

A PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY FOR THE HARLEY KNOX 2021 PROJECT

220-280 EAST NANCE STREET
PERRIS, CALIFORNIA 92571

APNs 302-100-020, -030, and -031

Submitted to:

City of Perris
Planning and Development
135 North D Street
Perris, California 92570

Prepared for:

Proficiency Capital, LLC
11777 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 780
Los Angeles, California 90049

Prepared by:

Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
14010 Poway Road, Suite A
Poway, California 92064



June 10, 2021

Archaeological Database Information

Authors: Brian F. Smith, M.A., Elena C. Goralogia, B.A., and Andrew J. Garrison, M.A.

Consulting Firm: Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
14010 Poway Road, Suite A
Poway, California 92064
(858) 679-8218

Report Date: June 10, 2021

Report Title: A Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the Harley Knox 2021 Project, 220-280 East Nance Street, Perris, California 92571

Prepared for: Proficiency Capital, LLC
11777 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 780
Los Angeles, California 90049

Submitted to: City of Perris
Planning and Development
135 North D Street
Perris, California 92570

Submitted by: Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
14010 Poway Road, Suite A
Poway, California 92064

Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 302-100-020, -030, and -031

USGS Quadrangle: *Perris, California* (7.5-minute)

Study Area: 6.4 acres and approximately 1,300 linear feet of new off-site storm drain

Key Words: USGS *Perris* Quadrangle (7.5-minute); archaeological survey; negative; monitoring not recommended.

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	1
II. SETTING	1
<i>Natural Environment</i>	1
<i>Cultural Setting – Archaeological Perspectives</i>	4
<i>Introduction</i>	5
<i>Paleo Indian Period (Late Pleistocene: 11,500 to circa 9,000 YBP)</i>	5
<i>Archaic Period (Early and Middle Holocene: circa 9,000 to 1,300 YBP)</i>	6
<i>Late Prehistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1,300 YBP to 1790)</i>	8
<i>Protohistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1542 to circa 1769)</i>	9
<i>Ethnohistoric Period (1769 to Present)</i>	16
<i>A Brief History of the City of Perris</i>	19
<i>A Brief History of the Project Area</i>	21
III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	21
IV. SCOPE OF WORK	23
<i>Research Goals</i>	23
<i>Data Needs</i>	24
<i>Applicable Regulations</i>	24
<i>California Environmental Quality Act</i>	24
<i>Local Guidelines</i>	27
V. RESULTS OF THE STUDY	28
<i>Background Research and Results of Records Searches</i>	28
<i>Field Reconnaissance</i>	29
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS	32
VII. CERTIFICATION	33
VII. REFERENCES	33

Appendices

Appendix A – Resumes of Key Personnel

Appendix B – Archaeological Records Search Results*

Appendix C – NAHC Sacred Lands File Search Results*

**Deleted for public review and bound separately in the Confidential Appendix*

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
Figure 1	General Location Map	2
Figure 2	Project Location Map (USGS).....	3
Figure 3	Project Development Plan.....	22

List of Plates

<u>Plate</u>		<u>Page</u>
Plate 1	Overview of the project, facing southwest	30
Plate 2	Overview of the project, facing south.....	30
Plate 3	Overview of a modern foundation, facing south	31
Plate 4	Overview of a modern foundation, facing south	31

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
Table 1	Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within a One-Mile Radius of the Project.....	28

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to a requirement by the City of Perris, Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. (BFSA) conducted an archaeological survey of the Harley Knox 2021 Project located within the Perris Valley Commerce Center (PVCC) Specific Plan area. The project proposes the construction of an industrial warehouse on a 6.4-acre property at 220-280 East Nance Street, between Harley Knox Boulevard, Perris Boulevard, Nance Street, and Redlands Avenue in the city of Perris, Riverside County, California (Figure 1). Additionally, the project includes off-site road improvements to East Nance Street along the southern boundary of the project and approximately 1,300 linear feet of new storm drain to extend from the southern boundary of the project along East Nance Street to Redlands Avenue. The subject property (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs] 302-100-020, -030, and -031) is situated within Section 5, Township 4 South, Range 3 West on the USGS 7.5-minute *Perris, California* (Figure 2).

The archaeological survey was conducted on April 19, 2021 to determine if cultural resources exist within the subject property. The survey did not identify any cultural resources within the project. As part of this study, a copy of this report will be submitted to the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California at Riverside (UCR). All investigations conducted by BFSA related to this project conformed to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and City of Perris environmental guidelines, including the PVCC Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

II. SETTING

Natural Environment

The city of Perris is situated within the Peninsular Ranges Geologic Province of southern California. The range, which lies in a northwest to southeast trend through the county, extends around 1,000 miles from the Raymond-Malibu Fault Zone in western Los Angeles County to the southern tip of Baja California. The property is situated within the Perris Valley between the bedrock-laden foothills surrounding Lake Perris to the east and Mead Valley to the west. The subject property is generally flat with an average elevation ranging of 1,450 feet above mean sea level. The property is generally characterized as cleared vacant land that historically was utilized for agriculture.

Soils in the project are comprised of Domino silt loam, saline-alkali, and Grangeville sandy loam, drained, saline-alkali, 0 to 5 percent slopes (NRCS 2019). Geologically, the project is located on Holocene and late Pleistocene young alluvial valley deposits, which at depth, likely overlie older early Pleistocene very old alluvial fan deposits.

The Perris Valley originally contained perennial grasses that have primarily been replaced by non-native weeds and grasses. Although not found within the subject property, the Riversidian sage scrub plant community is the most prevalent native vegetation found in the region.




Figure 1
General Location Map
 The Harley Knox 2021 Project

DeLorme (1:250,000)






Figure 2
Project Location Map
 The Harley Knox 2021 Project
 USGS *Perris* Quadrangle (7.5-minute series)



The Riversidian sage scrub is primarily found within adjacent Lakeview Mountains and Bernasconi Hills and includes brittlebush, sagebrush, black sage, white sage, buckwheat, foxtails, and cacti. Mammals within the region include mule deer, coyote, bobcat, mountain lion, and ground squirrel; birds include hawks, eagles, owls, mourning dove, mockingbird, jay, heron, crow, finch, quail, and sparrow. During the prehistoric period, vegetation near the project area provided sufficient food resources to support prehistoric human occupants. Fresh water was likely obtainable on a year-round basis from local seasonal drainages and the San Jacinto River.

Cultural Setting – Archaeological Perspectives

The archaeological perspective seeks to reconstruct past cultures based upon the material remains left behind. This is done using a range of scientific methodologies, almost all of which draw from evolutionary theory as the base framework. Archaeology allows one to look deeper into history or prehistory to see where the beginnings of ideas manifest themselves via analysis of material culture, allowing for the understanding of outside forces that shape social change. Thus, the archaeological perspective allows one to better understand the consequences of the history of a given culture upon modern cultures. Archaeologists seek to understand the effects of past contexts of a given culture on this moment in time, not culture in context *in* the moment.

Despite this, a distinction exists between “emic” and “etic” ways of understanding material culture, prehistoric lifeways, and cultural phenomena in general (Harris 1991). While “emic” perspectives serve the subjective ways in which things are perceived and interpreted by the participants within a culture, “etic” perspectives are those of an outsider looking in hopes of attaining a more scientific or “objective” understanding of the given phenomena. Archaeologists, by definition, will almost always serve an etic perspective as a result of the very nature of their work. As indicated by Laylander et al. (2014), it has sometimes been suggested that etic understanding, and therefore an archaeological understanding, is an imperfect and potentially ethnocentric attempt to arrive at emic understanding. In contrast to this, however, an etic understanding of material culture, cultural phenomena, and prehistoric lifeways can address significant dimensions of culture that lie entirely beyond the understanding or interest of those solely utilizing an emic perspective. As Harris (1991:20) appropriately points out, “Etic studies often involve the measurement and juxtaposition of activities and events that native informants find inappropriate or meaningless.” This is also likely true of archaeological comparisons and juxtapositions of material culture. However, culture as a whole does not occur in a vacuum and is the result of several millennia of choices and consequences influencing everything from technology, to religions, to institutions. Archaeology allows for the ability to not only see what came before, but to see how those choices, changes, and consequences affect the present. Where possible, archaeology should seek to address both emic and etic understandings to the extent that they may be recoverable from the archaeological record as manifestations of patterned human behavior (Laylander et al. 2014).

To that point, the culture history offered herein is primarily based upon archaeological

(etic) and ethnographic (partially emic and partially etic) information. It is understood that the ethnographic record and early archaeological records were incompletely and imperfectly collected. In addition, in most cases, more than a century of intensive cultural change and cultural evolution had elapsed since the terminus of the prehistoric period. Coupled with the centuries and millennia of prehistoric change separating the “ethnographic present” from the prehistoric past, this has affected the emic and etic understandings of prehistoric cultural settings. Regardless, there remains a need to present the changing cultural setting within the region under investigation. As a result, both archaeological and Native American perspectives are offered when possible.

Introduction

Paleo Indian, Archaic Period Milling Stone Horizon, and the Late Prehistoric Takic groups are the three general cultural periods represented in Riverside County. The following discussion of the cultural history of Riverside County references the San Dieguito Complex, Encinitas Tradition, Milling Stone Horizon, La Jolla Complex, Pauma Complex, and San Luis Rey Complex, since these culture sequences have been used to describe archaeological manifestations in the region. The Late Prehistoric component present in the Riverside County area was primarily represented by the Cahuilla, Gabrielino, and Luiseño Indians.

Absolute chronological information, where possible, will be incorporated into this archaeological discussion to examine the effectiveness of continuing to interchangeably use these terms. Reference will be made to the geological framework that divides the archaeologically based culture chronology of the area into four segments: the late Pleistocene (20,000 to 10,000 years before the present [YBP]), the early Holocene (10,000 to 6,650 YBP), the middle Holocene (6,650 to 3,350 YBP), and the late Holocene (3,350 to 200 YBP).

Paleo Indian Period (Late Pleistocene: 11,500 to circa 9,000 YBP)

Archaeologically, the Paleo Indian Period is associated with the terminus of the late Pleistocene (12,000 to 10,000 YBP). The environment during the late Pleistocene was cool and moist, which allowed for glaciation in the mountains and the formation of deep, pluvial lakes in the deserts and basin lands (Moratto 1984). However, by the terminus of the late Pleistocene, the climate became warmer, which caused the glaciers to melt, sea levels to rise, greater coastal erosion, large lakes to recede and evaporate, extinction of Pleistocene megafauna, and major vegetation changes (Moratto 1984; Martin 1967, 1973; Fagan 1991). The coastal shoreline at 10,000 YBP, depending upon the particular area of the coast, was near the 30-meter isobath, or two to six kilometers further west than its present location (Masters 1983).

Paleo Indians were likely attracted to multiple habitat types, including mountains, marshlands, estuaries, and lakeshores. These people likely subsisted using a more generalized hunting, gathering, and collecting adaptation utilizing a variety of resources including birds, mollusks, and both large and small mammals (Erlandson and Colten 1991; Moratto 1984; Moss and Erlandson 1995).

Archaic Period (Early and Middle Holocene: circa 9,000 to 1,300 YBP)

Archaeological data indicates that between 9,000 and 8,000 YBP, a widespread complex was established in the southern California region, primarily along the coast (Warren and True 1961). This complex is locally known as the La Jolla Complex (Rogers 1939; Moriarty 1966), which is regionally associated with the Encinitas Tradition (Warren 1968) and shares cultural components with the widespread Milling Stone Horizon (Wallace 1955). The coastal expression of this complex appeared in southern California coastal areas and focused upon coastal resources and the development of deeply stratified shell middens that were primarily located around bays and lagoons. The older sites associated with this expression are located at Topanga Canyon, Newport Bay, Agua Hedionda Lagoon, and some of the Channel Islands. Radiocarbon dates from sites attributed to this complex span a period of over 7,000 years in this region, beginning over 9,000 YBP.

