An Archaeological Survey Report for the
(name of project)
(name of county), California

by:

(author’s name)
(author’s affiliation/title)
(author’s mailing address)
(author’s telephone number)

(date report was written)

Part 1: Project Information

Project Number:
Name of CAL FIRE Project Manager:
Project Size (acres):
Name of 7.5° USGS Quad Map:
Name of Landowner:
Legal Location:

Funding Information:

Project Description:

Date of Records Check Conducted by Information Center:
Information Center File Number:
Summary of Records Check Results:

( ) Records Check Request, Map, and written reply from the Information Center are attached
( ) Records Check Not Attached

Justification:

Part 3: Native American Consultation Information

( ) Example of a notification letter (including maps) is attached
List of Native American individuals or groups that were provided written notification:
Date of the CDF Native American Contact List that was used:

Date notification was sent:
Results of Information Request:
( ) No reply received as of (date):
( ) Written reply received (copy attached)
( ) Verbal reply received (summarize reply below):

Native American archaeological or cultural sites were not identified within the plan.
Signature of CAL FIRE Archaeologist, Forest Practice Approval or Acceptance
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports:
Types of Archaeological Survey Reports

- Archaeological Survey Report (ASR)
- Confidential Archaeological Addendum (CAA)
- Confidential Archaeological Letter (CAL)
http://calfire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/archaeology-survey_forms
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Timber Harvest Plans – CAA Sections

I. Project Information
II. Archaeological Records Search
III. Native American Consultation Information
IV. Pre-Field Research
V. Training and Experience of Archaeological Surveyors
VI. Survey Methods and Procedures
VII. Survey Results
VIII. Evaluation of Significance
IX. Protection Measures
X. Meeting with LTO
XI. Site Recording
XII. Other Applicable Information
XIII. List of Attachments
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Emergency Notices & Exemptions – CAL Sections

I. Project Information
II. Archaeological Records Check Information
III. Native American Notification
IV. Survey Methods and Procedures
V. Survey Results
VI. Evaluation of Significance
VII. Protection Measures
VIII. Site Recording
IX. Archaeological Coverage Map
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Project Information Sections (ALL)

Project Number:  
Name of CAL FIRE Project Manager:  
Project Size (acres):  
Name of 7.5’ USGS Quad Map:  
Name of Landowner:  
Legal Location:  
Funding Information:  
Project Description: 

THP number:  
Name, address and telephone number of the RPF:  
Project Size (acres):  
Name of 7.5’ USGS Quad Map:  
Name of Landowner:  
Legal Location:  
Project Description:
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Archaeological Records Check Sections (ALL)

Part 2: Archaeological Records Check Information

Date of Records Check Conducted by Information Center:
Information Center File Number:
Summary of Records Check Results:

( ) Records Check Request, Map, and written reply from the Information Center are attached
( ) Records Check Not Attached
Justification:

**For Emergency notices, the requirement is waived if the Information Center cannot return the records search results within 3 business days.**
Part 2: Archaeological Records Check Information

Date of Records Check Conducted by Information Center: 2/8/2012
Information Center File Number: EIC-RIV-ST-1738
Summary of Records Check Results:
( X) Records Check Request, Map, and written reply from the Information Center are attached
( ) Records Check Not Attached
Justification:
Records search results indicate the ~2,000 acre record search area contains eight previous cultural resource studies, four general overviews, and 24 previously recorded cultural resources; of these, three previous surveys and six previously recorded cultural resources are within the VMP project boundary. Neither the National Register of Historic Places nor California’s Office of Historic Preservation (Cal OHP) Archaeological Determination Of Eligibility list show any properties listed within the VMP record search area. Two properties within the record search area are listed on Cal OHP’s Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data file, neither property is within the proposed VMP boundary.
Part 3: Native American Consultation Information

( ) Example of a notification letter(s) (including maps) is attached
List of Native American individuals or groups that were provided written notification:
Date of the CAL FIRE Native American Contact List that was used:
Date notification was sent:
Results of Information Request:
( ) No reply received as of (date):
( ) Written reply received (copy attached)
( ) Verbal reply received (summarize reply below):
( ) Native American archaeological or cultural sites were not identified within the project area
( ) Native American archaeological or cultural sites have been identified within the project area
Date Notification Letters were sent to Native Americans (if applicable):
Date copies of notification letters sent to the Director:
Results of Notification to Native Americans:
( ) No reply received as of (date):
( ) Written reply received (copy attached)
( ) Verbal reply received (summarize reply below):
☐ Yes  ☐ No  Is this CAL for an **exemption notice**?

