3.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The incremental change to the existing Larkspur Energy Facility, as described in Section 2.0, Project Description of this document, would not involve substantial changes to the cultural resources findings and conclusions documented in Section 13 (Cultural Resources) of the 2001 AFC. However, supplemental cultural resources information and required archaeological services associated with ground-disturbing activities during construction activities are documented in this section.

3.3.1 Environmental Baseline

The existing Larkspur Energy Facility is contained within one 3.44-acre (approximate 300-foot by 500-foot) parcel of land. The entire Larkspur Parcel was previously examined in the 2001 AFC. The incremental change to the existing Larkspur Energy Facility, the proposed Larkspur 3 Energy Facility (the Project) is an approximate 0.9-acre (approximate 300-foot by 125-foot) area within this parcel. In addition, the Project will require use of a temporary construction laydown area, including worker parking. The laydown area would reutilize a parcel located at the southeast corner of the Heinrich Hertz Drive/Airway Road intersection (APN 646-142-10; approximately 3.89 acres). It should be noted that an alternative temporary laydown area, adjacent parcel (APN 646-142-09; approximately 3.52 acres), was also assessed as part of this amendment. Both parcels are considered highly disturbed and the 3.89 acre parcel was previously used as construction laydown for the existing Larkspur Energy Facility.

The archaeological Areas of Potential Effect (APEs) examined for this Amendment include the Larkspur 3 Energy Facility Project site and both construction laydown area parcels. Consequently, URS completed a cultural resources assessment for the Project to supplement previously completed cultural resources surveys and mitigations for the 2001 AFC.

The cultural resources assessment prepared for the Project includes: a review of site records for previously completed cultural resource investigations and recorded sites in the APEs and within a 1-mile study area; a review of previous archaeological investigations within the Larkspur parcel conducted as part of the 2001 AFC process; archaeological pedestrian surveys of the APEs; and Native American consultation. Complete documentation of the cultural resources assessment for the incremental change to the existing Larkspur Energy Facility is appended in the archaeological survey report (Confidential Appendix C).

All cultural resources work for the Project was carried out under the direct supervision of an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and is consistent with the procedures for compliance.

3.3.1.1 Site Records and Literature Review

On March 2, 2007, the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC), the California Historical Resource Information System (CHRIS) cultural resources database for San Diego County, performed a records search as requested by URS. SCIC provided all relevant previously recorded cultural resources and previous investigations completed for the APEs and a 1-mile search radius (Confidential Appendix C). Information reviewed by SCIC staff included location maps for all previously recorded trinomial and primary prehistoric and historic archaeological sites and isolates, site record forms and updates for all

cultural resources previously identified, previous investigation boundaries and National Archaeological Database (NADB) citations for associated reports, historic maps, and historic addresses.

According to SCIC, at least 87 cultural resources investigations have been performed within 1-mile of the APEs. The boundaries of five previous investigations extend into the Project site. In 2001, Gallegos & Associates performed the most recent survey as part of the 2001 AFC processes. Three previous investigations extend into the construction laydown area, with the most recent investigation completed by M. Rosen and K. Krafts in 1993.

No previously recorded cultural resources have been identified within the APEs for the Project; however, site records identify 65 previously recorded cultural resources within 1-mile of the APEs. Cultural resources include 47 historic, prehistoric, and multicomponent archaeological sites and 18 historic and prehistoric isolates.

3.3.1.2 Previous Cultural Resource Investigations within the Larkspur Parcel

The two cultural resources identified in the western portion of the Larkspur parcel were reviewed by Gallegos & Associates as part of the 2001 AFC process (Confidential Appendix C). CA-SDI-5352 was updated by Martin D. Rosen in 1990. Rosen identified the site as a much larger complex to include sites: CA-SDI-9974, CA-SDI-10072, CA-SDI-10735, and CA-SDI-14081. These five sites were re-recorded and incorporated into one larger site and re-numbered CA-SDI-12337. CA-SDI-12337, likely a prehistoric tool reduction site or encampment, now comprises over 700 acres of lithic debitage, cores, and stone tools. While the exact extent of the site has been fully realized, a portion of the site was observed on the western perimeter of the Larkspur parcel. According to the East Otay Mesa Specific Plan Cultural Resources Technical Report (GPA 94-02; Log No. 93-19-6), CA-SDI-12337 was identified as “Tested, No Further Constraint” (Ogden & Gallegos & Associates 1993). The site was evaluated to determine its significance per California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) criteria and for eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The evaluation of the site resulted in the finding that it is not a significant resource based on state and national criteria (Widell 1995).

