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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

The Mission/Academy Planned Development (PD) Plan project is located in the City of Oceanside in northwestern San Diego County. The property is on the north side of Mission Avenue and State Route 76, immediately east of the Mission San Luis Rey. The San Luis Rey River is a short distance to the north of the project.

One archaeological site has been previously recorded as extending into the southwestern portion of the project. CA-SDI-5422 is a large site, and several different archaeological projects have addressed portions of the site in conjunction with various development plans. Caltrans archaeologists tested the site, including the portion within the Mission/Academy PD Plan area, in conjunction with the development of the State Route 76 alignment (Rosen and Tordoff 1991). The extended Phase 1 testing program at CA-SDI-5422 included the excavation of 22 backhoe trenches, 7 power auger holes, and 1 shovel test pit within the current project area, as well as a number of backhoe trenches, power auger holes, test units, and shovel test pits in other portions of the archaeological site outside the Mission/Academy PD Plan area. Rosen and Tordoff indicated, “Only that portion of the field west of Trench 16 contains materials in sufficient quantities to be worthy of further evaluation…” (Rosen and Tordoff 1991:60). Based on this, the areas of concentration of cultural material are outside the Mission/Academy PD Plan property; one such concentration is just west of the project, in the San Luis Rey Academy grounds.

The project was surveyed for cultural resources by Affinis archaeologists and Native American monitors from Saving Sacred Sites in December 2012. Pottery, flakes, and a core were noted within the mapped boundaries of CA-SDI-5422. In addition, small amounts of marine shell were observed in two areas, but the shell was in very disturbed contexts and appeared to be in fill soils.

CA-SDI-5422 meets the criteria of a significant cultural resource under CEQA. However, the significant portions of the site outside the Mission/Academy PD Plan project area and would not be subject to impacts from the project. It must be noted that all areas of past cultural use are of cultural importance to the Luiseño community. This area is of particular importance as part of a larger habitation area despite the lack of archaeological significance of the portion of the site within the project.

No specific project plan is proposed at this time; however, it is assumed that the entire project site will require some level of grading to accommodate eventual development. Due to the presence of undocumented fills, as well as alluvial and colluvial soils, remedial grading is anticipated. Although CA-SDI-5422 is a significant archaeological site, the portion of the site within the current project is outside the significant area of the site. Therefore, project impacts would not constitute significant effects under CEQA.

Due to the cultural sensitivity of this area and the potential for buried cultural resources, a monitoring program shall be undertaken for the project. An archaeologist and a Native American monitor will be present to observe all grading/ground-disturbing activity. Monitors will have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect grading in the event of potentially significant finds.
I. INTRODUCTION

PROJECT LOCATION

The Mission/Academy PD Plan area is located in the north-central portion of the City of Oceanside in northwestern San Diego County (Figure 1). The property is on the north side of Mission Avenue and State Route 76 (SR 76), immediately east of the Mission San Luis Rey. Academy Road bisects the property, and Spring Canyon Way forms the eastern boundary (Figures 2 and 3). The San Luis Rey River is a short distance to the north. The project is within the Mission San Luis Rey Historic Area, and land west of Academy Road is located within the designated Historic Area ‘Core’. The project is within Township 11 South, Range 4 West, Section 8, on the USGS 7.5’ San Luis Rey quadrangle (Figure 2).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Mission/Academy PD Plan envisions the development of a high quality residential community that is respectful of nearby historic resources and complementary to surrounding land uses. The PD Plan establishes the land use, density, development regulations, design standards, and primary infrastructure components that will direct future development within the plan area. The PD Plan designates four separate Planning Areas that will support a variety of residential uses including single-family detached and cluster developments, single-family attached clusters, townhouses, and stacked flats. In order to respond to existing edge conditions the Plan transitions from lower to higher density across the site from north to south.

No specific development plan is proposed at this time. The applicant proposes to prepare the 35.59-acre project site for eventual development under the PD Plan. The project site is shown in Figure 3.

