

2.5 Cultural Resources

<i>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.	CULTURAL RESOURCES—Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.5.1 Setting

This setting description provides a brief overview of the environment, prehistory, ethnography, and history of the surrounding region that includes the project area. Because archaeological regions can represent large geographic areas and display some cultural homogeneity throughout, a discussion of the broad context is useful in order to evaluate the impacts to cultural resources.

Existing Environment

The area that represents the proposed transmission line between the Lakeville Substation to Sonoma Creek—or the Sonoma Mountains—consists of moderately high relief with numerous upland and riparian vegetation communities. Large grassland areas are interspersed with patches of oak and redwood, along with vineyard and parcels used for grazing animals. As a whole, during the prehistoric period, the Sonoma Mountains would have been an attractive locale for temporary camps and gathering excursions, while the valleys to the east and west of the Sonoma range would likely have been more suitable for permanent villages—namely along major watercourses. Conversely, the landscape that represents the Lakeville Substation and the Sonoma Substation areas are now paved and urbanized underlain by mostly alluvial fan deposits, which reduce the probability of encountering intact archaeological sites, especially near the surface.

Prehistoric Context

Much of the prehistoric occupation of the commonly called Sonoma Archaeological District—or the area represented roughly by the boundaries of Sonoma County—was very similar to the chronology of traditions within the San Francisco Bay; however, the patterns¹ in the record seem to reflect connection to the North Coast Ranges and that region's prehistoric peoples. The later patterns that exemplified the Bay Area regions—such as the Berkeley and Augustine Patterns—

¹ A *pattern* is an essentially integrative cultural unit, or, in other words, the general mode of living shared by people within a given geographic region

was represented in the Sonoma District, but demonstrated a lack of similarity to the earliest Sacramento Valley material culture called the Windmill Pattern (4,750–3,750 years before present (B.P.)). The material remains of the Windmill sites reflected a people well adapted to riverine and marshland environments with common mortar and millstone fragments and fishing implements (Ragir, 1972). However, while being contemporaneous with the Windmill Pattern, the artifacts discovered in the Sonoma District reflected a greater influence from artifacts seen in the San Francisco Bay Area, often called the Berkeley Pattern (Morrato, 1984). By about 2,500 B.P., the Berkeley Pattern in the Sonoma District (sometimes called the Houx Aspect by archaeologists), showed a greater reliance on hunting tools than milling implements.

A few earlier sites were discovered in the Napa Valley to the northeast of Petaluma, as well as near the drought-exposed shoreline of Lake Berryessa, often called the Hultman Phase sites (dated at 8,000 to 5,000 B.P.) (Meighan, 1953 and True et al., 1979). These sites contained crude and heavy core stone tools, millstones, and manos, or hand-sized grinding stones. Similarities to the Berkeley Pattern of the Bay Area continued to evolve and demonstrate increasing complexity, both technologically and socially. This sequence ultimately led to the Augustine Pattern, also very similar to the assemblages found in the Bay Area, with increasing emphasis on ornamentation, like *Olivella* and *Halotis* beads and bone tool forms. The increased distribution of beads and obsidian tool use indicative of the Augustine Pattern further reflects the increasing sociopolitical complexity and status distinctions in wealth observable in the archaeological record (Morrato, 1984).

Ethnographic Context

By the time of European settlement, the project area was included within part of the Coast Miwok territory, which was centered in Marin and Sonoma Counties (Kelly 1978). Miwok was one of the California Penutian languages, which included two discrete groups: the Lake Miwok, to the northwest, and the Coast Miwok, to the west. The Coast Miwok exploited a large and abundant resource base that shaped a complex hunter-gatherer society. The settlement patterns consisted of large village sites surrounded by a constellation of small, task-specific camps. Primary village sites had headmen and were occupied throughout the year; these sites were located near to shore or freshwater sources. The ethnographic Patwin territory intersects with the eastern segment of the project area.

Historical Context

With the advent of the mission period and the establishment of the San Francisco –Solano Mission at Sonoma, much of the Coast Miwok culture was irrevocably changed. The missionization of the native peoples was followed by the occupation of the region by General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, who owned the large *Rancho Petaluma*. Between 1834 and 1840, Vallejo built the largest adobe in Northern California, the Petaluma Adobe, in the foothills of the Sonoma Mountains, just a quarter-mile northeast of the Lakeville Substation. Vallejo also owned *Rancho Agua Caliente* along Sonoma Creek adjacent to the town of Sonoma. As the American Period began in the 1840s, the influx of new economies and the process of secularization resulted in an increase in settlement and the development of farming, ranching, and businesses in Sonoma County. In the mid-nineteenth century, wine grapes from Europe were first grown successfully in

Sonoma County. Today, Sonoma County is best known for the Sonoma Valley and its world-renowned wine production.

