A
PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY
FOR
APNS 3150-021-019, -020, -022, -023, -024, -025, and -026,
40th STREET EAST AND LANCASTER BOULEVARD,
CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA

Submitted to:
Royal Investors Group, LLC
15821 Ventura Blvd., Suite 460
Encino, California 91436

Keywords:
Lancaster East 7.5' Quadrangle, City of Lancaster,
California Environmental Quality Act

Submitted by:
Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates
1405 Sutter Lane
Bakersfield, California 93309

Author:
Scott M. Hudlow

August 2020

Management Summary

At the request of Royal Investor's Group, a Phase I Cultural Resource Survey was conducted on approximately forty acres, APNs 3150-021-019, -020, -022, -023, -024, -025, and -026. The property lies at the northwest corner at 40th Street East and Lancaster Boulevard in the City of Lancaster, California. The Phase I Cultural Resource Survey consisted of a pedestrian survey of the forty-acre site and a cultural resource record search.

Three cultural resources were identified. R-1, R-2, and R-3. R-1 is a sump/pond directly at the northwest corner of 40th Street East and Lancaster Boulevard. R-2 is the remains of an agricultural water system. This largely underground concrete waterline system runs in both north/south and east/west directions. Aboveground standpipes are also present. The underground waterlines were identified running along parcel lines, which were probably earlier field boundaries. R-3 is a small homestead on the western edge of the parcel. None of these historic resources are eligible for nomination to the California Register of Historic Resources under Criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4. R-1, R-2, and R-3 are not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. Criterion 1 does not apply. R-1, R-2, and R-3 are not associated with the lives of persons important to local, California history. Criteria 2 does not apply. R-1, R-2, and R-3 do not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values. Criteria 3 does not apply. Last, R-1, R-2, and R-3 will not yield, or does not have the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area or California. Criteria 4 does not apply.

No further work is required. If archaeological resources are encountered during the course of construction, a qualified archaeologist should be consulted for further evaluation.

If human remains or potential human remains are observed during construction, work in the vicinity of the remains will cease, and they will be treated in accordance with the provisions of State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. The protection of human remains follows California Public Resources Codes, Sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

1.0 Introduction

At the request of Royal Investor's Group, *Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates* conducted a Phase I Cultural Resource Survey on forty acres, APNs 3150-021-019, -020, -022, -023, -024, -025, and -026. The property lies at the northwest corner of 40th Street East and Lancaster Boulevard, City of Lancaster, California. This project is being undertaken in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) with the City of Lancaster responsible as Lead Agency to implement CEQA. The Phase I Cultural Resource Survey consisted of a pedestrian survey and a cultural resource record search.

2.0 Survey Location

The project area is in the City of Lancaster. The parcel is the SE ¼ of the NE ¼ of Section 17, T.7N., R.11W., San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian, as displayed on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Lancaster East 7.5-minute quadrangle map at the northwest corner of 40th Street East and Lancaster Boulevard, City of Lancaster, California (Figure 1).

3.0 Record Search

A record search of the project area and the environs within one-half mile was conducted at the South Central Coast Information Center. Information Center staff conducted the record search on August 26 2020 (Appendix II). The record search revealed that fourteen cultural resource surveys have been conducted within one-half mile radius of the project area, including two (CRM Tech 2006 and Hudlow 2004), which previously addressed the current project area. The CRM Tech report did not include fieldwork; it is solely a literature review. Ten cultural resources have been recorded within one half-mile of the current project area, four of these sites are prehistoric and six are historic. Four of these ten sites are located within the current project area, two are historic isolates and two are prehistoric isolates. None of these four isolates were re-identified. The remaining six sites are four historic sites, including one adjacent historic homestead that has been recorded as outside the project area, but is related to the current project area. The other three are historic homesteads, and the two prehistoric sites are a lithic scatter and an isolated flake.

4.0 Environmental Background

The project area is found northwest of the Little Rock Wash and south of the Rosamond Hills in the Antelope Valley portion of the western Mojave Desert. the project area is found at elevations between 2398 and 2405 feet above mean sea level. The project area was found within a saltbush scrub environmental zone; however, the parcel has been farmed with row crops. It is now covered with a succession of weeds.



