall
6 also indicate where artifacts, samples, and documentation resulting from the data recovery
7 program will be curated. The Data Recovery Report ~~CRMPT~~ shall specify that the curation
8 facility meets the requirements of 36 CFR 79. The Data Recovery Report shall be submitted
9 to the CPUC for review and approval. Once approved, the Data Recovery Report shall be
10 filed with the Eastern Information Center. All impacted known resources and all
11 unanticipated resources shall be recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation
12 523 forms and filed at the Eastern Information Center with the Data Recovery Report. If the
13 Data Recovery Report concerns Native American resources or archaeological or prehistoric
14 resources, the Data Recovery Report shall also be submitted to the Native American Tribe per
15 the procedures outlined in the Data Recovery Plan.
- 16 - The CRMTP shall include a summary of the California laws regarding the discovery of
17 human remains, including: CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e); PRC sections 5097.94,
18 5097.98, and 5097.99; and California Health and Safety Code section 7050.5. In addition, the
19 plan shall include the contact information for the Riverside County Medical Examiner. The
20 CRMTP shall specify that the curation facility, where artifacts, samples, and documentation
21 resulting from the data recovery program shall be curated, meets the requirements of 36 CFR
22 79.

23
24 **MM CR-2: Monitor ground disturbing activities (includes Native American monitoring).**

25 Archaeological monitoring shall be required for ground disturbing activities in areas with moderate to
26 high archaeological sensitivity. In some areas where previous disturbance has occurred, spot checking
27 may be appropriate and will be defined in the CRMTP. The archaeological monitor(s) shall be approved
28 by CPUC staff prior to the start of construction. If any cultural resources are discovered, the
29 archaeological monitor has the authority to stop ground-disturbing activities in the immediate area of the
30 discovery. The process outlined in the CRMTP required under MM CR-1b shall then be followed.

31
32 One Native American monitor from each tribe that has requested involvement (the Pechanga Tribe and
33 the Soboba Band) monitoring shall be retained, at the Tribes' option, to observe~~required for~~ ground-
34 disturbing activities and all work at P33-00714, ~~if requested by interested Native American tribes and~~
35 subject to the conditions outlined in this mitigation measure. SCE shall consult with Native American
36 tribes that have requested involvement (including Pechanga and Soboba) to determine where additional
37 Native American monitoring is required. SCE shall document consultation efforts that show queries to the
38 NAHC and tribes on the NAHC contact list regarding culturally sensitive sites and shall provide this
39 documentation to the CPUC for review and approval prior to any ground-disturbing activities and prior to
40 work at resource P33-00714. Native American monitoring shall be subject to the following conditions:

- 41
42 • Tribes requesting presence at construction or excavation activities shall be given 30 days advance
43 notice prior to the start of construction and shall be provided the opportunity to monitor
44 construction activities as requested in consultation with SCE subject to the terms of this
45 mitigation measure. The applicant shall make a good-faith best effort to schedule construction
46 when a monitor is available.
- 47 • Attendance by Native American monitors during these activities is ultimately at the discretion of
48 the Tribe and the absence of a Native American monitor shall not delay work if the Native
49 American tribe has been given 30 days advance notice. Documentation of consultation activities
50 shall be included in the monitoring plan.

- The Native American monitors shall have the ability to temporarily halt work or redirect grading from the immediate vicinity of a potential unanticipated archaeological find that may require recordation and evaluation. The archaeological monitor shall be notified immediately to determine the procedure to follow per MM CR-1b.

~~**MM CR-3: Follow historic resource and unique archaeological resource discovery protocol.** In the case that a previously unknown resource is discovered during construction activities, the CPUC approved archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(a) or a unique archaeological resource as defined in PRC section 21083.2(g). Work can recommence if the resource is determined to be neither. Work shall not be allowed within 150 feet of the resource if the resource meets the criteria for either a historic or unique archaeological resource. The archaeologist shall then consult with the CPUC and adhere to the CRMPT (MM CR-1b) to determine the course of action required to prevent a substantial adverse change to an historical resource or a significant effect on a unique archaeological resource.~~

MM CR-6: Avoid impacts to contributing elements of P33-000714. All activities within the site boundaries of P33-000714 shall be in accordance with SHPO's concurrence letter, sent to SCE on October 7, 2014. Access road construction shall occur only as described in SCE's letter to the SHPO for concurrence. No contributing elements of P33-000714 shall be impacted during construction, operation, and maintenance activities. An ESA shall be established around contributing elements during construction to prevent access by construction crews. Archaeological monitoring shall be required for construction activities within the boundaries of P33-000714. Archaeological monitoring shall be required for maintenance activities within the boundaries of P33-000714 unless the activities involve only driving on established access roads. The archaeological monitor shall have the authority to stop work in the case of an unanticipated resource. In the case of an unanticipated resource, the process outlined in MM CR-1b shall be implemented. In addition, eucalyptus trees shall not be uprooted at site P-33-000714 but shall be removed by a method that minimizes ground disturbance, such as cutting down the tree and grinding the stump to ground level with a stump grinder.

