

Report Date: April 2022

**Updated Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment for the
Riverside Chicago Avenue Project, Riverside County, California**

U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute Quadrangles: Riverside East (1967 photorevised 1980)

Owner Applicant:

TTL Management, Inc., An Arizona Corporation
2942 Century Place, Suite 121
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
(949) 261-7010

Prepared For:

County of Riverside Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor, Riverside, CA 92501
(951) 955-2873

Prepared By:

ECORP Consulting, Inc.
215 N. Fifth Street
Redlands, CA 92374
(909) 307-0046
Principal Investigator: John O'Connor, Ph.D., RPA

Keywords: Perris, Riverside County, orchards, [REDACTED]

Results: Four previously recorded resources (P-33-012915/CA-RIV-7181, P-33-012916/CA-RIV-7182, P-33-012917/CA-RIV-7183, and P-33-012918/CA-RIV-7184) and two newly recorded resources (Field Numbers CA-001 and CA-002)

Report Preparers: Robert Cunningham, Sonia Sifuentes, RPA, Lisa Westwood, RPA (909) 307-0046

Field Personnel: Robert Cunningham (Field Director) and Julian Acuña, RPA (909) 307-0046

Riverside County Project Numbers: PAR210156

Riverside County APN: 245-300-001, 245-300-004

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

TTL Management, Inc., is filing a Site Plan for the Riverside Chicago Avenue Project, which consists of two parcels located in Riverside County, near the community of Woodcrest. In 2015, First Carbon Solutions (FCS) conducted a Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment in support of the Riverside Chicago Avenue Project (Project). The FCS 2015 report summarizes the results of the Phase I study that covered 140 acres. ECORP Consulting, Inc., (ECORP) conducted an update to the 2015 study in 2022. The purpose of the update was to include an additional 20 acres added to the Project Area since the original study, cover lapses in the original study, and to present data consistent with Riverside County standards. The Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) for the two properties included in the Project Area are 245-300-001 and 245-300-004. The total Project Area contains 160 acres of land.

Between December and April 2021, ECORP requested a cultural resources records search from the Eastern Information Center (EIC; University of California, Riverside), requested a search of the Sacred Lands File from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and conducted a field visit and a second intensive systematic pedestrian survey of the 160-acre Project Area.

The updated records search indicated that 55 cultural resources investigations have been conducted within the 1-mile records search radius between 1974 and 2016. Of these studies, two investigations overlapped the Project Area, covering more than 95 percent of the area. The records search also showed that [REDACTED] cultural resources have been recorded within or adjacent to the Project Area. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] previously recorded cultural resources are located within 1 mile of the Project Area.

The results of the Sacred Lands File search by the NAHC did not indicate the presence of Native American sacred lands within the vicinity of the Project Area. In addition to the search of the Sacred Lands File, the NAHC identified 21 Native American groups and individuals with historical and traditional ties to the Project Area.

ECORP conducted field visits in February and April 2022 to document ground conditions and to revisit four previously recorded sites. During the field visits, ECORP confirmed the presence of the four previously recorded resources and updated site boundaries. Previously recorded sites consisted of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] sites: P-33-012915, P-33-012916, P-33-012917, and P-33-012918.

In March 2022, ECORP conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of the 20-acre addition to the Project Area. As a result of the 20-acre survey, ECORP identified two newly recorded resources. The two newly recorded resources consist of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]: CA-001 and CA-002. Surface visibility during the survey ranged from fair (60 percent) to poor (10 percent) throughout the entire Project Area. Due to poor ground visibility, there exists the potential for additional resources to be present within the Project Area; however, due to the past agricultural use of the property, in-situ cultural deposits are unlikely.

ECORP recommends that all known sites be avoided and preserved in place. If avoidance is not possible, ECORP recommends additional Phase II studies be conducted for resources that will be impacted by Project activities. In the event that one or more Historical Resource is within the Project Area and cannot

be avoided, further work including an impact assessment and, if warranted, mitigation in the form of data recovery may be required.

The Project Area has a high potential to contain unidentified surface-level resources that were obscured from view by heavy vegetation or wood debris from the removal of the citrus groves. Due to ground conditions and the presence of [REDACTED] within the property and within the general vicinity, ECORP recommends that a qualified archaeological monitor be present during vegetation removal for the Project to identify and assess surface and near-surface-level resources that may not have been visible at the time of the survey. The potential for the Project Area to contain unidentified subsurface resources is low based on the underlying sediments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF APPENDICES	iv
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	iv
I INTRODUCTION AND SETTING.....	1
a. Project Description.....	1
b. Project Location.....	1
c. USGS Quad Location	1
d. Field Personnel.....	2
e. Topographic Description and Elevation	2
f. Disturbance and Present Land Use.....	2
g. Vegetation	2
h. Geology	3
II PRECONTACT CONTEXT.....	3
a. Regional Prehistory	3
b. Summary of Known Archaeology in the Project Area.....	6
c. Ethnohistory.....	6
III HISTORIC CONTEXT	9
a. Historic Periods.....	9
b. Historic-Period Native American Settlement.....	10
c. Land Granting and Modern Use of the Area	11
IV RESEARCH DESIGN	11
a. Legal Compliance Basis	11
b. Research Framework	13
V METHODS.....	14
a. Records Search Methods.....	14
b. Field Survey Methods.....	15
VI RESULTS	16
a. Records Search Results.....	16

b. Field Survey Results31

VII RECOMMENDED MITIGATION 36

VIII CERTIFICATION 37

IX REFERENCES CITED..... 38

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Previous Cultural Studies in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area17

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area22

LIST OF APPENDICES

- A. *CONFIDENTIAL* First Carbon Solutions Report
- B. Project Location and Vicinity Map
- C. Staff Qualifications
- D. *CONFIDENTIAL* CHRIS Results
- E. NAHC
- F. Tribal Correspondence
- G. *CONFIDENTIAL* DPR Records
- H. Survey Photographs

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

- AB Assembly Bill
- APN Assessor Parcel Number
- BERD Built Environment Resource Directory
- BP Before present
- CEQA California Environmental Quality Act
- CHRIS California Historical Resources Information System
- CRHR California Register of Historical Resources
- DPR Department of Parks and Recreation
- ECORP ECORP Consulting, Inc.
- EIC Eastern Information Center
- FCS First Carbon Solutions
- MLD Most Likely Descendant
- NAHC Native American Heritage Commission
- NRHP National Register of Historic Places
- OHP Office of Historic Preservation
- OHV Off-Highway Vehicle
- PRC Public Resources Code
- RPA Registered Professional Archaeologist

SB Senate Bill
U.S. United States of America
UCSB University of California, Santa Barbara
USGS U.S. Geological Survey

I INTRODUCTION AND SETTING

a. Project Description

In 2015, First Carbon Solutions (FCS) conducted a Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of the Riverside Chicago Avenue Project (Project). TTL Management proposes to construct a residential development on approximately 140 acres. In May 2015, FCS completed a Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment Report summarizing the results of the Phase I study that covered 140 acres (FCS 2015). Similarly, the cultural and historical context of the Project Area is summarized in the technical study prepared for the Project, which is also hereby incorporated by reference. The 2015 Phase I report is also included as Confidential Appendix A of this Update Report.