The Encinitas Tradition is best recognized for its pattern of large coastal sites characterized by shell middens, grinding tools that are closely associated with the marine resources of the area, cobble-based tools, and flexed human burials (Shumway et al. 1961; Smith and Moriarty 1985). While ground stone tools and scrapers are the most recognized tool types, coastal Encinitas Tradition sites also contain numerous utilized flakes, which may have been used to pry open shellfish. Artifact assemblages at coastal sites indicate a subsistence pattern focused upon shellfish collection and nearshore fishing. This suggests an incipient maritime adaptation with regional similarities to more northern sites of the same period (Koerper et al. 1986). Other artifacts associated with Encinitas Tradition sites include stone bowls, doughnut stones, discoidals, stone balls, and stone, bone, and shell beads.

The coastal lagoons in southern California supported large Milling Stone Horizon populations circa 6,000 YBP, as is shown by numerous radiocarbon dates from the many sites adjacent to the lagoons. The ensuing millennia were not stable environmentally, and by 3,000 YBP, many of the coastal sites in central San Diego County had been abandoned (Gallegos 1987, 1992). The abandonment of the area is usually attributed to the sedimentation of coastal lagoons and the resulting deterioration of fish and mollusk habitat, which is a well-documented situation at Batiquitos Lagoon (Miller 1966; Gallegos 1987). Over a two-thousand-year period at Batiquitos Lagoon, dominant mollusk species occurring in archaeological middens shift from deep-water mollusks (*Argopecten* sp.) to species tolerant of tidal flat conditions (*Chione* sp.), indicating water depth and temperature changes (Miller 1966; Gallegos 1987).

This situation likely occurred for other small drainages (Buena Vista, Agua Hedionda, San Marcos, and Escondido creeks) along the central San Diego coast where low flow rates did not produce sufficient discharge to flush the lagoons they fed (Buena Vista, Agua Hedionda, Batiquitos, and San Elijo lagoons) (Byrd 1998). Drainages along the northern and southern San Diego coastline were larger and flushed the coastal hydrological features they fed, keeping them open to the ocean and allowing for continued human exploitation (Byrd 1998). Peñasquitos Lagoon exhibits dates as late as 2,355 YBP (Smith and Moriarty 1985) and San Diego Bay showed

continuous occupation until the close of the Milling Stone Horizon (Gallegos and Kyle 1988). Additionally, data from several drainages in Camp Pendleton indicate a continued occupation of shell midden sites until the close of the period, indicating that coastal sites were not entirely abandoned during this time (Byrd 1998).

By 5,000 YBP, an inland expression of the La Jolla Complex is evident in the archaeological record, exhibiting influences from the Campbell Tradition from the north. These inland Milling Stone Horizon sites have been termed “Pauma Complex” (True 1958; Warren et al. 1961; Meighan 1954). By definition, Pauma Complex sites share a predominance of grinding implements (manos and metates), lack mollusk remains, have greater tool variety (including atlatl dart points, quarry-based tools, and crescentics), and seem to express a more sedentary lifestyle with a subsistence economy based upon the use of a broad variety of terrestrial resources. Although originally viewed as a separate culture from the coastal La Jolla Complex (True 1980), it appears that these inland sites may be part of a subsistence and settlement system utilized by the coastal peoples. Evidence from the 4S Project in inland San Diego County suggests that these inland sites may represent seasonal components within an annual subsistence round by La Jolla Complex populations (Raven-Jennings et al. 1996). Including both coastal and inland sites of this time period in discussions of the Encinitas Tradition, therefore, provides a more complete appraisal of the settlement and subsistence system exhibited by this cultural complex.

More recent work by Sutton has identified a more localized complex known as the Greven Knoll Complex. The Greven Knoll Complex is a redefined northern inland expression of the Encinitas Tradition first put forth by Mark Sutton and Jill Gardener (2010). Sutton and Gardener (2010:25) state that “[t]he early millingstone archaeological record in the northern portion of the interior southern California was not formally named but was often referred to as ‘Inland Millingstone,’ ‘Encinitas,’ or even ‘Topanga.’” Therefore, they proposed that all expressions of the inland Milling Stone in southern California north of San Diego County be grouped together in the Greven Knoll Complex.

The Greven Knoll Complex, as postulated by Sutton and Gardener (2010), is broken into three phases and obtained its name from the type-site Greven Knoll located in Yucaipa, California. Presently, the Greven Knoll Site is part of the Yucaipa’t Site (SBR-1000) and was combined with the adjacent Simpson Site. Excavations at Greven Knoll recovered manos, metates, projectile points, discoidal cogged stones, and a flexed inhumation with a possible cremation (Kowta 1969:39). It is believed that the Greven Knoll Site was occupied between 5,000 and 3,500 YBP. The Simpson Site contained mortars, pestles, side-notched points, and stone and shell beads. Based upon the data recovered at these sites, Kowta (1969:39) suggested that “coastal Milling Stone Complexes extended to and interdigitated with the desert Pinto Basin Complex in the vicinity of the Cajon Pass.”

Phase I of the Greven Knoll Complex is generally dominated by the presence of manos and metates, core tools, hammerstones, large dart points, flexed inhumations, and occasional cremations. Mortars and pestles are absent from this early phase, and the subsistence economy

emphasized hunting. Sutton and Gardener (2010:26) propose that the similarity of the material culture of Greven Knoll Phase I and that found in the Mojave Desert at Pinto Period sites indicates that the Greven Knoll Complex was influenced by neighbors to the north at that time. Accordingly, Sutton and Gardener (2010) believe that Greven Knoll Phase I may have appeared as early as 9,400 YBP and lasted until about 4,000 YBP.

Greven Knoll Phase II is associated with a period between 4,000 and 3,000 YBP. Artifacts common to Greven Knoll Phase II include manos and metates, Elko points, core tools, and discoids. Pestles and mortars are present; however, they are only represented in small numbers. Finally, there is an emphasis upon hunting and gathering for subsistence (Sutton and Gardener 2010:8).

Greven Knoll Phase III includes manos, metates, Elko points, scraper planes, choppers, hammerstones, and discoids. Again, small numbers of mortars and pestles are present. Greven Knoll Phase III spans from approximately 3,000 to 1,000 YBP and shows a reliance upon seeds and yucca. Hunting is still important, but bones seem to have been processed to obtain bone grease more often in this later phase (Sutton and Gardener 2010:8).

The shifts in food processing technologies during each of these phases indicate a change in subsistence strategies; although people were still hunting for large game, plant-based foods eventually became the primary dietary resource (Sutton 2011a). Sutton's (2011b) argument posits that the development of mortars and pestles during the middle Holocene can be attributed to the year-round exploitation of acorns as a main dietary provision. Additionally, the warmer and drier climate may have been responsible for groups from the east moving toward coastal populations, which is archaeologically represented by the interchange of coastal and eastern cultural traits (Sutton 2011a).

Late Prehistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1,300 YBP to 1790)

Many Luiseño hold the world view that as a population they were created in southern California; however, archaeological and anthropological data proposes a scientific/archaeological perspective. Archaeological and anthropological evidence suggests that at approximately 1,350 YBP, Takic-speaking groups from the Great Basin region moved into Riverside County, marking the transition to the Late Prehistoric Period. An analysis of the Takic expansion by Sutton (2009) indicates that inland southern California was occupied by "proto-Yuman" populations before 1,000 YBP. The comprehensive, multi-phase model offered by Sutton (2009) employs linguistic, ethnographic, archaeological, and biological data to solidify a reasonable argument for population replacement of Takic groups to the north by Penutians (Laylander 1985). As a result, it is believed that Takic expansion occurred starting around 3,500 YBP moving toward southern California, with the Gabrielino language diffusing south into neighboring Yuman (Hokan) groups around 1,500 to 1,000 YBP, possibly resulting in the Luiseño dialect.

Based upon Sutton's model, the final Takic expansion would not have occurred until about 1,000 YBP, resulting in Vanyume, Serrano, Cahuilla, and Cupeño dialects. The model suggests

that the Luiseño did not simply replace Hokan speakers, but rather, they were a northern San Diego County/southern Riverside County Yuman population who adopted the Takic language. This period is characterized by higher population densities and elaborations in social, political, and technological systems. Economic systems diversified and intensified during this period with the continued elaboration of trade networks, the use of shell-bead currency, and the appearance of more labor-intensive, yet effective, technological innovations. Technological developments during this period included the introduction of the bow and arrow between A.D. 400 and 600 and the introduction of ceramics. Atlatl darts were replaced by smaller arrow darts, including Cottonwood series points. Other hallmarks of the Late Prehistoric Period include extensive trade networks as far-reaching as the Colorado River Basin and cremation of the dead.

Protohistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1542 to circa 1769)

Ethnohistoric and ethnographic evidence indicates that three Takic-speaking groups occupied portions of Riverside County: the Cahuilla, the Gabrielino, and the Luiseño. The geographic boundaries between these groups in pre- and proto-historic times are difficult to place, but the project is located well within the borders of ethnographic Luiseño territory. This group was a seasonal hunting and gathering people with cultural elements that were very distinct from Archaic Period peoples. These distinctions include cremation of the dead, the use of the bow and arrow, and exploitation of the acorn as a main food staple (Moratto 1984). Along the coast, the Luiseño made use of available marine resources by fishing and collecting mollusks for food. Seasonally available terrestrial resources, including acorns and game, were also sources of nourishment for Luiseño groups. Elaborate kinship and clan systems between the Luiseño and other groups facilitated a wide-reaching trade network that included trade of Obsidian Butte obsidian and other resources from the eastern deserts, as well as steatite from the Channel Islands.

According to Charles Handley (1967), the primary settlements of Late Prehistoric Luiseño Indians in the San Jacinto Plain were represented by Ivah and Soboba near Soboba Springs, Jusipah near the town of San Jacinto, Ararah in Webster's Canyon en route to Idyllwild, Pahsitha near Big Springs Ranch southeast of Hemet, and Corova in Castillo Canyon. These locations share features such as the availability of food and water resources. Features of this land use include petroglyphs and pictographs, as well as widespread milling, which is evident in bedrock and portable implements. Groups in the vicinity of the project, neighboring the Luiseño, include the Cahuilla and the Gabrielino. Ethnographic data for the three groups is presented below.