Impact CR-2 (VIG): Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION

Construction

There are no known unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geological features in the Valley-Ivyglen project area; however, undiscovered surface and subsurface paleontological resources could occur in the area, as described in Table 4.5-6. The proposed Valley-Ivyglen Project would include ground disturbance and excavation, which could destroy undiscovered paleontological resources and result in a significant impact. MM CR-4 will require monitoring where it has been determined that there is a reasonable potential for discovery of fossils, as defined in the Paleontological Resource Monitoring Plan (PRMP), in the project area based on information from the records search and literature review summarized in Table 4.5-6. MM CR-5 outlines procedures to follow if a paleontological resource is discovered during construction. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM CR-4 and MM CR-5.

Operation and Maintenance

Operation and maintenance activities on proposed Valley-Ivyglen Project components would all occur within areas disturbed during construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed areas would occur during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential to affect known or previously unknown unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features during operation and maintenance. As a result, there would be no impact to these resources.

1
2 **Mitigation Measures**

3 **MM CR-4: Monitor Paleontologically Sensitive Areas.** SCE shall retain a qualified paleontologist to
4 monitor ground-disturbing activities in paleontologically sensitive areas as defined in the PRMP. The
5 qualified paleontologist shall be approved in advance by the CPUC. The qualified paleontologist shall
6 prepare a brief Paleontological Resource Monitoring Plan that includes methods of paleontological
7 monitoring and includes construction maps delineating areas of ground disturbance that shall be
8 monitored for paleontological resources. These shall include areas where:
9

- 10 • There is a high or undetermined paleontological sensitivity.
11 • There is a potential for fossils to occur at a level shallow enough to be adversely affected by
12 project activities.
13

14 Areas where fossils would likely occur include but are not limited to the Silverado ~~Foundation~~Formation.
15 Areas where fossils are not reasonably likely to be discovered include areas of igneous substrate, such as
16 the Estelle Mountain volcanic rock. Qualifications for proposed paleontological monitors shall be
17 submitted to the CPUC for review and approval. Only CPUC-approved paleontological monitors shall
18 serve on this project. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt construction in the
19 vicinity of any potential finds in order to begin implementation of MM CR-5. A reduction in monitoring
20 activities will be determined based on field observations and in coordination with SCE and CPUC.
21

22 **MM CR-5: Follow Paleontological Resource Discovery Protocol.** In the case that a previously
23 unknown paleontological resource is discovered during construction activities, all work within 15 meters
24 of the resource shall be stopped, and the CPUC-approved paleontologist shall determine whether the
25 resource can be avoided. If the resource cannot be avoided, the paleontologist shall determine whether the
26 resource is unique under Part V of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G. A paleontological resource shall be
27 considered unique if it meets the definition of a significant paleontological resource under the 2010
28 Society of Vertebrate Paleontology *Standard Procedures for the Assessment of Adverse Impacts to*
29 *Paleontological Resources* definition:
30

31 Significant paleontological resources are fossils and fossiliferous deposits, here defined as
32 consisting of identifiable vertebrate fossils, large or small, uncommon invertebrate, plant, and
33 trace fossils, and other data that provide taphonomic, taxonomic, phylogenetic, paleoecologic,
34 stratigraphic, and/or biochronologic information. Paleontological resources are considered to be
35 older than recorded human history and/or older than middle Holocene (i.e., older than about 5,000
36 radiocarbon years) (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010).
37

38 Substantiation of the uniqueness conclusion shall be provided to the CPUC for review and approval.
39 Work shall be allowed to continue if the resource is not unique.
40

41 If the resource is unique, then work shall remain stopped until the approved paleontologist has consulted
42 with SCE and the CPUC and a feasible approach, approved by the CPUC, has been developed that will
43 prevent destruction of the resource by site protection or recovery. Methods of recovery, testing, and
44 evaluation shall adhere to current professional standards for recovery, preparation, identification, analysis,
45 and curation, such as the 2010 Society of Vertebrate Paleontology *Standard Procedures for the*
46 *Assessment of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources*. Work can commence following recovery
47 and CPUC approval.
48

1 **Impact CR-3 (VIG): Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal**
2 **cemeteries.**
3 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION*
4

5 **Construction**

6 Human bone has been reported on the surface of one site (P33-000714/CA-RIV-714). Another nearby
7 potential archaeological resource located approximately 0.8 miles from the Alberhill Substation site may
8 contain human remains. Given the rich Native American history of the general area and the high potential
9 that there are possibly human burial sites in the vicinity of project components, there is a possibility that
10 previously unknown human remains may be encountered during construction activities. This would be a
11 potentially significant impact. MM CR-7 will require adherence to applicable laws as well as training of
12 workers on the appropriate procedures to follow if human remains are encountered. Impacts would be less
13 than significant with mitigation.
14