If **yes**, then complete (g)-(j).

  g.  ☐ The exemption notice was sent to Native American contacts.

  h.  ☐ A list of the individuals or groups that were provided written notification is attached.

  i.  Date of the Native American Contact List used:  Click or tap here to enter text.

  j.  Date notification sent:  Click or tap here to enter text.
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Pre-Field Research Sections (ASR/CAA)

Part 4: Pre-Field Research

Literature Reviewed:

- Archaeological Survey by Rebecca Loveland Anastasio
- Archaeological and Historical Investigations of the CAL FIRE Cayucos Forest Fire Station, San Luis Obispo County, California
- CDF-CLFA Archaeological Training Program Reference Manuals and Study Guides
- GLO Plats
- Rancho Plats
- Various web sites

Literature Reviewed:

Mirro, Michael
2004 Cultural Resources Survey of 120 Acres on the Fish and Game Property for the National Resources Conservation Service. Report on file at the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center (File 1064241).

Williams, Audry and Hubert Switalski
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports:
Pre-Field Research Sections (ASR/CAA)

Summary of Results of Pre-Field Research

- Prehistoric
- Ethnographic
- Historic
- Local
Part 4: Pre-Field Research

*Handbook of the Indians of California (Kroeber 1925), Chapter 48*

Persons Contacted: Stephanie Velasquez, Cal Fire Archaeologist.

Summary of Results of Pre-Field Research: The Native Americans in this area are likely of Cahuilla decent, but may also have some influence from the Luiseno and Serrano tribes. This is evident by the Morongo Band of Mission Indians to the north that has influence from the Serrano, Cahuilla and Cupeno tribes. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, located to the east of the project area, has their heritage from the Cahuilla and Luiseno Indians. To the south, there are the Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, the Cahuilla Band of Indians and the Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians, all of which are descendants of Cahuilla Indians.
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Pre-Field Research Sections (ASR/CAA)

The Chumash inhabiting the northern part of their territory (including the project area and most of San Luis Obispo County) are generally referred to as Obispeño, however the Chumash from this region refer to themselves as Stishni. Based on historical accounts and archaeological evidence, the Obispeño Chumash had a hunting and gathering economy based primarily on the exploitation of tide pools and shallow water using traps, poles, nets, and hook and line. Although tule balsas have been noted, the planked canoe characteristic of the Santa Barbara Channel was not introduced into the Obispeño area until the historic period (sic). Hunting is suggested by the presence of projectile points. Plant and animal foods were processed using stone manos with stone metates or wooden grinding trough as well as stone mortars. Hand sized cobbles with small pits may have been used to crack mollusks or acorns. The Chumash were also active traders: steatite from Catalina Island, deerskins, acorns, and grasshoppers from the Salinan; pottery and obsidian from the Yokut; in turn the Chumash supplied asphaltum, sea shells, dried fish, and sea otter furs (Greenwood 1978:521-523).

The Chumash people moved from their villages to the Franciscan missions between 1772 and 1817. Mission San Luis Obispo, established in 1772, was the first mission in Chumash-speaking lands, as well as the northernmost of the five missions ever constructed in those lands.

GLO and Rancho Plats indicate portions of two Ranchos within the project area. Rancho San Miguelito was granted by Mexico to Miguel Avila in two portions, first in 1842 then in 1846. This rancho ultimately became the present day areas of Port San Luis and Avila Beach. The other rancho, Rancho Pismo, was granted to Jose Ortega by Mexico in 1840. This Rancho later encompassed present day Pismo Beach, Grover Beach, Shell Beach and parts of Arroyo Grande. The plats indicate features including original house sites, fence lines and travel routes (roads), however no features as depicted from these plats are within the project area.
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Surveyor Information Sections (ASR/CAA)

Part 5: Training and Experience of Archaeological Surveyors

Name of current Archaeological Surveyor(s):

☐ Archaeological Survey conducted by Professional Archaeologist

☐ Archaeological Survey conducted by person with current CAL FIRE Archaeological Training

CAL FIRE Archaeological Training Course #

Date Training Course was completed:

☐ Archaeological Survey for previous project within site survey area previously conducted by

(provide name):

➢ Previous Survey Information
➢ Report Information
➢ Project Information
➢ Description
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Type of Study</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Report Date</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI-1909</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Cottrell</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-2354</td>
<td>Property Survey</td>
<td>Drover</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Cultural Resource Studies**

*Lawson (2014)*: an archaeological survey undertaken in 2004 to assess approximately 2,600 acres encompassed in a proposed development; of this, 1,500 acres is designated open space and will not be developed. The 2004 survey systematically surveyed utilizing 20 meter transects; ridgelines were surveyed independent of lower elevation plains, slopes exceeding 25 degrees were intuitively surveyed, and recently planted agricultural fields were surveyed along their borders (Lawson et al 2004:14). Record search information indicated three previously recorded sites within the project area; field survey resulted in the identification of 17 previously unrecorded archaeological resources. The 2004 survey indicated generally poor ground visibility (<5% in plains and <10% on ridge tops) existed due to thick vegetation growth, with visibility improving in burned areas (90%) and recently plowed fields (100%) (Lawson et al 2004:16). Staff made site visits to previously recorded site, but were unable to relocate one.
Part 6: Survey Methods and Procedures