Luiseño: An Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspective

When contacted by the Spanish in the sixteenth century, the Luiseño occupied a territory bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the east by the Peninsular Ranges mountains at San Jacinto (including Palomar Mountain to the south and Santiago Peak to the north), on the south by Agua Hedionda Lagoon, and on the north by Aliso Creek in present-day San Juan Capistrano. The Luiseño were a Takic-speaking people more closely related linguistically and ethnographically to

the Cahuilla, Gabrielino, and Cupeño to the north and east rather than the Kumeyaay who occupied territory to the south. The Luiseño differed from their neighboring Takic speakers in having an extensive proliferation of social statuses, a system of ruling families that provided ethnic cohesion within the territory, a distinct worldview that stemmed from the use of datura (a hallucinogen), and an elaborate religion that included the creation of sacred sand paintings depicting the deity Chingichngish (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Subsistence and Settlement

The Luiseño occupied sedentary villages most often located in sheltered areas in valley bottoms, along streams, or along coastal strands near mountain ranges. Villages were located near water sources to facilitate acorn leaching and in areas that offered thermal and defensive protection. Villages were composed of areas that were publicly and privately (by family) owned. Publicly owned areas included trails, temporary campsites, hunting areas, and quarry sites. Inland groups had fishing and gathering sites along the coast that were intensively used from January to March when inland food resources were scarce. During October and November, most of the village would relocate to mountain oak groves to harvest acorns. The Luiseño remained at village sites for the remainder of the year where food resources were within a day's travel (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

The most important food source for the Luiseño was the acorn, six different species of which were used (*Quercus californica*, *Quercus agrifolia*, *Quercus chrysolepis*, *Quercus dumosa*, *Quercus engelmannii*, and *Quercus wislizenii*). Seeds, particularly of grasses, flowering plants, and mints, were also heavily exploited. Seed-bearing species were encouraged through controlled burns which were conducted at least every third year. A variety of other stems, leaves, shoots, bulbs, roots, and fruits were also collected. Hunting augmented this vegetal diet. Animal species taken included deer, rabbit, hare, woodrat, ground squirrel, antelope, quail, duck, freshwater fish from mountain streams, marine mammals, and other sea creatures such as fish, crustaceans, and mollusks (particularly abalone, or *Haliotis* sp.). In addition, a variety of snakes, small birds, and rodents were eaten (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Social Organization

Social groups within the Luiseño nation consisted of patrilineal families or clans, which were politically and economically autonomous. Several clans comprised a religious party, or nota, which was headed by a chief who organized ceremonies and controlled economics and warfare. The chief had assistants who specialized in particular aspects of ceremonial or environmental knowledge and who, with the chief, were part of a religion-based social group with special access to supernatural power, particularly that of Chingichngish. The positions of chief and assistants were hereditary, and the complexity and multiplicity of these specialists' roles likely increased in coastal and larger inland villages (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976; Strong 1929).

Marriages were arranged by the parents, often made to forge alliances between lineages.

Useful alliances included those between groups of differing ecological niches and those that resulted in territorial expansion. Residence was patrilocal (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976). Women were primarily responsible for plant gathering and men principally hunted, although, at times, particularly during acorn and marine mollusk harvests, there was no division of labor. Elderly women cared for children and elderly men participated in rituals, ceremonies, and political affairs. They were also responsible for manufacturing hunting and ritual implements. Children were taught subsistence skills at the earliest age possible (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Material Culture

House structures were conical, partially subterranean, and thatched with reeds, brush, or bark. Ramadas were rectangular, protected workplaces for domestic chores such as cooking. Ceremonial sweathouses were important in purification rituals; these were round and partially subterranean thatched structures covered with a layer of mud. Another ceremonial structure was the wámkis (located in the center of the village, serving as the place of rituals), where sand paintings and other rituals associated with the Chingichngish religious group were performed (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Clothing was minimal; women wore a cedar-bark and netted twine double apron and men wore a waist cord. In cold weather, cloaks or robes of rabbit fur, deerskin, or sea otter fur were worn by both sexes. Footwear included deerskin moccasins and sandals fashioned from yucca fibers. Adornments included bead necklaces and pendants made of bone, clay, stone, shell, bear claw, mica, deer hooves, and abalone shell. Men wore ear and nose piercings made from cane or bone, which were sometimes decorated with beads. Other adornments were commonly decorated with semiprecious stones including quartz, topaz, garnet, opal, opalite, agate, and jasper (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Hunting implements included the bow and arrow. Arrows were tipped with either a carved, fire-hardened wood tip or a lithic point, usually fashioned from locally available metavolcanic material or quartz. Throwing sticks fashioned from wood were used in hunting small game, while deer head decoys were used during deer hunts. Coastal groups fashioned dugout canoes for nearshore fishing and harvested fish with seines, nets, traps, and hooks made of bone or abalone shell (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

The Luiseño had a well-developed basket industry. Baskets were used in resource gathering, food preparation, storage, and food serving. Ceramic containers were shaped by paddle and anvil and fired in shallow open pits to be used for food storage, cooking, and serving. Other utensils included wood implements, steatite bowls, and ground stone manos, metates, mortars, and pestles (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976). Additional tools such as knives, scrapers, choppers, awls, and drills were also used. Shamanistic items include soapstone or clay smoking pipes and crystals made of quartz or tourmaline (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Cahuilla: An Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspective

At the time of Spanish contact in the sixteenth century, the Cahuilla occupied territory that included the San Bernardino Mountains, Orocopia Mountain, and the Chocolate Mountains to the west, Salton Sea and Borrego Springs to the south, Palomar Mountain and Lake Mathews to the west, and the Santa Ana River to the north. The Cahuilla are a Takic-speaking people closely related to their Gabrielino and Luiseño neighbors, although relations with the Gabrielino were more intense than with the Luiseño. They differ from the Luiseño and Gabrielino in that their religion is more similar to the Mohave tribes of the eastern deserts than the Chingichngish religious group of the Luiseño and Gabrielino. The following is a summary of ethnographic data regarding this group (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Subsistence and Settlement

Cahuilla villages were typically permanent and located on low terraces within canyons in proximity to water sources. These locations proved to be rich in food resources and afforded protection from prevailing winds. Villages had areas that were publicly owned and areas that were privately owned by clans, families, or individuals. Each village was associated with a particular lineage and series of sacred sites that included unique petroglyphs and pictographs. Villages were occupied throughout the year; however, during a several-week period in the fall, most of the village members relocated to mountain oak groves to take part in acorn harvesting (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

The Cahuilla's use of plant resources is well documented. Plant foods harvested by the Cahuilla included valley oak acorns and single-leaf pinyon pine nuts. Other important plant species included bean and screw mesquite, agave, Mohave yucca, cacti, palm, chia, quail brush, yellowray goldfield, goosefoot, manzanita, catsclaw, desert lily, mariposa lily, and several other species such as grass seed. Several agricultural domesticates were acquired from the Colorado River tribes including corn, bean, squash, and melon grown in limited amounts. Animal species taken included deer, bighorn sheep, pronghorn antelope, rabbit, hare, rat, quail, dove, duck, roadrunner, and a variety of rodents, reptiles, fish, and insects (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Social Organization

The Cahuilla was not a political nation, but rather a cultural nationality with a common language. Two non-political, non-territorial patrimoieties were recognized: the Wildcats (túktem) and the Coyotes (?ístam). Lineage and kinship were memorized at a young age among the Cahuilla, providing a backdrop for political relationships. Clans were composed of three to 10 lineages; each lineage owned a village site and specific resource areas. Lineages within a clan cooperated in subsistence activities, defense, and rituals (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

A system of ceremonial hierarchy operated within each lineage. The hierarchy included the lineage leader, who was responsible for leading subsistence activities, guarding the sacred bundle, and negotiating with other lineage leaders in matters concerning land use, boundary

disputes, marriage arrangements, trade, warfare, and ceremonies. The ceremonial assistant to the lineage leader was responsible for organizing ceremonies. A ceremonial singer possessed and performed songs at rituals and trained assistant singers. The shaman cured illnesses through supernatural powers, controlled natural phenomena, and was the guardian of ceremonies, keeping evil spirits away. The diviner was responsible for finding lost objects, telling future events, and locating game and other food resources. Doctors were usually older women who cured various ailments and illnesses with their knowledge of medicinal herbs. Finally, certain Cahuilla specialized as traders, who ranged as far west as Santa Catalina and as far east as the Gila River (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Marriages were arranged by parents from opposite moieties. When a child was born, an alliance formed between the families, which included frequent reciprocal exchanges. The Cahuilla kinship system extended to relatives within five generations. Important economic decisions, primarily the distribution of goods, operated within this kinship system (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Material Culture

Cahuilla houses were dome-shaped or rectangular, thatched structures. The home of the lineage leader was the largest, located near the ceremonial house with the best access to water. Other structures within the village included the men's sweathouse and granaries (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Cahuilla clothing, like other groups in the area, was minimal. Men typically wore a loincloth and sandals; women wore skirts made from mesquite bark, animal skin, or tules. Babies wore mesquite bark diapers. Rabbit skin cloaks were worn in cold weather (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Hunting implements included the bow and arrow, throwing sticks, and clubs. Grinding tools used in food processing included manos, metates, and wood mortars. The Cahuilla were known to use long grinding implements made from wood to process mesquite beans; the mortar was typically a hollowed log buried in the ground. Other tools included steatite arrow shaft straighteners (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Baskets were made from rush, deer grass, and skunkbrush. Different species and leaves were chosen for different colors in the basket design. Coiled-ware baskets were either flat (for plates, trays, or winnowing), bowl-shaped (for food serving), deep, inverted, and cone-shaped (for transporting), or rounded and flat-bottomed for storing utensils and personal items (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Cahuilla pottery was made from a thin, red-colored ceramic ware that was often painted and incised. Four basic vessel types are known for the Cahuilla: small-mouthed jars, cooking pots, bowls, and dishes. Additionally, smoking pipes and flutes were fashioned from ceramic (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Gabrielino: An Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspective

The territory of the Gabrielino at the time of Spanish contact covers much of present-day Los Angeles and Orange counties. The southern extent of this culture area is bounded by Aliso Creek, the eastern extent is located east of present-day San Bernardino along the Santa Ana River, the northern extent includes the San Fernando Valley, and the western extent includes portions of the Santa Monica Mountains. The Gabrielino also occupied several Channel Islands including Santa Barbara Island, Santa Catalina Island, San Nicholas Island, and San Clemente Island. Because of their access to certain resources, including a steatite source from Santa Catalina Island, this group was among the wealthiest and most populous aboriginal groups in all of southern California. Trade of materials and resources controlled by the Gabrielino extended as far north as the San Joaquin Valley, as far east as the Colorado River, and as far south as Baja California (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Subsistence and Settlement

The Gabrielino lived in permanent villages and occupied smaller resource-gathering camps at various times of the year depending upon the seasonality of the resource. Larger villages were comprised of several families or clans, while smaller, seasonal camps typically housed smaller family units. The coastal area between San Pedro and Topanga Canyon was the location of primary subsistence villages, while secondary sites were located near inland sage stands, oak groves, and pine forests. Permanent villages were located along rivers and streams and in sheltered areas along the coast. As previously mentioned, the Channel Islands were also the locations of relatively large settlements (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Resources procured along the coast and on the islands were primarily marine in nature and included tuna, swordfish, ray and shark, California sea lion, Stellar sea lion, harbor seal, northern elephant seal, sea otter, dolphin and porpoise, various waterfowl species, numerous fish species, purple sea urchin, and mollusks, such as rock scallop, California mussel, and limpet. Inland resources included oak acorn, pine nut, Mohave yucca, cacti, sage, grass nut, deer, rabbit, hare, rodent, quail, duck, and a variety of reptiles such as western pond turtle and numerous snake species (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Social Organization

The social structure of the Gabrielino is little known; however, there appears to have been at least three social classes: 1) the elite, which included the rich, chiefs, and their immediate family; 2) a middle class, which included people of relatively high economic status or long-established lineages; and 3) a class of people that included most other individuals in the society. Villages were politically autonomous units comprised of several lineages. During times of the year when certain seasonal resources were available, the village would divide into lineage groups and move out to exploit them, returning to the village between forays (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Each lineage had its own leader, with the village chief coming from the dominant lineage.

