

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 Consultation*

37 Native American consultation was conducted by the applicant and the CPUC for the proposed projects.
38 Consultation for the original Valley–Ivyglen Draft EIR is discussed here, since the results of consultation
39 are relevant to the analysis for this EIR because the concerns raised in consultation are relevant to the
40 Native American resources and cultural importance of general geographic area of the proposed projects.
41 Correspondence with Native American groups for the proposed projects is documented in Appendix I.
42 During initial cultural resources assessments for the proposed projects, the applicant contacted the Native
43 American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in 2005 for the Valley–Ivyglen Project (for information to
44 include in application materials for the original Valley–Ivyglen EIR) and in 2008 for the Alberhill

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.

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

13
14 The CPUC has contacted several tribes through distribution of Notices of Preparation (NOPs) for both
15 proposed projects. In January 2008, a NOP document for the proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project EIR was
16 circulated to the public by the CPUC and in April 2010, a NOP for the proposed Alberhill Project EIR
17 was circulated (Section 1.3.2, “Public Scoping”). In July 2011, a second NOP was circulated by the
18 CPUC for the proposed Alberhill Project. The second NOP was circulated following an amendment to the
19 Proponent’s Environmental Assessment submitted by the applicant. A third NOP was circulated in May
20 2015. The third NOP covered the proposed Alberhill project and the proposed Valley–Ivyglen project.

21
22 The CPUC held meetings regarding the proposed modifications to the Valley–Ivyglen Project evaluated
23 in this EIR with the Soboba Band on June 10, 2013 and Pechanga Tribe on June 11, 2013. Cultural sites
24 data provided by both groups were verified by the CPUC and are incorporated into the analysis presented
25 in this EIR.

26 27 **Paleontological Resources**

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

36 37 **Regional Setting**

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

43 44 **Prehistory**

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

- 46
47 • ***San Dieguito/Lake Mojave Complexes (10,000 years to 7,000 years before present [BP]):*** These
48 are the earliest, widely accepted archaeological materials in Southern California (Warren 1967,
49 Sutton et al. 2007). Tools associated with these assemblages include a range of scrapers and
50 stemmed points. It is thought that hunting played an important part in the lives of these people.

1 Starting about 8,500 years ago, there were marked changes in subsistence patterns. The changes
2 visible in the archaeological record include a reduced number of projectile points, scrapers, and
3 choppers and an increased number of ground stone artifacts.

- 4 • **Millingstone Horizon (7,000 to 3,500 years BP):** Cultures from this time period are well
5 described and much better understood than cultures from the preceding period. Pauma sites in the
6 Peninsular Ranges and inland valleys are described as reflecting a relatively sedentary lifestyle
7 and a greater reliance on gathering, when compared to the earlier San Dieguito sites. Artifacts
8 associated with Pauma sites include large, leaf-shaped points and knives, milling implements in
9 large numbers, and items such as beads, pendants, and charm stones. Projectile points used
10 throughout the middle Holocene are relatively large and are associated with atlatl-and-dart
11 weapons. The presence of deep-basined concave surfaces on stone blocks from this period
12 indicates a heavy reliance on seeds, probably from various grasses, sages, and wheat.
- 13 • **Latter Middle Holocene (3,000 to 1,500 years BP):** People broadened their subsistence base, as
14 indicated by the appearance of the mortar and pestle in the archaeological record. The
15 introduction of such innovations suggests an intensification of food production and a concurrent
16 increase in population. In many areas of southern California, the Millingstone cultures survived
17 into the early part of the late Holocene, although by the year 500, there had been several
18 distinctive changes in material culture. For example, there was a shift to the bow-and-arrow as the
19 primary weapon system.
- 20 • **San Luis Rey I Phase (600 to 250 years BP) and San Luis Rey II Phase (250 years BP to
21 present):** San Luis Rey I is distinguished from San Luis Rey II based on the absence of ceramics,
22 cremation urns, and rock paintings during this phase. It was later proposed that three relatively
23 distinct settlement patterns marked the San Luis Rey period. The first pattern was characterized
24 by scattered temporary sites, thus suggesting a somewhat mobile population. A shift to more
25 sedentary settlements, located where streams emerged from canyons, took place in the late San
26 Luis Rey I or early San Luis Rey II period. During the latter part of late prehistoric or
27 protohistoric times, the “one village per drainage” pattern shifted to a more complex,
28 consolidated village pattern. This last shift was probably stimulated by contact with missionaries
29 and other settlers and by factors such as drought and resource competition. At that time, the
30 subsistence patterns of the San Luis Rey culture began to incorporate nonnative plants and
31 animals and to focus less on coastal resources. This final village-based settlement pattern appears
32 to be similar to ethnohistorically-documented Luiseño settlements.

33 34 **Ethnography and Ethnohistory**

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

40
41 The Luiseño shared elements of social and philosophical structure with their Takic-speaking neighbors.
42 Some differences were: “(1) extensive proliferation of social statuses, (2) clearly defined ruling families
43 that interlocked various rancherias within the ethnic nationality, (3) a sophisticated philosophical structure
44 associated with the taking of hallucinogenics (datura), and (4) elaborate ritual paraphernalia including
45 sand paintings symbolic of an avenging sacred being named Chinigchingish” (Bean and Shipek 1978).

46
47 Luiseño villages were sedentary and autonomous, each with areas for extraction of resources in various
48 ecological settings. In Inland areas, villages were often found along streams in valley bottoms. Village

1 territories contained numerous named places, each place being associated with particular resources of
2 sacred beings (Bean and Shipek 1978).

4 **History**

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

- 7
- 8 • **Spanish Mission Period (1769–1821):** This period can be defined by the Spanish settlement of
9 the area beginning in 1769 and the establishment of the San Diego Presidio and the Missions San
10 Diego, San Luis Rey (1798), and San Juan Capistrano (1776). The inland area remained relatively
11 unexplored. In 1774, an expedition led by Juan Bautista de Anza’s entered California and the San
12 Jacinto Valley. The end of the period occurred when Mexico gained independence from Spain in
13 1821. The subsequent Secularization Act of 1833 marked the end of the Mission period and the
14 return of the secularized mission lands to Mexico’s citizenry in the form of land grants or
15 “ranchos.” There were 16 ranchos in Riverside County, including Ranchos Temescal, La Laguna
16 (Lake Elsinore), San Jacinto Nuevo y Portrero (Perris), and Temecula.
- 17 • **Mexican Rancho Period (1821–1848):** Secularized mission lands were returned to Mexico’s
18 citizenry in the form of ranchos. In Riverside County, the period began with the establishment of
19 Leandro Serrano’s Rancho Temescal, on which he built a succession of three adobe structures;
20 planted a garden with fruit trees; and raised oxen, cattle, and horses. The period ended after
21 California was ceded to the United States after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed in
22 1848.
- 23 • **The Anglo-American Period (1848–present):** The Anglo-American period was marked by
24 unprecedented growth and industry. In Riverside County, several trends emerged: increased
25 settlement, the growth of commercial resource extraction, and the development of transportation.
- 26 - **Temescal Valley:** The westernmost portion of the proposed project area consists of Temescal
27 Valley and Glen Ivy Hot Springs. As early as 1860, the sulfur springs at Temescal were
28 advertised as public baths. In 1884, the bathhouse resort building burned to the ground. A few
29 years later, rebuilt and billed as the Glen Ivy Hot Sulfur Springs, the resort re-opened under
30 new proprietorship. More than 100 years later, the springs still attract guests.
- 31 - **Lake Elsinore:** In September 1883, La Laguna Rancho, which spread over 12,000 acres, was
32 purchased by Franklin H. Heald, Donald M. Graham, and William Collier. By 1884, Elsinore
33 railway station was operational a few miles northwest of the town of Elsinore but was later
34 moved to the town of Elsinore. In 1887, the Crescent Bathhouse was constructed in Elsinore
35 for use as a public bath. The town soon became a resort community furnishing visitors with
36 hot mud baths. In 1895, C. H. Alber purchased 135 acres of William Collier’s land and began
37 a successful olive operation. The town was becoming a Mediterranean-style resort
38 community in the exotic olive grove setting. After the turn of the century, Lake Elsinore
39 became a popular getaway destination for Hollywood motion picture actors.
- 40 - **Alberhill:** The Alberhill area, located about 8 miles north of Elsinore, is named for C. H.
41 Alber and James and George Hill, although Alberhill never officially became a town. Coal
42 was first discovered in the vicinity in 1883. Mineral resource activities, including clay
43 mining, are currently ongoing in Alberhill.
- 44

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

46 This section discusses results of the records searches, field surveys, and Native American consultation.
47 General sensitivity of the areas is described in the context of all data gathered. More specific information
48 is provided for the areas within 0.1 miles (about 500 feet) of components for the proposed projects since

these areas would be subject to disturbance while resources beyond 0.1 miles from components for the proposed projects would not be impacted.