In the 2015 report, FCS provided results of a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search for a 0.5-mile radius around the 140-acre Project Area. These results indicated the presence of four previously recorded precontact sites within the Project Area: CA-RIV-7181, CA-RIV-7182, CA-RIV-7183, and CA-RIV-7184. FCS conducted Phase I fieldwork for the Project in March and April 2015, and the field crew was unable to locate two of the previously recorded sites (CA-RIV-7183 and CA-RIV-7184). The report notes the presence of orchards throughout much of the Project Area and indicates the orchards were planted in the late 1960s (FCS 2015).

In 2022, TTL Management added an additional 20-acre parcel to the Project, expanding the Project Area to a total of 160 acres. ECORP conducted an update to the 2015 study in 2022. The purpose of the update was to include the additional 20 acres added to the Project Area since the original study, cover lapses in the original study, and present data consistent with Riverside County standards. To this purpose, ECORP conducted an update to the CHRIS records search, expanding the records search area to the current standard of a 1.0-mile radius around the Project Area. ECORP requested an update to the Sacred Lands File search from the NAHC for any Tribal Cultural Resources that may have been documented since the 2015 study. ECORP conducted a field visit of the original 140-acre Project Area to document ground conditions since the removal of the historic-period orange grove, and to confirm the presence of the previously recorded resources within the Project Area. ECORP also conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of the additional 20 acres.

b. Project Location

The Project Area is located within the Woodcrest Area of unincorporated Riverside County, south of Twin Lakes Drive, north of Iris Avenue, west of Chicago Avenue, and east of an unnamed, unpaved road connecting Iris Avenue to Ridge Canyon Drive (Appendix B, Figure 1).

c. USGS Quad Location

As shown on the United States (U.S.) Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute Riverside East, California topographic quadrangle map (1967, photorevised 1980), the Project Area is located in Sections 24, Township 3 South, Range 5 West of the San Bernardino Base and Meridian (Appendix B).

d. Field Personnel

Field personnel for the initial 140-acre site visit and the intensive pedestrian survey of the additional 20-acre parcel consisted of ECORP archaeologists Robert Cunningham (Field Director), and Julian Acuña, RPA. ECORP personnel qualifications are located in Appendix C.

Supplemental survey was monitored by tribal representative Edward Ortiz from the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians.

e. Topographic Description and Elevation

The Project Area is located in unincorporated western Riverside County, in the unincorporated community of Woodcrest, 7.39 miles east of the City of Norco, 5.09 miles northwest of the City of Perris, and 0.5 mile south of the City of Riverside. The Project Area is situated at an elevation of 1,403 to 1,571 feet above mean sea level in Mead Valley, located east of the Santa Ana Mountains and west of the San Jacinto Mountains in southern California. The San Bernardino Mountains are to the north. Local topography is undulating terrain crossed by seasonal streams. The climate of the Project Area is somewhat comparable to the high deserts of southern California, though with a more moderate coastal temperature range than the inland deserts.

f. Disturbance and Present Land Use

The eastern portion of the Project Area is former orchards, and the western portion is undeveloped grassland. Historic aerial photographs show that the eastern portion of the Project Area was undeveloped land and has been utilized for agriculture from 1931 to 1962. In aerial photographs from 1962, a house and two structures are visible within the Project Area and the southern portion of the Project Area has been planted for orchards. From 1966 to 1967, the northeastern portion of the Project Area was also planted for orchards (NETROnline 2022; University of California, Santa Barbara [UCSB] Library 2022). Since 2018, the last year for which aerial photographs of the Project Area are available, the orchards and irrigation features have been removed and the ground surface is covered in a dense layer of wood chips. The western undeveloped portion of the Project Area has been disturbed by Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) activity and modern dumping.

Surrounding parcels are utilized for residential, small-scale agricultural, and recreational purposes, with notable increases in residential development since the late 1970s. Some land still sits vacant. Investment in community-oriented projects is evident in the presence of Martin Luther King High School, John F. Kennedy Elementary School, and Orange Terrace Community Park to the east of the Project Area.

g. Vegetation

Vegetation within the Project Area consisted of low-lying invasive grasses in formal agricultural areas, and dense and tall vegetation along drainages and fence lines. Much of the property has undergone decades of extensive agricultural use. The Project Area contains non-native grassland characterized by Russian thistle and other non-native grasses and scrub.

h. Geology

Local geology can be characterized as Cretaceous period plutonic rocks of peninsular ranges (qdi) composed of quartz diorite (Dibblee 2003). Surface sediments within the Project Area are mainly composed of sandy loam alfisols, entisols, and inceptisols resulting from granite-derived alluvium. Base landforms are characterized as alluvial fans and rocky outcrops. The majority of the Project Area contains three soil types: Fallbrook sandy loam coarse sandy loam with 8 to 15 percent slopes, Vista coarse sandy loam with 8 to 15 percent slopes, and Cieneba rocky sandy loam with 15 to 50 percent slopes. Other soil types that overlap the Project Area include Cieneba sandy loam, Bonsall fine sandy loam, and Handord coarse sandy loam (Soilweb 2022).

II PRECONTACT CONTEXT

a. Regional Prehistory

Paleo-Indian Period/Terminal Pleistocene (12,000 to 10,000 Before Present [BP])

The first inhabitants of southern California were big game hunters and gatherers exploiting extinct species of Pleistocene megafauna (e.g., mammoth and other Rancholabrean fauna). Local "fluted point" assemblages comprised of large spear points or knives are stylistically and technologically similar to the Clovis Paleo-Indian cultural tradition dated to this period elsewhere in North America (Moratto 1984). Archaeological evidence for this period in southern California is limited to a few small temporary camps with fluted points found around late Pleistocene lake margins in the Mojave Desert and around Tulare Lake in the southern San Joaquin Valley. Single points are reported from Ocotillo Wells and Cuyamaca Pass in eastern San Diego County and from the Yuha Desert in Imperial County (Rondeau et al. 2007).