15 **Operation and Maintenance**

16 Operation and maintenance activities on the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project components would all
17 occur within areas disturbed during construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in
18 previously undisturbed areas would occur during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential
19 to affect human remains during operation and maintenance. As a result, there would be no impact to these
20 resources.
21

22 **Mitigation Measure**

23 **MM-CR-7: Follow Necessary Procedures for Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains.** The
24 CRMTP (MM CR-1b) shall include a summary of the applicable laws concerning human remains,
25 including: CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e); PRC sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99; and
26 California Health and Safety Code section 7050.5. These laws require Native American consultation for
27 Native American burial sites. The CPUC shall be notified immediately after the legally-mandated
28 notification of the county medical examiner if any human remains are encountered during construction.
29 Workers shall be trained in procedures to follow in case of unanticipated discovery of human remains as
30 part of the Worker Environmental Awareness Plan.
31

32 **4.5.5 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Alberhill Project)**

34 **4.5.5.1 Project Commitments (Alberhill Project)**

35
36 The applicant has committed to the following as part of the design of the proposed Alberhill Project. See
37 Section 2.6, “Project Commitments,” for a complete description of each project commitment.
38

- 39 • **Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan.** Prior to construction of the
40 proposed projects, a Worker Environmental Awareness Plan would be developed based on final
41 engineering designs, the results of preconstruction surveys, project commitments, and mitigation
42 measures imposed by the California Public Utilities Commission. A presentation would be
43 prepared by the applicant and shown to all site workers prior to their start of work. A record of all
44 trained personnel would be kept with the construction foreman. In addition to the instruction for
45 compliance with any site-specific biological or cultural resource protective measures and project
46 mitigation measures, all construction personnel would also receive the following:
47 - A list of phone numbers of the applicant's personnel with the (archeologist, biologist,
48 environmental compliance coordinator, and regional spill response coordinator);
49 - Instruction on the South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 for control of dust;

- Instruction on what typical cultural resources look like, and if discovered during construction, to suspend work in the vicinity of any find and contact the site foreman and archeologist or environmental compliance coordinator;
- Instruction on individual responsibilities under the Clean Water Act, the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for the projects, site-specific Best Management Practices, and the location of Material Safety Data Sheets for the projects;
- Instructions to notify the foreman and regional spill response coordinator in case of hazardous materials spills and leaks from equipment or upon the discovery of soil or groundwater contamination;
- A copy of the truck routes to be used for material delivery; and
- Instruction that noncompliance with any laws, rules, regulations, or mitigation measures could result in being barred from participating in any remaining construction activities associated with the projects.

4.5.5.2 Impacts Analysis (Alberhill Project)

Impact CR-1 (ASP): Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource or an archaeological resource.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION

Construction

Alberhill Substation Site and 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5

There are no known prehistoric-age resources or unique archaeological resources on the Alberhill Substation Site or immediately adjacent to 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5; ~~however, there are~~

There are five known historic resources in this area. Three historic-age resources (P33-17571/CWA18-2, P33-17572/CWA18-1, and P33-15426) occur within 0.1 miles of the substation site or 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5 but are not eligible for the California or National Registers. These resources do not otherwise qualify as an historical resource under the CEQA Guidelines so these project components would not result in any impact with respect to these three resources.

Project activities would not affect the fourth known historic resource, Temescal Valley Road, which has been recommended as not eligible. The road has been re-graded, widened, realigned, and recently repaved. This road would be used during construction, but no alterations would be made. There would be no substantial adverse change in the significance of the Temescal Valley Road resource.

The fifth known historic resource (~~Resource P2233-15428~~), a house built in 1920, has not been evaluated for California or National Register eligibility. Adverse effects to the resource could result in a significant impact, given that the resource has not been evaluated for eligibility. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources; this would not reduce impacts to less than significant because it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to resources. MM CR-1b would require a plan that outlines that avoidance of this resource ~~is required~~. Implementation of MM CR-1b would prevent any change in significance of P22-15428. With implementation of MM CR-1b, there would be no substantial adverse change in the significance of a known historical resource.