115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8

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

- Twenty-seven prehistoric archaeological sites
- Five prehistoric isolates
- Forty-six historic archaeological sites
- Nineteen historic buildings or building complexes
- Two railroads

Historic resources located within 0.1 miles of 115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8 are listed in Table 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

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
P33-015352/ 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
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 Prehistoric sites located within 0.1 miles of 115-kV Segments VIG1 through VIG8 are listed in Table
3 4.5-2.
4

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

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
P33-014760/ CA-RIV-7857	0.1	Lithic scatter	No information available
P33-014811	0.1	Lithic scatter	No information available

Source: Lerch and Gray 2006

Both the Pechanga Tribe and the Soboba Band expressed concerns about possible impacts to resource P-33-000714 (E & E 2013a, 2013b). The Pechanga Tribe also expressed concern about a traditional cultural property that includes the area where site P-33-000630 is located. This is the location of the ethnographic village of *Paxivxa*. The site is very important to the people of Pechanga and is considered sensitive by the Pechanga Tribe (E & E 2013b). The archaeological sensitivity of the alignment would be moderate to high because of the presence of prehistoric archaeological sites in proximity to the proposed alignment and presence of nearby traditional cultural properties.

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

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

- Six prehistoric-age archaeological sites
- One prehistoric-age isolated find
- Five historic-age archaeological sites
- Ten historic-age buildings or groups of buildings
- One historic-age bridge

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

No archaeological resources were located on or within 0.1 miles of the substation site or 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP 1.5. During discussions with representatives of the Pechanga Tribe at the Pechanga Indian Reservation, additional sensitive cultural places were identified. The tribal representatives identified *Paayoxch*, a village complex located about 0.6 miles from the proposed Alberhill Substation site. The complex is associated with the death of the cultural hero Wuyóot (also Wiyot or Ouiot) (DuBois 1908). The red coloring of the clay is said to be from where he bled as he died. Lake Elsinore was important in the Luiseño creation story. Not only did Wuyóot die near the lake, staining the ground red with his blood, it is the place that the people of San Juan Capistrano say the Luiseño were created out of the mud of the lake. Although no previously recorded prehistoric archaeological resources were located within the substation site or adjacent 115-kV alignments, the

1 archaeological sensitivity of the area would be moderate to high because of the presence of prehistoric
2 archaeological sites in proximity to the proposed substation site and the presence of a nearby traditional
3 cultural property (Cotterman and Chandler 2008, 2009). Further, the presence of alluvial wash deposits at
4 the proposed substation site indicate that buried archaeological materials may be found.
5

**Table 4.5-3 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

6
7 **500-kV Transmission Lines (ASP)**

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

- 10
11
- One prehistoric archaeological site
 - One prehistoric isolated find
 - Ten historic archaeological sites
 - Six historic buildings or building complexes
 - One historic railroad ROW
- 12
13
14
15
16

17 Historic resources located within 0.1 miles of the 500-kV transmission line routes are listed in Table
18 4.5-4.
19

Table 4.5-4 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

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

115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8

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

- Six prehistoric-age archaeological sites
- Eight prehistoric-age isolated finds
- Three historic-age archaeological sites
- Three historic-age buildings or building complexes
- One historic-age isolated find
- One historic railroad ROW
- One historic bridge

Historic resources located within 0.1 miles of 115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8 are listed in Table 4.5-5.

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

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

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

- The Audie Murphy complex, which is located more than 0.1 miles from proposed 115-kV segments. Although recorded as a number of different sites, the Tribe considers them to be part of

1 a village complex. Sites that make up the complex, according to the Tribe, continue beyond the
2 limits of the Audie Murphy Ranch (E & E 2011).

- 3 • *Taawila* (Ringing Rock Complex)—a granite boulder that sits on other boulders and has cuppules
4 (small pits) ground into it (Hillinger 1991) and is more than 0.1 miles from proposed 115-kV
5 segments. In the past it was used by the Tribe to call people to gather for meetings or burial
6 ceremonies. It is considered to be culturally important by the Tribe (E & E 2011).
- 7 • *Pû'iv*—The Tribe indicated that this place is located near Skylark Field Airport, within 0.1 miles
8 of the Skylark Substation. The exact nature of the place is not certain, but the location is
9 important to the Tribe (E & E 2011).
- 10 • *Paayoxch*—Previously discussed under “Alberhill Substation and 115-kV Segments ASP1 and
11 ASP1.5,” the village complex is more than 0.1 miles from all proposed 115-kV segments.
12

13 The archaeological sensitivity of the areas around these proposed 115-kV segments would be moderate to
14 high because of the presence of prehistoric archaeological sites in proximity to the proposed 115-kV lines
15 and presence of nearby traditionally important properties.
16

17 ***Native American Consultation Results***

18 ***Pechanga Tribe***

19 The Pechanga Tribe responded to the applicant’s letter regarding the proposed Alberhill Project, which
20 was sent to all Native American groups on the NAHC contact list in 2009. The Tribe stated that, although
21 the components of the proposed Alberhill Project would not be located within the Tribe’s present
22 reservation, they would be located within the Tribe’s traditional use areas. The Pechanga Tribe requested
23 consultation with the applicant concerning the proposed Alberhill Project; participation by Native
24 American monitors in any additional surveys, archaeological excavations, and ground-disturbing
25 construction activities; return of any prehistoric artifacts that are recovered to the appropriate tribe after
26 they have been analyzed by archaeologists; the right to inspect sites where human remains are discovered
27 and to determine the treatment and disposition of the remains; and copies of all site records, survey
28 reports, or other environmental documents.
29

30 In response to two NOPs (January 2008 Valley–Ivyglen and 2010 Alberhill), the Pechanga Tribe
31 previously submitted comment letters that outlined concerns regarding cultural resources and traditional
32 cultural properties. The Pechanga Tribe submitted a similar comment letter in response to the second
33 Alberhill Project NOP (July 2011 Alberhill). The CPUC held a meeting with representatives of the
34 Pechanga Tribe in December 2011 and follow-up meeting by telephone in 2012 to discuss the proposed
35 Alberhill Project and tribal concerns about cultural resources in the proposed project area. Two areas are
36 considered by the Tribe to be traditional properties. These include the Audie Murphy Ranch
37 archaeological site complex and an area south of the proposed Alberhill Substation site associated with
38 the death of Wuyóot, as discussed in the previous section. The Pechanga Tribe expressed concern about
39 cultural site P-33-000714 along 115-kV Segment VIG1 during the June 2013 meetings. Pechanga also
40 expressed concerns about P-33-000630 as well as the recording of P-33-000641 and P-33-000643. The
41 tribe requested formalization of a Native American monitoring program and continued inclusion in
42 project processes (E & E 2013a, 2013b). In response to the third NOP (May 2015), which covers the
43 proposed projects, the Pechanga Tribe submitted a comment letter expressing concern about impacts on
44 cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities; requested involvement in future surveys, site visits,
45 and excavations; and provided suggested mitigation plans and measures to lessen or avoid impacts on
46 cultural resources.
47

1 *Soboba Band*

2 The Soboba Band responded to the applicant's letter regarding the Alberhill Project, which was sent to all
3 Native American groups on the NAHC contact list. The Band stated that, although the components of the
4 proposed Alberhill Project would not be located within its present reservation, they would be located
5 within the Band's traditional use areas. The Band requested consultation with the applicant concerning
6 the proposed Alberhill Project; participation by Native American monitors in any additional surveys,
7 archaeological excavations, and ground-disturbing construction activities; return of any prehistoric
8 artifacts that are recovered to the appropriate tribe after they have been analyzed by archaeologists; the
9 right to inspect sites where human remains are discovered and to determine the treatment and disposition
10 of the remains; and copies of all site records, survey reports, or other environmental documents. The
11 Soboba Band made similar requests regarding the proposed Valley-Ivyglen Project. The applicant met
12 with a Soboba Band representative in February 2010. The representative expressed concern regarding
13 Native American resources present within the areas of the proposed projects and requested that ground-
14 disturbing activities be monitored by a qualified archaeologist. It was also requested that a tribal
15 representative be allowed to visit project sites as necessary during construction and that the Soboba Band
16 be notified when resources are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities.