Figure 1
Project Area Location Map

5.0 Prehistoric Archaeological Context

A generally accepted prehistoric cultural chronology for the western Mojave Desert region has yet to be developed, partially because sparse local chronometric data is available to use as a foundation. Consequently, most proposed local culture histories have been borrowed from other regions, with minor modifications based on sparse local data. The most common pattern is the tripartite Early/Middle/ Late sequence familiar in Californian culture history, often with the addition of a Post-Contact (Norwood 1987) or Protohistoric Period (Sutton 1988). The differences between the sequences are mainly in the inclusion of various horizons, technologies, or stages. The following chronology is based on Claude Warren's Lake Mojave, Pinto, Gypsum, Saratoga Springs, and Protohistoric Periods, which is partially based on time-sensitive projectile points and shell bead sequences (Warren 1984; Warren and Crabtree 1986).

Lake Mojave Period - ca. 10,000-5,000 B.C.

Most Lake Mojave Period sites within the northern Mojave Desert and southwestern Great Basin are early Holocene lakeshore occupations. Sutton stated that the subsistence strategy during this period was presumably one of hunting and utilization of lacustrine resources (Sutton 1988:30). The best examples of sites from this period are associated with the shoreline of Pleistocene Lake Mojave (Campbell *et al.* 1937). Artifacts include percussion-flaked foliate points and knives, Lake Mojave and Silver Lake projectile points, and an unspecialized tool kit of scrapers, gravers, and perforating tools.

Pinto Period - ca. 5,000-2,000 B.C.

Some scholars have interpreted the association of Pinto Basin sites and a now extinct riverbed as indicative of occupation during a time of abundant moisture (Campbell and Campbell 1935). Settlement patterns appear to be associated with ephemeral lakes and now-dry streams and springs (Warren 1984). Though the Pinto Period is roughly concurrent with the Altithermal climatic event, (a time when human populations were supposedly reduced in size and more widely dispersed due to the desiccation of wetter habitats), the occurrence of a milder, wetter, Little Pluvial period within the Altithermal has been noted by several archaeologists (Moratto 1984:546). The extent to which the Little Pluvial climatic period may coincide with Pinto Period sites is unknown.

To date, at least seventeen Pinto points and six Pinto Period sites have been recorded in the vicinity (Campbell 1994a). Norwood (1987:104) noted that the lowland areas in the northern portions of adjacent Edwards Air Force Base (AFB) contain evidence of substantial occupations which may date to the Pinto Period; such a conclusion would contradict the hypothesis of a small, dispersed population distribution at this time. Recent evaluation of a Lake Mojave/Pinto

Period site at Phillips Laboratory supports Norwood's observation about substantial occupations (Campbell 1994b).

Gypsum Period - ca. 2000 B.C.-A.D. 500

During the Gypsum Period, evidence of a millingstone culture becomes much more common. The mortar and pestle were probably introduced during this period (Wallace 1955:222-223; Warren 1984:4163). Wallace noted evidence of expanded subsistence activities where late period peoples around Mesquite Flat were believed to have extended their food-collecting activities into the surrounding mountains (Wallace 1977:121).

A gradual transition from the use of large dart points to smaller projectile points associated with use of the bow and arrow occurred toward the end of the Gypsum Period. Approximately A.D. 500, the bow and arrow essentially replaced the atlatl (a device used for throwing spears or darts that consists of a rod with a hook at the rear end to hold the projectile in place until release) (Warren 1984:415). Shutler postulated that Anasazi ceramics were initially introduced into the eastern Mojave at about the same time (Shutler *et al* 1961). Diagnostic projectile points associated with the Gypsum Period include the Humboldt, Gypsum Cave, Elko Eared, and Elko Corner-notched types (Warren 1984:414-415). Other temporal designations, which may be correlated with Warren's Gypsum Period, include the Early and Middle Rose Spring Periods (Lanning 1963; Clewlow *et al.* 1970) and the Newberry Period (Bettinger and Taylor 1974).

The scant published literature reports relatively little local evidence of Gypsum material (Robinson 1977:45; Sutton 1988:38). Norwood (1987:101-104) however, notes several isolated examples of projectile points from this period at Edwards AFB. A study of projectile points in the Base Historic Preservation Officer's database has identified ten Humboldt points, four Elko Corner-notched points, one Elko Side-notched point, five undifferentiated Elko points, and three Gypsum Cave points (Campbell 1994a). If isolated points are eliminated from the sample, the remaining 17 points from the Gypsum Period come from 16 sites. Radiocarbon data identifies another five Antelope Valley sites (LAN-82, LAN-192, KER-303, KER-526, and KER-533) with materials that fall within the Gypsum Period. Hydration readings suggest the possibility that a number of additional Gypsum Period sites are present. Therefore, a Gypsum presence in the area is well represented.