The cultural resources study consisted of an archaeological survey, review of previous cultural resources studies that included the project area, and discussions with Native American representatives. Mary Robbins-Wade served as the project manager/principal investigator. Andrew Giletti was the field director. Native American monitoring was provided by Savings Sacred Sites, overseen by Cami Mojado. This report addresses the methods and results of the cultural resources study.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

PHYSICAL AND BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

The project area is in the coastal plains of northern San Diego County, where the climate is characterized as semi-arid, cool. Annual temperatures range from an average January low between 40° and 44° to an average July high of about 75° F, and annual rainfall averages 10-15 inches (Griner and Pryde 1976). The parcel lies within the San Luis Rey River valley (Figure 2) and is located approximately five miles east of the present day coastline of the Pacific Ocean.
The project site is relatively flat, with elevation ranging from about 63 ft. above mean sea level on the northeastern portion, east of Academy Road to about 93 ft. in the north-central area, west of Academy Road. A knoll on the east side of Academy Road rises about 20 ft. above the lower floodplain area. Geologically, the majority of the project area is underlain by the Tertiary Santiago formation with Quaternary alluvial deposits on the eastern and northern portions of the site (Kennedy et al. 2007). Soils mapped on the parcel are Visalia sandy loam, Huerhuero loam, and Ramona sandy loam (Bowman 1973). These soils generally support annual grasses and forbs, chamise, buckwheat, scrub oak, and similar vegetation, including coast live oak (Bowman 1973); such plants would have been used by the Luiseño people for food, medicine, tools, shelter, ceremonial and other uses (Bean and Shipek 1978; Sparkman 1908). Many of the animal species found in these communities would have been used by native populations as well.

CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT

General Culture History


Carter (1957, 1978, 1980), Minshall (1976) and others (e.g., Childers 1974; Davis 1968, 1973) have long argued for the presence of Pleistocene humans in California, including the San Diego area. The sites identified as "early man" are all controversial. Carter and Minshall are best known for their discoveries at Texas Street and Buchanan Canyon. The material from these sites is generally considered nonartifactual, and the investigative methodology is often questioned (Moratto 1984).

The earliest accepted archaeological manifestation of Native Americans in the San Diego area is the San Dieguito complex, dating to approximately 10,000 years ago (Warren 1967). The San Dieguito complex was originally defined by Rogers (1939), and Warren published a clear synthesis of the complex in 1967. The material culture of the San Dieguito complex consists primarily of scrapers, scraper planes, choppers, large blades, and large projectile points. Rogers considered crescentic stones to be characteristic of the San Dieguito complex as well. Tools and debitage made of fine-grained green metavolcanic material, locally known as felsite, were found at many sites that Rogers identified as San Dieguito. Often these artifacts were heavily patinated. Felsite tools, especially patinated felsite, came to be seen as an indicator of the San Dieguito complex. Until relatively recently, many archaeologists felt that the San Dieguito culture lacked milling technology and saw this as an important difference between the San Dieguito and La Jolla complexes. Sleeping circles, trail shrines, and rock alignments have also been associated with early San Dieguito sites. The San Dieguito complex is chronologically equivalent to other Paleoindian complexes across North America, and sites are
sometimes called "Paleoindian" rather than "San Dieguito". San Dieguito material underlies La Jolla complex strata at the C. W. Harris site in San Dieguito Valley (Warren, ed. 1966).

The traditional view of San Diego prehistory has the San Dieguito complex followed by the La Jolla complex at least 7000 years ago, possibly as long as 9000 years ago (Rogers 1966). The La Jolla complex is part of the Encinitas tradition and equates with Wallace's (1955) Millingstone Horizon, also known as Early Archaic or Milling Archaic. The Encinitas tradition is generally "recognized by millingstone assemblages in shell middens, often near sloughs and lagoons" (Moratto 1984:147). "Crude" cobble tools, especially choppers and scrapers, characterize the La Jolla complex (Moriarty 1966). Basin metates, manos, discoidals, a small number of Pinto series and Elko series points, and flexed burials are also characteristic.