The records review performed by Gallegos & Associates for the 2001 AFC indicated the McCool-Lohman site, CA-SDI-16264, was mapped on the 1899 Otay Mesa Second Road District Map and the 1903 Cuyamaca Quadrangle 30-Minute Series Topographic Map (Gallegos et al. 2002). The 2001 AFC field survey identified palm, eucalyptus, olive, and pepper trees; a cement foundation; a cistern; and a general scatter of historic trash and debris throughout the Larkspur parcel (Confidential Appendix C). Based on these findings, Gallegos & Associates recommended the site be evaluated to determine its significance per CRHR criteria (2001a). The McCool-Lohman site was subsequently tested and identified as a significant resource under CEQA and a mitigation plan was drafted (Gallegos 2001b). Accordingly, because the archaeological site would have been impacted by construction of the existing Larkspur Energy Facility, mitigation through the form of a data recovery was completed and archaeological monitoring was conducted during construction activities for the purpose of identifying archaeological features not identified during the site assessment and evaluation (Gallegos et al. 2002).

Additional background historical research for the data recovery indicated Alexander C. McCool originally homesteaded the Larkspur parcel. William Lohman, in 1902, subsequently purchased the property from

the McCool family (Gallegos et al. 2002). The Wetmores purchased the property in 1941 and the home burned down in the 1950s (Gallegos et al. 2002).

Testing and data recovery at the McCool-Lohman site included the excavation of trenches and documentation and recordation of a subterranean cistern (Gallegos et al. 2002). A total of four backhoe trenches were excavated, in addition to an approximately 20-foot by 20-foot area around the cistern (Confidential Appendix C). The four test trenches revealed no subsurface features and no historic materials were observed during the cistern excavation (Gallegos et al. 2002). Likewise, no concentrations of artifacts were observed during monitoring of construction activities. Although no house foundation outlines were observed, pockets of brick and burned wood were located in the northwest corner of the property where old photographs indicate the Lohman house once stood (Gallegos et al. 2002). Additionally, three privies were identified and documented during monitoring activities. The three privies were excavated and historic materials were collected. Three cisterns were also identified while SDG&E was trenching for utility lines. The cisterns were measured, mapped, and recorded.

Artifact analysis resulted in the identification of an estimated 2,251 items (Gallegos et al. 2002). Historic artifacts recovered from the site included bottle glass, decorated transferware, porcelain ceramics, ink wells, chimney lamps, light bulbs, window glass, ceramic tile, newspaper fragments, and building materials (Gallegos et al. 2002). Based on the analysis of datable artifacts, the historic assemblage of artifacts recovered from the McCool-Lohman site represent refuse from a rural San Diego homestead deposited between 1890 and approximately 1930 (Gallegos et al. 2002).

3.3.1.3 Archaeological Survey Results

On March 2, 2007, URS archaeologists completed an archaeological pedestrian survey for the archaeological APEs (Confidential Appendix C). The principal survey method consisted of a systematic walk-over in parallel transect intervals at approximately 5-meter increments. The survey transects extended across the entire horizontal extent of the APEs. The Project site and the construction laydown areas contained disturbed vegetation over heavily disturbed terrain.

No cultural materials were observed on the Project site surface. Evidence of disturbances within and surrounding the site include sewer manholes, an irrigation system, riprap along the site perimeter, ornamental tree plantings, and grading. Overall visibility within the Project site averaged approximately 20 percent of the ground surface; however, areas with greater visibility were thoroughly inspected for cultural materials to ensure adequate coverage for resource discovery.

No cultural materials were observed within the construction laydown areas. The construction laydown areas have been completely graded and are highly disturbed. Large piles of dirt were observed in the northeastern corner of the proposed laydown area. Overall visibility was approximately 80 percent.

3.3.1.4 Architectural Reconnaissance Survey Results

No buildings or structures are located within the archaeological APEs. Likewise, the SCIC identified no Historic Addresses in their database within 1-mile of the APEs. As a result, no architectural reconnaissance survey was conducted.