Saratoga Springs Period - ca. A.D. 500-1200

The Saratoga Springs Period is marked by what appears to be the establishment of large villages, or village complexes. This reflects a transition from the previous seasonal transhumance pattern into one of semi-, or fully-sedentary occupation within the Antelope Valley (Sutton 1988).

This period also marks the beginning of the Shoshonean period, named for the Shoshonean peoples who occupied the Western Mojave Desert during this period (Robinson 1977). The Numic and Takic Shoshonean groups were expanding during this period. Both groups made use of a millingstone technology-- other aspects of their material culture include marine shell, bone, and perishable artifacts. Takic sociopolitical organizations differ from those of Northern Numic groups. The Kitanemuk (a Takic group) are reported as having well developed social ranking and prestige systems (Blackburn and Bean 1978). Grover Krantz postulated that the Takic expansion to the south was stimulated by Northern groups who "...overran their neighbors for a considerable distance to the south" (Krantz 1978:64) in order to obtain acorn resources. This migration occurred at about 2000 B.P. (Sutton 1988:40).

Time-sensitive projectile points from this period include the Rose Spring, Cottonwood, and Desert Side-Notched series. It has been argued that assemblages with Cottonwood points and no Desert Side-Notched points represent an earlier occupation than sites with both Cottonwood and Desert Side-notched points, and that the earlier occupation is associated with the Hakataya influence from the Southwest (Warren 1984:423-424; Warren and Crabtree 1986:191). In the western Mojave Desert, diagnostic materials from this period include various types or examples of poorly understood brownware pottery and desert side notch series projectile points (Warren and Crabtree 1986:191). The use of pottery in the Antelope Valley is currently poorly understood.

A current local projectile point database includes four complete Rose Spring points and three projectile point fragments identified as Rose Spring. These seven items were recovered from six sites (CA-KER-562, CA-KER-672, CA-KER-1171, CA-KER-2533, CA-KER-2817, and CA-LAN-828). Twenty-five complete points and twenty-seven point fragments recovered from twenty sites represent the Cottonwood series of projectile points (Campbell 1994a). One complete Desert Side-notched point and three fragments identified as Desert Side-notched have been recovered from four sites (CA-KER-672, CA-KER-1180, CA-KER-2025, and CA-LAN-769).

Protohistoric Period- ca. A.D. 1200-Historic

Warren used the term "Protohistoric" to describe the period, which reflects a transition from the prehistoric to historic eras (Warren 1984). However, Arkush, noting this term has distinct cultural implications, argued this time is more properly designated the "Late Archaic," while many archaeologists colloquially call this period the "Late Prehistoric" (Arkush 1990:29). This period is also termed the "Shoshonean" Period (Warren 1984; Warren and Crabtree 1986), potentially clouding the culture history sequence by adding a name, which has cultural and linguistic meanings when describing modern groups. Whatever its name, the period markers are considered to be Desert Side-notched arrow points "...and

various poorly defined types of brownware pottery including Owens Valley Brownware" (Warren and Crabtree 1986:191).

This period reflects a continuation of cultural developments established during the previous period, but with adaptive modifications. Trade along the Mojave River likely affected the people of the Eastern Antelope Valley, allowing active groups to acquire considerable amounts of wealth. Socioeconomic and sociopolitical organizations continued to increase in complexity. However, most Antelope Valley groups appear to have developed stronger ties with coastal groups rather than those of the eastern desert and Great Basin (Warren 1984:426). By approximately A.D. 1300, the Hakataya expansion reached its western extreme. Warren (1984) interprets the paucity of ceramic ware in Antelope Valley village sites as evidence that Hakatayan influence upon local groups was minimal.