Survey strategy:
Time spent conducting archaeological field survey:
Date or Dates the survey was conducted:
Survey coverage intensity:
Ground visibility/other limitations:
Other relevant information:
Part 6: Survey Methods and Procedures: The information you provide in this section is intended to describe the effort made to search for cultural resources within the project area, and to demonstrate that an adequate and appropriate effort was made. In describing the survey strategy explain the archaeological survey methods that were used. Develop your survey strategy by incorporating recommendations made by the Information Center and by using results of your pre-field research. Your strategy may be influenced by additional considerations such as topography and/or other physical attributes of the property. Provide information addressing where you looked, what methods were employed, and what you were looking for. For example, CDF recommends that you not state that you were searching for bedrock mortars in Humboldt County, since to date no bedrock mortars have been identified there and, therefore, it is believed that bedrock mortars do not occur there. On the other hand, if your survey was within the Sierra Nevada region it would be quite appropriate for you to indicate that you were searching all likely rock outcrops for bedrock milling features. In other words, demonstrate that you know what you should have been looking for and that you employed a survey strategy that was appropriate for the area or region in which the property is located. CDF has produced a few articles designed to assist RPFs in developing appropriate strategies and these are available on CDF Archaeology Program Web Site and in the Reference Manual and Study Guide for the CDF Archaeological Training Program.
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Survey Methods, cont.

- **Survey Strategy:**
  - Incorporate recommendations from IC
  - Include information from background research
  - Indicate method employed (Complete, General, Intuitive, Cursory)
  - Factors influencing survey design
  - Describe resources you are expecting to find

- **Survey Time:**
  - Date
  - Time spent surveying
  - Weather conditions
Survey strategy: Vegetation and terrain prohibited field personnel from surveying the entire unit utilizing systematic transects. The information center identified little survey coverage exists for the project area and recommends cultural resource survey; their research suggests low probability of identifying previously unrecorded Native American archaeological sites, and a high possibility of encountering historic-period cultural resources. Areas identified on historic maps provided by the information center (a road and two structures) were spot checked. Complete survey was conducted along the ridge-top where level terrain and vegetation cover allowed systematic survey. Pre-field and information center research identified areas with high-probability to contain Native American archaeological sites in this region occur in coastal low-lands, near water sources, in mountain valleys and on mid-slope benches; because the project area’s steep and heavily vegetated ridgeline slopes contain low probability for archaeological resources, they were intuitively surveyed.
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Survey Methods Sections, cont.

- **Survey Intensity:**
  - Describe Transect spacing

- **Ground Visibility**
  - Ground visibility & other limiting factors
  - Discuss efforts made to locate sites (e.g., boot scrapes, road cuts, creek banks, rodent/ant disturbance, etc)

- **Other Relevant Information:**
  - Explain any excluded areas
  - Previous land use (e.g., agriculture)
  - Previous impacts (e.g., disking, fire)
  - Any other information you used to make survey decisions
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Survey Methods Sections, cont.

**Time spent conducting archaeological field survey:** 2 days.

**Date or Dates the survey was conducted:** Velasquez (3/6/12; 3/29/12; 4/3/12); Barr (3/6/12 & 4/3/12); Katay (4/3/12)

**Survey coverage intensity:** 15 meter transect spacing along all control line locations. Trending ridgelines and water confluences intuitively inspected.

**Ground visibility/other limitations:** Interior of project area fairly overgrown with chest-high grasses and thick thistle in spots; slopes and ridges have more brush and less grass cover, ground visibility improves slightly in these areas. Visibility estimated <50% in interior, grassy areas and ~75% on slopes and ridgelines.

**Other relevant information:** The southeast corner of project area has been graded and mowed continuously throughout the years, and is heavily impacted by these activities. The area is also within a historic rancho and eventual ranching operation, areas along the tributary creek appear altered for ranching and irrigation purposes. An extensive water conveyance system involving buried pipes and standpipes spreads throughout the project area. Project area experiences frequent fire activity.

**Survey coverage intensity:** ~50% coverage – transect spacing 10-meters along ridgeline; steep, heavily vegetated slopes were not walked and were intuitively surveyed instead.

**Ground visibility/other limitations:** Dense shrub growth and steep slopes inhibits access to slopes along the ridge. Visibility and access was good along the ridgeline.