Methods

A records search of all pertinent survey and site data was conducted at the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University (PG&E, 2004). The records were accessed by utilizing the Glen Ellen and Sonoma USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle maps.

Previous surveys and studies and archaeological site records were accessed as they pertained to the project area. Records were also accessed and reviewed in the *Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File for Sonoma County* for information on sites of recognized historical significance within the *National Register of Historic Places* (as of November, 2004), the *California Register of Historic Resources* (as of November, 2004), the *California Inventory of Historic Resources* (1976), the *California Historical Landmarks* (1996), and the *California Points of Historical Interest* (1992). In addition, General Land Office (GLO) maps were also consulted.

EDAW project archaeologists attended a series of field inspections of the proposed project and alternative routes on various dates in the summer and fall of 2003 (PG&E, 2004). These sessions were attended by PG&E personnel, as well as other environmental specialists. In order to minimize potential impacts to cultural resources, input from PG&E was solicited regarding the placement of various installations. In addition, letters requesting information regarding the project area were sent to the Native American Heritage Commission and 15 Native American individuals or organizations which might have knowledge of the area. No response has been received as of the publication of this Initial Study.

Additional field reconnaissance was conducted subsequently by ESA archaeologist Dean Martorana, M.A., in January, 2005, to obtain a general impression of the physiographic setting and check the existence and condition of properties previously identified by the above field and archival research.

Results

Several surveys have been conducted in the general region of the project area, but none have included more than minor coverage of any project segment. Therefore, where feasible, the project route was examined by archaeologists (PG&E PEA, 2004). Limitations included terrain too steep to safely examine and areas where landowner permission could not be obtained for access. The steepest areas are unlikely to contain cultural resources. Furthermore, transmission line installation in these areas would involve overhead line work that would not impact any sites, features, or artifacts that might be present.

Two cultural resources have been identified near the proposed project route and within the access roads/other construction areas. The first is inside the Petaluma Adobe State Historic Park (CA-Son-363H), located about 1/4-mile northeast of the Lakeville Substation. This park includes the restored Petaluma Adobe (State Historic Landmark No. 18 and National Register of Historic

Places #70000151), built by General Mariano G. Vallejo. The adobe has been restored to its appearance during its prime period of significance, 1834–1845.

The second resource consists of a portion of a stone wall found along Segment 1, at Pole 61. The project would eliminate this pole and a planned access road would require a breach in the wall. No information was obtained defining the date of construction, specific purpose, or contextual association of the historic stone wall located near Pole 61 (PG&E PEA, 2004). However, stone walls of this type are ubiquitous in this region and are generally not considered to be significant cultural resources. The stone wall does not appear on historic maps of the Napa area, does not line up with known Mexican Land Grant boundaries, and is of a type, style, and method of construction common in the region (Beck and Haase, 1974; Elliot and Smith 1878; and PG&E PEA, 2004). There is no available information to indicate that the stone wall is associated with significant events or persons important in California's past. The stone wall is not of a distinctive design or high artistic value, and would not yield information important in history. Furthermore, the context in which the stone wall was built appears to lack integrity and portions of the wall have been damaged or removed. Therefore, the stone wall is not considered an historical resource.

Although located outside of the boundaries of the Proposed Project, numerous archaeological and historical resources have been identified within the Petaluma and Sonoma Valley regions and the Sonoma Mountains, which represents the physiographic setting for the proposed transmission line. A myriad of creek settings, such as Adobe Creek and Rogers Creek, have yielded significant midden deposits and sites consisting of obsidian tools and waste flakes, among other archaeological site types and constituents. Because the settings for known sites corresponds to portions of the Proposed Project, specifically within the transmission line corridor segments in proximity to watercourses, the probability for the discovery of previously unidentified cultural resources during construction in these areas is moderate to high.

2.5.2 Regulatory Context

Section 106

Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800) of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires a federal agency with jurisdiction over a federally funded, federally assisted, or federally licensed undertaking to take into account the effects of the agency's undertaking on properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (16 USC 470 et seq.). Because the project may require permits from federal agencies, it may be necessary for the Project to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA (please see discussion of Impact 2.4-7 in Section 2.4, *Biological Resources*).

For compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, the lead federal agency (e.g., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) is required to consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) before granting permits, funding, or other authorization of the undertaking. The Section 106 review process is implemented using a 5-step procedure, which includes:

1. Determination of the area of potential effects (APE) and the identification and evaluation of cultural resources within the APE;
2. Assessment of the effects of the undertaking on properties that are eligible for listing in the NRHP;
3. Consultation with the SHPO and lead agency on the determination of effect on historic properties;
4. Completion of a Memorandum of Agreement, or similar document, to address the resolution of adverse effect, if necessary; and
5. Implementation of the project according to the conditions of the agreement.

To determine whether the Proposed Project could affect NRHP-eligible properties, cultural sites (including archaeological, historical, and architectural properties) must be inventoried and evaluated for eligibility for listing in the NRHP. Although compliance with Section 106 is the responsibility of the federal lead agency, the work necessary to fulfill compliance can be delegated to others.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

CEQA requires that public or private projects financed or approved by public agencies must assess the effects of the project on historical resources. CEQA also applies to effects on archaeological sites, which may be included among “historical resources” as defined by Guidelines section 15064.5, subdivision (a), or, in the alternative, may be subject to the provisions of Public Resources Code section 21083.2, which govern review of “unique archaeological resources.” Historical resources may generally include buildings, sites, structures, objects or districts, each of which may have historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific significance.

Under CEQA, “historical resources” include the following:

- (1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, §5024.1.)
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resources as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- (3) 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) 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.
- (4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

Archaeological resources that are not “historical resources” according to the above definitions may be “unique archaeological resources” as defined in Public Resources Code section 21083.2, which also generally provides that “nonunique archaeological resources” do not receive any protection under CEQA. If an archaeological resource is neither a “unique archaeological” nor an “historical resource,” the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. It shall be sufficient that both the resource and the effect on it are noted in the EIR, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.

In summary, CEQA requires that if a project results in an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, or would cause significant effects on a unique archaeological resource, then alternative plans or mitigation measures must be considered.

Sonoma County General Plan

The Sonoma County General Plan Open Space Element contains the following goal and objective that are relevant to the Proposed Project:

- Goal OS-9: Preserve significant archaeological and historical sites which represent the ethnic, cultural, and economic groups that have lived and worked in Sonoma County. Preserve unique or historically significant heritage or landmark trees.
- Objective OS-9.1: Encourage the preservation and conservation of historic structures by promoting their rehabilitation or adaptation to new uses. (Sonoma County PRMD, 1989)

City of Sonoma General Plan

The City of Sonoma General Plan does not contain any policies related to cultural resources that are relevant to the Proposed Project (City of Sonoma, 1995).

2.5.3 Cultural Resources Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts on cultural resources could result from ground-disturbing activities and/or damage, destruction, or alteration of historic buildings. Ground-disturbing activities include project-related excavation, grading, trenching, or other sub-surface disturbance that could damage or destroy buried archaeological resources including prehistoric and historic remains or human burials. Mechanisms that would cause damage, destruction, or alteration of historic buildings includes project-related demolition, damage, or alteration of historic buildings or their immediate surroundings that could impair the significance of an historic resource or adversely alter those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance.

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5: *less than significant impact*.

The Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of an historical resource. EDAW identified two cultural resources through archival and field inspection: the Petaluma Adobe and an historic stone wall located near Pole 61. The Petaluma Adobe (State Historic Landmark No. 18) is located about 1/4 mile northeast of the Lakeville Substation. The Petaluma Adobe would not be directly or indirectly affected by the Proposed Project. While the proposed modifications to the Lakeville Substation and the proposed height increases to the existing transmission line would constitute a change to the existing conditions of the area surrounding the Petaluma Adobe, the present existence of multiple transmission lines and other modern features of the landscape demonstrates that the proposed changes are irrelevant to the significance of the property. That is, the physical features of the setting are not the criteria that contribute to the Adobe's significance; therefore, this would be a less than significant impact.

As discussed above, the stone wall identified at Pole 61 was determined not to qualify as an historic resource; therefore, the project's potential to damage the stone wall would be a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5: *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated*.