There is a potential for discovery of previously unknown prehistoric-age and historic-age cultural resources and unique archaeological resources during substation and 115-kV alignment construction

1 activities. As previously described, though there are no known prehistoric cultural resources within
2 0.1 miles of the work areas, cultural sensitivity in the area is moderate to high due to proximity to a
3 known traditional cultural property (*Paayoxch*), the type of alluvial material present at the substation site,
4 and known importance of the general area to local Native American groups. Construction impacts could
5 potentially include physical damage or alteration, change in visual elements of a resource, and destruction
6 of a resource. Impacts to previously unknown cultural resources, including historic resources and unique
7 archaeological resources, would be significant if the resources are considered historic resources and if the
8 impacts are substantial and adverse. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require
9 preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources and when to
10 suspend work if a cultural resource is encountered. Impacts would be potentially significant after
11 implementation of Project Commitment B because the measure would not prevent substantial adverse
12 changes to the significance of any discovered resource. MM CR-1a requires the applicant to ensure
13 surveys have been conducted in all work areas and staging areas prior to construction. MM CR-1b
14 requires preparation of plan outlining the procedures for analyzing a previously unknown resource
15 discovered during construction activities. MM CR-2 outlines monitoring requirements, including
16 involvement of Native American tribes and groups to determine Native American monitoring locations.
17 ~~MM CR-3 describes procedures to be followed on-site if a previously unknown resource is discovered.~~
18 Impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources (including historical and unique archaeological
19 resources) would be less than significant with implementation of MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b, and MM CR-
20 ~~2, and MM CR-3.~~

21 **ASP 500-kV Transmission Line Routes**

22 There are no known prehistoric-age resources or unique archaeological resources at or immediately
23 adjacent to the ASP 500-kV Transmission Lines.

24
25
26 There are seven known historic resources in this area. Two historic-age resources (P33-17571/CWA18-2
27 and P33-15426/CWA18-1) occur within 0.1 miles of the 500-kV transmission line routes but are not
28 eligible for the California or National Registers. These resources do not otherwise qualify as an historical
29 resource under the CEQA Guidelines and so these project components would not result in any impact
30 with respect to these two resources.

31
32 Another two~~Two~~ resources within 0.1 miles of the proposed 500-kV transmission line routes (Temescal
33 Valley Road [currently Temescal Canyon Road] and P-33-021068/CA-RIV-10913) have been evaluated
34 but recommended not eligible, ~~while three resources within 0.1 miles of the proposed 500-kV~~
35 ~~transmission line routes have not been formally evaluated for eligibility.~~ Project activities, as previously
36 described for the Alberhill Substation site, would not affect Temescal Valley Road, which was
37 recommended not eligible for the California Register, ~~as previously described for the Alberhill Substation~~
38 ~~site~~, so there would be no substantial adverse change in the significance of the Temescal Valley Road
39 resource.

40
41 Resource P-33-021068/CA-RIV-10913, a culvert, has also been recommended not eligible, although
42 SHPO has not concurred on the eligibility of this resource. ~~Therefore, adverse~~ Adverse effects to this
43 resource, which could include damage or destruction of the resource, could ~~therefore~~ result in significant
44 effects if the affected resource is determined to be eligible by the SHPO. SCE has proposed Project
45 Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on
46 recognition of cultural resources; this would not reduce impacts to less than significant because it would
47 not prevent substantial adverse changes to resources. MM CR-1b would require avoidance of known
48 resources. Implementation of MM CR-1b would prevent any change in significance of the resources.

49
50 The remaining three resources within 0.1 miles of the proposed 500-kV transmission line routes
51 (Resources CWA60-3, P33-021067/CA-RIV-10912, and P-33-021069/CA-RIV-10914) have not been

1 | evaluated for California or National Register eligibility. ~~Therefore, substantial~~Substantial adverse effects
2 | to the resources could result in a significant impact, given that the resources have not been evaluated for
3 | eligibility. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP. Part
4 | of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources; this would not reduce impacts to less than
5 | significant because it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to resources. MM CR-1b would
6 | require avoidance of known resources. Implementation of MM CR-1b would prevent any change in
7 | known resources. With implementation of MM CR-1b, there would be no substantial adverse change in
8 | the significance of a known historical resource.
9 |

10 | There is a potential for discovery of previously unknown prehistoric-age and historic-age cultural
11 | resources and unique archaeological resources during construction activities at the 500-kV lattice steel
12 | tower sites within the substation site boundaries where archaeological sensitivity is moderate to high. The
13 | potential for discovery is higher under the Conventional Method than the Helicopter Construction method
14 | for the 500-kV transmission lines, since the latter construction approach would result in less ground
15 | disturbance (refer to Section 2.4.2.2). Impacts would be potentially significant under both approaches,
16 | however, as described previously for work at the Alberhill Substation site. Impacts would be potentially
17 | significant even after implementation of Project Commitment B because the measure would not prevent
18 | substantial adverse changes to the significance of any discovered resource. MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b, and
19 | ~~MM CR-2, and MM CR-3~~would be implemented for these project components, as described in the
20 | substation site analysis, to reduce impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources at the two 500-
21 | kV lattice steel tower sites within the substation site boundaries. At other locations along the 500-kV
22 | transmission alignment where archaeological sensitivity is low, monitoring would not be required but
23 | MM CR-1a, MM-CR1b, and MM CR-2 would be implemented to reduce impacts to previously
24 | undiscovered cultural resources. Impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources (including
25 | historical and unique archaeological resources) would be less than significant with implementation of
26 | MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b, and ~~MM CR-2, and MM CR-3~~.