6.0 Ethnographic Background

The "Contact" period is difficult to define in theory and to detect in practice. The earliest contact between the native populations of the New and Old Worlds traditionally dates to Columbus' landfall. Native Americans felt the Europeans' impact (and later, the Euro-Americans) in a variety of ways, and direct, face-to-face contact was not necessary for their lives to be changed irrevocably. For example, trade items like guns, horses, metal, and cloth spread quickly, and were rapidly incorporated into the indigenous cultures; in many cases, trade with Europeans altered an entire culture or dramatically shifted power balances between groups. Diseases to which Native Americans had little or no resistance preceded the Euro-Americans to the furthest corners of the continent, decimating entire populations within months (Cook 1955). Specific types of osteological damage or mass burials can indicate the onset of Euro-American diseases. However, such evidence has been elusive. Thus, "contact" in North America is usually perceived by anthropologists not as a single point in time, but rather, as a period of centuries, the beginning and ending points of which are frustratingly vague and vary from region to region. Such population shifts rippled across the continent, exacerbated by the expansion of European and Euro-American settlements. Even word-of-mouth spread the news of alien people, goods, and events.

In the archaeological record, clear evidence of contact takes three forms: a mix of aboriginal and Euro-American artifacts, aboriginal-style artifacts made from Euro-American materials (e.g., glass projectile points or thimble tinklers), or European forms, designs, and motifs utilized in aboriginal crafts (i.e. basketry or pottery).

The term "Protohistoric" is also sometimes used in this context. Arkush (1990:29) defined this Protohistoric Period as "...a distinct span of time during which native cultures were modified by the introduction of Euro-American diseases, material, and/or practices prior to intensive, face-to-face contact with

whites." In fact, historical documents from explorers and others describe many tribes long before "intensive" contact occurred, and other groups experienced such contact without much, if any, historical documentation.

Just as the dates are hard to define, it is a challenge to determine which aboriginal groups inhabited the Antelope Valley, particularly the area, which is now Edwards AFB. Generally, people occupied core areas in the hills and mountains surrounding the valley and traveled into the desert to gather particular plants, or to escape mountain weather; consequently, the desert boundaries were neither strict nor firmly embedded in the "memory culture" of the ethnographic present. The peripatetic hunter-gatherers of the area do not seem to have been particularly territorial. According to Earle, Harrington's informants indicated "...that all of the clan groups of Serrano/Haminat speech affiliation north of Cajon Pass and east of Soledad Pass constituted a single ethnic domain," although differences in dialect, social organization, and material culture are present (Earle 1990:97).

To add to the ethnographic tangle, or perhaps causing some of it, the cultures of the Antelope Valley were severely impacted by repeated diasporas, a common tale in California: first, missionization under the Spanish; then transfer to "reserved" land under the Americans; then dispossession from the reservations as the land was converted (sometimes questionably) to claims by Euro-Americans under the Homestead Laws, and last, another removal to still more distant reservations or marginal land.

Each dislocation effectively removed the people further from the traditional patterns of the generations before, adding a new layer of custom and habit, creating a cultural mosaic by the time ethnographers arrived.

For these and a variety of other reasons, determining contact-period aboriginal territories on the Base may be a futile exercise, if not impossible. In fact, in the available ethnographic territorial information for the Antelope Valley, by far the vaguest data concerns an area almost exactly described by the boundaries of Edwards AFB.

In the following discussions, it should be kept firmly in mind that the "territories" are all somewhat arbitrary, descriptions from "memory culture," and different author's comments may be based on the same sources, giving a false impression of corroborating evidence. Generally, four groups occupied the western Mojave at the time of contact: Kitanemuk, Tataviam ("Alliklik"), Kawaiisu, and Vanyume ("Serrano"). Additionally, other groups, particularly the Mojave from the east, were known to pass through the area while trading with coastal groups. The Kawaiisu are known to have occasionally utilized portions of the Base (Cultural Systems Research 1980:190-191). Lowell Bean and Sylvia Brakke Vane speculated the Tataviam and Gabrielino may have also exploited resources found on the Base. It is also probable that Mojave and Quechan

groups, wide-ranging travelers and traders, utilized resources as they passed through the region (Cultural Systems Research 1980:191).

Kitanemuk and Tataviam

The Kitanemuk and the Tataviam occupied the western portion of the Antelope Valley, but no distinct line can be drawn between their lands. Kroeber's description of Tataviam (or, as he called them, "Alliklik") territory did not include the Antelope Valley, but clearly was centered on the nearby upper Santa Clara River in the mountains west of the valley (Kroeber 1925: 556). According to Kroeber, the Sawmill Mountains and adjacent Liebre Mountains at the western rim of the valley were the territory of the Kitanemuk. King and Blackburn rejected this division, agreeing that the Tataviam were centered on the southern-facing slopes of the Santa Clara River drainage, but arguing it was the Tataviam whose "...territory extended over the Sawmill Mountains to the north [of the Santa Clara River] to include at least the southwestern fringes of the Antelope Valley" and Lake Elizabeth (King and Blackburn 1978:535-536). Their map placed the Tataviam south of Pastoria Creek, midway up the western edge of the Antelope Valley.