Early Archaic Period/Early Holocene (10,000 to 8,500 BP)

Approximately 10,000 years ago, at the beginning of the Holocene, warming temperatures, and the extinction of the megafauna resulted in changing subsistence strategies with an emphasis on hunting smaller game and increasing reliance on plant gathering. Previously, Early Holocene sites were represented by only a few sites and isolates from the Lake Mojave and San Dieguito complexes found along former lakebeds and grasslands of the Mojave Desert and in inland San Diego County. More recently, southern California Early Holocene sites have been found along the Santa Barbara Channel (Erlandson 1994), in western Riverside County (Goldberg 2001; Grenda 1997), and along the San Diego County coast (Gallegos 1991; Koerper et al. 1991; Warren 1967).

The San Dieguito Complex was defined based on material found at the Harris site (CA-SDI-149) on the San Dieguito River near Lake Hodges in San Diego County. San Dieguito artifacts include large leaf-shaped points; leaf-shaped knives; large ovoid, domed, and rectangular end and side scrapers; engraving tools; and crescentics (Koerper et al. 1991). The San Dieguito Complex at the Harris site dates to 9,000 to 7,500 BP (Gallegos 1991). However, sites from this time period in coastal San Diego County have yielded artifacts and subsistence remains characteristic of the succeeding Encinitas Tradition, including manos, metates, core-cobble tools, and marine shell (Gallegos 1991; Koerper et al. 1991).

Encinitas Tradition or Milling Stone Period/Middle Holocene (8,500 to 1,250 BP)

The Encinitas Tradition (Warren 1968) and the Milling Stone Period (Wallace 1955) refer to a long period of time during which small mobile bands of people who spoke an early Hokan language foraged for a wide variety of resources including hard seeds, berries, and roots/tubers (yucca in inland areas), rabbits and other small animals, and shellfish and fish in coastal areas. Sites from the Encinitas Tradition consist of residential bases and resource acquisition locations with no evidence for overnight stays. Residential bases have hearths and fire-affected rock indicating overnight stays and food preparation. Residential bases along the coast have large amounts of shell and are often termed shell middens.

The Encinitas Tradition as originally defined (Warren 1968) applied to all of the non-desert areas of southern California. Recently, four patterns within the Encinitas Tradition have been proposed which apply to different regions of southern California (Sutton and Gardner 2010). The Topanga Pattern includes archaeological material from the Los Angeles Basin and Orange County. The Greven Knoll Pattern pertains to southwestern San Bernardino County and western Riverside County (Sutton and Gardner 2010). Each of the patterns is divided into temporal phases. The Topanga Pattern included the Los Angeles Basin and Orange County. The Topanga I phase extends from 8,500 to 5,000 BP and Topanga II runs from 5,000 to 3,500 BP. The Topanga Pattern ended about 3,500 BP with the arrival of Takic speakers, except in the Santa Monica Mountains where the Topanga III phase lasted until about 2,000 BP.

The Encinitas Tradition in inland areas east of the Topanga Pattern (southwestern San Bernardino County and western Riverside County) is the Greven Knoll Pattern (Sutton and Gardner 2010). Greven Knoll I (9,400-4,000 BP) has abundant manos and metates. Projectile points are few and are mostly Pinto points. Greven Knoll II (4,000-3,000 BP) has abundant manos and metates and core tools. Projectile points are mostly Elko points. The Elsinore site on the east shore of Lake Elsinore was occupied during Greven Knoll I and Greven Knoll II. During Greven Knoll I faunal processing (butchering) took place at the lakeshore and floral processing (seed grinding), cooking, and eating took place farther from the shore. The primary foods were rabbit meat and seeds from grasses, sage, and ragweed. A few deer, waterfowl, and reptiles were consumed. The recovered archaeological material suggests that a highly mobile population visited the site at a specific time each year. It is possible that their seasonal round included the ocean coast at other times of the year. These people had an unspecialized technology as exemplified by the numerous crescents, a multi-purpose tool. The few projectile points suggest that most of the small game was trapped using nets and snares (Grenda 1997:279). During Greven Knoll II, which included a warmer drier climatic episode known as the Altithermal, it is thought that populations in interior southern California concentrated at oases and that Lake Elsinore was one of them. The Elsinore site (CA-RIV-2798) is one of five known Middle Holocene residential sites around Lake Elsinore. Tools were mostly manos, metates, and hammerstones. Scraper planes were absent. Flaked-stone tools consisted mostly of utilized flakes used as scrapers. The Elsinore site during the Middle Holocene was a "recurrent extended encampment" which could have been occupied during much of the year.

The Encinitas Tradition lasted longer in inland areas because Takic speakers did not move east into these areas until circa 1,000 BP. Greven Knoll III (3,000-1,000 BP) is present at the Liberty Grove site in Cucamonga (Salls 1983) and at sites in Cajon Pass that were defined as part of the Sayles Complex (Kowta 1969). Greven Knoll III sites have a large proportion of manos and metates and core tools as well as

scraper planes. Kowta (1969) suggested the scraper planes may have been used to process yucca and agave. The faunal assemblage consists of large quantities of lagomorphs (rabbits and hares) and lesser quantities of deer, rodents, birds, carnivores, and reptiles.

Palomar Tradition (1,250 – 150 BP)

The native people of southern California (north of a line from Agua Hedionda to Lake Henshaw in San Diego County) spoke Takic languages which form a branch or subfamily of the Uto-Aztecan language family. The Takic languages are divided into the Gabrielino-Fernandeño language, the Serrano-Kitanemuk group (the Serrano [includes the Vanyume dialect] and Kitanemuk languages), the Tataviam language, and the Cupan group (the Luiseño-Juaneño language, the Cahuilla Language, and the Cupeño language) (Golla 2011). According to Sutton (2009), Takic speakers occupied the southern San Joaquin Valley before 3,500 BP. Perhaps as a result of the arrival of Yokutsan speakers (a language in the Penutian language family) from the north, Takic speakers moved southeast. The ancestors of the Kitanemuk moved into the Tehachapi Mountains and the ancestors of the Tataviam moved into the upper Santa Clara River drainage. The ancestors of the Gabrielino (Tongva) moved into the Los Angeles Basin about 3,500 BP, replacing the native Hokan speakers. Speakers of proto-Gabrielino reached the southern Channel Islands by 3,200 BP (Sutton 2009) and moved as far south as Aliso Creek in Orange County by 3,000 BP.