**Other relevant information:** Mechanized mastication will occur along the ridgeline where complete survey was accomplished; equipment cannot operate on steep slopes, therefore areas undergoing intuitive survey will likely be hand-treated.
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Survey Results Sections (ALL)

Part 7: Survey Results

List and description of all sites found:

- No sites found within the site survey area.
- The following sites have been recorded and completed records are attached.
- The following sites were previously recorded, updates not prepared (attach copy(ies)).
- The following sites were previously recorded, updates prepared (attach copy(ies)).
- The following sites will not be recorded, justification provided below.

Part 11: Site Recording

List and description of all sites found:

- No sites found within the site survey area.
- The following sites have been recorded and completed records are attached.
- The following sites were previously recorded, updates not prepared (attach copy(ies)).
- The following sites were previously recorded, updates prepared (attach copy(ies)).
- The following sites will not be recorded, justification provided below.
8. Site Recording

a. □ Yes □ No Were archaeological or historical sites found in the site survey area? If yes, then address (i)-(iv):

i. □ The following sites were recorded and completed records are attached: Click or tap here to enter text.

ii. □ The following sites were previously recorded, updates not prepared and copies are attached: Click or tap here to enter text.

iii. □ The following sites were previously recorded, updates prepared and records are attached: Click or tap here to enter text.

iv. The following sites will not be recorded based on the included justification: Click or tap here to enter text.
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Survey Results Sections, cont.

- Type
- Size
- Condition
- Description
Site 1: is a prehistoric resource procurement and processing site encompassing an approximately 300 x 500 meter area. The assemblage contains lithic tools (scrapers and bifaces) anddebitage derived from obsidian, chert and rhyolite; milling implements, including handstone fragments, metate fragments and possible slicks, are also documented on site. The site is in an area subjected to generations of cattle grazing and land alteration, but generally is in fair condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource ID</th>
<th>Associated Unit</th>
<th>Location to Unit</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-7480</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Historic complex containing capped well, pipes, concrete windmill pad, concrete septic tank, metal tanks and concrete slab foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-008-L1</td>
<td>Units 1 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>600 feet</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The resource is a dirt road currently utilized by Preserve staff. The road appears on the 1901 Elsinore 30' Topographic Map, and likely leads to a windmill complex in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Evaluation of Significance**

☐ Yes  ☐ No Will the identified archaeological or historical sites in the site survey area be protected from damaging effects of timber operations?

If **no**, then the preliminary determination of significance for each site, based on the criteria for a significant archaeological or historical site in 14 CCR § 895.1, is: Click or tap here to enter text.

7. **Protection Measures**

Specific enforceable protection measures to be implemented both within the site boundaries and within 100 feet of the site boundaries for each identified archaeological and historical site are: Click or tap here to enter text.
Part 10: Implementation of Protection Measures

Discuss actions taken to carry out protection measures:

Part 10: Meeting with the Licensed Timber Operator (LTO)

Meeting with LTO:

() Since there are no archaeological or historical sites requiring protection, no meeting is required.

() Meeting between RPF or supervised designee familiar with on-site conditions and LTO will be conducted prior to start of timber operations.

() Meeting between RPF or supervised designee familiar with on-site conditions and LTO has been conducted (provide details):

() This RPF or supervised designee will not be meeting with the LTO. Provide information demonstrating compliance with 14 CCR Section 929.2 [949.2, 969.2] (c):
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Other Information & Attachments (ASR/CAA)

Part 12: Other Applicable Information

Additional Information:

Part 13: List of Attachments

- Archaeological Records Check Request
- Archaeological Records Check Request Map
- Information Center Reply
- Example of Notice(s) to Native Americans:
- USFS or other Agency Correspondence:
- Other:
- Archaeological Coverage Map (1:1 scale of USGS 7.5’ quad)
- Additional Archaeological coverage map(s)
- Project Vicinity Map
- Written Reply from Native Americans
- Site Records
- Photographs

Part 11: Other Applicable Information

Additional Information:

Part 12: List of Attachments

- Archaeological Records Check Request
- Archaeological Records Check Request Map
- Information Center Reply
- Example of Notice(s) to Native Americans:
- USFS or other Agency Correspondence:
- Other:
- Archaeological Coverage Map (1:1 scale of USGS 7.5’ quad)
- Additional Archaeological coverage map(s)
- Project Vicinity Map
- Written Reply from Native Americans
- Site Records
- Photographs
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Project Maps (ALL)

- North arrow, scale, project boundary, site survey area, location of all cultural resources
- Must be on 7.5’ USGS Quadrangle, 1:1 scale
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Project Maps, cont.

- Identify survey coverage
Preparing Archaeological Survey Reports: Resources

**Archaeological Review Procedures for CAL FIRE Projects**
Available @ http://calfire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/archaeology-resources

**Instructions for completing a Confidential Archaeological Addendum (CAA)**
available @ http://calfire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/archaeology-survey_forms