3.3.1.5 Native American Consultation

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted on March 1, 2007 to request a search of the Native American Sacred Lands File (SLF) to determine the presence of Native American sacred sites within the APEs. A list of Native American Contacts that may have some knowledge of known cultural resources or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) within the APEs was also requested. The NAHC responded on March 5, 2007 and indicated a records search of the SLF failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate APEs. In addition to the response letter, the NAHC also supplied a Native American Contact list. Each contact on the list was sent a notification of the proposed undertaking by certified mail on March 8, 2007 with a request that he or she respond with any known cultural resources, TCPs, or sacred lands within the APEs. To date, no responses have been received regarding the Project. Correspondence with the NAHC and Native American Contacts is included in the archaeological survey report (Confidential Appendix C).

3.3.2 Environmental Consequences

3.3.2.1 Significance Criteria

The potential effects of the Project upon cultural resources are evaluated under CEQA, Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4. Cultural resources include archaeological and historical objects, sites and districts, historic buildings and structures, cultural landscapes, and sites and resources of concern to local Native Americans and other ethnic groups. In considering impact significance under CEQA, the significance of the resource itself must first be determined. At the state level, consideration of significance as an "important archaeological resource" is measured by cultural resource provisions considered under CEQA Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4, and the draft criteria regarding resource eligibility to the CRHR.

Generally, under CEQA, a historical resource (these include the historic built-environment and historic and prehistoric archaeological resources) is considered significant if it meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR. These criteria are set forth in Section 15064.5, and define a significant resource as any resource that:

- Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage
- Is associated with lives of persons important in our past
- 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
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

Section 15064.5 of CEQA also assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. These procedures are detailed under Public Resources Code (PRC) 5097.98.

Impacts to "unique archaeological resources" are also considered under CEQA, as described under PRC 21083.2. A unique archaeological resource implies an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which

it can be clearly demonstrated that – without merely adding to the current body of knowledge – there is a high probability that it meets one of the following criteria:

- The archaeological artifact, object, or site contains information needed to answer important scientific questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information
- The archaeological artifact, object, or site has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type
- The archaeological artifact, object, or site is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person

A non-unique archaeological resource indicates an archaeological artifact, object, or site that does not meet the above criteria. Impacts to non-unique archaeological resources and resources which do not qualify for listing on the CRHR receive no further consideration under CEQA.

Under CEQA, a project potentially would have significant impacts if it would cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource (i.e., a cultural resource eligible to CRHR, or archaeological resource defined as a unique archaeological resource which does not meet CRHR criteria), or would disturb human remains.

3.3.2.2 Construction Related Impacts

No significant or unique cultural resources were found in the APEs during the archaeological pedestrian survey. However, buried cultural resources that have not been previously identified could be encountered during the construction phase of the Project. Additional unknown subsurface features associated with the McCool-Lohman site (CA-SDI-16264), such as historic privies and dumps, may be encountered on-site during Project construction activities. Significant cultural resources impacted by the Project would require mitigation, which may include data recovery.

3.3.3 Mitigation Measures

The Project is not anticipated to impact significant cultural resources; however, mitigation measures have been provided that would reduce potential impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level in the event that an archaeological site is identified within the Project boundaries during construction. As a result, archaeological monitoring must be conducted during all ground-disturbing activities within the Project site. Should a potentially significant cultural resource be encountered, evaluation of this resource to determine significance is required. The mitigation measures and procedures described below would apply to any cultural resources located within the identified Project APEs. With implementation of the mitigation measures listed below, no significant unavoidable impacts to cultural resources are expected to occur.

All cultural resources monitoring and mitigation will be carried out under the direct supervision of an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and will be consistent with the procedures for compliance with Section 15064.5 of CEQA.

3.3.3.1 Monitoring of Construction Activities

3.3.3.1.1 Preconstruction Assessment and Construction Training

A qualified professional archaeologist shall be retained to observe all ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project. Ground disturbing activities include clearing, grubbing, grading, and trenching within the Project site. The archaeological monitor shall visit the Project site prior to commencement of construction activities to become familiar with site conditions. The archaeological monitor shall attend the pre-construction meeting and work with the City of San Diego, the client, and construction management staff to suspend or redirect construction activities if cultural materials are encountered. The archaeological monitor shall also provide training to appropriate construction personnel on the site to explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources.