Several villages might be allied under a paramount chief. Chiefly positions were of an ascribed status, most often passed to the eldest son. Chiefly duties included providing village cohesion, leading warfare and peace negotiations with other groups, collecting tribute from the village(s) under his jurisdiction, and arbitrating disputes within the village(s). The status of the chief was legitimized by his safekeeping of the sacred bundle, a representation of the link between the material and spiritual realms and the embodiment of power (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Shamans were leaders in the spirit realm. The duties of the shaman included conducting healing and curing ceremonies, guarding the sacred bundle, locating lost items, identifying and collecting poisons for arrows, and making rain (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Marriages were made between individuals of equal social status and, in the case of powerful lineages, marriages were arranged to establish political ties between the lineages (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Men conducted the majority of the heavy labor, hunting, fishing, and trading with other groups. Women's duties included gathering and preparing plant and animal resources, and making baskets, pots, and clothing (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Material Culture

Gabrielino houses were domed, circular structures made of thatched vegetation. Houses varied in size and could house from one to several families. Sweathouses (semicircular, earth-covered buildings) were public structures used in male social ceremonies. Other structures included menstrual huts and a ceremonial structure called a yuvar, an open-air structure built near the chief's house (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Clothing was minimal; men and children most often went naked, while women wore deerskin or bark aprons. In cold weather, deerskin, rabbit fur, or bird skin (with feathers intact) cloaks were worn. Island and coastal groups used sea otter fur for cloaks. In areas of rough terrain, yucca fiber sandals were worn. Women often used red ochre on their faces and skin for adornment or protection from the sun. Adornment items included feathers, fur, shells, and beads (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Hunting implements included wood clubs, sinew-backed bows, slings, and throwing clubs. Maritime implements included rafts, harpoons, spears, hook and line, and nets. A variety of other tools included deer scapulae saws, bone and shell needles, bone awls, scrapers, bone or shell flakers, wedges, stone knives and drills, metates, mullers, manos, shell spoons, bark platters, and wood paddles and bowls. Baskets were made from rush, deer grass, and skunkbush. Baskets were fashioned for hoppers, plates, trays, and winnowers for leaching, straining, and gathering. Baskets were also used for storing, preparing, and serving food, and for keeping personal and ceremonial items (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

The Gabrielino had exclusive access to soapstone, or steatite, procured from Santa Catalina Island quarries. This highly prized material was used for making pipes, animal carvings, ritual objects, ornaments, and cooking utensils. The Gabrielino profited well from trading steatite since

it was valued so much by groups throughout southern California (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Ethnohistoric Period (1769 to Present)

Traditionally, the history of the state of California has been divided into three general periods: the Spanish Period (1769 to 1821), the Mexican Period (1822 to 1846), and the American Period (1848 to present) (Caughey 1970). The American Period is often further subdivided into additional phases: the nineteenth century (1848 to 1900), the early twentieth century (1900 to 1950), and the Modern Period (1950 to present). From an archaeological standpoint, all of these phases can be referred to together as the Ethnohistoric Period. This provides a valuable tool for archaeologists, as ethnohistory is directly concerned with the study of indigenous or non-Western peoples from a combined historical/anthropological viewpoint, which employs written documents, oral narrative, material culture, and ethnographic data for analysis.

European exploration along the California coast began in 1542 with the landing of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo and his men at San Diego Bay. Sixty years after the Cabrillo expeditions, an expedition under Sebastian Viscaíno made an extensive and thorough exploration of the Pacific coast. Although the voyage did not extend beyond the northern limits of the Cabrillo track, Viscaíno had the most lasting effect upon the nomenclature of the coast. Many of his place names have survived, whereas practically every one of the names created by Cabrillo have faded from use. For instance, Cabrillo named the first (now) United States port he stopped at “San Miguel”; 60 years later, Viscaíno changed it to “San Diego” (Rolle 1969). The early European voyages observed Native Americans living in villages along the coast but did not make any substantial, long-lasting impact. At the time of contact, the Luiseño population was estimated to have ranged from 4,000 to as many as 10,000 individuals (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

The historic background of the project area began with the Spanish colonization of Alta California. The first Spanish colonizing expedition reached southern California in 1769 with the intention of converting and civilizing the indigenous populations, as well as expanding the knowledge of and access to new resources in the region (Brigandi 1998). As a result, by the late eighteenth century, a large portion of southern California was overseen by Mission San Luis Rey (San Diego County), Mission San Juan Capistrano (Orange County), and Mission San Gabriel (Los Angeles County), who began colonization the region and surrounding areas (Chapman 1921).

Up until this time, the only known way to feasibly travel from Sonora to Alta California was by sea. In 1774, Juan Bautista de Anza, an army captain at Tubac, requested and was given permission by the governor of the Mexican State of Sonora to establish an overland route from Sonora to Monterey (Chapman 1921). In doing so, Juan Bautista de Anza passed through Riverside County and described the area in writing for the first time (Caughey 1970; Chapman 1921). In 1797, Father Presidente Lausen (of Mission San Diego de Alcalá), Father Norberto de Santiago, and Corporal Pedro Lialde (of Mission San Juan Capistrano) led an expedition through southwestern Riverside County in search of a new mission site to establish a presence between

San Diego and San Juan Capistrano (Engelhardt 1921). Their efforts ultimately resulted in the establishment of Mission San Luis Rey in Oceanside, California.

Each mission gained power through the support of a large, subjugated Native American workforce. As the missions grew, livestock holdings increased and became increasingly vulnerable to theft. In order to protect their interests, the southern California missions began to expand inland to try and provide additional security (Beattie and Beattie 1939; Caughey 1970). In order to meet their needs, the Spaniards embarked on a formal expedition in 1806 to find potential locations within what is now the San Bernardino Valley. As a result, by 1810, Father Francisco Dumetz of Mission San Gabriel had succeeded in establishing a religious site, or capilla, at a Cahuilla rancheria called Guachama (Beattie and Beattie 1939). San Bernardino Valley received its name from this site, which was dedicated to San Bernardino de Siena by Father Dumetz. The Guachama rancheria was located in present-day Bryn Mawr in San Bernardino County.

These early colonization efforts were followed by the establishment of estancias at Puente (circa 1816) and San Bernardino (circa 1819) near Guachama (Beattie and Beattie 1939). These efforts were soon mirrored by the Spaniards from Mission San Luis Rey, who in turn established a presence in what is now Lake Elsinore, Temecula, and Murrieta (Chapman 1921). The indigenous groups who occupied these lands were recruited by missionaries, converted, and put to work in the missions (Pourade 1961). Throughout this period, the Native American populations were decimated by introduced diseases, a drastic shift in diet resulting in poor nutrition, and social conflicts due to the introduction of an entirely new social order (Cook 1976).

Mexico achieved independence from Spain in 1822 and became a federal republic in 1824. As a result, both Baja and Alta California became classified as territories (Rolle 1969). Shortly thereafter, the Mexican Republic sought to grant large tracts of private land to its citizens to begin to encourage immigration to California and to establish its presence in the region. Part of the establishment of power and control included the desecularization of the missions circa 1832. These same missions were also located on some of the most fertile land in California and, as a result, were considered highly valuable. The resulting land grants, known as “ranchos,” covered expansive portions of California and by 1846, more than 600 land grants had been issued by the Mexican government. Rancho Jurupa was the first rancho to be established and was issued to Juan Bandini in 1838. Although Bandini primarily resided in San Diego, Rancho Jurupa was located in what is now Riverside County (Pourade 1963). A review of Riverside County place names quickly illustrates that many of the ranchos in Riverside County lent their names to present-day locations, including Jurupa, El Rincon, La Sierra, El Sobrante de San Jacinto, La Laguna (Lake Elsinore), Santa Rosa, Temecula, Pauba, San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero, and San Jacinto Viejo (Gunther 1984). As was typical of many ranchos, these were all located in the valley environments within western Riverside County.

The treatment of Native Americans grew worse during the Rancho Period. Most of the Native Americans were forced off of their land or put to work on the now privately-owned ranchos, most often as slave labor. In light of the brutal ranchos, the degree to which Native Americans

had become dependent upon the mission system is evident when, in 1838, a group of Native Americans from Mission San Luis Rey petitioned government officials in San Diego to relieve suffering at the hands of the rancheros:

We have suffered incalculable losses, for some of which we are in part to be blamed for because many of us have abandoned the Mission ... We plead and beseech you ... to grant us a Rev. Father for this place. We have been accustomed to the Rev. Fathers and to their manner of managing the duties. We labored under their intelligent directions, and we were obedient to the Fathers according to the regulations, because we considered it as good for us. (Brigandi 1998:21)

Native American culture had been disrupted to the point where they could no longer rely upon prehistoric subsistence and social patterns. Not only does this illustrate how dependent the Native Americans had become upon the missionaries, but it also indicates a marked contrast in the way the Spanish treated the Native Americans compared to the Mexican and United States ranchers. Spanish colonialism (missions) is based upon utilizing human resources while integrating them into their society. The Mexican and American ranchers did not accept Native Americans into their social order and used them specifically for the extraction of labor, resources, and profit. Rather than being incorporated, they were either subjugated or exterminated (Cook 1976).

By 1846, tensions between the United States and Mexico had escalated to the point of war (Rolle 1969). In order to reach a peaceful agreement, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was put into effect in 1848, which resulted in the annexation of California to the United States. Once California opened to the United States, waves of settlers moved in searching for gold mines, business opportunities, political opportunities, religious freedom, and adventure (Rolle 1969; Caughey 1970). By 1850, California had become a state and was eventually divided into 27 separate counties. While a much larger population was now settling in California, this was primarily in the central valley, San Francisco, and the Gold Rush region of the Sierra Nevada mountain range (Rolle 1969; Caughey 1970). During this time, southern California grew at a much slower pace than northern California and was still dominated by the cattle industry established during the earlier rancho period. However, by 1859, the first United States Post Office in what would eventually become Riverside County was set up at John Magee's store on the Temecula Rancho (Gunther 1984).

During the same decade, circa 1852, the Native Americans of southern Riverside County, including the Luiseño and the Cahuilla, thought they had signed a treaty resulting in their ownership of all lands from Temecula to Aguanga east to the desert, including the San Jacinto Valley and the San Gorgonio Pass. The Temecula Treaty also included food and clothing provisions for the Native Americans. However, Congress never ratified these treaties, and the promise of one large reservation was rescinded (Brigandi 1998).

With the completion of the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1869, southern California saw its first major population expansion. The population boom continued circa 1874 with the completion of connections between the Southern Pacific Railroad in Sacramento to the transcontinental Central Pacific Railroad in Los Angeles (Rolle 1969; Caughey 1970). The population influx brought farmers, land speculators, and prospective developers to the region. As the Jurupa area became more and more populated, circa 1870, Judge John Wesley North and a group of associates founded the city of Riverside on part of the former rancho.

Although the first orange trees were planted in Riverside County circa 1871, it was not until a few years later when a small number of Brazilian navel orange trees were established that the citrus industry truly began in the region (Patterson 1971). The Brazilian navel orange was well suited to the climate of Riverside County and thrived with assistance from several extensive irrigation projects. At the close of 1882, an estimated half a million citrus trees were present in California. It is estimated that nearly half of that population was in Riverside County. Population growth and 1880s tax revenue from the booming citrus industry prompted the official formation of Riverside County in 1893 out of portions of what was once San Bernardino County (Patterson 1971).

Shortly thereafter, with the start of World War I, the United States began to develop a military presence in Riverside County with the construction of March Air Reserve Base. During World War II, Camp Haan was constructed in what is now the current location of the National Veteran's Cemetery. In the decades that followed, populations spread throughout the county into Lake Elsinore, Corona, Norco, Murrieta, and Wildomar. However, a significant portion of the county remained largely agricultural well into the 1970s. Following the 1970s, Riverside saw a period of dramatic population increase as the result of new development, more than doubling the population of the county with a population of over 1.3 million residents (Patterson 1971).