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

Since the 1980s, archaeologists in the region have begun to question the traditional definition of San Dieguito people simply as makers of finely crafted felsite projectile points, domed scrapers, and discoidal cores, who lacked milling technology. The traditional defining criteria for La Jolla sites (manos, metates, "crude" cobble tools, and reliance on lagoonal resources) have also been questioned (Bull 1987; Cárdenas and Robbins-Wade 1985; Robbins-Wade 1986). There is speculation that differences between artifact assemblages of "San Dieguito" and "La Jolla" sites reflect functional differences rather than temporal or cultural variability (Bull 1987; Gallegos 1987). Gallegos (1987) has proposed that the San Dieguito, La Jolla, and Pauma complexes are manifestations of the same culture, with differing site types "explained by site location, resources exploited, influence, innovation and adaptation to a rich coastal region over a long period of time" (Gallegos 1987:30). The classic "La Jolla" assemblage is one adapted to life on the coast and appears to continue through time (Robbins-Wade 1986; Winterrowd and Cárdenas 1987). Inland sites adapted to hunting contain a different tool kit, regardless of temporal period (Cárdenas and Van Wormer 1984).

Several archaeologists in San Diego, however, do not subscribe to the Early Prehistoric/Late Prehistoric chronology (see Cook 1985; Gross and Hildebrand 1998; Gross and Robbins-Wade 1989; Shackley 1988; Warren 1998). They feel that an apparent overlap among assemblages identified as "La Jolla," "Pauma," or "San Dieguito" does not preclude the existence of an Early Milling period culture in the San Diego region, whatever name is used to identify it, separate from an earlier culture. One problem these archaeologists perceive is that many site reports in the San Diego region present conclusions based on interpretations of stratigraphic profiles from sites at which stratigraphy cannot validly be used to address chronology or changes through time. Archaeology emphasizes stratigraphy as a tool, but many of the sites known in the San Diego region are not in depositional situations. In contexts where natural sources of sediment or anthropogenic sources of debris to bury archaeological materials are lacking, other factors must be responsible for the subsurface occurrence of cultural materials. The subsurface deposits at numerous sites are the result of such agencies as rodent burrowing and insect activity. A number of studies have emphasized the importance of bioturbative factors in producing the stratigraphic profiles observed at archaeological sites (see Gross 1992). Different
classes of artifacts move through the soil in different ways (Bocek 1986; Erlandson 1984; Johnson 1989), creating vertical patterning (Johnson 1989) that is not culturally relevant. Many sites that have been used to help define the culture sequence of the San Diego region are the result of just such nondepositional stratigraphy.

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

The San Luis Rey complex (SLR) is divided into two phases, SLR I and SLR II. Elements of the SLR complex include small, triangular, pressure-flaked projectile points (generally Cottonwood series, but Desert side-notched series also occurs); milling implements: mortars and pestles, manos and metates, and bedrock milling features; bone awls; Olivella shell beads; other stone and shell ornaments; and cremations (Meighan 1954; Moratto 1984; True et al. 1974). The later SLR II complex also includes several elements not found in the SLR I complex: pottery vessels, cremation urns, red and black pictographs, and such nonaboriginal items as metal knives and glass beads (Meighan 1954:223).

SLR I was originally thought to date from A.D. 1400 to A.D. 1750, with SLR II dating between A.D. 1750 and A.D. 1850 (Meighan 1954). However, that division was based on the assumption that the Luiseño did not practice pottery manufacture until just prior to the arrival of the Spanish. The chronology has since been revised due to evidence that pottery may have been introduced to the Luiseño circa A.D. 1200-1600. Ceramics were probably introduced from the Luiseños' southern neighbors, the Kumeyaay (True et al. 1974).

**Ethnography**

The name Luiseño derives from Mission San Luis Rey de Francia and has been used to refer to the Native people associated with the mission. The Luiseño language belongs to the Cupan group of the Takic subfamily, which has also been called Southern California Shoshonean, and is part of the widespread Uto-Aztecan language family (Bean and Shipek 1978; Sparkman 1908; White 1963). Neighboring groups that speak Cupan languages are Cupeño, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino. The Indians associated with Mission San Juan Capistrano, called Juaneño by the Spanish, have sometimes been described as a separate group. The language, culture, and territory of the Luiseño and Juaneño people are so closely related that the two are often considered to be a single ethnic nationality (Bean and Shipek 1978; White 1963); however, many Luiseño and Juaneño individuals consider themselves to be separate groups. Cameron (1987:319-321) has noted archaeological differences between the two groups.