Takic people moved south into southern Orange County after 1,250 BP and became the ancestors of the Juaneño. Takic people moved inland from southern Orange County about 1,000 BP, becoming the ancestors of the Luiseño, Cupeño, and Cahuilla. Takic people from the Kitanemuk area moved east along the northern slopes of the San Gabriel Mountains and spread into the San Bernardino Mountains and along the Mojave River becoming the ancestors of the Serrano and the Vanyume.

The material culture of the inland areas where Takic languages were spoken at the time of Spanish contact is part of the Palomar Tradition (Sutton 2011). San Luis Rey I Phase (1,000 – 500 BP) and San Luis Rey II Phase (500 – 150 BP) pertain to the area occupied by the Luiseño at the time of Spanish contact. The Peninsular I (1,000 – 750 BP), II (750 – 300 BP), and III (300 – 150 BP) Phases are used in the areas occupied by the Cahuilla and Serrano (Sutton 2011).

San Luis Rey I is characterized by Cottonwood Triangular arrow points, use of bedrock mortars, stone pendants, shell beads, quartz crystals, and bone tools. San Luis Rey II sees the addition of ceramics, including ceramic cremation urns, red pictographs on boulders in village sites, and steatite arrow straighteners. San Luis Rey II represents the archaeological manifestation of the antecedents of the historically known Luiseño (Goldberg 2001). During San Luis Rey I there were a series of small permanent residential bases at water sources, each occupied by a kin group (probably a lineage). During San Luis Rey II people from several related residential bases moved into a large village located at the most reliable water source (Waugh 1986). Each village had a territory that included acorn harvesting camps at higher elevations. Villages have numerous bedrock mortars, large dense midden areas with a full range of flaked and ground stone tools, rock art, and a cemetery.

b. Summary of Known Archaeology in the Project Area

The 2015 and 2022 records search indicated that there are four previously recorded resources within or adjacent to the Project Area, consisting of four precontact milling feature sites. Based on the available literature, it appears that none of these sites have been tested for the presence of subsurface resources.

Over [REDACTED] previously recorded cultural resources are located within the vicinity of the Project Area. These consist of a mix of precontact and historic-period sites; however, the majority consist of precontact milling sites located within the nearby hillsides and nearby drainages around the Project Area.

c. Ethnohistory

The Project Area is located within the territory known to have been occupied by the Cahuilla group of Native Americans, and near territory occupied the Gabrielino and Luiseño groups of Native Americans, at the time of contact with Europeans, around A.D. 1769.

Cahuilla. Ethnographic accounts of Native Americans indicate that the Project Area lies predominantly within the original territory of the Cahuilla. The Cahuilla spoke a Takic language. The Takic group of languages is part of the Uto-Aztecan language family. The Cahuilla occupied a territory ranging from the San Bernardino Mountains in the north to the Chocolate Mountains and Borrego Springs in the south, and from the Colorado Desert in the east to Palomar Mountain in the west. They engaged in trade, marriage, shared rituals, and war with other groups of Native Americans whose territories they overlapped, primarily the Serrano and Gabrielino (Bean 1978, 1972; Kroeber 1925).

Cahuilla subsistence consisted of hunting, gathering, and fishing. Villages were often located near water sources, most commonly in canyons or near drainages on alluvial fans. Major villages were fully occupied during the winter, but during other seasons task groups made periodic forays to collect various plant foods, with larger groupings from several villages organizing for the annual acorn harvest (Bean and Saubel 1972). Bean and Saubel (1972) have recorded the use of several hundred species of plants used for food, building/artifact materials, and medicines. The major plant foods included acorns, pinyon nuts, and various seed-producing legumes. These were complemented by agave, wild fruits and berries, tubers, cactus bulbs, roots and greens, and seeds.

Hunting focused on both small to medium-sized mammals, such as rodents and rabbits, and large mammals, such as pronghorn sheep, mountain sheep, and mule deer. Hunting was done using the throwing stick or the bow and arrow, though nets and traps were also used for small animals (Bean 1972).

Cahuilla buildings consisted of dome-shaped or rectangular houses, constructed of poles covered with brush and above-ground granaries (Bean 1978; Strong 1929). Other material culture included baskets, pottery, and grinding implements; stone tools, arrow shaft straighteners and bows; clothing (loincloths, blankets, rope, sandals, skirts, and diapers); and various ceremonial objects made from mineral, plant, and animal substances (Bean 1972).

As many as 10,000 Cahuilla may have existed at the time of European contact in the eighteenth century (Bean 1978). Circa 1900, Cahuilla lived in the settlements of La Mesa, Toro, and Martinez on the Augustin

and Toro Indian Reservations east and southeast of the Project Area (USGS 1904). As of 1974, approximately 900 people claimed Cahuilla ancestry (Bean 1978).

There was no substantial Euro-American settlement in the Coachella Valley until the Southern Pacific Railroad completed its line from Los Angeles to Indio (then known as Indian Wells) in 1876. The railroad was completed to Yuma in 1877, linking southern California with Arizona and points east. Wells to supply water for the steam locomotives were dug at Indio, Coachella (originally named Woodspur), Thermal (originally named Kokell), and Mecca (originally named Walters). Settlement began around these wells and railroad stations, forming the nucleus of today's Coachella Valley towns.

Gabrieliño. Ethnographic accounts of Native Americans indicate that the Gabrieliño (also known as Gabrieleno, or Tongva) once occupied the region that encompasses the project area. At the time of contact with Europeans, the Gabrieliño were the main occupants of the southern Channel Islands, the Los Angeles Basin, much of Orange County, and extended as far east as the western San Bernardino Valley. The term "Gabrieliño" came from the group's association with Mission San Gabriel Arcángel, established in 1771. The Gabrieliño are believed to have been one of the most populous and wealthy Native American tribes in southern California prior to European contact. (Bean and Smith 1978a; McCawley 1996; Moratto 1984) and spoke a Takic language. The Takic group of languages is part of the Uto-Aztecan language family.

The Gabrieliño occupied villages located along rivers and at the mouths of canyons. Populations ranged from 50 to 200 inhabitants. Residential structures within the villages were domed, circular, and made from thatched tule or other available wood. Gabrieliño society was organized by kinship groups, with each group composed of several related families who together owned hunting and gathering territories. Settlement patterns varied according to the availability of floral and faunal resources (Bean and Smith 1978a; McCawley 1996; Miller 1991).

Vegetal staples consisted of acorns, chia, seeds, piñon nuts, sage, cacti, roots, and bulbs. Animals hunted included deer, antelope, coyote, rabbits, squirrels, rodents, birds, and snakes. The Gabrieliño also fished and collected marine shellfish (Bean and Smith 1978a; McCawley 1996; Miller 1991).