17
18 In response to two NOPs (January 2008 Valley-Ivyglen and 2010 Alberhill), the Soboba Band submitted
19 comments requesting involvement with consultation activities for the proposed Valley-Ivyglen Project.
20 The Band expressed concern about cultural site P-33-000714 along 115-kV Segment VIG1 during the
21 June 2013 meetings. Soboba also expressed concern about sites P-33-001655 (located in the Valley-
22 Ivyglen alignment) and P-33-000630 (located 0.1 miles from the Valley-Ivyglen alignment). The Band
23 requested formalization of a Native American monitoring program and continued inclusion in project
24 processes (E & E 2013a, 2013b).

25
26 *Cahuilla Band of Indians*

27 The Cahuilla Band of Indians responded to the applicant's letter, which was sent to all Native American
28 groups on the NAHC contact list. The letter stated that, although the components of the proposed
29 Alberhill Project would not be located within the Band's present reservation, they would be located
30 within its traditional use areas. The Cahuilla Band requested that copies of cultural resources documents
31 and reports be provided to the Tribe for their archives.

32
33 *Pala Band of Mission Indians*

34 The Pala Band of Mission Indians responded to the applicant's letter, which was sent to all Native
35 American groups on the NAHC contact list. The Pala Band stated that components of the proposed
36 Alberhill and Valley-Ivyglen projects would not be located within their reservation or ancestral territory,
37 and that they have no objection to the continuation of the proposed projects without their participation.

38
39 ***Paleontology Background and Records Search Results***

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

46
47 The Pleistocene-age Quaternary alluvium deposits in the area of the proposed projects are known to have
48 the potential to yield significant fossils (Scott 2009, City of Lake Elsinore 2011, CPUC 2009).
49 Throughout the Inland Empire region, which includes much of western Riverside County, Quaternary

1 older alluvium (Pleistocene age) has been reported to yield significant fossils of extinct animals from the
 2 Ice Age and fossilized plant remains (Anderson et al. 2002, Lander 2008, Scott 2009). In addition, coal
 3 seams, lignite beds, and clay deposits of the Silverado Formation (Paleocene age, approximately 66 to 55
 4 million years old) within the areas of the proposed projects have the potential to yield significant fossils.
 5 The Silverado Formation is considered highly sensitive for invertebrate and plant material. The fossil
 6 plants from this geologic unit have been studied for more than half a century (City of Lake Elsinore
 7 2011). Search results indicated that no paleontological resource localities are recorded within 1 mile of
 8 areas that would be impacted by construction or operation of the proposed project (Lander 2008, Scott
 9 2009). Table 4.5-6 details the results of the record search and literature/data review.

10

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.
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).

Table 4.5-6 Paleontological Resources and Sensitivity

Component	Record Search and Literature Review
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**

3
4 **4.5.2.1 Federal**

5
6 ***National Historic Preservation Act***

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

13
14 The basis for determining significance of impacts to cultural resources for projects with a federal nexus is
15 Section 106 of the NHPA. Sections of the proposed projects may require a permit from the United States
16 Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Section 4.4, “Biological
17 Resources”) for potential impacts to waters of the United States. Issuance of such a permit would require
18 federal agency compliance with provisions of Section 106 of the NHPA. To comply with Section 106, the
19 federal agency must consider effects of the proposed project on historic properties that are on, or eligible
20 for listing on, the National Register. In addition, the ACHP must be given the opportunity to comment on
21 the proposed project and its potential effects on historic properties. Section 106 requires public input in
22 the decision making process. Section 106 compliance would be triggered during the federal permitting
23 process, and the federal permitting agency would be responsible for SHPO and Native American
24 consultation pursuant to Section 106. Because Section 106 compliance is a federal requirement and would
25 be completed separate from the CEQA environmental review documented in this EIR, compliance with
26 Section 106 is not discussed further in this document.

27
28 ***National Register of Historic Places***

29 The NHPA established the National Register as “an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and
30 local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and indicate
31 what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment” (36 Code of Federal
32 Regulations [CFR] § 60.2). The National Register recognizes both historic period and prehistoric
33 archaeological properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels. To be eligible for

1 listing on the National Register, a resource must be considered significant according to the National
2 Register listing criteria defined in CFR, title 36, section 60.4:

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

11
12 Unless the property possesses exceptional significance, it must be at least 50 years old to be eligible for
13 listing. In addition to meeting the significance criteria, a property must have integrity. The National
14 Register recognizes seven qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. To retain historic
15 integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, of these seven aspects. The seven factors that
16 define integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.
17 Cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historic figures; properties owned by religious institutions or used
18 for religious purposes; structures that have been moved from their original locations; reconstructed
19 historic buildings; and properties that are primarily commemorative in nature are not considered eligible
20 for the National Register unless they satisfy certain conditions.

21 22 **4.5.2.2 State**

23 24 ***California Office of Historic Preservation and State Historic Preservation Officer***

25 The State of California implements the NHPA through its statewide comprehensive cultural resources
26 surveys and preservation programs. The California Office of Historic Preservation implements the
27 policies of the NHPA on a statewide level. The Office of Historic Preservation also maintains the
28 California Historic Resources Inventory. The SHPO is an appointed official who implements historic
29 preservation programs within the state's jurisdictions. The California Office of Historic Preservation
30 maintains the California Register under the direction of the SHPO and the State Historical Resources
31 Commission.

32 33 ***California Register of Historical Resources***

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

- 39
 - 40 1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of
41 California's history and cultural heritage.
 - 42 2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
 - 43 3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or
44 represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
 - 45 4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
- 46

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

6 ***California Environmental Quality Act and Guidelines***

7 Section 21084.1 of the PRC establishes that a substantial adverse effect on an historical resource may
8 have a significant effect on the environment.³ CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5 recognizes that an
9 historical resource includes: (1) a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical
10 Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register; (2) a resource included in a local register of
11 historical resources; and (3) any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a
12 lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering,
13 scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California
14 by the lead agency, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light
15 of the whole record. In some cases, an archaeological resource may be considered an historical resource.
16 CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b) establishes mitigation guidelines for effects on historical resources
17 and historical resources of an archaeological nature.

18
19 CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(c) states that if an archaeological resource does not meet the criteria
20 for an historical resource contained in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, then the resource may be
21 treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC section 21083.2 if it is a "unique" archaeological
22 resource. CEQA is contained in the California PRC as sections 21000 et seq. Section 21083.2 of CEQA
23 provides for the protection of "unique archaeological resources" as defined in subsection (g) of section
24 21083.2. If it can be demonstrated that a project would cause damage to a unique archaeological resource,
25 the lead agency may require reasonable efforts to preserve in place or avoid the resources. This section
26 also establishes mitigation requirements for the excavation (data recovery) of unique archaeological
27 resources.

28
29 If an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor historical resource, effects of a
30 proposed project on the resource would not be considered a significant effect.

32 ***Additional State Laws Regarding Archaeological and Native American Cultural Resources***

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

- 36 • California PRC sections 5097.91 through 5097.991 pertain to the establishment and authorities of
37 the NAHC. These sections also prohibit the acquisition or possession of Native American
38 artifacts or human remains taken from a Native American grave or cairn, except in accordance
39 with an agreement reached with the NAHC, and provide for Native American remains and
40 associated grave artifacts to be repatriated. Subsections 5097.98(b) and (e) require a landowner
41 on whose property Native American human remains are found to limit further development
42 activity in the vicinity until conferring with the most likely descendants (as identified by the
43 NAHC) to consider treatment options. Because of the importance of human remains to the Native

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.

American community, Health and Safety Code (HSC) sections 7050 through 7054 make the disturbance and removal of human remains felony offenses. Provision is made in PRC section 65092 for the notification of California Native American tribes who are on the contact list maintained by the NAHC about construction projects.

- California PRC sections 5097.993 through 5097.994 make it a misdemeanor crime for the unlawful and malicious excavation, removal, or destruction of Native American archaeological or historical sites on public or private lands.
- Penal Code section 622 establishes as a misdemeanor the willful injury, disfigurement, defacement, or destruction of any object or thing of archaeological or historical interest or value, whether situated on private or public lands.
- California PRC section 6254(r) protects Native American graves, cemeteries, and sacred places maintained by the NAHC by protecting records of such resources from public disclosure under the California Public Records Act.