Earle, however, compared Garcés diary, upon which most of the preceding discussions were based, against J. P. Harrington's unpublished notes. Earle determined that the "*Beñeme*" of whom Garcés wrote were Vanyume proper, not a generic name assigned by the Mojave to all local Indians. Such misinterpretations of Garcés' comments and place names resulted in the mis-assignment of the southwestern Antelope Valley to the Tataviam or Kitanemuk. Earle's conclusions seem stronger than earlier arguments, for they support a more straightforward reading of Garcés, agree with ethnographic testimony, and are consistent with the mission records.

Kawaiisu

Moving to the northern portion of the Antelope Valley, the Kawaiisu are generally agreed to have occupied the Sierra Nevada south of the Kern River fork (now Lake Isabella), and eastward for an unknown distance. Kroeber stated the Kawaiisu territory went to the boundaries of the "westernmost of the Chemehuevi [i.e., the Southern Paiute of California]" who "visited and owned" the northwestern corner of San Bernardino County--far north of Edwards AFB (Kroeber 1925:593, 594, 601).

On the other hand, Zigmond illustrated a far more limited range for the Kawaiisu, encompassing a "core area" from the northern edge of the Tehachapis to the fork of the Kern River (Zigmond 1986:398). Zigmond's map also indicates a seasonal range extending east just north of Rosamond Lake but dipping southeast to encompass Rogers Lake and the central portion of the Mojave River. This outline roughly agrees with the northeastern border of the Kitanemuk as defined by Blackburn and Bean. These boundaries should not be considered

mutually exclusive, however, as among the Kawaiisu, "...the concept of territory was weakly developed, and the idea of boundary was probably nonexistent…. The characteristic shifting about in relation to the seasons makes it impossible to devise a static map of land occupation" (Zigmond 1986:398)

Vanyume

The last group is the Vanyume, occasionally referred to as "Serrano" in the literature (Kroeber 1925; Bean and Smith 1978). Kroeber stated they were found as far east as Barstow, a statement which would preclude their presence in the Antelope Valley. However, King and Blackburn (1978:535) speculated that "the major portion of the Antelope Valley itself was probably held by Kitanemuk and Vanyume speakers." Further clouding the issue, Bean and Smith (1978:570), writing about the Vanyume in the same volume, state the language of the Vanyume cannot be identified. Bean and Smith did not fully depict the Vanyume territory in their map, omitting the northern and western portions, which may have included the Antelope Valley.

Earle correctly realized that the location of the Vanyume is the key to understanding the ethnogeography of the Antelope Valley. As previously mentioned, Harrington's notes revealed his Kitanemuk informants grouped the languages in the southern Antelope Valley and east to Cajon Pass under the name "Haminat." Dialect differences were noted and conform to the Kitanemuk, Serrano, and Vanyume "language" divisions of earlier research (Earle 1990: 98-99). This would indicate that an emphasis on determining (or despairing over) the ethnographic boundaries between these groups is wasted effort. A more productive approach, Earle argues, is an examination of the chiefs, clans and/or moieties, and *naciónes*, or intermediate sociopolitical groups, which seem to have been hierarchical and reflected in inter-village organization (Earle 1990:101).

7.0 Field Procedures and Methods

On July 10, 2020, Scott M. Hudlow (for qualifications see Appendix I) conducted a pedestrian survey of the entire project area. Hudlow surveyed in north/south transects at 15-meter (33 feet) intervals. All archaeological material more than fifty years of age or earlier encountered during the inventory would have been recorded.

8.0 Report of Findings

Three cultural resources were identified. R-1, R-2, and R-3. R-1 is a sump/pond directly at the northwest corner of 40th Street East and Lancaster Boulevard. The sump measures approximately 137' x 100'. It has an earthen berm, which is now overgrown with weeds (Figure 2).

R-2 is the remains of an agricultural water system. This largely underground concrete waterline system runs in both north/south and east/west

directions. Aboveground standpipes are also present (Figures 3 and 4). The underground waterlines were identified running along parcel lines, which were probably earlier field boundaries. The waterlines are concrete. These concrete waterlines fit end to end. Underground water storage is also possibly present within the water system.