By the late 18th century, Gabrieliño population had significantly dwindled due to introduced European diseases and dietary deficiencies. Gabrieliño communities disintegrated as families were taken to the missions (Bean and Smith 1978a; McCawley 1996; Miller 1991). However, current descendants of the Gabrieliño are preserving Gabrieliño culture.

Luisseño. The Luisseño are a Takic-speaking people who occupied what is now western Riverside County and northern San Diego County (the San Luis Rey River drainage) in prehistoric and historic times. The term Luisseño was given by the Spanish to the native groups who were living in this area and who were forcibly removed to Mission San Luis Rey. The Luisseño believe the world was created in the area now known as Temecula and that they have been here since the beginning of time.

The Luisseño lived in sedentary and autonomous village groups, each with specific subsistence territories encompassing hunting, collecting, and fishing areas. Villages were typically located in valley bottoms, along streams, or along coastal strands near mountain ranges where water was available and village

defense was possible. Inland populations had access to fishing and gathering sites on the coast, which they used during the winter months (Bean and Shipek 1978).

Luißeño subsistence was centered around the gathering of acorns, seeds, greens, bulbs, roots, berries, and other vegetal foods. This was supplemented with hunting mammals such as deer, antelope, rabbit, woodrat, ground squirrels, and mice, as well as quail, doves, ducks, and other birds. Bands along the coast also exploited marine resources, such as sea mammals, fish, crustaceans, and mollusks. Inland, trout and other fish were taken from mountain streams (Bean and Shipek 1978).

Hunting was carried out both individually and by organized groups. Tool technology for food acquisition, storage, and preparation reflects the size and quantity of items procured. Small game was hunted with the use of curved throwing sticks, nets, slings, or traps. Bows and arrows were used for hunting larger game. Dugout canoes, basketry fish traps, and shell hooks were used for near-shore ocean fishing. Coiled and twined baskets were made for food gathering, preparation, storing, and serving. Other items used for food processing included large shallow trays for winnowing chaff from grain, ceramic and basketry storage containers, manos and metates for grinding seeds, and ceramic jars for cooking (Bean and Shipek 1978).

Villages had hereditary chiefs who controlled religious, economic, and territorial activities (Bean and Shipek 1978; Boscana 1933). An advisory council of ritual specialists and shamans was consulted for environmental and other knowledge. Large villages located along the coast or in inland valleys may have had more complex social and political structures than settlements controlling smaller territories (Bean and Shipek 1978; Strong 1929).

Most Luißeño villages contained a ceremonial structure, enclosed by circular fencing and located near the center of the village. Houses were semisubterranean and thatched with locally available brush, bark, or reeds. Earth-covered semisubterranean sweathouses were also common and were used for purification and curing rituals (Bean and Shipek 1978).

The Luißeño first came into contact with Europeans in 1769 when the expedition led by Gaspar de Portolá arrived in their territory. That same year, the San Diego Mission was established just to the south, followed by the San Juan Capistrano Mission in 1776 and the San Luis Rey Mission in 1798. Poor living conditions at the missions and introduced European diseases led to a rapid decline of the Luißeño population. Following the Mission Period (1769-1834), Luißeño Indians scattered throughout southern California. Some became serfs on the Mexican ranchos, others moved to newly founded pueblos established for them, some sought refuge among inland groups, and a few managed to acquire land grants. Later, many moved to or were forced onto reservations. Although many of their cultural traditions had been suppressed during the Mission Period, the Luißeño were successful at retaining their language and certain rituals and ceremonies. Starting in the 1970s, there was a revival of interest in the Luißeño language and classes were organized. Since then, traditional games, songs, and dances have been performed, traditional foods have been gathered and prepared, and traditional medicines and curing procedures have been practiced (Bean and Shipek 1978).

III HISTORIC CONTEXT

a. Historic Periods

Early Southern California History

The first European to visit California was Spanish maritime explorer Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo in 1542. Cabrillo was sent north by the Viceroy of New Spain (Mexico) to look for the Northwest Passage. Cabrillo visited San Diego Bay, Catalina Island, San Pedro Bay, and the northern Channel Islands. The English adventurer Francis Drake visited the Miwok Native American group at Drake's Bay or Bodega Bay in 1579. Sebastian Vizcaíno explored the coast as far north as Monterey in 1602. He reported that Monterey was an excellent location for a port (Castillo 1978). Vizcaíno also named San Diego Bay to commemorate Saint Didacus. The name began to appear on European maps of the New World by 1624 (Gudde 1998:332).

Colonization of California began with the Spanish Portolá land expedition. The expedition, led by Captain Gaspar de Portolá of the Spanish army and Father Junipero Serra, a Franciscan missionary, explored the California coast from San Diego to the Monterey Bay Area in 1769. As a result of this expedition, Spanish missions to convert the native population, presidios (forts), and towns were established. The Franciscan missionary friars established 21 missions in Alta California (the area north of Baja California) beginning with Mission San Diego in 1769 and ending with the mission in Sonoma established in 1823. The purpose of the missions and presidios was to establish Spanish economic, military, political, and religious control over the Alta California territory. Mission San Diego was established to convert the Native Americans that lived in the area, known as the Kumeyaay or Diegueño. Mission San Gabriel Archangel was founded in 1771 east of what is now Los Angeles to convert the Tongva or Gabrieliño. Mission San Fernando, also in Tongva/Gabrieliño territory, was established in 1797. Mission San Juan Capistrano was established in 1776 on San Juan Creek (in what is now southern Orange County) to convert the Agjachemem or Juaneño. Mission San Luis Rey was established in 1798 on the San Luis Rey River (in what is now northern San Diego County) to convert the Luiseño. Missions San Buenaventura and Santa Barbara were founded in Chumash territory in 1782 and 1786, respectively (Castillo 1978:100).

Some missions later established outposts in inland areas. An asistencia (mission outpost) of Mission San Luis Rey, known as San Antonio de Pala, was built in Luiseño territory along the upper San Luis Rey River near Mount Palomar in 1810 (Pourade 1961). A chapel administered by Mission San Gabriel Archangel was established in the San Bernardino area in 1819 (Bean and Smith 1978b). The present asistencia within the western outskirts of present-day Redlands was built circa 1830 (Haenszel and Reynolds 1975). The missions sustained themselves through cattle ranching and traded hides and tallow for supplies brought by ship. Large cattle ranches were established by Mission San Luis Rey at Temecula and San Jacinto (Gunther 1984). The Spanish also constructed presidios, or forts, at San Diego and Santa Barbara, and a pueblo, or town, was established at Los Angeles. The Spanish period in California began in 1769 with the Portola expedition and ended in 1821 with Mexican independence.

