APPENDIX C

PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY (HELIX 2016B)
January 20, 2016

Ms. Catherine Presmyk
UCSD Physical and Community Planning Office
9500 Gilman Drive MC 0074 (U.S. Mail)
La Jolla, CA 92093-0074

Subject: UCSD Fire Station – Cultural Resources Survey

Dear Ms. Presmyk:

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) was contracted to conduct a cultural resources survey for a proposed fire station (project) on the University of California San Diego (UCSD) campus. This letter report details the methods and results of the cultural resources survey, which included a review of the cultural resources study for the UCSD Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), a Sacred Lands File search, and a field survey.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

The project site is located in the northern portion of the UCSD campus, in the City of San Diego in western San Diego County (Figure 1). The project area is located west of Interstate 5, south of Genesee Avenue, and east and south of North Torrey Pines Road (Figure 1). Northpoint Lane is adjacent to the project on the east, and North Torrey Pines Road forms the western project boundary (Figures 2 and 3). The project site is in an unsectioned portion of Township 15 South, Range 4 West, on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5’ Del Mar quadrangle (Figure 2).

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that 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 (CRHR) (Public Resources Code [PRC] §5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 4852) including the following:
A (1): Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;

B (2): Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

C (3): 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 (4): Has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Cultural resources eligible for the CRHR are considered significant resources, and impacts to them are significant environmental effects under CEQA.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located roughly ½ mile east of the Pacific Coast on the Torrey Pines Mesa, within the largely developed UCSD campus. Elevations within the project area range from approximately 419 feet (ft.) above mean sea level (AMSL) along the western border with North Torrey Pines Road to approximately 435 ft. AMSL along the eastern border with Northpoint Lane. Geologically, the project site is underlain by early- to middle Pleistocene paralic deposits consisting of “dune and back beach ‘beach ridge’ deposits composed of cross-bedded sandstone” (Kennedy and Tan 2005). Carlsbad gravelly loamy sand, 5 to 9 percent slopes, is the only soil type mapped for the project area (Bowman 1973). This soil type would have supported native plant species such as chamise, sumac, black sage, and annual grasses and forbs (Bowman 1973).

Prehistorically, the various nearby canyons and ridges of the Torrey Pines Mesa would have provided a seasonal food and water source for local Native American populations. The accompanying coastal environment held a variety of resources, as well as habitat for wildlife, which would have been utilized in multiple ways by these inhabitants. Coastal sage scrub would have most likely added to the vegetation community known to have been used by the local Native Americans who inhabited the area.

CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT

Several summaries discuss the prehistory of San Diego County and provide a background for understanding the archaeology of the general area surrounding the project. Moratto’s (1984) review of the archaeology of California contains important discussions of Southern California, including the San Diego area, as does a relatively recent book by Neusius and Gross (2007). Bull (1983, 1987), Carrico (1987), Gallegos (1987), and Warren (1985, 1987) provide summaries of archaeological work and interpretations; another paper (Arnold et al. 2004) discusses advances since 1984. The following is a brief discussion of the cultural history of the San Diego region.

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 material culture of the San Dieguito complex consists primarily of scrapers, scraper planes, choppers, large blades, and large projectile points. 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 7,000 years ago, possibly as long as 9,000 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 complex. 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).

Various authors (Bull 1987; Gallegos 1987) have 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, 1988; Winterrowd and Cárdenas 1987). Inland sites adapted to hunting contain a different tool kit, regardless of temporal period (Cárdenas and Van Wormer 1984).

Other archaeologists argue 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, separate from an earlier culture (Cook 1985; Gross and Hildebrand 1998; Warren 1998). One perceived problem 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. The subsurface deposits at numerous sites are the result of such agencies as rodent burrowing, insect activity, and other bioturbative factors (Bocek 1986; Erlandson 1984; Gross 1992; Johnson 1989).
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 Native people 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), although various researchers use slightly different ethnographic territory boundaries. Traditional stories and songs of the Native people also describe the extent of traditional use areas.

STUDY METHODS

HELIX staff reviewed the UCSD LRDP cultural resources inventory update (Kyle 2004) for locations and descriptions of cultural resources within the UCSD campus and the immediate vicinity of the project site. HELIX contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in January 2016 for a Sacred Lands File search and list of Native American contacts for the project area.

HELIX archaeologist Andrew Giletti surveyed the project area on December 4, 2015. The parcel, which is part of the North Campus Recreation Area, includes a single tennis court, with seven additional courts being located to the south. The portions of the project site west and north of the existing tennis court appear to be manufactured slopes. All open areas were surveyed in 10 meter (m) parallel transects.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The UCSD campus was surveyed for cultural resources by Hanna in 1980, with cultural resource study updates in 1989 (Gallegos et al. 1989) and 2004 (Kyle 2004). The latter study was done in conjunction with the campus LRDP. HELIX relied on information from these studies; no additional cultural resources have been recorded in the vicinity of the project area since the LRDP study. One archaeological site, CA-SDI-8470, is mapped as abutting the project’s southwestern corner. This site was described as containing flakes, manos, shell, and midden soils and may have been a secondary deposit of cultural material that was removed from SDM-W-9N (CA-SDI-525) by the US Army and transported to Camp Callan in the early 1940s. Gallegos et al. (1989) also indicated that a root cellar and subterranean room, possibly dating to the nineteenth century, had been recorded as part of the site in 1974. These features were not found during the 1980 survey by Hanna, and environmental documents identified the site as having little scientific value (Gallegos et al. 1989). Kyle (2004) indicated that “the entire area has either been destroyed by construction or is currently under construction. None of CA-SDI-8470 remains and no additional work is recommended for this resource” (Kyle 2004: 2-5).
RESULTS

Historic aerial photographs and topographic maps were referenced for historical information about the project site. No buildings are shown within the project area on the 1901 topographic maps, although there are buildings in the vicinity.

The NAHC was contacted for a Sacred Lands File search and list of Native American contacts. To date, no response has been received from the NAHC.

As previously noted, the project site supports a tennis court, and the areas west and north of the existing tennis court appear to be manufactured slopes. The area west of the tennis court was noted as containing imported fill soils; one *Donax* shell was observed within the imported fill, and modern refuse was also noted. Ground visibility within the proposed project area was excellent. No evidence of cultural material was observed within the project area at the time of the survey. Based on the cultural resources survey for the LRDP (Kyle 2004) and the current study, no remnants of CA-SI-8470 remain, and no other cultural resources are present in the project area.

CONCLUSIONS

No extant cultural resources have been identified within the project. One site was recorded adjacent to the project area; however, it has been destroyed by past development. Therefore, the project will have no impacts to cultural resources, and no mitigation measures are recommended.

If you have any questions, please contact Mary Robbins-Wade at (619) 462-1515.

Mary Robbins-Wade, RPA
Director of Cultural Resources
Southern California

Kristina Davison
Staff Archaeologist

Attachments:

- Figure 1  Regional Location Map
- Figure 2  Project Vicinity (USGS Topography)
- Figure 3  Project Plan
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