R-3 is the remains of a small homestead on the western edge of the parcel. The homestead is primarily a concrete block that has been heavily tagged with graffiti (Figure 5). Fence posts, a set of wooden steps, and a large underground cistern are also present (Figure 6). Although, some architectural remains, including wall boards, are presents, the outlines of the homestead are difficult to discern. No intact foundation or roofing elements are present to assist with understanding the nature of this small homestead. A smattering of domestic artifacts, including both food cans and bottles, are present, which suggest that the homestead dates to the 1930s. Most of the artifacts are broken and disintegrated, except a few intact bottles (Figure 7).

Figure 2
Site R-1, Sump/Pond, View to the North

Figure 3
Site R-2, Agricultural Water System, View to the North

Figure 4
Site R-2, Agricultural Water System, View to the West

Figure 5
Site R-3, Homestead Remains, View to the West

Figure 6
Site R-3, Underground Cistern

Figure 7
Site R-3, Intact Sample Bottle

9.0 Management Recommendations

At the request of Royal Investor's Group, a Phase I Cultural Resource Survey was conducted on approximately forty acres, APNs 3150-021-019, -020, -022, -023, -024, -025, and -026. The property lies at the northwest corner at 40th Street East and Lancaster Boulevard in the City of Lancaster, California. The Phase I Cultural Resource Survey consisted of a pedestrian survey of the forty-acre site and a cultural resource record search.

Three cultural resources were identified. R-1, R-2, and R-3. R-1 is a sump/pond directly at the northwest corner of 40th Street East and Lancaster Boulevard. R-2 is the remains of an agricultural water system. This largely underground concrete waterline system runs in both north/south and east/west directions. Aboveground standpipes are also present. The underground waterlines were identified running along parcel lines, which were probably earlier field boundaries. R-3 is a small homestead on the western edge of the parcel. None of these historic resources are eligible for nomination to the California Register of Historic Resources under Criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4. R-1, R-2, and R-3 are not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. Criterion 1 does not apply. R-1, R-2, and R-3 are not associated with the lives of persons important to local, California history. Criteria 2 does not apply. R-1, R-2, and R-3 do not embody the distinctive characteristics

of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values. Criteria 3 does not apply. Last, R-1, R-2, and R-3 will not yield, or does not have the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area or California. Criteria 4 does not apply.

No further work is required. If archaeological resources are encountered during the course of construction, a qualified archaeologist should be consulted for further evaluation.

If human remains or potential human remains are observed during construction, work in the vicinity of the remains will cease, and they will be treated in accordance with the provisions of State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. The protection of human remains follows California Public Resources Codes, Sections 5097.94, 5097.98, and 5097.99.

10.0 References

Arkush, Brooke S.
1990 "The Protohistoric Period in the Western Great Basin." *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 12(1): 28-36.

Bean, Lowell John and Charles R. Smith
1978 "Serrano." In *The Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California*, Robert F. Heizer, ed. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., pp. 570-574.

Bettinger, Robert L., and R. E. Taylor
1974 "Suggested Revisions in Archaeological Sequences of the Great Basin in Interior Southern California". *Nevada Archaeological Survey Research Papers* 5: 1-26.

Blackburn, Thomas C., and Lowell John Bean
1978 "Kitanemuk." In *The Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California*, Robert F. Heizer, ed. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., pp. 564-569.

Campbell, E. W. C., and W. H. Campbell
1935 "The Pinto Basin site: An ancient aboriginal camping ground in the California desert," Los Angeles: *Southwest Museum Papers* 9: 1-56.

Campbell, E. W. C., W. H. Campbell, E. Antevs, C. E. Amsden, J. A. Barbieri, F. D. Bode
1937 "The Archaeology of Pleistocene Lake Mojave," Los Angeles: *Southwest Museum Papers* pp. 11.

Campbell, Mark M.

1994a "Toward a Lithic Hermeneutic" 1994 Great Basin Anthropological Association Meeting, Elko, Nevada. Unpublished manuscript in possession of the author.

1994b *Cultural Resource Evaluation for the Emplacement of an Underground Gas Transmission Line to Boron from the Phillips Laboratory Edwards AFB, Kern County, California*. Report on file, AFFTC/EM, Edwards AFB, California.

Clewlow, C. W., Jr., Robert F. Heizer, and R. Berger

1970 "An assessment of radiocarbon dates for the Rose Spring site (CA-Iny-372), Inyo County, California." Berkeley: *Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility* 7: 19-25.