The territory of the Luiseño people is generally described as extending along the coast from Agua Hedionda Creek on the southwest to Aliso Creek on the northwest. On the north this boundary extended east beyond Santiago Peak to the eastern side of the Elsinore Fault Valley,
continuing southeast to Palomar Mountain, then around the southern slope above the valley of San Jose. The southern boundary follows westerly to Agua Hedionda Creek (Bean and Shipek 1978; White 1963).

Ethnographic and ethnohistoric studies of the Luiseño include Bean and Shipek (1978), Boscana (1947), Kroeber (1976), Robinson (1947), Shipek (1977), Sparkman (1908), Talley (1982), and White (1963). Archaeological studies addressing the Late Prehistoric San Luis Rey complex include Meighan (1954), McCown (1955), True et al. (1974), and Wallace (1960). Most of the ethnographic studies, as well as the "classic" archaeological studies of the Luiseño, have concentrated on the Pauma Valley and the Palomar Mountain area, although Wallace's (1960) study was an archaeological survey of the Buena Vista Creek watershed.

San Luis Rey Area

The project area is located immediately east of Mission San Luis Rey in the San Luis Rey Valley (Figure 2).

Sparkman (1908) lists *Keish* as the name his Luiseño informants gave for San Luis Rey. Kelsey indicated that the Luiseño name for the village in the area of Mission San Luis was *Tacayme*, “although Pablo Tac recalls that the people called the area Quechla, the Indian name for the stone found there” (Kelsey 1990:26). Hudson (1964) noted that *Keish*, *Qee’sh*, and *Quechla* are all orthographic variants of the same village or place name (Franklin and Carrico 1978:19). The rancherias at San Luis Rey became integral parts of the Mission, supplying laborers as well as converts (Carrico 1977; Hewes and Hewes 1958). Kroeber (1970: Plate 57) noted several villages along the San Luis Rey River, in addition to *Keish*, including one at the coast (*Wiawio*), two a short distance east of San Luis Rey (*Wiasamai* and *Wahaumai*), and two between this area and Pala (*Kwalam* and *Tomkav*). Kroeber (1970 Plate 57) also shows a village called *Ikaimai* (Carrico 1977 calls it *Ikalmal*) at San Luis Rey. Kroeber (1970 Plate 57) shows *Wahaumai* at a bend in the river approximately where Guajome Rancho is located.

When it came time to establish a mission between San Diego and San Juan Capistrano, the site on the San Luis Rey River was chosen, and a mission was established there on June 13, 1798 (Englehardt 1921:8). The mission was a self-supporting agricultural community whose economy was based on cattle raising and growing of crops. A large population was supported at the mission and in the surrounding Indian villages. Livestock raised by the inhabitants of the mission included cattle, sheep, horses, and mules; crops included wheat, barley, and corn (Englehardt 1921:16). Grazing and farming were carried out in the vicinity of the mission proper, but ranchos in outlying areas were a critical part of the mission's system of production. Mission ranchos included Pala, Temecula, Santa Margarita, San Jacinto, San Marcos, and Las Flores (Englehardt 1921:98-100).

The Mexican War of Independence led to rough times for the mission system. The missions were called upon to supply the military in California, and increasingly large demands were made on the system (Englehardt 1921; Pourade 1961). Following Mexican independence in 1821, large tracts of land were claimed as private ranchos in California. This land included land which the missions used for grazing, and ultimately the mission ranchos themselves.

In 1833, the Mexican government secularized the missions in California. This resulted in the confiscation of mission lands and the delivery of the missions to the hands of secular
administrators. The first administrator for Mission San Luis Rey was Capt. Pablo de la Portilla. Pourade (1961:208), in discussing the transfer of the mission, noted that it was the only one of the California missions to show a population increase in the difficult years between 1831 and 1834. Pio Pico, who, along with his brother Andres, claimed large tracts of former mission land, was the administrator from late 1835 to 1840 (Englehardt 1921:102, 117).

Secularization led to deterioration of the mission buildings and loss of the herds and flocks that had been so important in supporting the mission community. After a brief period between 1843 and 1845, during which the mission property was returned to the administration of the Friars, the mission was sold by then Governor Pio Pico in May of 1846 (Englehardt 1921:133). By 1846, when U.S. troops stayed at the mission, the buildings were abandoned and only a few Indians remained in the surrounding village (Kelsey 1990:57).

III. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Portions of the Mission/Academy PD Plan project were surveyed for cultural resources by Caltrans staff in conjunction with the development of SR 76 (Dominici 1989). Affinis archaeologists surveyed the vast majority of the property in 1999; a small piece on the northeastern portion of the project site was not included in that survey (Robbins-Wade 2000).

Records searches conducted at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) show a number of archaeological sites recorded in the vicinity, most notably Mission San Luis Rey (CA-SDI-241) and CA-SDI-5422, a large habitation site associated with occupation of the Mission. Other sites in the area include remnants of historic ranches, some including historic structures, as well as Native American habitation sites or camp sites associated with the Mission or the large residential base located in the area prior to the arrival of the Spanish. A portion of CA-SDI-5422 is located within the current project area (Figure 4).

CA-SDI-5422 is a large site, and several different archaeological projects have addressed portions of the site in conjunction with various development plans. An excavation of a small portion of the site was undertaken by Greenwood in conjunction with proposed widening of SR 76 (Greenwood 1978). Cárdenas surveyed a portion of the site for a proposed homeless shelter (1989), and Affinis archaeologists conducted a monitoring program for the same project. Caltrans archaeologists surveyed the site (Dominici 1989), enlarging the site boundaries, and conducted an extended Phase I testing program for improvements related to the SR 76 Expressway (Rosen and Tordoff 1991). That investigation included excavation of shovel tests, power auger holes, backhoe trenches and units, and included portions of the current project area, as addressed below. Cárdenas (1992) surveyed a portion of Ivey Ranch Park and suggested the potential for important archaeological deposits within that project area. Affinis archaeologists conducted a testing program on a portion of CA-SDI-5422 within Ivey Ranch Park in 1995 (Robbins-Wade et al. 1995). Portions of the area to be subject to impacts from that project were quite disturbed and no longer retained research or cultural value, but portions of the area tested retained significance. The Ivey Ranch Park project, located south-southwest of the current project site, included preservation of an intact segment of garden wall (Robbins-Wade et al. 1995). The intact wall segment and the significant buried deposit identified in the Ivey Ranch Park project are both over 500 ft. outside the current project area, on the south side of Mission Avenue. As noted above, Affinis conducted an archaeological survey of the current project site in 1999. At that time, the only cultural material observed was a small ceramic sherd...
within the mapped boundaries of CA-SDI-5422 and a pile of Mission-era tiles in a disturbed context east of that site.

Within the current project area, Caltrans excavated 22 backhoe trenches, 7 power auger holes, and 1 shovel test as part of the extended Phase 1 testing of CA-SDI-5422. An additional four backhoe trenches, six power auger holes, nine shovel tests, and two 1 m by 1 m units were excavated in the Academy and Mission grounds just west of the current project. Of the 22 backhoe trenches, 14 were negative, and 8 contained cultural material. Three of the 7 power auger holes and the shovel test within the project area were also devoid of cultural material. Based on the results of this testing, the site boundaries were revised. Rosen and Tordoff (1991) explained:

Changes in the site boundaries occur primarily to the east, where an outlying area of tiles had been included within the CA-SDI-5422 site limits. The revised eastern limit of the site represents the farthest eastern extent of the sandy loam soils containing cultural remains. East of this limit soils are almost exclusively clays and contain no subsurface cultural materials. .. [Rosen and Tordoff 1991:40].

Several reports have concluded that CA-SDI-5422 has a high potential for containing important archaeological materials. Rosen and Tordoff (1991) concluded that, although the integrity of the site has been compromised by construction, landscaping, agriculture, and other factors, "[t]he data present within the site could contribute to questions related to development of the mission system within California and the acculturation of the Native Californians whose cultures were forever changed by the coming of the Spanish" (Rosen and Tordoff 1991:61).