27 |
28 | **115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8**

29 | There are ~~seven~~ known ~~cultural prehistoric and historic age~~ resources along 115-kV Segments ASP2
30 | through ASP8. One of these known
31 | ~~Three historic age resources is and one~~ prehistoric-age resource within 0.1 miles of the 500-~~kv~~kV
32 | transmission line routes (P33-013802, an isolated mano) that ~~is~~are not eligible for the California or
33 | National Registers and does not otherwise qualify as a historical resources under the CEQA Guidelines. ÷
34 |

35 | • ~~The remaining six known cultural resources are historic-age resources. Four of the known~~
36 | historic-age resources within 0.1 miles of the 500-kV transmission line routes (P33-06883/CA-
37 | RIV-5785H, P33-03832, P33-14891, and P33-021126) are not eligible for the California or
38 | National Registers. Prehistoric

39 | ~~—~~ P33-14712

40 | • ~~Historic~~

41 | ~~—~~ P33-06883/CA RIV-5785H

42 | ~~—~~ P33-03832

43 | ~~—~~ P33-14891
44 |

45 | These resources do not otherwise qualify as an historical resource under the CEQA Guidelines and so
46 | these project components would not result in any impact with respect to these four known historic-age
47 | resources.
48 |

1 ~~The fifth known~~ Within 0.1 miles of the project, there is one historic-age resource that has been
2 ~~determined eligible~~ (P33-17016/Alberhill community and industrial buildings) has been determined
3 eligible and the sixth known and one historic-age resource (CWA60-2/irrigation pump and motor) that has
4 not been formally evaluated for eligibility. ~~(CWA60-2/irrigation pump and motor)~~. Substantial adverse
5 effects to either of these two known historic-age resources resource could result in a significant impact,
6 given that one resource is eligible and the other may be eligible, pending formal evaluation. SCE has
7 proposed Project Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would
8 focus on recognition of cultural resources; this would not reduce impacts to less than significant because
9 it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to resources. MM CR-1b would require avoidance of
10 these known resources. Implementation of MM CR-1b would prevent any change in significance of P33-
11 17016 and CWA60-2. With implementation of MM CR-1b, there would be no substantial adverse change
12 in the significance of a known resource.
13

14 There is a potential for discovery of previously unknown prehistoric-age and historic-age cultural
15 resources and unique archaeological resources during construction activities along 115-kV Segments
16 ASP3 through ASP8, where archaeological sensitivity is moderate to high (as previously discussed) and
17 where ground-disturbing activities would occur. No ground-disturbing activities would occur along
18 ASP2, where only stringing of conductor and installation of additional structures on existing poles would
19 occur. Impacts would be potentially significant, as described previously for work at the Alberhill
20 Substation site. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP.
21 Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources; this would not reduce impacts to less
22 than significant because it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to resources. MM CR-1a, MM
23 CR-1b, and MM CR-2, ~~and~~ MM CR-3 would be implemented for these project components, as described
24 in the substation site analysis, to reduce impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources. Impacts to
25 previously undiscovered cultural resources (including historical and unique archaeological resources)
26 would be less than significant with implementation of MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b, and MM CR-2, ~~and~~ MM
27 CR-3.
28

29 ***Operation and Maintenance***

30 Operation and maintenance activities on proposed Alberhill Project components would all occur within
31 areas disturbed during construction of the project or within or along facilities erected during construction
32 of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed areas would occur during
33 operation and maintenance. There would be no potential to affect known or previously unknown historic-
34 age or prehistoric-age historical resources or unique archaeological resources during operation and
35 maintenance. As a result, there would be no impact to these resources.
36

37 ***Mitigation Measures***

38 **MM CR-1a: Ensure preconstruction survey coverage of all work areas and staging areas.**

39
40 **MM CR-1b: Avoid impacts to known and undiscovered historic resources and unique**
41 **archaeological resources (except for site P33-000714).**

42
43 **MM CR-2: Monitor ground disturbing activities (includes Native American monitoring).**

44
45 **MM CR-3: Follow historic resource and unique archaeological resource discovery protocol.**
46
47

1 **Impact CR-2 (ASP): Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or**
2 **unique geologic feature.**

3 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION*

4
5 **Construction**

6 There are no known unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features in the proposed
7 Alberhill project area; however, undiscovered surface and subsurface paleontological resources could
8 occur in the area, as described in Table 4.5-6. The proposed Alberhill Project would include ground
9 disturbance and excavation at the substation site, along the 500-kV alignments, and along all 115-kV
10 segments except ASP2 (where the ASP conductor would be located on existing poles and therefore would
11 not result in ground disturbance), which could destroy undiscovered paleontological resources and result
12 in a significant impact. The potential for discovery is higher under the Conventional Method than the
13 Helicopter Construction method for the 500-kV transmission lines, since the latter construction approach
14 would result in less ground disturbance (refer to Section 2.4.2.2). Impacts would be potentially
15 significant, however, under both approaches. MM CR-4 would require monitoring where it has been
16 determined that there is a reasonable potential for discovery of fossils in the project area based on
17 information from the records search and literature review summarized in Table 4.5-6. MM CR-5 outlines
18 procedures to follow if a paleontological resource is discovered during construction. Impacts to
19 paleontological resources would be less than significant with implementation of MM CR-4 and MM CR-
20 5.