A Brief History of the City of Perris

The project is located within the former Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Portrero land grant, which was granted to Miguel Pedorena by Mexican Governor Pío Pico in 1846 (Hoffman 1862). After Pedorena's death in 1850, the land grant passed to his heirs under the guardianship of T.W. Sutherland (Gunther 1984). In 1881, the California Southern Railroad laid the tracks for the transcontinental route of the Santa Fe Railway through what was referred to at that time as the San Jacinto Plains. Surveying and construction of the railroad route was led by Frederick Thomas Perris, for whom the city of Perris was named. The railroad was completed in 1882, which allowed hundreds of settlers to enter the area for homesteading, most of them settling in Pinacate to the south (City of Perris n.d.). While still part of San Diego County, Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Portrero was patented to Sutherland in 1883 (Robinson 1997). In 1885, the citizens of Pinacate created a more conveniently located station along the railroad route, and in 1886, the town site of Perris was established (City of Perris n.d.).

In 1883, pioneer Frank E. Brown formed the Bear Valley Land and Water Company,

which, by 1885, had successfully constructed the largest water reservoir in the county at the time (the Bear Valley Dam and Reservoir) to supply water to the city of Redlands (City of Moreno Valley n.d.). With its now-ample water supply, the city of Redlands flourished, and Brown soon began expanding the Bear Valley Land and Water Company's holdings in order to provide water to the surrounding areas. Among those regions slated to receive Bear Valley water was the town site of Perris, and in 1890, a group of investors formed the Perris Irrigation District and established an agreement with the Bear Valley Land and Water Company to provide water to the region (Hinton 1892). However, "Frank Brown had overestimated the Bear Valley Dam and Reservoir's capability to supply the Inland Empire," and due to a period of drought between 1891 and 1893, the reservoir failed to meet all of its obligations for water delivery (Berba 2017; *Redlands Daily Facts* 2008). The lack of water severely affected farmers who had developed an agricultural base of deciduous and citrus fruit trees and residents of the region were forced to leave the area for a more habitable environment.

In 1911, Perris became an incorporated city, relying heavily upon dry grain farming and citrus groves (City of Perris n.d.). Although the Perris Irrigation District was not as successful as originally predicted, the area remained agricultural throughout the twentieth century. Due to the limited groundwater, dry grain farming was the main crop until the 1950s, when the Eastern Municipal Water District began constructing infrastructure to better distribute water to the region. With better access to water, alfalfa, the King potato (which would produce two crops a year), and sugar beets became the mainstay of farming in the Perris Valley (City of Perris n.d.).

The Perris area was influenced by the development of March Field, which was established on March 1, 1918 as the Alessandro Flying Training Field following the United States' entry into World War I (Gunther 1984). The name was officially changed to March Field on March 20, 1918 in honor of Peyton C. March, Jr., who had been killed in a training plane crash in Fort Worth, Texas, earlier that year. The air field changed names many times throughout the 1940s. In 1941, the name was changed to March Army Air Field; in 1942, to March Army Air Base; in 1947, to March Army Air Force Base to reflect the establishment of the United States Air Force; and finally to March Air Reserve Base in 1996 (March Field Air Museum 2020). Although the official name changed multiple times, residents have continued to refer to it as "March Field" (Gunther 1984). The establishment of March Field was important to the region due to the role the local inhabitants would play during World War I and World War II.

Farming continued to be important to the region. During the mid- to late twentieth century, the Riverside County Flood Control and the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) began to establish storm drains and modern water conveyance systems, which would allow farmers to better manage water on their land (City of Perris n.d.; Environmental Science Associates 2016; MWD n.d.).

Although Perris generally remained agricultural throughout the twentieth century, in recent years, the city has seen a growth in residential and industrial development. Today, many of the large agricultural fields have been developed into large logistics centers and warehouses servicing

the greater southern California region.

A Brief History of the Project Area

Except for a land patent confirming the subject property's inclusion in the Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Portrero land grant (Document Number Plc 487), no other documents are on file with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) General Land Office (GLO) for the property. However, documents on file with the County of Riverside Transportation and Land Management Agency (TLMA) and the County of Riverside Assessor's Office indicate that the subject property was subdivided in 1891 as part of the Riverside Tract. The Riverside Tract was originally held by the Perris Irrigation District (Perris Land Company) and was named by the original investors, almost all of whom resided in the city of Riverside (Gunther 1984). The land was laid out in 80-acre blocks that were subdivided into 10-acre lots. The current project comprised the eastern three-fourths of Block 1, Lot 7.

The Riverside Tract lots were sold to farmers and speculators, which was intended to guarantee the success of the Perris Irrigation District; however, the inability to secure steady access to water limited success in the area. As such, by 1900, many of the properties had failed (Gunther 1984). Despite the failure of many of the original farm lots, the area surrounding the current project proved to be a successful agricultural region.

According to aerial photographs, the subject property was being utilized for agriculture as early as 1938. However, no structures or historic features are visible on the property until 1997, when structures are located in the eastern and southwestern portions of the project. In 1982, Lot 7 was subdivided into four 2.5-acre parcels that were annexed into the city of Perris in 1986 (Parcel Map 18223).

The subject property is currently located within the eastern three parcels divided from Lot 7. Between 2014 and 2016, Harley Knox Boulevard was extended through the northern portion of these parcels, which removed approximately 0.5 acres from them. By 2020, the easternmost structure had been demolished, and sometime between 2020 and the date of the current survey, the structure in the southwestern corner was demolished; however, as evident by the survey results, the foundations remain (see Plates 3 and 4).

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 6.4-acre property is located at 220-280 East Nance Street, between Harley Knox Boulevard, Perris Boulevard, Nance Street, and Redlands Avenue in the city of Perris, Riverside County, California (APNs 302-100-020, -030, and -031). The project will include the construction of a warehouse with associated loading docks, parking, and infrastructure. Additionally, the project includes off-site road improvements to East Nance Street along the southern boundary of the project and approximately 1,300 linear feet of new storm drain to extend from the southern boundary of the project along East Nance Street to Redlands Avenue (Figure 3).




Figure 3
Project Development Plan
 The Harley Knox 2021 Project



IV. SCOPE OF WORK

In order to assess the potential for cultural resources within the proposed project, the archaeological investigation consisted of the following tasks:

- 1) An archaeological records search was conducted by BFSA at the EIC at UCR to gather any information regarding recorded cultural resources within or adjacent to the project.
- 2) A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search was conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the property.
- 3) Additional archival research of the property, including historic maps, aerial photographs, BLM GLO records, Riverside County Assessor's Office data, and Riverside County TLMA records.
- 4) The archaeological survey of the property was accomplished by conducting a systematic pedestrian survey that followed survey transects spaced 10 meters apart and parallel to the existing street directions. All areas of disturbed ground and any rodent burrows were analyzed for evidence of buried archaeological deposits.
- 5) This archaeological technical report was prepared to present the results of the field survey, impact analysis, and presentation of any mitigation measures required for project approval.

Research Goals

The primary goal of the research design is to attempt to understand the way in which humans have used the land and resources within the project area over time, as well as to aid in the determination of resource significance. For the current project, the study area under investigation is the west-central portion of Riverside County. The scope of work for the archaeological program conducted for the Harley Knox 2021 Project included a survey of the 6.4-acre project and approximately 1,300 linear feet of off-site storm drain alignment along East Nance Street. Given the area involved and the narrow focus of the cultural resources study, the research design for this project was necessarily limited and general in nature. Since the main objective of the investigation was to identify the presence of and potential impacts to cultural resources, the goal is not necessarily to answer wide-reaching theories regarding the development of early southern California, but to investigate the role and importance of the identified resources. Although survey-level investigations are limited in terms of the amount of information available, several specific research questions were developed that could be used to guide the initial investigations of any observed cultural resources. The following research questions take into account the size and location of the project.

Research Questions:

- Can located cultural resources be situated with a specific time period,

- population, or individual?
- Do the types of located cultural resources allow a site activity/function to be determined from a preliminary investigation? What are the site activities? What is the site function? What resources were exploited?
 - How do the located sites compare to others reported from different surveys conducted in the area?
 - How do the located sites fit existing models of settlement and subsistence for valley environments of the region?

Data Needs

At the survey level, the principal research objective is a generalized investigation of changing settlement patterns in both the prehistoric and historic periods within the study area. The overall goal is to understand settlement and resource procurement patterns of the project area occupants. Therefore, adequate information on site function, context, and chronology from an archaeological perspective is essential for the investigation. The fieldwork and archival research were undertaken with these primary research goals in mind:

- 1) To identify cultural resources occurring within the project;
- 2) To determine, if possible, site type and function, context of the deposit, and chronological placement of each cultural resource identified;
- 3) To place each cultural resource identified within a regional perspective; and
- 4) To provide recommendations for the treatment of each of the cultural resources identified.

Applicable Regulations

Resource importance is assigned to districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess exceptional value or quality illustrating or interpreting the heritage of Riverside County in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. A number of criteria are used in demonstrating resource importance. Expressly, criteria outlined in the CEQA provide the guidance for making such a determination. The following sections detail the specific CEQA criteria that a resource must meet in order to be determined important.

California Environmental Quality Act

According to CEQA (§15064.5a), the term “historical resource” includes 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 (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR. Section 4850 et seq.).
- 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 resource 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 (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14, Section 4852) 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 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.

According to CEQA (§15064.5b), a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect upon the environment. CEQA defines a substantial adverse change as:

- 1) Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially

impaired.

- 2) The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:
 - a) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
 - b) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or,
 - c) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

Section 15064.5(c) of CEQA applies to effects upon archaeological sites and contains the following additional provisions regarding archaeological sites:

- 1) When a project will impact an archaeological site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is an historical resource, as defined in subsection (a).
- 2) If a lead agency determines that the archaeological site is an historical resource, it shall refer to the provisions of Section 21084.1 of the Public Resources Code, Section 15126.4 of the guidelines, and the limits contained in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code do not apply.
- 3) If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria defined in subsection (a) but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code, the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 21083.2. The time and cost limitations described in Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(c-f) do not apply to surveys and site evaluation activities intended to determine whether the project location contains unique archaeological resources.
- 4) If an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor 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 Initial Study or Environmental Impact Report, if one is prepared to address impacts on other resources, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA

process.

Section 15064.5(d) and Section 15064.5(e) contain additional provisions regarding human remains. Regarding Native American human remains, paragraph (d) provides:

(d) When an Initial Study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American human remains within the project, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC as provided in Public Resources Code SS5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC. Action implementing such an agreement is exempt from:

- 1) The general prohibition on disinterring, disturbing, or removing human remains from any location other than a dedicated cemetery (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5).
- 2) The requirement of CEQA and the Coastal Act.

Local Guidelines

The project is situated within the PVCC Specific Plan and is subject to the policies and regulations established within the plan’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The PVCC MMRP does not establish any additional local-level criteria for evaluating resources beyond the standard CEQA criteria but instead reiterates that projects within the PVCC must adhere to the following two measures from the City of Perris General Plan – Conservation Element (City of Perris 2008) to assess the potential for significant resources within the subject property:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Implementation Measure IV.A.2 | For all projects subject to CEQA, applicants will be required to submit results of an archaeological records search request through the Eastern Information Center, at the University of California, Riverside. |
| Implementation Measure IV.A.3 | Require Phase I Surveys for all projects located in areas that have not previously been surveyed for archaeological or historic resources, or which lie near areas where archaeological and/or historic sites have been recorded. |

V. RESULTS OF STUDY

Background Research and Results of Records Searches

BFSA conducted a records search at the EIC at UCR (Appendix B), which indicates that 11 cultural resource sites are located within one mile of the project, none of which are within the project boundaries (Table 1). The recorded sites include historic water conveyance and irrigation features, historic structure foundations and pads, a segment of the historic Perris Valley Storm Drain, and prehistoric bedrock milling features and a lithic scatter.