Rosen and Tordoff (1991) identified a cultural deposit 12 to 42 in. thick (30 to 107 cm). They noted that CA-SDI-5422 is contiguous with the Mission San Luis Rey site (CA-SDI-241), and that in subsequent studies the two sites should be addressed as a single site complex. CA-SDI-241 is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Rosen and Tordoff noted, however, that at CA-SDI-5422 the cultural material is generally diffuse, with three areas of concentration, none of which are within the Mission/Academy PD Plan property. One area of concentration is just west of the current project, between Trench 16 and Unit 2: from the west end of the Academy field to the east end of the Academy grounds. Rosen and Tordoff indicated, "Only that portion of the field west of Trench 16 contains materials in sufficient quantities to be worthy of further evaluation..." (Rosen and Tordoff 1991:60). Based on statements by Rosen and Tordoff (1991), the nearest area of concentration of cultural material is within the Academy grounds, west of the Mission/Academy PD Plan area.

### IV. RESEARCH METHODS

An updated records search was conducted at the SCIC. The Caltrans Extended Phase 1 testing report (Rosen and Tordoff 1991) and the previous Affinis survey report (Robbins-Wade 2000) were reviewed. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a Sacred Lands File Check and a list of Native American contacts. Letters were sent to the contacts listed by the NAHC (see Confidential Appendix A).
The Mission/Academy PD Plan project was surveyed for cultural resources by Affinis archaeologists Andrew Giletti and Kristina Davison with Ray Castañeda of Savings Sacred Sites (Native American monitor) on December 18, 2012. The project site was walked in parallel transects spaced approximately 10 m apart. Ground visibility was poor to fair over the majority of the property with the southwest corner having the most visible areas of open ground.

V. RESULTS

As previously noted, archaeological site CA-SDI-5422 extends into the Mission/Academy PD Plan project area. During the 2012 survey, pottery, flakes, and a core were noted within the mapped boundaries of this site. In addition, small amounts of marine shell were observed in two areas, but the shell was in very disturbed contexts and appeared to be in fill soils, as addressed below. The locations of the shell and CA-SDI-5422 are shown in Figure 5.

As discussed under Previous Research, Caltrans archaeologists conducted an extended Phase 1 testing program at CA-SDI-5422 that included the excavation of 22 backhoe trenches, 9 power auger holes, and 1 shovel test pit within the current project area, as well as a number of backhoe trenches, power auger holes, test units, and shovel test pits in other portions of the site to the west of the Mission/Academy PD Plan area. Three areas of concentration were noted, none of them within the current project area. One area of concentration is between Trench 16 and Unit 2, just to the west of the project, in the Academy grounds. Rosen and Tordoff indicated, “Only that portion of the field west of Trench 16 contains materials in sufficient quantities to be worthy of further evaluation…” (Rosen and Tordoff 1991:60).

The due diligence-level geotechnical evaluation for the current project indicated, “Undocumented fill soils were locally observed scattered across the site, including some apparently imported/dumped materials. Thicker zones of fill were noted in association with existing site roadways and storm drain improvement areas… Other areas of undocumented fill (unmapped) are likely present on the site, as a result of existing and past site improvements and activities (GeoTek 2012:4). The small amounts of marine shell noted during the 2012 survey appear to be in fill soils.

“Colluvial/alluvial soils were observed to cover the eastern-most portions of the property. The alluvium is likely thickest toward the eastern edge of the property, and thinner (i.e. bedrock is shallower) toward the west, based on geomorphic/geologic interpretation” (GeoTek 2012:4). There is a potential for buried cultural resources within and beneath the colluvial/alluvial soils and beneath the fill soil.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONCERNS

As previously stated, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a Sacred Lands File Check and a list of Native American contacts. Letters were sent to the contacts listed by the NAHC (see Confidential Appendix A). The Sacred Lands File Check did not indicate the presence of significant cultural resources within the project area. However, representatives of the San Luis Rey Band have indicated that this area is of cultural significance
SENSITIVE MATERIAL – IN CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX B
to the Luiseño people. Two written responses have been received: one from the Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office, representing the Pala Band of Mission Indians, the other from the Culture Committee of the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians (Confidential Appendix A). Both letters indicated that the project is within the tribes' Traditional Use Area and requested that the tribes be kept in the information loop for the project. In addition they recommended archaeological monitoring, due to the proximity of known cultural and historic resources.