21
22 **Operation and Maintenance**

23 Operation and maintenance activities on ASP components would all occur within areas disturbed during
24 construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed areas would occur
25 during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential to affect known or previously unknown
26 unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features during operation and maintenance. As a
27 result, there would be no impact to these resources.

28
29 **Mitigation Measures**

30 **MM CR-4: Monitor Paleontologically Sensitive Areas.**

31
32 **MM CR-5: Follow Paleontological Resource Discovery Protocol.**

33
34 **Impact CR-3 (ASP): Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal**
35 **cemeteries.**

36 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION*

37
38 **Construction**

39 Research has not uncovered any known Native American or other human remains in the project area. One
40 potential archaeological resource may contain human remains; it is located approximately 0.8 miles from
41 the Alberhill Substation site. Given the rich Native American history of the general area and the potential
42 for human burial sites in the vicinity of the project components, there is a possibility that previously
43 unknown human remains may be encountered during construction activities. This would be a potentially
44 significant impact. MM CR-7 would require adherence to applicable laws as well as training of workers
45 of the appropriate procedures to follow if human remains are discovered. Impacts would be less than
46 significant with mitigation.

1 **Operation and Maintenance**

2 All operation and maintenance activities on proposed Alberhill Project components would occur within
3 areas disturbed during construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in previously
4 undisturbed areas would occur during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential to affect
5 disturb human remains during operation and maintenance. As a result, there would be no impact to these
6 resources.

7
8 **Mitigation Measure**

9 **MM-CR-7: Follow Necessary Procedures for Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains.**

10
11 **4.5.6 References**

12
13 Anderson, R.S., M.J. Power, S.J. Smith, K.B. Springer, and E. Scott. 2002. Paleocology of a Middle
14 Wisconsin Deposit from Southern California. *Quaternary Research* 58: 310–317.

15
16 Bean, Lowell John, and Florence C. Shipek. 1978. “Luiseño” in the *Handbook of North American*
17 *Indians: California*, edited by R. F. Heizer. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

18
19 Brodie, Natalie. 2011a. Cultural Resources Study of Proposed Access Roads, Alternative Pole Locations,
20 Pulling Locations, and Alternative Corridors for the Serrano–Valley 500-kV Transmission Line
21 Project, Riverside County, CA. LSA Associates, Inc., Carlsbad, CA.

22
23 _____. 2011b. Ivy-Glen Subtransmission Project, Additional Survey for Three Proposed Poles on the
24 Pawnee 12kV Reconductor Project Connection to Valley Ivy-Glen, Lake Elsinore, Riverside
25 County, California (LSA Project No. SCE1107, Purchase Order No. 4500432638, Valley). LSA
26 Associates, Inc., Carlsbad, CA.

27
28 _____. 2011c. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment for the Valley Ivy-Glen Subtransmission
29 Line Project: Additional Survey for Portions of Access Roads and Pull Sites Along State Route
30 74 and West of the Valley Substation, Riverside County, California (LSA Project No. SCE1107).
31 LSA Associates, Inc., Carlsbad, CA.

32
33 _____. 2012. Purchase Order No. 4500432638, Valley Ivy-Glen Subtransmission Project, Testing and
34 Evaluation of Site CA-RIV-714, Lake Elsinore, Riverside County, California (LSA Project No.
35 SCE1006A5). LSA Associates, Inc., Carlsbad, CA.

36
37 Chmiel, Karolina A., and Theodore G. Cooley. 2008. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment of the
38 Valley-Ivyglen Transmission Line Project Alternatives EX-A through EX-D and W-01, W-1A
39 through W-1C, and W-4, Riverside, CA. Jones & Stokes, San Diego, CA.

40
41 City of Lake Elsinore. 2006. Lake Elsinore General Plan Update: Appendix B. Cultural, Historical, and
42 Paleontological Background Report. January.

43
44 _____. 2011. City of Lake Elsinore General Plan. Section 4.0: Resource Protection and Preservation.
45 December 13.

46
47 City of Menifee. 2013. Hearing Draft General Plan. <http://www.cityofmenifee.us/index.aspx?NID=221>.
48 Accessed February 13, 2014.