As described in the *Methods* section above, archival research at the Northwest Information Center was conducted to determine whether any archaeological resources have been identified along the transmission corridor or within the proposed access roads and staging areas. There are no recorded prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources listed with the Northwest Information Center within the footprint of the proposed alignment. Although no extant cultural resources along the corridor have been

documented, no intensive survey with subsurface testing has been conducted. Moreover, the abundant grassland vegetation throughout much of the transmission line corridor precluded adequate surface examination. Therefore, the nonexistence of subsurface cultural resources cannot be demonstrated and unidentified, buried archaeological remains could be present along the corridor. Buried archaeological remains such as prehistoric midden deposits, flaked and ground stone artifacts, bone, shell, building foundations and walls, and other buried cultural resource materials could be damaged during grading, trenching, and other construction related activities.

Impact 2.5-1: If construction of the proposed project encounters currently unknown cultural resources, including archaeological resources, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or CEQA Section 21083.2(g), this could cause substantial adverse changes to the significance of the resource. This would be a less than significant impact with implementation of Mitigation Measures 2.5-1a and 2.5-1b.

Damage to significant buried archaeological deposits would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.5-1a would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Further, based on the reasonable potential that archeological resources may be present within the transmission line corridor, Mitigation Measure 2.5-1b is provided to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect to buried or subsurface unique archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measure 2.5-1a: In the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the resources shall be halted and PG&E and/or the CPUC shall consult with a qualified archaeologist to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, representatives of PG&E and/or the CPUC and a Specialist shall meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation, with the ultimate determination to be made by the CPUC. All significant cultural materials recovered shall be, as necessary, subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared by a Specialist according to current professional standards.

In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the consulting archaeologist in order to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the CPUC shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for historical resources or unique archaeological resources is carried out.

Mitigation Measure 2.5-1b: PG&E shall retain the services of a Specialist that has expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology to monitor ground-disturbing activity within 200 feet of a perennial or seasonal watercourse (see Figures 1-4a through 1-4d). If an intact archeological deposit is encountered, all soil disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/construction crews and heavy equipment until the deposit is

evaluated. The archeological monitor shall immediately notify the CPUC of the encountered archeological deposit. The archeological monitor shall, after making a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archeological deposit, present the findings of this assessment to the CPUC.

If the CPUC, in consultation with the Specialist, determines that a significant archeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the CPUC shall require PG&E to:

- Re-design the project to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource; or
- Implement an archeological data recovery program (ADRP) (unless the archaeologist determines that the archeological resource is of greater interpretive use than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible). If the circumstances warrant an archeological data recovery program, an ADRP shall be conducted. The project archaeologist and the CPUC shall meet and consult to determine the scope of the ADRP. The archaeologist shall prepare a draft ADRP that shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program would preserve the significant information the archeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP shall identify the scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, the data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the Proposed Project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant.

Mitigation Measure 2.1-1

As discussed in Section 2.1, *Land Use and Planning*, Mitigation Measure 2.1-1 requires the undergrounding of the transmission line within Leveroni Road from about Fifth Street West to the Sonoma Substation. No previously recorded cultural resources have been identified within this corridor, and no built structures or buildings would be altered. While the undergrounding of the transmission line that would occur under this mitigation measure would increase the potential to disturb currently unknown, subsurface cultural resources, implementation of Mitigation Measures 2.5-1a and 2.5-1b would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

- c) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature: *less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.***

Paleontologic Resources

Paleontologic resources are the fossilized evidence of past life found in the geologic record. Despite the tremendous volume of sedimentary rock deposits preserved worldwide, and the enormous number of organisms that have lived through time, preservation of plant or animal remains as fossils is an extremely rare occurrence. Because of the infrequency of fossil preservation, fossils – particularly vertebrate fossils – are considered to be nonrenewable resources. Because of their rarity, and the scientific information they can provide, fossils are highly significant records of ancient life.

The majority of the project area contains pre-Quaternary (approximately 3 million years ago and older) deposits and bedrock in montane areas combined with areas of Pleistocene alluvium in valleys. These types of sediments have been known to yield significant paleontologic remains because they are formations considered as fossil-bearing rock units. Because the Proposed Project would result in minimal excavation in bedrock conditions for the installation of the transmission line, significant paleontologic discovery would be unlikely. However, in the event a paleontologic resource is encountered, Mitigation Measure 2.5-2 is provided.

Impact 2.5-2: The Proposed Project could adversely affect unidentified paleontologic resources at the pole and road construction sites. This would be a less than significant impact with implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.5-2.

While not anticipated to result from the Proposed Project, significant fossil discoveries can be made even in areas of supposed low sensitivity, and could result from the excavation activities related to the Proposed Project, which could have a deleterious effect on such resources.