4.5.2.3 Local

County of Riverside

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

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

County of Orange

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

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

City of Lake Elsinore

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

- *Goal 6: Preserve, protect, and promote the cultural heritage of the City and surrounding region for the education and enjoyment of all City residents and visitors, as well as for the advancement of historical and archeological knowledge.*
- *Policy 6.1: Encourage the preservation of significant archeological, historical, and other cultural resources located within the City.*
- *Goal 8: Preserve paleontological resources occurring within the City.*

- 1 • **Goal 9:** Assure the recognition of the City’s heritage through preservation of the City’s
2 significant historical sites and structures.
- 3 • **Goal 10:** Encourage the preservation, protection, and restoration of historical and cultural
4 resources.
5

6 **City of Perris**

7 The City of Perris General Plan establishes the following goals and policies relevant to the protection of
8 cultural and paleontological resources:
9

- 10 • **Goal IV:** Protection of historical, archaeological and paleontological sites.
 - 11 - **Policy IV.A:** Comply with state and federal regulations and ensure preservation of
12 significant historical, archaeological and paleontological resources.
- 13 • **Goal VII:** Protection of significant landforms.
 - 14 - **Policy VII.A:** Preserve significant hillsides and rock outcroppings in the planning areas.
15

16 **City of Menifee**

17 The City of Menifee General Plan (City of Menifee 2013) establishes the following goals and policies
18 relevant to the protection of cultural and paleontological resources:
19

- 20 • **Goal OSC-3:** Undisturbed slopes, hillsides, rock outcroppings, and other natural landforms that
21 enhance the City’s environmental setting and rich cultural and historical past and present.
 - 22 - **Policy OSC-3.4:** Support the preservation of natural vegetation and rock outcroppings
23 during and after the construction process.
- 24 • **Goal OSC-5:** Archaeological, historical, and cultural resources are protected and integrated into
25 the City’s built environment.
 - 26 - **Policy OSC-5.1:** Preserve and protect archaeological and historic resources and cultural
27 sites, places, districts, structures, landforms, objects and native burial sites, traditional
28 cultural landscapes and other features, consistent with state law and any laws, regulations or
29 policies which may be adopted by the City to implement this goal and associated policies.
 - 30 - **Policy OSC-5.3:** Preserve sacred sites identified in consultation with the appropriate **Native**
31 **American** tribes whose ancestral territories are within the City, such as Native American
32 burial locations, by avoiding activities that would negatively impact the sites, while
33 maintaining the confidentiality of the location and nature of the sacred site.
34

35 **City of Wildomar**

36 At the time of preparation of this EIR, the city of Wildomar has not adopted a general plan. The city was
37 incorporated in 2008 and adopted all County of Riverside ordinances at that time. County ordinances
38 remain in effect until the city enacts ordinances superseding them. Policies listed above under the
39 Riverside County General Plan also apply to the City of Wildomar.
40

41 **4.5.3 Methodology and Significance Criteria**

42
43 To determine whether cultural or paleontological resources have been previously identified within the
44 areas of the proposed projects, published scientific documents and technical and survey reports regarding
45 areas in proximity to components of the proposed projects and general plan and policy documents were

1 reviewed, as previously described. In addition, database searches, field studies, and Native American
2 consultations were completed, and Native American group comments were reviewed. For paleontological
3 resources, literature reviews and database searches were conducted to identify previously recorded
4 paleontological resources in the areas of the proposed projects. In addition, the geology of the proposed
5 Alberhill Substation site and 500-kV and 115-kV transmission line routes was reviewed for
6 paleontological sensitivity (Lander 2008, Scott 2009).
7

8 Impacts on cultural resources were evaluated according to the following significance criteria. The criteria
9 are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed projects would cause a significant
10 impact on cultural resources if they would:
11

- 12 a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in
13 CEQA section 15064.5;
- 14 b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to
15 CEQA section 15064.5;
- 16 c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature;
17 or
- 18 d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

19 20 **4.5.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Valley–Ivyglen Project)**

21 22 **4.5.4.1 Project Commitments (Valley–Ivyglen Project)**

23
24 The applicant has committed to the following as part of the design of the proposed Valley–Ivyglen
25 Project. See Section 2.6, “Project Commitments,” for a complete description of each project commitment.
26

- 27 • **Project Commitment B: Worker Environmental Awareness Plan.** Prior to construction of the
28 proposed projects, a Worker Environmental Awareness Plan would be developed based on final
29 engineering designs, the results of preconstruction surveys, project commitments, and mitigation
30 measures imposed by the California Public Utilities Commission. A presentation would be
31 prepared by the applicant and shown to all site workers prior to their start of work. A record of all
32 trained personnel would be kept with the construction foreman. In addition to the instruction for
33 compliance with any site-specific biological or cultural resource protective measures and project
34 mitigation measures, all construction personnel would also receive the following:
35
 - 36 - A list of phone numbers of the applicant's personnel with the (archeologist, biologist,
environmental compliance coordinator, and regional spill response coordinator);
 - 37 - Instruction on the South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 for control of dust;
 - 38 - Instruction on what typical cultural resources look like, and if discovered during construction,
39 to suspend work in the vicinity of any find and contact the site foreman and archeologist or
40 environmental compliance coordinator;
 - 41 - Instruction on individual responsibilities under the Clean Water Act, the Storm Water
42 Pollution Prevention Plan for the projects, site-specific Best Management Practices, and the
43 location of Material Safety Data Sheets for the projects;
 - 44 - Instructions to notify the foreman and regional spill response coordinator in case of hazardous
45 materials spills and leaks from equipment or upon the discovery of soil or groundwater
46 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.

4.5.4.2 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 P33-17016 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 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 4.5-4 and 4.5-5. 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.

1
2 There is a potential for discovery of previously unknown prehistoric-age and historic-age cultural
3 resources and unique archaeological resources during construction activities. Cultural resources
4 sensitivity along the alignment range from moderate to high due to the presence of prehistoric
5 archaeological sites and traditional cultural properties in proximity to the proposed alignment.
6 Construction impacts could potentially include physical damage or alteration, change in visual elements
7 of a resource, and destruction of a resource. Impacts to previously unknown cultural resources, including
8 historic resources and unique archaeological resources would be significant if the resources are
9 considered historic resources and if the impacts are substantial and adverse. SCE has proposed Project
10 Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on
11 recognition of cultural resources and when to suspend work if a cultural resource is encountered. Impacts
12 would still be potentially significant after implementation of Project Commitment B because the measure
13 would not prevent substantial adverse changes to the significance of a discovered resource. MM CR-1a
14 outlines survey requirements to ensure all work areas and staging areas have been surveyed prior to
15 construction. MM CR-1b outlines a plan that would contain the procedures to be followed in the event
16 that a previously-unknown resource is discovered during construction activities. MM CR-2 outlines
17 monitoring requirements, including involvement of Native American tribes and groups to determine
18 Native American monitoring locations. MM CR-3 describes procedures to be followed on-site if a
19 previously-unknown resource is discovered. Impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources
20 (including historical and unique archaeological resources) would be less than significant with
21 implementation of MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b, MM CR-2, and MM CR-3.
22

23 ***Operation and Maintenance***

24 Operation and maintenance activities on proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project components would all occur
25 within areas disturbed during construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in previously
26 undisturbed areas would occur during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential to affect
27 known or previously unknown historic-age or prehistoric-age historical resources or unique
28 archaeological resources during operation and maintenance. As a result, there would be no impact to these
29 resources.
30

31 ***Mitigation Measures***

32 **MM CR-1a: Ensure preconstruction survey coverage of all work areas and staging areas.** Prior to
33 construction, the applicant shall compare the limits of the work areas and staging areas to project maps
34 that show where areas have been previously surveyed for cultural resources at the Intensive Cultural
35 Resources Inventory level. The applicant shall verify the proposed work areas and staging areas have
36 been surveyed at the Intensive Cultural Resources Inventory level. An Intensive Cultural Resources
37 Inventory level of survey is defined here as consisting of pedestrian surveys with transects spaced no
38 farther apart than 15 meters except where field conditions such as exceptionally dense vegetation or steep
39 slopes make walking transects difficult. In order to rely upon a prior survey for a work area, all areas that
40 can be reasonably covered by transect surveys within such work area shall have been surveyed.
41

42 If such a prior survey has been completed in the proposed work area or staging area, work can commence
43 as follows:
44

- 45 • If no known resources are located in the work area or staging area, work or staging can proceed in
46 the area. Previously unknown resources that are discovered during work activities shall be subject
47 to MM CR-1b.