After Mexico became independent from Spain in 1821, what is now California became the Mexican province of Alta California. The Mexican government closed the missions in the 1830s and former mission lands were granted to retired soldiers and other Mexican citizens for use as cattle ranches. Much of the

land along the coast and in the interior valleys became part of Mexican land grants or “ranchos” (Robinson 1948). During the Mexican period there were small towns at San Diego (near the presidio), San Juan Capistrano (around the mission), and Los Angeles. The rancho owners lived in one of the towns or in an adobe house on the rancho. The Mexican Period includes the years 1821 to 1848.

The American period began when the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed between Mexico and the United States in 1848. As a result of the treaty, Alta California became part of the United States as the territory of California. Rapid population increase occasioned by the Gold Rush of 1849 allowed California to become a state in 1850. Most Mexican land grants were confirmed to the grantees by U.S. courts, but usually with more restricted boundaries which were surveyed by the U.S. Surveyor General’s office. Land that was not part of a land grant was owned by the U.S. government until it was acquired by individuals through purchase or homesteading. Floods and drought in the 1860s greatly reduced the cattle herds on the ranchos, making it difficult to pay the new American taxes on the thousands of acres they owned. Many Mexican-American cattle ranchers borrowed money at usurious rates from newly arrived Anglo-Americans. The resulting foreclosures and land sales transferred most of the land grants into the hands of Anglo-Americans (Cleland 1941:137-138).

Woodcrest History

Woodcrest is a census designated place in Riverside County. Although its name comes from Woodcrest Acres, a subdivision constructed in 1924, people have claimed it is attributed to the people with variations of the surname Wood who were involved in the early history of the area. One such person was John C. Woodard, an Ohio native, who built a homestead in Woodcrest in 1884. Woodard later became a trustee of the school board and ran for county treasurer in 1894.

As no roads were constructed in the area, Woodard built Woodard’s Grade, a wagon road, which ran from modern day Golden Star Avenue, south to Washington Street. The alignment of the road was used until 1959 when the County realigned the road.

Another contribution to the Woodcrest name was from Wood Road built in 1916. The road was named as such as it crossed through property owned by Susan Wood.

In 1926, the Woodcrest Post Office was established. The Woodcrest name was then used for four additional subdivisions in the area. During the 1950’s, the Western Municipal Water District was formed, and included Woodcrest which soon led to the planting of orange groves throughout the community (Johnson 2020).

b. Historic-Period Native American Settlement

The immediate Project Area does not retain documentation of any protohistoric villages; however, the presence of many bedrock milling features in the area is testament to the history of food processing and habitation activity in the area. The intensive ownership of land by Euro-Americans from the Spanish Period through the Mexican Period to the American Period reduced the footprint of many Native American villages in historic times.

c. Land Granting and Modern Use of the Area

Rancho San Jacinto was first granted to José Antonio Estudillo in 1842, subsequently being split in half three years later with Estudillo's son forming Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero and his daughter forming El Sobrante de San Jacinto (Haggland 1983). Private lands gradually shrank during the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century due to increased railroad and economic activity and the sale of land for new settlements and homesteads. Agriculture remained a staple of the region with periodic downturns due to variability in access to water. The earliest available aerial photos of the Project Area date to 1931 (UCSB Library 2022). Aerial photographs from the 1930s through 2018 present show that the eastern portion of the Project Area was used for agriculture from the early 1963 to the present. A house and two associated structures are first visible in aerial photographs from 1963 (NETROnline 2022; UCSB Library 2022). Roads have existed for some time around portions of the perimeter of the Project Area, and the increase in residential and commercial development in the region can be seen through time to the present day.

IV RESEARCH DESIGN

a. Legal Compliance Basis

This updated Phase 1 study was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the County of Riverside and under a Memorandum of Agreement with the County to support future environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA is the state law that applies to a project's impacts on cultural resources. A project is an activity that may cause a direct or indirect physical change in the environment and that is undertaken or funded by a state or local agency, or requires a permit, license, or lease from a state or local agency. CEQA requires that impacts to Historical Resources be identified and, if the impacts will be significant, then apply mitigation measures to reduce the impacts. A Historical Resource is a resource that:

- 1) is listed in or has been determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) by the State Historical Resources Commission, or has been determined historically significant by the CEQA lead agency because it meets the eligibility criteria for the CRHR,
- 2) is included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) 5020.1(k), or
- 3) has been identified as significant in a historical resources survey, as defined in PRC 5024.1(g) (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 14, Section 15064.5(a)).

The eligibility criteria for the CRHR are as follows (CCR Title 14, Section 4852(b)):

- (1) It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the U.S.;
- (2) It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history;
- (3) It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values; or

- (4) It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

In addition, the resource must retain integrity, which is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (CCR Title 14, Section 4852(c)). Resources that have been determined eligible for the NRHP are automatically eligible for the CRHR.

Impacts to a Historical Resource, as defined by CEQA (listed in an official historic inventory or survey or eligible for the CRHR), are significant if the resource is demolished or destroyed or if the characteristics that made the resource eligible are materially impaired (CCR Title 14, Section 15064.5(b)). Demolition or alteration of eligible buildings, structures, and features that they would no longer be eligible would result in a significant impact. Whole or partial destruction of eligible archaeological sites would result in a significant impact. In addition to impacts from construction resulting in destruction or physical alteration of an eligible resource, impacts to the integrity of setting (sometimes termed visual impacts) of physical features in the Project Area could also result in significant impacts.

Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) are defined in Section 21074 of the California PRC as sites, features, places, cultural landscapes (geographically defined in terms of the size and scope), sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either included in or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR, or are included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1, or are a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. Section 1(b)(4) of Assembly Bill (AB) 52 established that only California Native American tribes, as defined in Section 21073 of the California PRC, are experts in the identification of TCRs and impacts thereto. Because ECORP does not meet the definition of a California Native American tribe, it only addresses information in this report for which it is qualified to identify and evaluate, and that which is needed to inform the cultural resources section of CEQA documents. This report, therefore, does not identify or evaluate TCRs. Should California Native American tribes ascribe additional importance to or interpretation of archaeological resources described herein, or provide information about non-archeological TCRs, that information is documented separately in the AB 52 tribal consultation record between the tribe(s) and lead agency and summarized in the TCRs section of the CEQA document, if applicable.