Table 1
Previously Recorded Cultural Resources
Within a One-Mile Radius of the Project

Site Number	Site Description
RIV-5516H	March Air Force Base Well No. 6
P-33-008699	Historic reservoir and standpipe
P-33-011604	Historic well and turbine pump
RIV-7758	Prehistoric bedrock milling features and an associated lithic scatter
RIV-8222 and RIV-8312	Historic concrete structure pads and water conveyance system
P-33-015854	Historic standpipe and remains of a well
RIV-10,111	Historic well
RIV-11,291	Historic grain mill facility foundation remnants
RIV-4206	Prehistoric bedrock milling feature
RIV-13,010	Historic Perris Valley Storm Drain segment

The records search results also indicate that 44 cultural resource studies have been conducted within a one-mile radius of the project, one of which includes the subject property (Tang et al. 2007). The CRM Tech study was a large overview of resources within the North Perris Industrial Specific Plan (now the PVCC Specific Plan). The current project was assigned a general cultural resource sensitivity rating of moderate to high to contain cultural resources based upon the property’s status as not being extensively disturbed (Tang et al. 2007).

BFSA also reviewed the following historic sources:

- The National Register of Historic Places Index
- The Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility
- The OHP Built Environment Resources Directory

None of these additional sources identified any potential resources within the project.

BFSA also requested a SLF search from the NAHC, which did not list any sacred sites or locations of religious or ceremonial importance within the project. Original correspondence is provided in Appendix C.

Based upon the results of the records search and literature review, there is limited potential for archaeological resources to be located within the project. The closest resources to the project are historic and only two prehistoric bedrock milling feature sites have been recorded within one mile of the project.

Field Reconnaissance

Principal Investigator Brian F. Smith directed the pedestrian survey of the subject property, which was conducted by Senior Field Archaeologist Clarence Hoff on April 19, 2021. Aerial photographs, maps, and a compass permitted orientation and location of project area boundaries. Where possible, narrow transect paths were employed to ensure maximum lot coverage. All exposed ground was inspected for cultural materials. The property is characterized as generally flat without any bedrock or natural drainages. The entire parcel has been cultivated in the past. During the survey, particular attention was paid to areas with exposed ground surfaces, such as rodent burrows and areas around the base of vegetation. A survey form, field notes, and photographs documented the survey work undertaken.

The entire property was accessible and was characterized during the survey as having been previously disked and mowed, which provided good ground visibility. Vegetation on the property consists of non-native weeds and grasses intermixed with wheat/barley and pine, eucalyptus, and pepper trees surround modern concrete foundations in the southern area of the property (Plates 1 to 4). The off-site improvement area extending east from the southern boundary along the partially paved and graveled East Nance Street to Redlands Avenue was included in the survey.



Plate 1: Overview of the project, facing southwest.



Plate 2: Overview of the project, facing south.



Plate 3: Overview of a modern foundation, facing south.



Plate 4: Overview of a modern foundation, facing south.

According to aerial imagery, the property was vacant agricultural land from the 1938 until sometime between 1978 and 1997. The buildings associated with the foundations in the southern portion of the project were constructed between 1978 and 1997 and are therefore not historic in age. However, both buildings were demolished prior to the date of the survey. No cultural resources, either historic or prehistoric, were discovered during the survey.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The cultural resources study for the Harley Knox 2021 Project was negative for the presence of archaeological sites. The EIC records search did not identify any recorded resources within the subject property. Although the records search identified two prehistoric resources within one mile of the project, both are located over a half-mile east of the project. Further, the property was historically utilized for agriculture and did not contain any structures until sometime after 1978, limiting the potential for historic resources. Therefore, based upon the records search data and the current archaeological study, no resources, historic or prehistoric, are located within the current project.

Based upon the absence of any cultural resources within the subject property, site-specific mitigation measures will not be recommended for this project. As a result of previous ground-disturbing activities associated with historical agricultural use, modern development, and the recent construction of Harley Knox Boulevard, there is little potential for cultural resources to be present or disturbed by the proposed development. No further archaeological study or mitigation monitoring for cultural resources are recommended as conditions of permit approval. However, in the event that any historic or prehistoric cultural resources are inadvertently discovered, all construction work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall stop, and a qualified archaeologist shall be engaged to discuss the discovery and determine if further mitigation measures are warranted in accordance with the MMRP for the PVCC Specific Plan. Should human remains be discovered, treatment of these remains shall follow MM 5-2 of the PVCC Specific Plan as presented below:

MM 5-2 In the event that human remains (or remains that may be human) are discovered within the project area during ground-disturbing activities, the construction contractors, Project archaeologist, and/or designated Luiseño tribal representative shall immediately stop all activities within 100 feet of the find. The project proponent shall then inform the Riverside County Coroner and the City of Perris Planning Division immediately, and the coroner shall be permitted to examine the remains as required by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b).

If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin,

the coroner would notify the [NAHC], which will identify the “Most Likely Descendent” (MLD). Despite the affiliation with any Luiseño tribal representative(s) at the site, the NAHC’s identification of the MLD will stand. The MLD shall be granted access to inspect the site of the discovery of Native American human remains and may recommend to the project proponent means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete his or her inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The disposition of the remains will be determined in consultation between the project proponent and the MLD. In the event that there is disagreement regarding the disposition of the remains, State law will apply and median with the NAHC will make the applicable determination (see Public Resources Code Section 5097.98I and 5097.94(k)).

The specific locations of Native American burials and reburials will be proprietary and not disclosed to the general public. The locations will be documented by the consulting archaeologist in conjunction with the various stakeholders and a report of findings shall be filed with the [EIC].

VII. CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this archaeological report, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and have been compiled in accordance with CEQA criteria as defined in Section 15064.5.



June 10, 2021

Brian F. Smith
Principal Investigator

Date

VIII. REFERENCES

Bean, Lowell John

1978 Cahuilla. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 575-587. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8. William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, Lowell John and Florence C. Shipek

1978 Luiseño. In *California*, edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 550-563. Handbook of North

American Indians, Vol. 8. William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, Lowell John and Charles R. Smith

1978 Gabrielino. In *California*, edited by R.F. Heizer. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8. William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Beattie, George W. and Helen P. Beattie

1939 *Heritage of the Valley: San Bernardino's First Century*. Biobooks, Oakland, California.

Berba, John Dominic

2017 Booms and Busts: Water's Role in the Development of Perris. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California.

Brigandi, Phil

1998 *Temecula: At the Crossroads of History*. Heritage Media Corporation, Encinitas, California.

Byrd, Brian F.

1998 Harvesting the Littoral Landscape During the Late Holocene: New Perspectives from Northern San Diego County. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 20(2):195-218.

Caughey, John W.

1970 *California, A Remarkable State's Life History*. Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Chapman, Charles E.

1921 *A History of California: The Spanish Period*. The Macmillan Company, New York.

City of Moreno Valley

N.d. The History of Moreno Valley. Electronic document, <http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us/community/about.shtml>, accessed January 23, 2019.

City of Perris

N.d. History. Electronic document, <http://www.cityofperris.org/about/history.html>, accessed January 23, 2019.

2008 City of Perris General Plan, Conservation Element. Electronic document, <https://www.cityofperris.org/home/showpublisheddocument?id=449#:~:text=This%20Conservation%20Element%20strives%20for,use%20of%20the%20City's%20resources.,> accessed September 2020.

Cook, Sherburne F.

- 1976 *The Conflict Between the California Indian and White Civilization*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California.

Engelhardt, Zephyrin

- 1921 *San Luis Rey Mission, The King of the Missions*. James M. Barry Company, San Francisco, California.

Environmental Science Associates

- 2016 DWR Perris Dam Emergency Release Facility Draft Environmental Impact Report. Prepared for the California Department of Water Resources. Electronic document, https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/lakeperris/DEIR/3-9_Hydrology.pdf, accessed January 23, 2019.

Erlandson, Jon M. and Roger H. Colten (editors)

- 1991 An Archaeological Context for Archaeological Sites on the California Coast. In *Hunter-Gatherers of Early Holocene Coastal California*. Perspectives in California Archaeology, Volume 1, Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Fagan, B.

- 1991 *Ancient North America: The Archaeology of a Continent*. Thames and Hudson. London.

Gallegos, Dennis

- 1987 A Review and Synthesis of Environmental and Cultural Material for the Batiquitos Lagoon Region. In *San Dieguito-La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*, edited by Dennis Gallegos. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.

Gallegos, Dennis R. and Carolyn E. Kyle

- 1988 Five Thousand Years of Maritime Subsistence at Ballast Point Prehistoric Site SDI-48 (W-164) San Diego, California. Unpublished report on file at the South Coastal Information Center at San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Gunther, Jane Davies

- 1984 *Riverside County, California, Place Names: Their Origins and Their Stories*. Rubidoux Printing, Riverside, California.

Handley, C.

- 1967 The Sun City Story. *Sun City News*, Sun City, California.

Harris, Marvin

- 1991 *Cultural Anthropology*. HarperCollins Publishers Inc., New York, New York.

Hinton, Richard J.

- 1892 A Report on Irrigation and the Cultivation of the Soil Thereby, with Physical Data, Conditions, and Progress Within the United States for 1891, Accompanied by Maps, Illustrations, and Papers. Office of Irrigation Inquiry, Department of Agriculture. Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C.

Hoffman, Ogden

- 1862 Reports of Land Cases Determined in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Numa Hubert, San Francisco.

Koerper, Henry, C., Jonathan E. Ericson, Christopher E. Drover, and Paul E. Langenwaller, II

- 1986 Obsidian Exchange in Prehistoric Orange County. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 22 (1):33-69.

Kowta, Makoto

- 1969 The Sayles Complex: A Late Millingstone Assemblage from Cajon Pass, and the Econological Implications of its Scraper Planes. *University of California Prehistory* (6), Salinas, California.

Kroeber, A.L.

- 1976 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Reprinted. Dover Editions, Dover Publications, Inc., New York. Originally published 1925, Bulletin No. 78, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Laylander, Don (editor)

- 1985 Some Linguistic Approaches to Southern California's Prehistory. *San Diego State University Cultural Resource Management Casual Papers* 2(1):14-58.

Laylander, Don, Jerry Schaefer, Nick Doose, Jessica Hennessey, and Ian Scharlotta

- 2014 A Regional Synthesis of Prehistoric Archaeological Landscapes in the Jacumba/McCain Valley Region, San Diego and Imperial Counties, California. Prepared for the Bureau of Land Management and San Diego Gas & Electric by ASM Affiliates, Carlsbad, California.

March Field Air Museum

- 2020 History of March Air Reserve Base. Electronic document, <https://www.marchfield.org/visit/about-us/march-air-reserve-base-history/>, accessed May 18, 2020.

Martin, P.S.

- 1967 Prehistoric Overkill. In *Pleistocene Extinctions: The Search for a Cause*, edited by P. Martin and H.E. Wright. Yale University Press:New Haven.
- 1973 The Discovery of America. *Science* 179(4077): 969-974.

Masters, Patricia M.

- 1983 Detection and Assessment of Prehistoric Artifact Sites off the Coast of Southern California. In *Quaternary Coastlines and Marine Archaeology: Towards the Prehistory of Land Bridges and Continental Shelves*, edited by P.M. Masters and N.C. Flemming, pp. 189-213. Academic Press, London.