- If known resources are located in the work area or staging area, they must be avoided pursuant to MM CR-1b. Previously unknown resources that are discovered during work activities shall be subject to MM CR-1b.

If such a prior survey has not been completed in the proposed work area or staging area, then work may not commence until an Intensive Cultural Resources Inventory has been completed by a CPUC-approved archaeologist or cultural resources specialist and reviewed and approved by the CPUC. If a resource is found during the survey, the applicant shall adhere to MM CR-1b procedures for unanticipated resources.

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

- Retain a qualified archaeologist, who shall prepare the CRMTP, oversee archaeological and Native American monitors, evaluate discoveries, and prepare Evaluation and Data Recovery Plans and subsequent reports. This archaeologist shall, at the minimum, meet the Secretary of Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology and be approved by the CPUC.
- Prepare the CRMTP, which shall include the following.
 - **Mapping.** The CRMPT shall map all known California Register eligible or potentially eligible resources in and within 100 feet of work areas. Maps shall be updated as necessary to incorporate any new information obtained pursuant to MM CR-1a.
 - **Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) Delineation.** The CRMTP should describe how California Register eligible or potentially eligible resources will be delineated and avoided as ESAs during construction. ESAs containing cultural resources shall not be identified on the ground or on maps to be used by anyone other than the qualified archaeologist, Native American monitors, cultural resource monitors, or other cultural resource professionals, as being cultural resources. They shall be labeled on maps and with signage in the field as “environmentally sensitive areas.” The sole method of mitigation in the CRMTP for known resources shall be total avoidance of the resource (preservation in place), per CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(A). The preferred method of mitigation in the CRMTP for unanticipated resources shall be total avoidance (preservation in place).
 - **Unanticipated resource discovery.** The CRMPT shall contain a description of procedures to be used if unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during construction. The CRMPT shall require that work shall be halted within 100 feet of the resource, protective barriers shall be installed along with signage identifying the area only as an “environmentally sensitive area” and forbidding entry into the area by all but authorized personnel, and the qualified archaeologist and the CPUC shall be notified. The preferred method of mitigation in the CRMTP shall be total avoidance of the resource (preservation in place), per CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(A). If the resource can be completely avoided, no additional mitigation is necessary. If the resource cannot be completely avoided, the qualified archaeologist shall then follow the procedures delineated for resources where it is not known whether the resource is historical. If an unanticipated resource is avoided, it shall nonetheless be recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 forms and filed at the Eastern Information Center.
 - **Determination if a resource is an historical resource.** The qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the CPUC, shall determine if there is a potential for the resource to be an

1 historical resource. If there is no potential for the resource to qualify as an historical resource,
2 work shall resume after CPUC concurrence. The CRMTP shall include a framework for
3 evaluating cultural resources. If there is a potential for the resource to be an historic resource,
4 the qualified archaeologist shall prepare an Evaluation Plan.

- 5 - **Evaluation Plan.** The resource-specific Evaluation Plan shall detail the procedures to be used
6 to determine if the discovery is an historical resource. The Evaluation Plan shall include
7 sufficient discussion of background and context to allow the evaluation of the resource
8 against the historic resource criteria. It shall include a description of procedures to be used in
9 the gathering of information to allow the evaluation. These techniques may include (but are
10 not limited to): excavation, written documentation, interviews, and/or photography. For
11 archaeological resource testing, the Evaluation Plan should describe the archaeological
12 testing procedures, including, but not limited to: surface collection (if surface artifacts are
13 discovered), test excavations (including type, number, and location of test pits and/or
14 trenches), analysis methods, and reporting procedure. The Evaluation Plan shall be submitted
15 to CPUC for review. Once approved, the Evaluation Plan shall be implemented in the field.
16 The report resulting from this work shall include evaluation of the discovery, based on the
17 significance criteria set forth in the Evaluation Plan, indicating if it is an historic resource. If
18 the discovery is not found to be an historic resource, and CPUC concurs with that
19 determination, protective barriers may be removed, and work may proceed in the area of the
20 discovery. If the discovery is determined to be an historic resource, SCE shall prepare a Data
21 Recovery Plan.
- 22 - **Data Recovery Plan.** Data recovery plans for historic resources that cannot be fully avoided
23 shall be prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(b)(3)(C) and PRC
24 section 21083.2, as applicable. The Data Recovery Plan shall outline how the recovery of
25 data from the resource will mitigate impacts to that resource to below a level of significance.
26 The Data Recovery Plan shall describe the level of effort, including numbers and kinds of
27 excavation units to be dug, excavation procedures, laboratory methods, samples (e.g., pollen,
28 sediment, as appropriate) to be collected and analyzed, analysis techniques that will yield
29 information relevant to the aspects of the site that make it an historic resource, and reporting
30 procedure. This plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval. Once
31 approved, the applicant shall implement the approved plan. Once the data recovery field work
32 is complete, a Data Recovery Field Memo shall be prepared.
- 33 - **Data Recovery Field Memo.** Following implementation of the Data Recovery Plan, the Data
34 Recovery Field Memo shall be prepared. The Data Recovery Field Memo shall briefly
35 describe the data recovery procedures in the field and summarize (at a field catalog level) the
36 materials recovery. The Data Recovery Field Memo shall also identify the number and kind
37 of samples recovered that are appropriate for special analyses, including radiocarbon dating,
38 obsidian sourcing, pollen analysis, microbotanical analysis, and others, as applicable. The
39 Data Recovery Field Memo shall be submitted to CPUC for review and approval. Once the
40 Data Recovery Field Memo has been approved, protective barriers may be removed, and
41 work may proceed in the area of the discovery. A Data Recovery Report shall then be
42 prepared.
- 43 - **Data Recovery Report.** Within 90 days of submittal of the Data Recovery Field Memo, a
44 Data Recovery Report shall be prepared presenting the results of the data recovery program,
45 including a description of field methods, location and size of excavation units, analysis of
46 materials recovered (including results of any special analyses conducted), and conclusions
47 drawn from the work. The Data Recovery Report shall also indicate where artifacts, samples,
48 and documentation resulting from the data recovery program will be curated. The CRMPT
49 shall specify that the curation facility meets the requirements of 36 CFR 79. The Data

1 Recovery Report shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval. Once approved,
2 the Data Recovery Report shall be filed with the Eastern Information Center. All impacted
3 known resources and all unanticipated resources shall be recorded on California Department
4 of Parks and Recreation 523 forms and filed at the Eastern Information Center with the Data
5 Recovery Report.

- 6 - The CRMTP shall include a summary of the California laws regarding the discovery of
7 human remains, including: CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e); PRC sections 5097.94,
8 5097.98, and 5097.99; and California Health and Safety Code section 7050.5. In addition, the
9 plan shall include the contact information for the Riverside County Medical Examiner.

10
11 **MM CR-2: Monitor ground disturbing activities (includes Native American monitoring).**

12 Archaeological monitoring shall be required for ground disturbing activities in areas with moderate to
13 high archaeological sensitivity. The archaeological monitor(s) shall be approved by CPUC staff prior to
14 the start of construction. If any cultural resources are discovered, the archaeological monitor has the
15 authority to stop ground-disturbing activities in the immediate area of the discovery. The process outlined
16 in the CRMTP required under MM CR-1b shall then be followed.

17
18 Native American monitoring shall be required for ground-disturbing activities and all work at P33-00714,
19 if requested by interested Native American tribes and subject to the conditions outlined in this mitigation
20 measure. SCE shall consult with Native American tribes that have requested involvement (including
21 Pechanga and Soboba) to determine where Native American monitoring is required. SCE shall document
22 consultation efforts that show queries to the NAHC and tribes on the NAHC contact list regarding
23 culturally sensitive sites and shall provide this documentation to the CPUC for review and approval prior
24 to any ground-disturbing activities and prior to work at resource P33-00714. Native American monitoring
25 shall be subject to the following conditions:

- 26
27 • Tribes requesting presence at construction or excavation activities shall be given 30 days advance
28 notice and shall be provided the opportunity to monitor construction activities as requested in
29 consultation with SCE subject to the terms of this mitigation measure. The applicant shall make a
30 good-faith best effort to schedule construction when a monitor is available.
- 31 • Attendance by Native American monitors during these activities is ultimately at the discretion of
32 the Tribe and the absence of a Native American monitor shall not delay work if the Native
33 American tribe has been given 30 days advance notice. Documentation of consultation activities
34 shall be included in the monitoring plan.
- 35 • The Native American monitors shall have the ability to temporarily halt work or redirect grading
36 from the immediate vicinity of a potential unanticipated archaeological find that may require
37 recordation and evaluation. The archaeological monitor shall be notified immediately to
38 determine the procedure to follow per MM CR-1b.