In addition, in the event that the Project would affect Waters of the U.S., thereby requiring the Project proponent to meet the requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and obtain a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE), this report was prepared to contribute to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. Section 106 of the NHPA requires that federal agencies take into account the effects of a federal undertaking on properties listed in or eligible for the NRHP. The agencies must afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking. A federal undertaking is defined in 36 CFR 800.16(y):

A federal undertaking means "a project, activity, or program funded in whole or in part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of a federal agency, including those carried out by or on behalf of a federal agency;

those carried out with Federal financial assistance; and those requiring a federal permit, license, or approval.”

The federal agency must seek comment from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and, in some cases, the ACHP, for its determinations of eligibility, effects, and proposed mitigation measures. Section 106 procedures for a specific project can be modified by negotiation of a Memorandum of Agreement or Programmatic Agreement between the federal agency, the SHPO, and, in some cases, the project proponent.

Effects to a cultural resource are potentially adverse if the lead federal agency, with the SHPO’s concurrence, determines the resource eligible for the NRHP, making it a Historic Property, and if application of the Criteria of Adverse Effects (36 CFR 800.5[a][2] et seq.) results in the conclusion that the effects will be adverse. The NRHP eligibility criteria, contained in 36 CFR 63, are as follows:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of state and local importance that possess aspects of integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, association, and

- (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.

In addition, the resource must be at least 50 years old, barring exceptional circumstances (36 CFR 60.4). Resources that are eligible for, or listed on, the NRHP are historic properties.

Regulations implementing Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800.5) require that the federal agency, in consultation with the SHPO, apply the Criteria of Adverse Effect to historic properties within the APE. According to 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1):

“An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling or association.”

b. Research Framework

The California OHP requires the use of a research design that “should present important research questions recognized for the region and relevant to the study, based on previous research” (OHP 1989:9). Research questions serve to guide research methods and to assess the potential for the recovery of scientifically valid data that are likely to satisfy NRHP Criterion D or CRHR Criterion 4, the ability of the resource to produce information important in prehistory or history.

As described in the records search results below, there are pre-contact sites in the APE. The principal activity at these sites was food processing and general subsistence activities. Research topics for the pre-contact sites in the Project APE include activities and site function, internal site organization, subsistence patterns, and chronology and temporal patterning.

Activities and Site Function: What activities other than acorn processing, if any, took place at the sites? Is there a full range of activities represented such as would be characteristic of a habitation site or only a limited set of activities? Is there evidence for lithic tool production and what techniques were used? Did techniques change over time? Data requirements to address these questions include tools classified functionally and debitage classified technologically. If subsurface features (hearths, ovens) are present, the type and number of features will also help address these questions.

Internal Site Organization: Are there distinct manufacturing, processing, or food preparation areas within the sites? Were male and female activities carried out in different areas of a site? Are distinct activity areas associated with each outcrop containing bedrock mortars or was a single activity area used by everyone using any of the bedrock mortars at the site? Data requirements include maps of the spatial distribution of tools, debitage, subsistence remains, and features. If the site is small and there are few categories that do not vary spatially, this domain cannot be addressed.

Subsistence Patterns: What resources were brought to the sites, prepared, and consumed? Is there evidence for specialization or intensification of resource use? Specialization would be indicated by large numbers of the remains of a single species. Intensification would be indicated by reliance on resources that require greater amounts of labor to procure or process. To address questions about subsistence, a reliable sample of plant or animal subsistence remains would be necessary.

Chronology and Temporal Patterning: Were the sites used at the same time as other nearby sites or sequentially? Were the sites used continuously for a short or long period of time? Were there periods of time when the sites were not used (continuous occupation or periodic abandonment)? Data requirements include sufficient charcoal for radiocarbon dating and/or time sensitive artifacts, such as beads.

V METHODS

a. Records Search Methods

FCS first conducted a records search of 0.5-mile radius from the Project Area on March 10, 2015, as part of the original 2015 Phase I study. The results of the 2015 records search results are summarized below and may also be found in the 2015 report, attached as Confidential Appendix A. In December 2021, ECORP requested a new records search of the CHRIS from the Eastern Information Center (EIC), University of California, Riverside. The EIC is the official repository of cultural resources reports and site records for Riverside County. The purpose of the updated records search was to determine the extent and location of any additional surveys, precontact or historic archaeological site locations, architectural resources, historic properties, cultural landscapes, or ethnic resources that have been recorded since the FCS 2015 Phase I study, and to expand the records search radius out to current standard of 1 mile. Materials reviewed included survey and evaluation reports, archaeological site records, historic maps, and listings of resources on the NRHP, CRHR, California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, and

National Historic Landmarks. Historic-period aerial photographs and Bureau of Land Management Government Land Office records were also reviewed as a part of this study. Results of the CHRIS records search are included in Confidential Appendix D.

FCS requested a search of the Sacred Lands File by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on March 5, 2015, as part of the 2015 Phase I study. The results of the 2015 records search results are summarized below in Section V.b. NAHC Sacred Lands File Search Results and may also be found in the 2015 report, attached as Confidential Appendix A. ECORP requested an updated search of the Sacred Lands File by the NAHC in December 2021. This updated search was requested to determine whether any sensitive or sacred Native American resources in the vicinity of the Project Area that could be affected by the proposed Project. The NAHC was also asked to provide a list of Native American groups that have historic or traditional ties to the Project Area. A copy of correspondence with the NAHC is provided as Appendix E.

On March 15, 2022, ECORP mailed notification letters to the following tribes, inviting them to participate in the fieldwork: Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Cahuilla Band of Indians, Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla and Cupeno Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Pala Band of Mission Indians, Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservations, Ramona Band of Cahuilla, Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians. Copies of the notification letters are provided in Appendix F.

b. Field Survey Methods

FCS conducted a formal survey of the majority of the Project Area in 2015. FCS Archaeologists Coral A. Eginton, M.A., RPA; Tim Garfin, B.A.; and Sydni Kitchel, B.A. surveyed the APE on March 26, March 27, and April 21, 2015. At the time, the APE consisted of 140 acres of existing orange groves, a single-family residence, and undeveloped rural land. The methods are detailed in the 2015 report that is attached as Confidential Appendix A.

In 2022, ECORP carried out additional fieldwork. Because the orange groves reported by FCS in 2015 were no longer visible on aerial photographs, archaeologists Robert Cunningham and Julian Acuña, RPA conducted an initial field visit to the Project Area on February 17, 2022. The purpose of this visit was to confirm the changes in field conditions since the FCS 2015 Phase I study and to attempt to locate all four previously recorded resources within the Project Area. As described further below, FCS had been unable to locate two of the previously recorded sites in 2015. ECORP archaeologists did not conduct a formal survey over the original 140-acre Project Area or identify or record archaeological resources during this visit.