- 1 Cooley, Theodore G., and Andrea Craft. 2008. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment of the Valley-
2 Ivyglen Transmission Line Project, Riverside County, CA. Jones & Stokes, San Diego, CA.
3
- 4 Cotterman, Cary D., and Evelyn N. Chandler. 2008. Cultural Resources Investigation of the Proposed
5 Southern California Edison 500/115 kV Alberhill Substation Project, Riverside County, CA (I.O.
6 301909). ECORP Consulting, Inc., Redlands, CA.
7
- 8 Cotterman, Cary D., and Evelyn N. Chandler. 2009. Cultural Resources Inventory of the Proposed
9 Southern California Edison 115kV/500kV Alberhill Circuits, Riverside County, CA. ECORP
10 Consulting, Inc., Redlands, CA.
11
- 12 County of Riverside. 2008. County of Riverside General Plan. Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space
13 Element. December.
14
- 15 CPUC (California Public Utilities Commission). 2009. Draft Environmental Impact Report: Valley-
16 Ivyglen Subtransmission Line and Fogarty Substation Project. State Clearinghouse No.
17 2008011082. Prepared by Ecology and Environment, Inc., San Francisco, CA. June.
18
- 19 Craft, Andrea M., and Theodore G. Cooley. 2008. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment of the
20 Valley-Ivyglen Transmission Line Project Alternatives C-9A through C-9E, Riverside County,
21 CA. Jones & Stokes, San Diego, CA.
22
- 23 Cunningham, Robert, Wendy Jones, Evelyn N. Chandler, and Roger Mason. 2013. Cultural Resources
24 Investigation Results of the Marshalling Yard Survey, Access Road Survey, and Supplemental
25 115kV Transmission Line Survey in Support of the Alberhill Substation Riverside County,
26 California. ECORP Consulting, Inc., Redlands, CA.
27
- 28 DuBois, Constance Goddard. 1908. The Religion of the Luiseño Indians of Southern California.
29 University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 8 (3):69-186.
30
- 31 E & E (Ecology and Environment, Inc.). 2011. CPUC Meeting with the Pechanga Tribe at the Pechanga
32 Reservation in Temecula, CA. Meeting Minutes. December 12.
33
- 34 _____. 2013a. CPUC Meeting with the Pechanga Tribe at the Pechanga Reservation in Temecula, CA.
35 Meeting Minutes. June 11.
36
- 37 _____. 2013b. CPUC Meeting with the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians at the Pechanga Reservation in
38 Temecula, CA. Meeting Minutes. June 10.
39
- 40 Glentis, Dionisios. 2011a. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment for the Valley-IvyGlen 115kV
41 Subtransmission Line Project: Proposed Hwy 74 Laydown Yard, Associated Access Road, and
42 Tubular Steel Poles 4765171E, 4765172E, 4765173E, 4765174E, and 4765175E. Prepared by the
43 Chambers Group for Southern California Edison, Monrovia, CA.
44
- 45 _____. 2011b. Addendum: Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment of the Fogarty
46 Substation, Lake Elsinore Area, Riverside County, California. Prepared by the Chambers Group
47 for Southern California Edison, Monrovia, CA.
48
- 49 Google Earth. 2014. Aerial Imagery in Vicinity of Alberhill Substation Site. April 27, 2014.
50

- 1 Hillinger, Charles. 1991. Singing Stone: Interest Centers on Ringing Rock Used by Prehistoric Indians.
2 Los Angeles Times.
3
- 4 Hill, Darren. 2008. Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, California. 2008. Letter to the Attention of Public
5 Scoping Comments regarding Ivyglen Project. January 28.
6
- 7 Hoover, Anna. 2010. Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation,
8 California. Letter to Karen Ladd, Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc. regarding
9 Pechanga Tribe Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact
10 Report (EIR), Southern California Edison's Alberhill System Project (Application A.09-09-022).
11 May 14.
12 -
- 13 . 2011. Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation, California.
14 Letter to Karen Ladd, Project Manager, Ecology and Environment, Inc. regarding Pechanga Tribe
15 Comments on the Notice of Amended Proponent's Environmental Assessment and Preparation of
16 an Environmental Impact Report, Southern California Edison's Alberhill System Project
17 (Application A.09-09-022). August 24.
18 -
- 19 . 2015a. Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation, California.
20 Electronic Submittal of Comments on the Notice of Preparation – SCE Ivyglen Subtransmission
21 (App A.07001-031). June 9.
22 -
- 23 . 2015b. Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation, California.
24 Electronic Submittal of Comments on the Notice of Preparation – SCE Alberhill System Project.
25 June 9.
26
- 27 Jefferson, G. T. 1989. Late Cenozoic Tapirs (Mammalia: Perrisodactyla) of Western North America.
28 Contributions in Science, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Number 406: 1–22.
29
- 30 Lander, E. Bruce. 2008. Paleontologic Resource Inventory, Impact Assessment, and Recommended
31 Mitigation Measures in Support of SCE Alberhill Substation, Riverside County, California. Paleo
32 Environmental Associates, Inc, Altadena, CA. June 2.
33
- 34 Lerch, Michael K., and Marlesa A. Gray. 2006. Cultural Resources Assessment of the Valley-Ivyglen
35 Transmission Line Project, Riverside County, CA. Statistical Research, Inc, Redlands, CA.
36
- 37 McLean, Roderic and Natalie Brodie. 2012. Cultural Resources Assessment: Supplemental Surveys and
38 Significance Evaluation of Historic Canal (CA-RIV-9439/P-33-14757). Valley Ivy-Glen Project
39 Southern California Edison. Riverside County, California. LSA Associates, Inc., Carlsbad,
40 California.
41
- 42 Miller, J.A. 2013. Cultural Resource Survey Report Addendum: Valley-Ivy Glen 1 15 Kv Transmission
43 Line Project Southern California Edison Riverside County, California LSA Associates, Inc.,
44 Carlsbad, California.
45
- 46 Miranda, Laura. 2008. Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation,
47 California. Letter to Public Scoping Comments regarding Pechanga Tribe Comments on the
48 Notice of Preparation for the Draft EIR for the Ivyglen Project as Proposed by Southern
49 California Edison Company, Application No.'s A. 07-01-031 and A. 07-04-028. February 22.
50