Cook, Sherburne F.

1955 "The Epidemic of 1830-1833 in California and Oregon." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 43(3):303-326.

CRM Tech

2006 *Cultural Resource Technical Report, City of Lancaster, General Plan Update*. Report on file, South Central Coastal Information Center, CSU Fullerton, Fullerton, California.

Cultural Systems Research, Inc.

1980 "Cultural Resources Narrative - Ethnography," in *Cultural Resources Overview for Edwards Air Force Base, Vol. I*. By Roberta S. Greenwood and Michael J. McIntyre. Report on file, AFFTC/EM, Edwards AFB, California, pp. 187-215.

Earle, David D.

1990 "New Evidence on the Political Geography of the Antelope Valley and the Western Mojave Desert at Spanish Contact." In *Archaeology and Ethnohistory of the Antelope Valley and Vicinity. Antelope Valley Occasional Papers No. 2* Bruce Love and William H. DeWitt, editors, pp. 87-104. Lancaster, California.

Hudlow, Scott M.

2004 *A Phase I Cultural Resource Survey for Property at 35th East and Lancaster Boulevard, City of Lancaster, California.* Report on file, South Central Coastal Information Center, CSU Fullerton, Fullerton, California.

King, Chester D., and Thomas C. Blackburn,

1978 "Tataviam." in *The Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California*, Robert F. Heizer, ed. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., pp. 535-537.

Krantz, Grover S.
1978 "Reply." In: *Method and Theory in California Archaeology*, Gary S. Breschini, ed. *Occasional Papers of the Society for California Archaeology* 2, pp. 62-64.

Kroeber, Alfred L.
1925 "Handbook of the Indians of California." *Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 78. [Reprinted 1976, New York, New York, Dover Publications.]

Lanning, Edward P.
1963 *Archaeology of the Rose Spring Site, INY-372*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 49(3): 237-336.

Moratto, Michael J.
1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, Florida.

Norwood, Richard H.
1987 "Prehistoric Archaeology at Edwards Air Force Base, California." In: *Prehistory of the Antelope Valley, California: An Overview*, R. W. Robinson, ed. *Antelope Valley Archaeological Society Occasional Paper* No. 1, pp. 91-106.

Robinson, Roger W.
1977 "The Prehistory of the Antelope Valley, California: An Overview." *Kern County Archaeological Society Journal* 1: 43-48.

Shutler, R., Jr., M. E. Shutler, and J. S. Griffith
1961 "Lost City, Pueblo Grande de Nevada." Carson City: *Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers 5*.

Sutton, Mark Q.
1988 "An Introduction to the Archaeology of the Western Mojave Desert, California." Salinas: *Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory* 14.

Wallace, W.
1955 "A suggested chronology for southern California coastal archaeology." Albuquerque: *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11: 214-230.

1977 *Death Valley National Monuments' prehistoric past: An Archaeological Overview*. Report on file, National Park Service, Western Archaeological Center, Tucson, Arizona.

Warren, Claude N.
1984 "The Desert Region." In *California Archaeology,* by Michael J. Moratto. Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, Florida, pp. 339-430.

Warren, Claude N., and Robert H. Crabtree
1986 "Prehistory of the Southwestern Area." In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 11, Great Basin. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., pp. 183-193.

Zigmond, Maurice L.
1986 "Kawaiisu," in *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 11, Great Basin*. Warren L. D'Azevedo, ed. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., pp. 398-411.

Appendix I

Scott M. Hudlow
1405 Sutter Lane
Bakersfield, California 93309
(661) 834-9183

Education

The George Washington University
M.A. American Studies, 1993
Specialization in Historical Archaeology
and Architectural History

University of California, Berkeley
B.A. History, 1987
B.A. Anthropology, 1987
Specialization in Historical Archaeology
and Colonial History

Public Service

3/94-12/02 *Historic Preservation Commission*. City of Bakersfield, Bakersfield, California 93305.

7/97-12/01 *Newsletter Editor. California History Action,* newsletter for the California Council for the Promotion of History.

Relevant Work Experience

8/96- *Adjutant Faculty*. Bakersfield College, 1801 Panorama Drive, Bakersfield, California, 93305. Teach History 17A, Introduction to American History and Anthropology 5, Introduction to North American Indians.