Meighan, Clement W.

- 1954 A Late Complex in Southern California Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10(2).

Metropolitan Water District

- N.d. Who We Are: 75 Years. Electronic document, <http://www.mwdh2o.com/WhoWeAre/History/75years/>, accessed January 23, 2019.

Miller, J.

- 1966 *The Present and Past Molluscan Faunas and Environments of Four Southern California Coastal Lagoons*. Master's thesis on file at the University of California at San Diego, San Diego, California.

Moratto, Michael J.

- 1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.

Moriarty, James R., III

- 1966 Culture Phase Divisions Suggested by Topological Change Coordinated with Stratigraphically Controlled Radiocarbon Dating in San Diego. *Anthropological Journal of Canada* 4(4):20-30.

Moss, M.L. and J. Erlandson

- 1995 Reflections on North American Coast Prehistory. *Journal of World Prehistory* 9(1):1-46.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

- 2019 Web Soil Survey. Electronic document, <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>, accessed April 26, 2021.

Patterson, Tom

- 1971 *A Colony for California: Riverside's First Hundred Years*. Press-Enterprise, Riverside, California.

Pourade, Richard F.

- 1961 Time of the Bells. In *The History of San Diego* (Volume 2). Union-Tribune Publishing Company, San Diego, California.
- 1963 The Silver Dons. In *The History of San Diego* (Volume 3). Union-Tribune Publishing Company, San Diego, California.

Raven-Jennings, Shelly, Brian F. Smith and Johnna L. Buysse

- 1996 The Results of a Cultural Resource Study at the 4S Ranch, Rancho Bernardo, County of San Diego. Unpublished report on file at the South Coastal Information Center at San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Redlands Daily Facts

- 2008 The Rise and Fall of Frank Brown. Electronic document, <https://www.redlandsdailyfacts.com/2008/08/09/the-rise-and-fall-of-frank-brown/>, accessed December 4, 2020.

Robinson, John W.

- 1997 Rancho San Jacinto Viejo and the Estudillo Family. In *Rancho Days in Southern California*, (Los Angeles: Los Angeles Corral of the Westerners), pp. 143-161.

Rogers, Malcolm J.

- 1939 Early Lithic Industries of the Lower Basin of the Colorado River and Adjacent Desert Areas. In *San Diego Museum Papers* (3) [1989 printing]. San Diego Museum of Man, San Diego, California.

Rolle, Andrew F.

- 1969 *California: A History* (Second Edition). Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York.

Shumway, George, Carl L. Hubbs, and James R. Moriarty, III

- 1961 Scripps Estate Site, San Diego, California: A La Jolla Site Dated 5,460-7,370 Years Before the Present. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 93(3).

Smith, Brian F. and James R. Moriarty, III

- 1985 The Archaeological Excavations at Batiquitos Pointe and Batiquitos Bluffs. Unpublished report on file at the City of Carlsbad, Carlsbad, California.

Strong, William Duncan

- 1929 Aboriginal Society in Southern California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 26(1).

Sutton, Mark Q.

- 2009 People and Language: Defining the Takic Expansion into Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 41(2&3):33-93.

- 2011a The Palomar Tradition and Its Place in the Prehistory of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 44(4):1-74.

- 2011b *A Prehistory of North America*. Routledge, New York.

Sutton, Mark Q. and Jill K. Gardener

- 2010 Reconceptualizing the Encinitas Tradition of Southern California. *Pacific Coast*

Archaeological Society Quarterly 42(4):1-64.

Tang, Bai “Tom,” Michael Hogan, Clarence Bodmer, Josh Smallwood, and Melissa Hernandez
2007 Cultural Resources Technical Report, North Perris Industrial Specific Plan, City of Perris, Riverside County, California. CRM Tech. Unpublished report on file at Eastern Information Center at University of California Riverside, Riverside, California.

True, Delbert L.

1958 An Early Complex in San Diego County, California. *American Antiquity* 23(3).

1980 The Pauma Complex in Northern San Diego County. *The Journal of New World Archaeology* 3(4):1-39

Wallace, William J.

1955 A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11:214-230.

Warren, Claude N.

1968 Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern Coast. In *Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States*, edited by C.I. Williams. *Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology* 1(3):1-14.

Warren, Claude N. and D.L. True

1961 The San Dieguito Complex and its Place in California Prehistory. *Archaeological Survey Annual Report 1960-1961*. University of California Press, Los Angeles, California.

APPENDIX A

Resumes of Key Personnel

Brian F. Smith, MA

Owner, Principal Investigator

Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
14010 Poway Road • Suite A •
Phone: (858) 679-8218 • Fax: (858) 679-9896 • E-Mail: bsmith@bfsa-ca.com



Education

Master of Arts, History, University of San Diego, California 1982

Bachelor of Arts, History, and Anthropology, University of San Diego, California 1975

Professional Memberships

Society for California Archaeology

Experience

Principal Investigator
Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.

1977–Present
Poway, California

Brian F. Smith is the owner and principal historical and archaeological consultant for Brian F. Smith and Associates. Over the past 32 years, he has conducted over 2,500 cultural resource studies in California, Arizona, Nevada, Montana, and Texas. These studies include every possible aspect of archaeology from literature searches and large-scale surveys to intensive data recovery excavations. Reports prepared by Mr. Smith have been submitted to all facets of local, state, and federal review agencies, including the US Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Homeland Security. In addition, Mr. Smith has conducted studies for utility companies (Sempra Energy) and state highway departments (CalTrans).

Professional Accomplishments

These selected major professional accomplishments represent research efforts that have added significantly to the body of knowledge concerning the prehistoric life ways of cultures once present in the Southern California area and historic settlement since the late 18th century. Mr. Smith has been principal investigator on the following select projects, except where noted.

Downtown San Diego Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Programs: Large numbers of downtown San Diego mitigation and monitoring projects, some of which included Broadway Block (2019), 915 Grape Street (2019), 1919 Pacific Highway (2018), Moxy Hotel (2018), Makers Quarter Block D (2017), Ballpark Village (2017), 460 16th Street (2017), Kettner and Ash (2017), Bayside Fire Station (2017), Pinnacle on the Park (2017), IDEA1 (2016), Blue Sky San Diego (2016), Pacific Gate (2016), Pendry Hotel (2015), Cisterra Sempra Office Tower (2014), 15th and Island (2014), Park and G (2014), Comm 22 (2014), 7th and F Street Parking (2013), Ariel Suites (2013), 13th and Marker (2012), Strata (2008), Hotel Indigo (2008), Lofts at 707 10th Avenue Project (2007), Breeza (2007), Bayside at the Embarcadero (2007), Aria (2007), Icon (2007), Vantage Pointe (2007), Aperture (2007), Sapphire Tower (2007), Lofts at 655 Sixth Avenue (2007), Metrowork (2007), The Legend (2006), The Mark (2006), Smart Corner (2006), Lofts at 677 7th Avenue (2005), Aloft on Cortez Hill (2005), Front and Beech Apartments (2003), Bella Via Condominiums (2003), Acqua Vista Residential Tower (2003), Northblock Lofts (2003), Westin Park Place Hotel (2001), Parkloff

Apartment Complex (2001), Renaissance Park (2001), and Laurel Bay Apartments (2001).

1900 and 1912 Spindrift Drive: An extensive data recovery and mitigation monitoring program at the Spindrift Site, an important prehistoric archaeological habitation site stretching across the La Jolla area. The project resulted in the discovery of over 20,000 artifacts and nearly 100,000 grams of bulk faunal remains and marine shell, indicating a substantial occupation area (2013-2014).

San Diego Airport Development Project: An extensive historic assessment of multiple buildings at the San Diego International Airport and included the preparation of Historic American Buildings Survey documentation to preserve significant elements of the airport prior to demolition (2017-2018).

Citracado Parkway Extension: A still-ongoing project in the city of Escondido to mitigate impacts to an important archaeological occupation site. Various archaeological studies have been conducted by BFSa resulting in the identification of a significant cultural deposit within the project area.

Westin Hotel and Timeshare (Grand Pacific Resorts): Data recovery and mitigation monitoring program in the city of Carlsbad consisted of the excavation of 176 one-square-meter archaeological data recovery units which produced thousands of prehistoric artifacts and ecofacts, and resulted in the preservation of a significant prehistoric habitation site. The artifacts recovered from the site presented important new data about the prehistory of the region and Native American occupation in the area (2017).

The Everly Subdivision Project: Data recovery and mitigation monitoring program in the city of El Cajon resulted in the identification of a significant prehistoric occupation site from both the Late Prehistoric and Archaic Periods, as well as producing historic artifacts that correspond to the use of the property since 1886. The project produced an unprecedented quantity of artifacts in comparison to the area encompassed by the site, but lacked characteristics that typically reflect intense occupation, indicating that the site was used intensively for food processing (2014-2015).

Ballpark Village: A mitigation and monitoring program within three city blocks in the East Village area of San Diego resulting in the discovery of a significant historic deposit. Nearly 5,000 historic artifacts and over 500,000 grams of bulk historic building fragments, food waste, and other materials representing an occupation period between 1880 and 1917 were recovered (2015-2017).

Archaeology at the Padres Ballpark: Involved the analysis of historic resources within a seven-block area of the "East Village" area of San Diego, where occupation spanned a period from the 1870s to the 1940s. Over a period of two years, BFSa recovered over 200,000 artifacts and hundreds of pounds of metal, construction debris, unidentified broken glass, and wood. Collectively, the Ballpark Project and the other downtown mitigation and monitoring projects represent the largest historical archaeological program anywhere in the country in the past decade (2000-2007).

4S Ranch Archaeological and Historical Cultural Resources Study: Data recovery program consisted of the excavation of over 2,000 square meters of archaeological deposits that produced over one million artifacts, containing primarily prehistoric materials. The archaeological program at 4S Ranch is the largest archaeological study ever undertaken in the San Diego County area and has produced data that has exceeded expectations regarding the resolution of long-standing research questions and regional prehistoric settlement patterns.

Charles H. Brown Site: Attracted international attention to the discovery of evidence of the antiquity of man in North America. Site located in Mission Valley, in the city of San Diego.

Del Mar Man Site: Study of the now famous Early Man Site in Del Mar, California, for the San Diego Science Foundation and the San Diego Museum of Man, under the direction of Dr. Spencer Rogers and Dr. James R. Moriarty.

Old Town State Park Projects: Consulting Historical Archaeologist. Projects completed in the Old Town State Park involved development of individual lots for commercial enterprises. The projects completed in Old Town include Archaeological and Historical Site Assessment for the Great Wall Cafe (1992), Archaeological Study for the Old Town Commercial Project (1991), and Cultural Resources Site Survey at the Old San Diego Inn (1988).

Site W-20, Del Mar, California: A two-year-long investigation of a major prehistoric site in the Del Mar area of the city of San Diego. This research effort documented the earliest practice of religious/ceremonial activities in San Diego County (circa 6,000 years ago), facilitated the projection of major non-material aspects of the La Jolla Complex, and revealed the pattern of civilization at this site over a continuous period of 5,000 years. The report for the investigation included over 600 pages, with nearly 500,000 words of text, illustrations, maps, and photographs documenting this major study.

City of San Diego Reclaimed Water Distribution System: A cultural resource study of nearly 400 miles of pipeline in the city and county of San Diego.

Master Environmental Assessment Project, City of Poway: Conducted for the City of Poway to produce a complete inventory of all recorded historic and prehistoric properties within the city. The information was used in conjunction with the City's General Plan Update to produce a map matrix of the city showing areas of high, moderate, and low potential for the presence of cultural resources. The effort also included the development of the City's Cultural Resource Guidelines, which were adopted as City policy.