39
40 **MM CR-3: Follow historic resource and unique archaeological resource discovery protocol.** In the
41 case that a previously unknown resource is discovered during construction activities, the CPUC-approved
42 archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is an historical resource as defined in CEQA
43 Guidelines section 15064.5(a) or a unique archaeological resource as defined in PRC section 21083.2(g).
44 Work can recommence if the resource is determined to be neither. Work shall not be allowed within 150
45 feet of the resource if the resource meets the criteria for either a historic or unique archaeological
46 resource. The archaeologist shall then consult with the CPUC and adhere to the CRMPT (MM CR-1b) to
47 determine the course of action required to prevent a substantial adverse change to an historical resource or
48 a significant effect on a unique archaeological resource.

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

14
15 **Impact CR-2 (VIG): Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or**
16 **unique geologic feature.**

17 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION*

18 **Construction**

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

28 **Operation and Maintenance**

29
30 Operation and maintenance activities on proposed Valley–Ivyglen Project components would all occur
31 within areas disturbed during construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in previously
32 undisturbed areas would occur during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential to affect
33 known or previously unknown unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features during
34 operation and maintenance. As a result, there would be no impact to these resources.

35 **Mitigation Measures**

36
37 **MM CR-4: Monitor Paleontologically Sensitive Areas.** SCE shall retain a qualified paleontologist to
38 monitor ground-disturbing activities in paleontologically sensitive areas. The qualified paleontologist
39 shall be approved in advance by the CPUC. The qualified paleontologist shall prepare a brief
40 Paleontological Resource Monitoring Plan that includes methods of paleontological monitoring and
41 includes construction maps delineating areas of ground disturbance that shall be monitored for
42 paleontological resources. These shall include areas where:

- 43 • There is a high or undetermined paleontological sensitivity.
- 44 • There is a potential for fossils to occur at a level shallow enough to be adversely affected by
45 project activities.
- 46
- 47

48 Areas where fossils would likely occur include but are not limited to the Silverado Foundation. Areas
49 where fossils are not reasonably likely to be discovered include areas of igneous substrate, such as the

1 Estelle Mountain volcanic rock. Qualifications for proposed paleontological monitors shall be submitted
2 to the CPUC for review and approval. Only CPUC-approved paleontological monitors shall serve on this
3 project. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to halt construction in the vicinity of any
4 potential finds in order to begin implementation of MM CR-5.

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

14
15 Significant paleontological resources are fossils and fossiliferous deposits, here defined as
16 consisting of identifiable vertebrate fossils, large or small, uncommon invertebrate, plant, and
17 trace fossils, and other data that provide taphonomic, taxonomic, phylogentic, paleoecologic,
18 stratigraphic, and/or biochronologic information. Paleontological resources are considered to be
19 older than recorded human history and/or older than middle Holocene (i.e., older than about 5,000
20 radiocarbon years) (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010).

21
22 Substantiation of the uniqueness conclusion shall be provided to the CPUC for review and approval.
23 Work shall be allowed to continue if the resource is not unique.

24
25 If the resource is unique, then work shall remain stopped until the approved paleontologist has consulted
26 with SCE and the CPUC and a feasible approach, approved by the CPUC, has been developed that will
27 prevent destruction of the resource by site protection or recovery. Methods of recovery, testing, and
28 evaluation shall adhere to current professional standards for recovery, preparation, identification, analysis,
29 and curation, such as the 2010 Society of Vertebrate Paleontology *Standard Procedures for the*
30 *Assessment of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources*. Work can commence following recovery
31 and CPUC approval.

32
33 **Impact CR-3 (VIG): Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal**
34 **cemeteries.**
35 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION*

36 37 **Construction**

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

46 47 **Operation and Maintenance**

48 Operation and maintenance activities on the proposed Valley-Ivyglen Project components would all
49 occur within areas disturbed during construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in
50 previously undisturbed areas would occur during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential

1 to affect human remains during operation and maintenance. As a result, there would be no impact to these
2 resources.

3 4 **Mitigation Measure**

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

13 14 **4.5.5 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Alberhill Project)**

15 16 **4.5.5.1 Project Commitments (Alberhill Project)**

17
18 The applicant has committed to the following as part of the design of the proposed Alberhill Project. See
19 Section 2.6, "Project Commitments," for a complete description of each project commitment.

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

45 46 **4.5.5.2 Impacts Analysis (Alberhill Project)**

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

4
5 **Construction**

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

7 There are no known prehistoric-age resources or unique archaeological resources on the Alberhill
8 Substation Site or 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5; however, there are known historic resources in
9 this area. Three historic-age resources (P33-17571/CWA18-2, P33-17572/CWA18-1, and P33-15426)
10 occur within 0.1 miles of the substation site or 115-kV Segments ASP1 and ASP1.5 but are not eligible
11 for the California or National Registers. These resources do not otherwise qualify as an historical resource
12 under the CEQA Guidelines so these project components would not result in any impact with respect to
13 these three resources.

14
15 Project activities would not affect Temescal Valley Road, which has been recommended as not eligible.
16 The road has been re-graded, widened, realigned, and recently repaved. This road would be used during
17 construction, but no alterations would be made. There would be no substantial adverse change in the
18 significance of the Temescal Valley Road resource.

19
20 Resource P22-15428, a house built in 1920, has not been evaluated for California or National Register
21 eligibility. Adverse effects to the resource could result in a significant impact, given that the resource has
22 not been evaluated for eligibility. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require
23 preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources; this would
24 not reduce impacts to less than significant because it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to
25 resources. MM CR-1b would require a plan that outlines that avoidance of this resource is required.
26 Implementation of MM CR-1b would prevent any change in significance of P22-15428. With
27 implementation of MM CR-1b, there would be no substantial adverse change in the significance of a
28 known historical resource.

29
30 There is a potential for discovery of previously unknown prehistoric-age and historic-age cultural
31 resources and unique archaeological resources during substation and 115-kV alignment construction
32 activities. As previously described, though there are no known prehistoric cultural resources within
33 0.1 miles of the work areas, cultural sensitivity in the area is moderate to high due to proximity to a
34 known traditional cultural property (*Paayoxch*), the type of alluvial material present at the substation site,
35 and known importance of the general area to local Native American groups. Construction impacts could
36 potentially include physical damage or alteration, change in visual elements of a resource, and destruction
37 of a resource. Impacts to previously unknown cultural resources, including historic resources and unique
38 archaeological resources, would be significant if the resources are considered historic resources and if the
39 impacts are substantial and adverse. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require
40 preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources and when to
41 suspend work if a cultural resource is encountered. Impacts would be potentially significant after
42 implementation of Project Commitment B because the measure would not prevent substantial adverse
43 changes to the significance of any discovered resource. MM CR-1a requires the applicant to ensure
44 surveys have been conducted in all work areas and staging areas prior to construction. MM CR-1b
45 requires preparation of plan outlining the procedures for analyzing a previously unknown resource
46 discovered during construction activities. MM CR-2 outlines monitoring requirements, including
47 involvement of Native American tribes and groups to determine Native American monitoring locations.
48 MM CR-3 describes procedures to be followed on-site if a previously unknown resource is discovered.
49 Impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources (including historical and unique archaeological

resources) would be less than significant with implementation of MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b, MM CR-2, and MM CR-3.

ASP 500-kV Transmission Line Routes

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

Two resources within 0.1 miles of the proposed 500-kV transmission line routes have been evaluated but recommended not eligible, while three resources within 0.1 miles of the proposed 500-kV transmission line routes have not been formally evaluated for eligibility. Project activities would not affect Temescal Valley Road, which was recommended not eligible for the California Register, as previously described for the Alberhill Substation site, so there would be no substantial adverse change in the significance of the Temescal Valley Road resource.

Resource P-33-021068/CA-RIV-10913, a culvert, has been recommended not eligible. SHPO has not concurred on the eligibility of this resource. Adverse effects to this resource, 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.