Representatives of the San Luis Rey Band had questions about the cultural material collected by Caltrans and whether that material had been examined per the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). The cultural material is curated at the San Diego Archaeological Center and has been examined per the requirements of NAGPRA. There are no human remains in the collection. One small fragment of clay pipe was identified as potentially of cultural importance, and it was placed in their NAGPRA cabinet for repatriation. There is no note in the file as to whether the item was repatriated and if so to whom. According to the Archaeological Center’s NAGPRA notes, this artifact was found in Unit 1, which is far to the west of the Mission/Academy PD Plan area.

VI. PROJECT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR Section 4852) including the following:

A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values, or:
D. Has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Archaeological resources are usually assessed as to significance under Criterion D.

SIGNIFICANCE

Past studies at various portions of CA-SDI-5422 have shown that site to contain areas of deep deposits and areas containing important archaeological materials. Rosen and Tordoff (1991) concluded that, although the integrity of the site has been compromised by construction,
landscaping, agriculture, and other factors, "[t]he data present within the site could contribute to questions related to development of the mission system within California and the acculturation of the Native Californians whose cultures were forever changed by the coming of the Spanish" (Rosen and Tordoff 1991:61). Therefore, CA-SDI-5422 meets the criteria of a significant cultural resource under CEQA. That being said, the significant portions of the site are outside the Mission/Academy PD Plan area. One area of artifact concentration is just west of the project property, within the grounds of the San Luis Rey Academy.

It must be noted that all areas of past cultural use are of cultural importance to the Luiseño community. This area is of particular importance as part of a larger habitation area despite the lack of archaeological significance of the portion of the site within the project.

PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

No specific project plan is proposed at this time; however, it is assumed that the entire project site will require some level of grading to accommodate eventual development. Due to the presence of undocumented fills, as well as alluvial and colluvial soils, remedial grading is anticipated. Although CA-SDI-5422 is a significant archaeological site, the portion of the site within the current project is outside the significant area of the site. Therefore, project impacts would not constitute significant effects under CEQA.

Due to the cultural sensitivity of this area and the potential for buried cultural resources, a monitoring program shall be undertaken for the project. The monitoring program shall consist of the following mitigation measures:

- Prior to implementation of the monitoring, a pre-excavation agreement shall be developed between the appropriate Luiseño tribe[s], the project applicant, and the City of Oceanside;
- The qualified archaeologist and the Native American representative shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to discuss the requirements of the monitoring program;
- An archaeologist and a Native American monitor shall be on-site during grading, trenching, and other ground-disturbing activities;
- If archaeological artifact deposits or cultural features are discovered, grading activities shall be directed away from these deposits to allow a determination of potential importance. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field, and grading shall proceed. For any potentially significant artifact deposits, an adequate artifact sample to address research avenues previously identified for sites in the area will be collected using professional archaeological collection methods;
- If any human remains are discovered, the County Coroner shall be contacted. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains;
- Recovered artifactual materials shall be cataloged and analyzed;
- A report shall be completed describing the methods and results of the monitoring and data recovery program;
• Cultural material collected will be curated at the San Diego Archaeological Center or other appropriate curatorial facility. Alternatively, cultural material may be repatriated to the Tribe[s], as addressed in the pre-excavation agreement.
VII. INDIVIDUALS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

Bennae Calac     Pauma Valley Band of Luiseño Indians
Shasta Gaughen    Pala Band of Mission Indians and Kupa Cultural Center (Pala Band)
Merri Lopez-Keifer San Luis Rey Band of Luiseño Mission Indians
Paul Macarro      Pechanga Band of Mission Indians
Randall Majel     Pauma & Yuima Reservation
Bo Mazzetti       Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians
Cultural Department San Luis Rey Band of Luiseño Mission Indians
Lavonne Peck      La Jolla Band of Mission Indians
G. David Singleton Native American Heritage Commission
Vincent Whipple   Rincon Band of Mission Indians

VIII. PERSONNEL

The following persons participated in the preparation of this report:

Affinis
Mary Robbins-Wade, M.A. (RPA)     Director of Cultural Resources
Andrew Giletti, B.A.               Field Director
Kristina Davison, B.A.             Archaeologist

Saving Sacred Sites
Cami Mojado                      Native American Representative
PJ Stoneburner                    Native American Representative
Ray Castañeda                    Native American Monitor
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