3.3.3.1.2 Archaeological Monitoring

The archaeological monitor shall be equipped with a cellular telephone to ensure rapid communication with URS senior cultural resources staff to promptly report any cultural finds or discuss any problems as they are encountered in the field. Archaeological monitors shall keep a daily monitoring log of construction activities, observations, types of equipment used, problems encountered, and any new archaeological discovery (including the cultural material observed and location). Photographs shall be taken as necessary to supplement the documentation. These logs shall be signed and dated by the archaeological monitor and included within the monitoring report.

The archaeological monitor shall observe all ground-disturbing activities within the Project site. Monitoring is not required within the construction laydown area. The archaeological monitor will be authorized to temporarily halt ground-disturbing activities in the immediate vicinity of a discovery in the event that cultural resources are uncovered during construction. Similarly, if the construction staff or others identify cultural resources during construction activities, they shall halt construction in the immediate vicinity and immediately notify the archaeological monitor and Project supervisor. The archaeological monitor shall then immediately notify URS senior cultural resources staff. The archaeological monitor shall use flagging tape to delineate the area of the find and protect the resources from construction activities. Construction activities shall not take place within the delineated discovery area until the archaeological monitor, in consultation with URS senior cultural resources staff and the CEC, can inspect and evaluate the significance of the find and implement mitigation measures, if needed. During this time, construction activities may be redirected to other areas outside of the flagged area.

3.3.3.1.3 Monitoring Documentation

After all ground-disturbing activities are complete, a cultural resources compliance monitoring report shall be prepared by URS cultural resources staff. The report shall include the daily monitoring logs as an appendix. The report shall also include the level of effort involved in monitoring cultural resources, a description of activities monitored, and the number and types of new cultural resources discoveries, including assessment and treatment action.

3.3.3.2 Mitigation of Construction Related Impacts

3.3.3.2.1 Resource Recordation and Evaluation

The archaeological monitor shall follow accepted professional standards in recording any discovery and shall submit applicable Department of Parks and Recreation forms to the SCIC. If the discovery is deemed not significant by URS senior cultural resources staff, construction activities may proceed. Should a potentially significant cultural resource be encountered during monitoring, evaluation of this resource to determine if significance will be required. Significant cultural resources impacted by the Project would require additional mitigation, which may include data recovery. A recovery of a sample of the deposit from which the archaeologist can define scientific data to address archaeological research questions is considered an effective mitigation measure. A mitigation plan shall be prepared and carried out by URS cultural resources staff. The mitigation program shall be carried out as quickly as possible to avoid construction delays. Construction may resume on site as soon as the field data collection phase of any data recovery program is completed.

3.3.3.2.2 Provisions for Encountering Human Remains

Human remains are not anticipated within the Project site given the absence of a prehistoric deposit. If human remains are encountered, construction activities shall be immediately halted in the immediate vicinity of the discovery. The Project supervisor shall immediately contact the San Diego County Coroner, the client, and the City of San Diego representative. If the remains are Native American, the NAHC shall be contacted. The NAHC is required to determine the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), notify that person, and request that they inspect the burial and make recommendation for treatment and removal.

3.3.3.2.3 Laboratory Analysis

Cultural material removed during the course of monitoring or other mitigation measures shall be bagged and catalogued in the field, and analyzed in the laboratory. Cultural materials shall be analyzed in order to characterize the resource(s) and their association to existing regional chronologies. The materials, and the contexts from which they were sampled, shall also be evaluated with regard to the eligibility criteria for inclusion on the CRHR.

The objectives of laboratory processing and analysis are to determine to the extent possible the date, function, cultural affiliation and significance of the archaeological sites, and to prepare artifacts for permanent curation. Artifacts shall be processed (i.e., cleaned, cataloged, and analyzed) according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Curation (36 CFR 79). Artifacts shall be gently

washed using tap water and a soft toothbrush. Delicate and/or unstable materials, such as decayed metal and organic material, shall be carefully dry-brushed with a soft toothbrush. After drying, artifacts shall be analyzed, cataloged, and rebagged according to provenience and type. Artifacts shall have acid-free paper labels with full provenience information, including the state site number, catalog number, shovel test pit (STP) or test unit number, stratum, and date. All artifact information shall be entered into a customized computer-based application.