Resources CWA60-3, P33-021067/CA-RIV-10912, and P-33-021069/CA-RIV-10914 have not been evaluated for California or National Register eligibility. Substantial adverse effects to the resources could result in a significant impact, given that the resources have 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 avoidance of known resources. Implementation of MM CR-1b would prevent any change in known resources. 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 construction activities at the 500-kV lattice steel tower sites within the substation site boundaries where archaeological sensitivity is moderate to high. The potential for discovery is higher under the Conventional Method than the Helicopter Construction method for the 500-kV transmission lines, since the latter construction approach would result in less ground disturbance (refer to Section 2.4.2.2). Impacts would be potentially significant under both approaches, however, as described previously for work at the Alberhill Substation site. Impacts would be potentially significant even after implementation of Project Commitment B because the measure would not prevent substantial adverse changes to the significance of any discovered resource. MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b, MM CR-2, and MM CR-3 would be implemented for these project components, as described in the substation site analysis, to reduce impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources at the two 500-kV lattice steel tower sites within the substation site boundaries. At other locations along the 500-kV transmission alignment where archaeological sensitivity is low, monitoring would not be required but MM CR-1a, MM-CR1b, and MM CR-2 would be implemented to reduce impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources. Impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources (including historical and unique

1 archaeological resources) would be less than significant with implementation of MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b,
2 MM CR-2, and MM CR-3.

4 **115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8**

5 There are known prehistoric- and historic-age resources along 115-kV Segments ASP2 through ASP8.
6 Three historic-age resources and one prehistoric-age resource within 0.1 miles of the 500-kV transmission
7 line routes are not eligible for the California or National Registers:

- 8 • Prehistoric
- 9 - P33-14712
- 10
- 11 • Historic
- 12 - P33-06883/CA-RIV-5785H
- 13 - P33-03832
- 14 - P33-14891
- 15

16 These resources do not otherwise qualify as an historical resource under the CEQA Guidelines and so
17 these project components would not result in any impact with respect to these four resources.

18
19 Within 0.1 miles of the project, there is one historic-age resource that has been determined eligible (P33-
20 17016/Alberhill community and industrial buildings) and one historic-age resource that has not been
21 formally evaluated for eligibility (CWA60-2/irrigation pump and motor). Substantial adverse effects to
22 either resource could result in a significant impact, given that one resource is eligible and the other may
23 be eligible, pending formal evaluation. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require
24 preparation of a WEAP. Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources; this would
25 not reduce impacts to less than significant because it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to
26 resources. MM CR-1b would require avoidance of these known resources. Implementation of MM CR-1b
27 would prevent any change in significance of P33-17016 and CWA60-2. With implementation of MM CR-
28 1b, there would be no substantial adverse change in the significance of a known resource.

29
30 There is a potential for discovery of previously unknown prehistoric-age and historic-age cultural
31 resources and unique archaeological resources during construction activities along 115-kV Segments
32 ASP3 through ASP8, where archaeological sensitivity is moderate to high (as previously discussed) and
33 where ground-disturbing activities would occur. No ground-disturbing activities would occur along
34 ASP2, where only stringing of conductor and installation of additional structures on existing poles would
35 occur. Impacts would be potentially significant, as described previously for work at the Alberhill
36 Substation site. SCE has proposed Project Commitment B, which would require preparation of a WEAP.
37 Part of the WEAP would focus on recognition of cultural resources; this would not reduce impacts to less
38 than significant because it would not prevent substantial adverse changes to resources. MM CR-1a, MM
39 CR-1b, MM CR-2, and MM CR-3 would be implemented for these project components, as described in
40 the substation site analysis, to reduce impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources. Impacts to
41 previously undiscovered cultural resources (including historical and unique archaeological resources)
42 would be less than significant with implementation of MM CR-1a, MM CR-1b, MM CR-2, and MM
43 CR-3.

44 **Operation and Maintenance**

45
46 Operation and maintenance activities on proposed Alberhill Project components would all occur within
47 areas disturbed during construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in previously
48 undisturbed areas would occur during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential to affect

1 known or previously unknown historic-age or prehistoric-age historical resources or unique
2 archaeological resources during operation and maintenance. As a result, there would be no impact to these
3 resources.

4
5 ***Mitigation Measures***

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

7
8 **MM CR-1b: Avoid impacts to known and undiscovered historic resources and unique
9 archaeological resources (except for site P33-000714).**

10
11 **MM CR-2: Monitor ground disturbing activities (includes Native American monitoring).**

12
13 **MM CR-3: Follow historic resource and unique archaeological resource discovery protocol.**

14
15 **Impact CR-2 (ASP): Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or
16 unique geologic feature.**

17 *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION*

18
19 ***Construction***

20 There are no known unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features in the proposed
21 Alberhill project area; however, undiscovered surface and subsurface paleontological resources could
22 occur in the area, as described in Table 4.5-6. The proposed Alberhill Project would include ground
23 disturbance and excavation at the substation site, along the 500-kV alignments, and along all 115-kV
24 segments except ASP2 (where the ASP conductor would be located on existing poles and therefore would
25 not result in ground disturbance), which could destroy undiscovered paleontological resources and result
26 in a significant impact. The potential for discovery is higher under the Conventional Method than the
27 Helicopter Construction method for the 500-kV transmission lines, since the latter construction approach
28 would result in less ground disturbance (refer to Section 2.4.2.2). Impacts would be potentially
29 significant, however, under both approaches. MM CR-4 would require monitoring where it has been
30 determined that there is a reasonable potential for discovery of fossils in the project area based on
31 information from the records search and literature review summarized in Table 4.5-6. MM CR-5 outlines
32 procedures to follow if a paleontological resource is discovered during construction. Impacts to
33 paleontological resources would be less than significant with implementation of MM CR-4 and MM CR-
34 5.

35
36 ***Operation and Maintenance***

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

42
43 ***Mitigation Measures***

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

45
46 **MM CR-5: Follow Paleontological Resource Discovery Protocol.**

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

5 **Construction**

6 Research has not uncovered any known Native American or other human remains in the project area. One
7 potential archaeological resource may contain human remains; it is located approximately 0.8 miles from
8 the Alberhill Substation site. Given the rich Native American history of the general area and the potential
9 for human burial sites in the vicinity of the project components, there is a possibility that previously
10 unknown human remains may be encountered during construction activities. This would be a potentially
11 significant impact. MM CR-7 would require adherence to applicable laws as well as training of workers
12 of the appropriate procedures to follow if human remains are discovered. Impacts would be less than
13 significant with mitigation.
14

15 **Operation and Maintenance**

16 All operation and maintenance activities on proposed Alberhill Project components would occur within
17 areas disturbed during construction of the project. No ground-disturbing activities in previously
18 undisturbed areas would occur during operation and maintenance. There would be no potential to affect
19 disturb 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.**
24

25 **4.5.6 References**

26
27 Anderson, R.S., M.J. Power, S.J. Smith, K.B. Springer, and E. Scott. 2002. Paleocology of a Middle
28 Wisconsin Deposit from Southern California. *Quaternary Research* 58: 310–317.
29

30 Bean, Lowell John, and Florence C. Shipek. 1978. “Luiseño” in the *Handbook of North American*
31 *Indians: California*, edited by R. F. Heizer. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
32

33 Brodie, Natalie. 2011a. Cultural Resources Study of Proposed Access Roads, Alternative Pole Locations,
34 Pulling Locations, and Alternative Corridors for the Serrano–Valley 500-kV Transmission Line
35 Project, Riverside County, CA. LSA Associates, Inc., Carlsbad, CA.
36

37 _____. 2011b. Ivy-Glen Subtransmission Project, Additional Survey for Three Proposed Poles on the
38 Pawnee 12kV Reconductor Project Connection to Valley Ivy-Glen, Lake Elsinore, Riverside
39 County, California (LSA Project No. SCE1107, Purchase Order No. 4500432638, Valley). LSA
40 Associates, Inc., Carlsbad, CA.
41

42 _____. 2011c. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment for the Valley Ivy-Glen Subtransmission
43 Line Project: Additional Survey for Portions of Access Roads and Pull Sites Along State Route
44 74 and West of the Valley Substation, Riverside County, California (LSA Project No. SCE1107).
45 LSA Associates, Inc., Carlsbad, CA.
46

47 _____. 2012. Purchase Order No. 4500432638, Valley Ivy-Glen Subtransmission Project, Testing and
48 Evaluation of Site CA-RIV-714, Lake Elsinore, Riverside County, California (LSA Project No.
49 SCE1006A5). LSA Associates, Inc., Carlsbad, CA.
50