Draft of the City of Carlsbad Historical and Archaeological Guidelines: Contracted by the City of Carlsbad to produce the draft of the City's historical and archaeological guidelines for use by the Planning Department of the City.

The Mid-Bayfront Project for the City of Chula Vista: Involved a large expanse of undeveloped agricultural land situated between the railroad and San Diego Bay in the northwestern portion of the city. The study included the analysis of some potentially historic features and numerous prehistoric

Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Audie Murphy Ranch, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of 1,113.4 acres and 43 sites, both prehistoric and historic—including project coordination; direction of field crews; evaluation of sites for significance based on County of Riverside and CEQA guidelines; assessment of cupule, pictograph, and rock shelter sites, co-authoring of cultural resources project report. February- September 2002.

Cultural Resources Evaluation of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Otay Ranch Village 13 Project, San Diego County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of 1,947 acres and 76 sites, both prehistoric and historic—including project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on County of San Diego and CEQA guidelines; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. May-November 2002.

Cultural Resources Survey for the Remote Video Surveillance Project, El Centro Sector, Imperial County: Project manager/director for a survey of 29 individual sites near the U.S./Mexico Border for proposed video surveillance camera locations associated with the San Diego Border barrier Project—project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; site identification and recordation; assessment of potential impacts to cultural resources; meeting and coordinating with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Border Patrol, and other government agencies involved; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. January, February, and July 2002.

Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Meniffee West GPA, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of nine sites, both prehistoric and historic—including project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; assessment of sites

for significance based on County of Riverside and CEQA guidelines; historic research; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. January-March 2002.

Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed French Valley Specific Plan/EIR, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of two prehistoric and three historic sites—included project coordination and budgeting; survey of project area; Native American consultation; direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; cultural resources project report in prep. July-August 2000.

Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Menifee Ranch, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of one prehistoric and five historic sites—included project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; feature recordation; historic structure assessments; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; historic research; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. February-June 2000.

Salvage Mitigation of a Portion of the San Diego Presidio Identified During Water Pipe Construction for the City of San Diego, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis and authoring of cultural resources project report in prep. April 2000.

Enhanced Cultural Resource Survey and Evaluation for the Tyrian 3 Project, La Jolla, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of a single-dwelling parcel—included project coordination; assessment of parcel for potentially buried cultural deposits; authoring of cultural resources project report. April 2000.

Enhanced Cultural Resource Survey and Evaluation for the Lamont 5 Project, Pacific Beach, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of a single-dwelling parcel—included project coordination; assessment of parcel for potentially buried cultural deposits; authoring of cultural resources project report. April 2000.

Enhanced Cultural Resource Survey and Evaluation for the Reiss Residence Project, La Jolla, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of a single-dwelling parcel—included project coordination; assessment of parcel for potentially buried cultural deposits; authoring of cultural resources project report. March-April 2000.

Salvage Mitigation of a Portion of Site SDM-W-95 (CA-SDI-211) for the Poinsettia Shores Santalina Development Project and Caltrans, Carlsbad, California: Project archaeologist/ director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis and authoring of cultural resources project report in prep. December 1999-January 2000.

Survey and Testing of Two Prehistoric Cultural Resources for the Airway Truck Parking Project, Otay Mesa, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of testing recovery program; assessment of site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. December 1999-January 2000.

Cultural Resources Phase I and II Investigations for the Tin Can Hill Segment of the Immigration and Naturalization Services Triple Fence Project Along the International Border, San Diego County, California: Project manager/director for a survey and testing of a prehistoric quarry site along the border—NRHP eligibility assessment; project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; feature recordation; meeting and coordinating with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. December 1999-January 2000.

Mitigation of a Prehistoric Cultural Resource for the Westview High School Project for the City of San Diego, California: Project archaeologist/ director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program including collection of material for specialized faunal and botanical analyses; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; co-authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. October 1999-January 2000.

Mitigation of a Prehistoric Cultural Resource for the Otay Ranch SPA-One West Project for the City of Chula Vista, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development of data recovery program; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; assessment of site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. September 1999-January 2000.

Monitoring of Grading for the Herschel Place Project, La Jolla, California: Project archaeologist/ monitor— included monitoring of grading activities associated with the development of a single- dwelling parcel. September 1999.

Survey and Testing of a Historic Resource for the Osterkamp Development Project, Valley Center, California: Project archaeologist/ director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program; budget development; assessment of site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report. July-August 1999.

Survey and Testing of a Prehistoric Cultural Resource for the Proposed College Boulevard Alignment Project, Carlsbad, California: Project manager/director —included direction of field crews; development and completion of testing recovery program; assessment of site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. July-August 1999.

Survey and Evaluation of Cultural Resources for the Palomar Christian Conference Center Project, Palomar Mountain, California: Project archaeologist—included direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report. July-August 1999.

Survey and Evaluation of Cultural Resources at the Village 2 High School Site, Otay Ranch, City of Chula Vista, California: Project manager/director —management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; assessment of site for significance based on CEQA guidelines; data synthesis; authoring of cultural resources project report. July 1999.

Cultural Resources Phase I, II, and III Investigations for the Immigration and Naturalization Services Triple Fence Project Along the International Border, San Diego County, California: Project manager/director for the survey, testing, and mitigation of sites along border—supervision of multiple field crews, NRHP eligibility assessments, Native American consultation, contribution to Environmental Assessment document, lithic and marine shell analysis, authoring of cultural resources project report. August 1997- January 2000.

Phase I, II, and III Investigations for the Scripps Poway Parkway East Project, Poway California: Project archaeologist/project director—included recordation and assessment of multicomponent prehistoric and historic sites; direction of Phase II and III investigations; direction of laboratory analyses including prehistoric and historic collections; curation of collections; data synthesis; coauthorship of final cultural resources report. February 1994; March-September 1994; September-December 1995.

Andrew J. Garrison, MA, RPA

Project Archaeologist

Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
14010 Poway Road • Suite A •
Phone: (858) 679-8218 • Fax: (858) 679-9896 • E-Mail: agarrison@bfsa-ca.com



Education

Master of Arts, Public History, University of California, Riverside	2009
Bachelor of Science, Anthropology, University of California, Riverside	2005
Bachelor of Arts, History, University of California, Riverside	2005

Professional Memberships

Register of Professional Archaeologists	Society of Primitive Technology
Society for California Archaeology	Lithic Studies Society
Society for American Archaeology	California Preservation Foundation
California Council for the Promotion of History	Pacific Coast Archaeological Society

Experience

Project Archaeologist **June 2017–Present**
Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. **Poway, California**

Project management of all phases of archaeological investigations for local, state, and federal agencies including National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) level projects interacting with clients, sub-consultants, and lead agencies. Supervise and perform fieldwork including archaeological survey, monitoring, site testing, comprehensive site records checks, and historic building assessments. Perform and oversee technological analysis of prehistoric lithic assemblages. Author or co-author cultural resource management reports submitted to private clients and lead agencies.

Senior Archaeologist and GIS Specialist **2009–2017**
Scientific Resource Surveys, Inc. **Orange, California**

Served as Project Archaeologist or Principal Investigator on multiple projects, including archaeological monitoring, cultural resource surveys, test excavations, and historic building assessments. Directed projects from start to finish, including budget and personnel hours proposals, field and laboratory direction, report writing, technical editing, Native American consultation, and final report submittal. Oversaw all GIS projects including data collection, spatial analysis, and map creation.

Preservation Researcher **2009**
City of Riverside Modernism Survey **Riverside, California**

Completed DPR Primary, District, and Building, Structure and Object Forms for five sites for a grant-funded project to survey designated modern architectural resources within the City of Riverside.

Information Officer
Eastern Information Center (EIC), University of California, Riverside

2005, 2008–2009
Riverside, California

Processed and catalogued restricted and unrestricted archaeological and historical site record forms. Conducted research projects and records searches for government agencies and private cultural resource firms.

Reports/Papers

- 2019 A Class III Archaeological Study for the Tuscany Valley (TM 33725) Project National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Compliance, Lake Elsinore, Riverside County, California. Contributing author. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2019 A Phase I and II Cultural Resources Assessment for the Jack Rabbit Trail Logistics Center Project, City of Beaumont, Riverside County, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2019 A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the 10575 Foothill Boulevard Project, Rancho Cucamonga, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2019 Cultural Resources Study for the County Road and East End Avenue Project, City of Chino, San Bernardino County, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2019 Phase II Cultural Resource Study for the McElwain Project, City of Murrieta, California. Contributing author. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2019 A Section 106 (NHPA) Historic Resources Study for the McElwain Project, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2018 Cultural Resource Monitoring Report for the Sewer Group 818 Project, City of San Diego. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2018 Phase I Cultural Resource Survey for the Stone Residence Project, 1525 Buckingham Drive, La Jolla, California 92037. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2018 A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Seaton Commerce Center Project, Riverside County, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2017 A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Marbella Villa Project, City of Desert Hot Springs, Riverside County, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2017 Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for TTM 37109, City of Jurupa Valley, County of Riverside. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2017 A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Winchester Dollar General Store Project, Riverside County, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
- 2016 John Wayne Airport Jet Fuel Pipeline and Tank Farm Archaeological Monitoring Plan. Scientific Resource Surveys, Inc. On file at the County of Orange, California.
- 2016 Historic Resource Assessment for 220 South Batavia Street, Orange, CA 92868 Assessor's Parcel Number 041-064-4. Scientific Resource Surveys, Inc. Submitted to the City of Orange as part of

- Mills Act application.
- 2015 Historic Resource Report: 807-813 Harvard Boulevard, Los Angeles. Scientific Resource Surveys, Inc. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- 2015 Exploring a Traditional Rock Cairn: Test Excavation at CA-SDI-13/RBLI-26: The Rincon Indian Reservation, San Diego County, California. Scientific Resource Surveys, Inc.
- 2014 Archaeological Monitoring Results: The New Los Angeles Federal Courthouse. Scientific Resource Surveys, Inc. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- 2012 Bolsa Chica Archaeological Project Volume 7, Technological Analysis of Stone Tools, Lithic Technology at Bolsa Chica: Reduction Maintenance and Experimentation. Scientific Resource Surveys, Inc.

Presentations

- 2017 "Repair and Replace: Lithic Production Behavior as Indicated by the Debitage Assemblage from CA-MRP-283 the Hackney Site." Presented at the Society for California Archaeology Annual Meeting, Fish Camp, California.
- 2016 "Bones, Stones, and Shell at Bolsa Chica: A Ceremonial Relationship?" Presented at the Society for California Archaeology Annual Meeting, Ontario, California.
- 2016 "Markers of Time: Exploring Transitions in the Bolsa Chica Assemblage." Presented at the Society for California Archaeology Annual Meeting, Ontario, California.
- 2016 "Dating Duress: Understanding Prehistoric Climate Change at Bolsa Chica." Presented at the Society for California Archaeology Annual Meeting, Ontario, California.
- 2014 "New Discoveries from an Old Collection: Comparing Recently Identified OGR Beads to Those Previously Analyzed from the Encino Village Site." Presented at the Society for California Archaeology Annual Meeting, Visalia, California.
- 2012 Bolsa Chica Archaeology: Part Seven: Culture and Chronology. Lithic demonstration of experimental manufacturing techniques at the April meeting of The Pacific Coast Archaeological Society, Irvine, California.

APPENDIX B

Archaeological Records Search Results

(Deleted for Public Review; Bound Separately)

APPENDIX C

NAHC Sacred Lands File Search Results

(Deleted for Public Review; Bound Separately)