Historic artifacts shall be cataloged according to group, material, and type, generally based on Stanley South's classifications (1977). South's artifact groups consist of:

- Architecture – construction material and decoratively functional (e.g., doorknobs or moldings) elements used in a building
- Clothing – any part of clothing, from a whole garment to a fragment of cloth, a single bead, or a button, as well as sewing items such as a needle or thimble
- Furniture – furniture hardware and other furniture parts
- Kitchen – items used primarily in the kitchen, such as glass, ceramics, stove parts, and food remains
- Personal – small items belonging to one person, such as coins, hygiene products, and jewelry.
- Arms – gun parts and ammunition
- Tobacco – items used to smoke tobacco
- Activities – items used to perform an act, such as hardware, toys, transportation, construction, and recreation

3.3.3.2.4 Curation

All artifacts, monitoring logs, and photographs are the property of the client and shall be placed in appropriately labeled boxes for temporary storage at URS. As part of mitigation requirements, final curation shall be at the San Diego Archaeological Center (SDAC) and funded by the client.

3.3.4 Consistency with LORS

The Project will be consistent with all applicable LORS. Any cultural resource potentially affected by the Project is subject to compliance with the provisions outlined in CEQA/CRHR. If a cultural resource is discovered during construction, and cannot be avoided, a program of site evaluation will be undertaken to ascertain site significance under CEQA/CRHR. The table below summarizes the cultural resource laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards that may be applicable to the Project.

TABLE 3.3-1
LAWS GOVERNING STATE AND LOCAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Statute	Regulation	Administering Agency
State		
Senate Bill 922 (Ducheny) (2005)	Exempts from California Public Records Act Native American graves, cemeteries, archaeological site information and sacred places in the possession of the Native American Heritage Commission and other state or local agencies	CEC; Native American Heritage Commission
Senate Bill 18 (Burton) (2004)	Protection and preservation of Native American Traditional Cultural Places during city and county general plan development	CEC; City of San Diego; County of San Diego; Native American Heritage Commission
Senate Concurrent Resolution Number 87 (1994)	Provides for the identification and protection of traditional Native American resource gathering sites on state land	CEC
The Warren-Alquist Act (1974, as amended)	Requires cultural, historic, and aesthetic resources be taken into account in consideration of an Application for Certification. Requires that a portion of any such resources on public land be set aside for public access	CEC
California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended	Applies to discretionary projects causing a significant effect on the environment and a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archaeological resource	CEC
Administrative Code, Title 14, Section 4307	No person shall remove, injure, deface or destroy any object of paleontological, archaeological, or historical interest or value	CEC
Government Code, Sections 6253, 6254, 6254.10	Disclosure of archaeological site information is not required for records that relate to archaeological site information maintained by the Department of Parks and Recreation, the State Historical Resources Commission, or the State Lands Commission	CEC
Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5	Requires construction or excavation stopped near human remains until a coroner determines whether the remains are Native American; requires the coroner to contact the NAHC if the remains are Native American	CEC
Health and Safety Code, Section 7051	Establishes removal of human remains from internment, or from a place of storage while awaiting internment or cremation, with the intent to sell them or to dissect them with malice or wantonness as a public offense punishable by imprisonment in a state prison	CEC
Health and Safety Code, Section 7052	States that willing mutilation of, disinterment of, removal from a place of disinterment of, and sexual penetration of or sexual contact with any remains known to be human are felony offenses	CEC

TABLE 3.3-1
LAWS GOVERNING STATE AND LOCAL CULTURAL RESOURCES
(Continued)

Statute	Regulation	Administering Agency
Penal Code, Title 14, Section 622.5	Misdemeanor offense for any person, other than the owner, who willfully damages or destroys archaeological or historic features on public or privately owned land	CEC
California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5020-5029.5	Establishes the California Register of Historical Resources, criterion, and creates the California Historic Landmarks Committee and authorizes the Department of Parks and Recreation to designate Registered Historical Landmarks and Registered Points of Historical Interest; establishes criteria for the protection and preservation of historic resources	CEC; Department of Parks and Recreation
PRC 5097-5097.6	Provides guidance for state agencies in the management of archaeological, paleontological, and historical sites affected by major public works project on state land	CEC
PRC 5097.9-5097.991	Establishes regulations for the protection of Native American religious places; establishes the Native American Heritage commission; California Native American Remains and Associated Grave artifacts shall be repatriated; notification of discovery of Native American human remains to a Most Likely Descendent	CEC; State Historic Preservation Office; Tribal Historic Preservation Office; Native American Heritage Commission
California Code of Regulations Section 1427	Recognizes that California's archaeological resources are endangered by urban development; the Legislature finds that these resources need preserving; it is a misdemeanor to alter any archaeological evidence found in any cave, or to remove any materials from a cave	CEC
Senate Concurrent Resolution Number 43	Requires all state agencies to cooperate with programs of archaeological survey and excavation, and to preserve known archaeological resources whenever reasonable	CEC
Local		
Ordinance No. 9628 (New Series) (amended 9425) (2002)	Provides incentives to increase local reinvestment and take advantage of historic preservation opportunities through the enactment of Mills Act Contracts for property tax relief within the unincorporated area of the County of San Diego	County of San Diego
Ordinance No. 9493 (New Series), Section 396.7 (2002)	Creation of local register of historic resources located within the unincorporated area of the County of San Diego	County of San Diego