- 1 Chmiel, Karolina A., and Theodore G. Cooley. 2008. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment of the
2 Valley-Ivyglen Transmission Line Project Alternatives EX-A through EX-D and W-01, W-1A
3 through W-1C, and W-4, Riverside, CA. Jones & Stokes, San Diego, CA.
4
- 5 City of Lake Elsinore. 2006. Lake Elsinore General Plan Update: Appendix B. Cultural, Historical, and
6 Paleontological Background Report. January.
7
- 8 _____. 2011. City of Lake Elsinore General Plan. Section 4.0: Resource Protection and Preservation.
9 December 13.
10
- 11 City of Menifee. 2013. Hearing Draft General Plan. <http://www.cityofmenifee.us/index.aspx?NID=221>.
12 Accessed February 13, 2014.
13
- 14 Cooley, Theodore G., and Andrea Craft. 2008. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment of the Valley-
15 Ivyglen Transmission Line Project, Riverside County, CA. Jones & Stokes, San Diego, CA.
16
- 17 Cotterman, Cary D., and Evelyn N. Chandler. 2008. Cultural Resources Investigation of the Proposed
18 Southern California Edison 500/115 kV Alberhill Substation Project, Riverside County, CA (I.O.
19 301909). ECORP Consulting, Inc., Redlands, CA.
20
- 21 Cotterman, Cary D., and Evelyn N. Chandler. 2009. Cultural Resources Inventory of the Proposed
22 Southern California Edison 115kV/500kV Alberhill Circuits, Riverside County, CA. ECORP
23 Consulting, Inc., Redlands, CA.
24
- 25 County of Riverside. 2008. County of Riverside General Plan. Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open Space
26 Element. December.
27
- 28 CPUC (California Public Utilities Commission). 2009. Draft Environmental Impact Report: Valley-
29 Ivyglen Subtransmission Line and Fogarty Substation Project. State Clearinghouse No.
30 2008011082. Prepared by Ecology and Environment, Inc., San Francisco, CA. June.
31
- 32 Craft, Andrea M., and Theodore G. Cooley. 2008. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment of the
33 Valley-Ivyglen Transmission Line Project Alternatives C-9A through C-9E, Riverside County,
34 CA. Jones & Stokes, San Diego, CA.
35
- 36 Cunningham, Robert, Wendy Jones, Evelyn N. Chandler, and Roger Mason. 2013. Cultural Resources
37 Investigation Results of the Marshalling Yard Survey, Access Road Survey, and Supplemental
38 115kV Transmission Line Survey in Support of the Alberhill Substation Riverside County,
39 California. ECORP Consulting, Inc., Redlands, CA.
40
- 41 DuBois, Constance Goddard. 1908. The Religion of the Luiseño Indians of Southern California.
42 University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 8 (3):69-186.
43
- 44 E & E (Ecology and Environment, Inc.). 2011. CPUC Meeting with the Pechanga Tribe at the Pechanga
45 Reservation in Temecula, CA. Meeting Minutes. December 12.
46
- 47 _____. 2013a. CPUC Meeting with the Pechanga Tribe at the Pechanga Reservation in Temecula, CA.
48 Meeting Minutes. June 11.
49
- 50 _____. 2013b. CPUC Meeting with the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians at the Pechanga Reservation in
51 Temecula, CA. Meeting Minutes. June 10.

- 1
2 Glentis, Dionisios. 2011a. Addendum: Cultural Resources Assessment for the Valley-IvyGlen 115kV
3 Subtransmission Line Project: Proposed Hwy 74 Laydown Yard, Associated Access Road, and
4 Tubular Steel Poles 4765171E, 4765172E, 4765173E, 4765174E, and 4765175E. Prepared by the
5 Chambers Group for Southern California Edison, Monrovia, CA.
6
7 _____. 2011b. Addendum: Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment of the Fogarty
8 Substation, Lake Elsinore Area, Riverside County, California. Prepared by the Chambers Group
9 for Southern California Edison, Monrovia, CA.
10
11 Google Earth. 2014. Aerial Imagery in Vicinity of Alberhill Substation Site. April 27, 2014.
12
13 Hillinger, Charles. 1991. Singing Stone: Interest Centers on Ringing Rock Used by Prehistoric Indians.
14 Los Angeles Times.
15
16 Jefferson, G. T. 1989. Late Cenozoic Tapirs (Mammalia: Perrisodactyla) of Western North America.
17 Contributions in Science, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Number 406: 1-22.
18
19 Lander, E. Bruce. 2008. Paleontologic Resource Inventory, Impact Assessment, and Recommended
20 Mitigation Measures in Support of SCE Alberhill Substation, Riverside County, California. Paleo
21 Environmental Associates, Inc, Altadena, CA. June 2.
22
23 Lerch, Michael K., and Marlesa A. Gray. 2006. Cultural Resources Assessment of the Valley-Ivyglen
24 Transmission Line Project, Riverside County, CA. Statistical Research, Inc, Redlands, CA.
25
26 McLean, Roderic and Natalie Brodie. 2012. Cultural Resources Assessment: Supplemental Surveys and
27 Significance Evaluation of Historic Canal (CA-RIV-9439/P-33-14757). Valley Ivy-Glen Project
28 Southern California Edison. Riverside County, California. LSA Associates, Inc., Carlsbad,
29 California.
30
31 Miller, J.A. 2013. Cultural Resource Survey Report Addendum: Valley-Ivy Glen 1 15 Kv Transmission
32 Line Project Southern California Edison Riverside County, California LSA Associates, Inc.,
33 Carlsbad, California.
34
35 NAHC (Native American Heritage Commission). 2005. Carol Gaubatz, Program Analyst. Letter
36 regarding Proposed Ivyglen Transmission Project, Riverside County, to Brett Rushing, Entrix,
37 Walnut Creek, CA. August 12.
38
39 _____. 2008. Dave Singleton, Program Analyst. Letter regarding Proposed Alberhill Substation Project,
40 Riverside County, to Koral Ahmet, Southern California Edison, Rosemead, CA. May 22.
41
42 Pollock, Katherine H. n.d. Addendum: Archaeological Assessment of the Valley-Ivyglen Transmission
43 Line Alternative Route Segment h and Alternative Route Segment i. Southern California Edison,
44 Rosemead, CA.
45
46 Roland-Nawi, Carol. 2014. State Historic Preservation Officer. Letter to Sarah M. Bholat, Senior
47 Archaeologist, Southern California Edison, Regarding Consultation for Southern California
48 Edison's Determination of No Significant Impacts Determination to Archaeological Site P-22-
49 000714 (CA-RIV-714) for the Valley - Ivy Glen 115kV Subtransmission Line Project. October 7.
50

- 1 SCE (Southern California Edison). 2011. Proponent’s Environmental Assessment: Alberhill System
2 Project (April 11), as amended by responses from SCE to CPUC requests for additional
3 information.
4
- 5 _____. 2013. Petition for Modification of Decision 10-08-009 (an August 12, 2010 decision by the
6 CPUC granting SCE a Permit to Construct the Valley–Ivyglen Subtransmission Line and Fogarty
7 Substation Project). March 29.
8
- 9 _____. 2014. Amended Petition for Modification of Decision 10-08-009 (an August 12, 2010 decision
10 by the CPUC granting SCE a Permit to Construct the Valley–Ivyglen Subtransmission Line and
11 Fogarty Substation Project). May 23, as revised by responses from SCE to CPUC requests for
12 additional information.
13
- 14 Scott, Eric. 2009. Paleontology Literature and Records Review, Alberhill Substation 500 kV
15 Transmission Line and 115 kV Source Line, Riverside County, California. San Bernardino
16 County Museum, Redlands, CA. August 27.
17
- 18 Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. 2010. Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of
19 adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources.
20
- 21 Stratton, Susan. 2011. Representative of the State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic
22 Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation. Letter to Sara Bholat, Senior Archaeologist at
23 Southern California Edison, Rosemead, CA. November 10.
24
- 25 Sutton, Mark Q., Mark E. Basgall, Jill K. Gardener, and Mark W. Allen. 2007. Advances in
26 Understanding Mojave Desert Prehistory. In California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and
27 Complexity, edited by T. L. Jones and K. A. Klar. Lanham, MD: Alta Mira.
28
- 29 USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). 2004. Preliminary Digital Geologic Map of the Santa Ana 30’ x 60’
30 Quadrangle, Southern California (Version 2.0). Compiled by D.M. Morton. Open-File Report 99-
31 172. Scale 1:100,000.
32
- 33 Warren, Claude N. 1967. The San Dieguito Complex: A Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity*
34 32:168–185. .

1

This page intentionally left blank.