Mitigation Measure 2.5-2: In the event of unanticipated paleontologic discoveries, PG&E shall notify a Specialist who shall document the discovery as needed, evaluate the potential resource, and assess the significance of the find under the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of a breas², true, and/or trace fossil during construction, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or diverted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist (per Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards (SVP 1995 and SVP, 1996). The paleontologist shall notify the appropriate agencies to determine procedures that would be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the CPUC determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall prepare an excavation plan for mitigating the effect of the project on the qualities that make the resource important, and such plan shall be implemented. The plan shall be submitted to the CPUC for review and approval.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant.

² A seep of natural petroleum that trapped extinct animals which preserved and fossilized their remains.

Mitigation Measure 2.1-1

As discussed in Section 2.1, *Land Use and Planning*, Mitigation Measure 2.1-1 requires the undergrounding of the transmission line within Leveroni Road from about Fifth Street West to the Sonoma Substation. The excavation required for the implementation of this mitigation measure would be conducted in surface alluvial deposits and road fill material. While the undergrounding would increase the potential to disturb unknown, paleontologic resources, the implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.5-2 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

- d) **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.**

Burial Resources

There is no indication that a particular site has been used for burial purposes in the recent or distant past along the transmission corridor. Thus, it is unlikely that human remains would be encountered during project construction. However, in the event of the discovery of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, during project construction, the following Mitigation Measure is provided.

Impact 2.5-3: Project construction could result in damage to previously unidentified human remains. This would be a less than significant impact with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.5-3.

Mitigation Measure 2.5-3: In the event that human skeletal remains are uncovered during construction activities for the Proposed Project, PG&E shall immediately halt work, contact the Sonoma County Coroner to evaluate the remains, and follow the procedures and protocols pursuant to Section 15064.5 (e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, PG&E shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission, pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and all excavation and site preparation activities shall cease until appropriate arrangements are made.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant.

Mitigation Measure 2.1-1

As discussed in Section 2.1, *Land Use and Planning*, Mitigation Measure 2.1-1 requires the undergrounding of the transmission line within Leveroni Road from about Fifth Street West to the Sonoma Substation. While the undergrounding would increase the potential to disturb unknown burials, the implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.5-3 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

References – Cultural Resources

- Beck, W., and Y. Haase, 1974. *Historical Atlas of California*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Publishing Division of the University, 1974.
- Office of Historic Preservation, California Department of Parks and Recreation, 1992. *California Points of Historical Interest*, Sacramento, CA, State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, 1992.
- Department of Parks and Recreation, State of California, Resources Agency, 1996. *California Historical Landmarks*, Sacramento, 1996.
- California Register of Historic Resources, 2004. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Rohnert Park, CA, list through November 2004.
- City of Sonoma Community Development Department, 1995. *City of Sonoma 1995-2005 General Plan*, adopted August 30, 1995.
- Elliott, W., and C. Smith, 1878. *Illustrations of Napa County California with Historical Sketch, Valley*. Publishers, Fresno, California, 1878.
- Kelley, I., 1978. *Eastern Miwok*, In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8, California, Ed by R.F. Heizer, Smithsonian Institution: Washington, D.C., 1978.
- Meighan, C.W., 1953. *Archaeology of Sites Nap-129 and Nap-131*, In R.F. Heizer ed., *The Archaeology of the Napa Region*, University of California Anthropological Records 12(6): 315-317, 1953.
- Moratto, M.J., 1984. *California Archaeology*, Academic Press: Orlando, 1984.
- National Register of Historic Places, 2004. On file at the Northwest Information Center, Rohnert Park, CA, list through November 2004.
- Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), 2004. *Proponent's Environmental Assessment, Lakeville-Sonoma 115 kV Transmission Line Project*, November 2004. Prepared by EDAW.
- Ragir, S., 1972. *The Early Horizon in Central California Prehistory*, University of California Archaeological Research Facility Contributions, No. 15: Berkeley, California, 1972.
- Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP), 1995. *Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontologic Resources – Standard Guidelines*, Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin, Vol. 163, p. 22-27, 1995.
- Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP), 1996. *Conditions of Receivership for Paleontologic Salvage Collections*, *Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin*, vol. 166, p. 31-32, 1996.

Sonoma County Permit and Resource Management Department (Sonoma County PRMD), 1989.
1989 Sonoma County General Plan, adopted March 23, 1989.

True, D.L., M.A. Baumhoff, and J.E. Hellen, 1979. *Milling Stone Cultures in Northern California: Berryessa Lake*, *The Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 1(1): 124-154, 1979.