TABLE 3.3-1
LAWS GOVERNING STATE AND LOCAL CULTURAL RESOURCES
(Continued)

Statute	Regulation	Administering Agency
Resource Protection Ordinance (1991)	Creates special controls on development for County of San Diego for County's wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, sensitive biological habitats, and prehistoric and historic sites. The ordinance protects sensitive lands and prevents their degradation	County of San Diego
Ordinance No. 9139 (New Series) (2000)	Creates San Diego County Historic Site Board to provide decision makers with input regarding cultural resources, and is responsible for reviewing resources seeking participation in the Mills Act Contract and projects with significant cultural resources	County of San Diego
San Diego County General Plan, Conservation Element (Part X) (1975)	The conservation element of the San Diego County General Plan provides policies for the protection of natural resources. These policies provide guidance for the preservation of cultural resources	County of San Diego
Zoning Ordinance, Section 5700-5749	Provides procedures for designating historic and archaeological resources with an "H" (Historic) Designator	County of San Diego
City of San Diego Municipal Code, Chapter 11, Article 1, Division 2, Section 111.0206 (2000)	Establishes the Historical Resources Board authority, appointment and terms, meeting conduct, and powers and duties	City of San Diego
City of San Diego Municipal Code, Chapter 12, Article 3, Division 2, Sections 123.0201-123.0206 (2000)	Describes the designation process including the nomination process, noticing and report requirements, appeals, recordation, amendments or rescission, and nomination of historical resources to state and national registers	City of San Diego
Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2, Sections 143.0201-143.0280 (2000)	Discusses development regulations for historical resources	City of San Diego
San Diego General Plan, Historic Preservation Element (1979, as amended)	Guides the preservation, protection, restoration, and rehabilitation of historical and cultural resources and maintain a sense of the City	City of San Diego

3.3.5 References Cited

California Energy Commission. 2001. Larkspur Energy Facility Conditions of Certification. Located at http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/peakers/larkspur/documents/01_Larkspur_SA.PDF.

Gallegos & Associates. 2001a. Cultural Resources Letter Report for the Otay Mesa, Larkspur Energy Facility, Otay Mesa, California (Archaeological Records Review for Otay Mesa/Larkspur Facility).

Gallegos & Associates. 2001b. Cultural Resource Mitigation Plan for the McCool Homestead, Otay Mesa, City of San Diego, California.

Gallegos, Dennis, Susan Bugbee, and Steve Van Wormer. 2002. Data Recovery Program for the McCool/Lohman Homestead: 1880s to 1940s, Otay Mesa, San Diego, California.

Ogden & Gallegos & Associates. 1993. East Otay Mesa Specific Plan Cultural Resources Technical Report (GPA 94-02; Log No. 93-19-6). On file at the City of San Diego, and South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Rosen, M., and K. Krafts. 1993. Negative Archaeological Survey Report for Construction of Class A Truck Inspection Station at Otay Mesa International Border Crossing. On file at the City of San Diego, and South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Rosen, Martin D. 1990. Site record form for CA-SDI-12337. On file at the City of San Diego, and South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

South, Stanley. 1977. Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Widell, Cherilyn. 1995. Letter of Concurrence regarding determination of non-eligibility for CA-SDI-12337. Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento. On file at the South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Wildflower Energy, Application for Certification Pursuant to the 21-Day Emergency Permitting Process Larkspur Energy Facility San Diego, California, March 7, 2001.

3.3.6 Conditions of Certification

This Amendment does not require changes to the conditions identified in the Cultural Resources section of the Larkspur Energy Facility Conditions of Certification (CEC 2001).