- 1 NAHC (Native American Heritage Commission). 2005. Carol Gaubatz, Program Analyst. Letter
2 regarding Proposed Ivyglen Transmission Project, Riverside County, to Brett Rushing, Entrix,
3 Walnut Creek, CA. August 12.
4
- 5 _____. 2008. Dave Singleton, Program Analyst. Letter regarding Proposed Alberhill Substation Project,
6 Riverside County, to Koral Ahmet, Southern California Edison, Rosemead, CA. May 22.
7
- 8 Ontiveros, Joseph. 2009. Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, California. Letter to Sara Bholat,
9 Archaeologist, Southern California Edison, Regarding Native American Consultation Regarding
10 the Proposed Alberhill Substation Project, Revised 115k Source Line Route, Riverside County,
11 California. August 20.
12
- 13 Pollock, Katherine H. n.d. Addendum: Archaeological Assessment of the Valley-Ivyglen Transmission
14 Line Alternative Route Segment h and Alternative Route Segment i. Southern California Edison,
15 Rosemead, CA.
16
- 17 Roland-Nawi, Carol. 2014. State Historic Preservation Officer. Letter to Sarah M. Bholat, Senior
18 Archaeologist, Southern California Edison, Regarding Consultation for Southern California
19 Edison's Determination of No Significant Impacts Determination to Archaeological Site P-22-
20 000714 (CA-RIV-714) for the Valley - Ivy Glen 115kV Subtransmission Line Project. October 7.
21
- 22 SCE (Southern California Edison). 2011. Proponent's Environmental Assessment: Alberhill System
23 Project (April 11), as amended by responses from SCE to CPUC requests for additional
24 information.
25
- 26 _____. 2013. Petition for Modification of Decision 10-08-009 (an August 12, 2010 decision by the
27 CPUC granting SCE a Permit to Construct the Valley-Ivyglen Subtransmission Line and Fogarty
28 Substation Project). March 29.
29
- 30 _____. 2014. Amended Petition for Modification of Decision 10-08-009 (an August 12, 2010 decision
31 by the CPUC granting SCE a Permit to Construct the Valley-Ivyglen Subtransmission Line and
32 Fogarty Substation Project). May 23, as revised by responses from SCE to CPUC requests for
33 additional information.
34
- 35 Scott, Eric. 2009. Paleontology Literature and Records Review, Alberhill Substation 500 kV
36 Transmission Line and 115 kV Source Line, Riverside County, California. San Bernardino
37 County Museum, Redlands, CA. August 27.
38
- 39 Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. 2010. Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of
40 adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources.
41
- 42 Stratton, Susan. 2011. Representative of the State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic
43 Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation. Letter to Sara Bholat, Senior Archaeologist at
44 Southern California Edison, Rosemead, CA. November 10.
45
- 46 Sutton, Mark Q., Mark E. Basgall, Jill K. Gardener, and Mark W. Allen. 2007. Advances in
47 Understanding Mojave Desert Prehistory. In California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and
48 Complexity, edited by T. L. Jones and K. A. Klar. Lanham, MD: Alta Mira.
49

- 1 USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). 2004. Preliminary Digital Geologic Map of the Santa Ana 30' x 60'
- 2 Quadrangle, Southern California (Version 2.0). Compiled by D.M. Morton. Open-File Report 99-
- 3 172. Scale 1:100,000.
- 4
- 5 Warren, Claude N. 1967. The San Dieguito Complex: A Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity*
- 6 32:168–185. .

1

This page intentionally left blank.