Owner, Sole Proprietorship. Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates. 1405 Sutter Lane, Bakersfield California 93309. Operate small cultural resource management business. Manage contracts, respond to RFP's, bill clients, manage temporary employees. Conduct Phase I archaeological and architectural surveys for private and public clients; including the cultural resource survey, documentary photography, measured drawings, mapping of structures, filing of survey forms, historic research, assessing impact and writing reports. Evaluated archaeological and architectural sites and properties in lieu of their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places in association with Section 106 and 110 requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act).

Full resume available upon request.

Appendix II

South Central Coastal Information Center
California State University, Fullerton
Department of Anthropology MH-426
800 North State College Boulevard
Fullerton, CA 92834-6846
657.278.5395 / FAX 657.278.5542
sccic@fullerton.edu
California Historical Resources Information System
Orange, Los Angeles, and Ventura Counties

8/26/2020 Records Search File No.: 21547.7618

Scott Hudlow
Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates
1405 Sutter Lane
Bakersfield, CA 93309

Re: Record Search Results for Royal, 40th Street East and Lancaster Boulevard

The South Central Coastal Information Center received your records search request for the project area referenced above, located on the Lancaster East, CA USGS 7.5' quadrangle. Due to the COVID-19 emergency, we have implemented new records search protocols, which limits the deliverables available to you at this time. Please see the attached document on COVID-19 Emergency Protocols for what data is available. If your selections on your data request form are in conflict with this document, we reserve the right to send you what we state on the document. You may receive more than you asked for or less than you wanted. The following reflects the results of the records search for the project area and a ½-mile radius:

As indicated on the data request form, the locations of resources and reports are provided in the following format: ☒ custom GIS maps ☐ shape files ☐ hand-drawn maps

Resources within project area: 4	P-19-100498, P-19-100499, P-19-100500, P-19-100501
Resources within ½-mile radius: 6	SEE ATTACHED MAP or LIST
Reports within project area: 2	LA-07991, LA-08378
Reports within ½-mile radius: 12	SEE ATTACHED MAP or LIST

Resource Database Printout (list):	☒ enclosed	☐ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Resource Database Printout (details):	☐ enclosed	☒ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Resource Digital Database (spreadsheet):	☐ enclosed	☒ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Report Database Printout (list):	☒ enclosed	☐ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Report Database Printout (details):	☐ enclosed	☒ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Report Digital Database (spreadsheet):	☐ enclosed	☒ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Resource Record Copies:	☒ enclosed	☐ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Report Copies:	☐ enclosed	☒ not requested	☐ nothing listed

OHP Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD) 2019: ☒ available online; please go to https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=30338

Archaeo Determinations of Eligibility 2012:	☐ enclosed	☒ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments	☐ enclosed	☒ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Historical Maps:	☐ enclosed	☒ not requested	☐ nothing listed
Ethnographic Information:	☒ not available at SCCIC		
Historical Literature:	☒ not available at SCCIC		
GLO and/or Rancho Plat Maps:	☒ not available at SCCIC		
Caltrans Bridge Survey:	☒ not available at SCCIC; please go to http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/structur/strmaint/historic.htm		
Shipwreck Inventory:	☒ not available at SCCIC; please go to http://shipwrecks.slc.ca.gov/ShipwrecksDatabase/Shipwrecks_Database.asp		
Soil Survey Maps: (see below)	☒ not available at SCCIC; please go to http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx		

Please forward a copy of any resulting reports from this project to the office as soon as possible. Due to the sensitive nature of archaeological site location data, we ask that you do not include resource location maps and resource location descriptions in your report if the report is for public distribution. If you have any questions regarding the results presented herein, please contact the office at the phone number listed above.

The provision of CHRIS Data via this records search response does not in any way constitute public disclosure of records otherwise exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act or any other law, including, but not limited to, records related to archeological site information maintained by or on behalf of, or in the possession of, the State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic Preservation, or the State Historical Resources Commission.

Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area. Additionally, Native American tribes have historical resource information not in the CHRIS Inventory, and you should contact the California Native American Heritage Commission for information on local/regional tribal contacts.

Should you require any additional information for the above referenced project, reference the record search number listed above when making inquiries. Requests made after initial invoicing will result in the preparation of a separate invoice.

Thank you for using the California Historical Resources Information System,

Isabela Kott

Digitally signed by Isabela Kott
Date: 2020.08.26 10:31:12 -07'00'

Isabela Kott
GIS Technician/Staff Researcher