Subsequently, ECORP was notified of the fact that an adjacent 20-acre property, referred to as the Gless Property, was included in the currently proposed project area, but that it had not been surveyed by FCS in 2015. Therefore, a second cultural resources pedestrian survey was required. ECORP archaeologists Robert Cunningham and Julian Acuña, RPA, accompanied by tribal monitor Edward Ortiz from Pechanga, conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of the additional 20 acres Project Area on March 31, 2022.

During this pedestrian survey, which used transect intervals of 10 to 15 meters, the ground surface was examined for indications of surface or subsurface cultural resources. The general morphological characteristics of the ground surface were inspected for indications of subsurface deposits that may be manifested on the surface, such as circular depressions or ditches. Whenever possible, the locations of subsurface exposures caused by such factors as rodent activity, water or soil erosion, or vegetation disturbances were examined for artifacts or for indications of buried deposits. No subsurface investigations or artifact collections were undertaken during the pedestrian survey.

On the following day, April 1, 2022, archaeologists Robert Cunningham and Julian Acuña, RPA returned to the 140-acre portion of the Project Area only to collect submeter GPS boundaries of the four previously recorded resources within the Project Area so that all resources (previously recorded and newly identified) were mapped with the same level of precision and accuracy. This was also necessary because the EIC would not provide maps showing the locations, other than what was contained in the original DPR records.

All cultural resources encountered during the survey were recorded using Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523-series forms approved by the California Office of Historic Preservation. The resources were photographed, mapped using a handheld Global Positioning System receiver, and sketched as necessary to document their presence using appropriate DPR forms.

VI RESULTS

a. Records Search Results

FCS conducted a records search as part of the 2015 Phase I study. The results of the 2015 records search indicated that 16 cultural resource investigations have been conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Area between 1978 and 2012. Of these studies, one of these studies overlapped a majority of the Project Area. The results of the 2015 study also revealed the presence of ■ previously recorded historic-period and precontact resources within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Area.

ECORP requested an updated records search in December 2021, expanding the records search radius out to the current standard of 1 mile from the Project Area. ECORP received the results from the EIC on February 14, 2022. The records search update results provided details for an additional 43 cultural resource investigations and ■ additional cultural resources. Due to the current COVID-19 pandemic and the effect it has had on staffing levels at Information Centers, including the EIC, maps depicting the locations of additional resources and reports not included in the FCS 2015 records search were not provided. All specific locations stated within the current report are based on the initial 2015 study. Results of the CHRIS records search are included in Confidential Appendix D.

A review of the FCS 2015 records search determined four of the listed 16 cultural resource investigations were not conducted within a 0.5-mile radius and therefore removed from the results. Incorporating the revised results of the FCS 2015 records search into the results of the 2022 records search update indicates that a total of 55 cultural resource investigations have been conducted within 1 mile of the Project Area between 1974 and 2016. Details of all 55 investigations are presented below in Table 1. The records search

indicated that approximately 95 percent of the Project Area had been previously surveyed for cultural resources.

Report Number	Author(s)	Report Title	Year	Includes Portion of the Project Area?
RI-00433	N. Nelson Leonard, III	Letter Report: Review of Tracts 11044, 11045, 11046, and 11047	1978	No
RI-00783	Larry L. Bowles and Jean A. Salpas	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 16191	1980	No
RI-00792	Larry L. Bowles and Jean A. Salpas	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 16190	1980	No
RI-00808	Jean A. Salpas	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 16998	1980	No
RI-00809	Larry L. Bowles and Jean A. Salpas	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 15033	1980	No
RI-01114	Larry L. Bowles	An Archaeological Assessment for Tentative Parcel 17219	1981	No
RI-01144	D.M Van Horn	Archaeological Survey Report: The 1500 Acre Woodcrest Agricultural Preserve Located Adjacent to March AFB, Riverside County, California	1980	No
RI-01254	Alan Davis	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Parcel 17435, Northeast of Woodcrest in Riverside County, California	1981	No
RI-01406	Larry L. Bowles	An Archaeological Assessment for Tentative Parcel 18415	1982	No
RI-01582	Larry L. Bowles	Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 11605, Riverside County, California	1978	No
RI-01583	Larry L. Bowles	Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 11604, Riverside County, California	1978	No
RI-01584	Larry L. Bowles	Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 11763, Riverside County, California	1978	Yes
RI-01648	Archaeological Research, Inc.	Archaeological Report – Project W.O. 5-3764, Box Springs Feeder	1974	No
RI-01649	Michael K. Lerch	Cultural resources Assessment of the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority Proposed Imported Water Conveyance System, Riverside County, California	1983	No
RI-01695	Jean A. Salpas	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 19188	1983	No

Table 1. Previous Cultural Studies in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area				
Report Number	Author(s)	Report Title	Year	Includes Portion of the Project Area?
RI-01726	Jean A. Salpas	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 19173	1983	No
RI-01889	Jean A. Salpas	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 20093	1984	No
RI-02224	Daniel F. McCarthy	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 1 of Parcel Map 12069 Located in the Woodcrest Area of Riverside County, California	1988	No
RI-02391	Robert E. Parr and P.J. Wilke	Cultural resources Assessment of the Alessandro Heights Project Located in the City of Riverside, Riverside County, California	1989	No
RI-02393	Bruce Love, Darcy Wiewall and Eugene Heck	Historical/Archaeological Resources Report: Executive Home Builders, City of Riverside, Riverside County, California	1999	No
RI-02461	Jean S. Keller	An Archaeological Assessment of TTM 24024, Riverside County, California	1989	No
RI-02464	C.E. Drover	An Archaeological Assessment of TT Map 23804, Riverside, California	1988	No
RI-02645	Christopher E. Drover	An Archaeological Assessment of the Lurin Roosevelt and Hillside Tank Sites Western Municipal Water District Riverside County, California	1990	No
RI-02810	Christopher E. Drover	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel # 274-210-013 and 266-070-002, Woodside, Riverside County, California	1990	No
RI-02979	Christopher Drover	Environmental Impact Evaluation: Archaeological Assessment of General Plan Amendment 277 Woodcrest, Riverside County, California	1990	No
RI-03465	Christopher Drover	A Cultural Resources Assessment of the 800-Acre Alta Cresta Ranch Specific Plan, Riverside East - Steele Peak USGS Quads, Woodcrest CA	1992	No
RI-04373	Curt Duke	Cultural Resource Assessment for Modifications to Pacific Bell Wireless Facility CM 348-03, County of Riverside, California	2000	No
RI-04389	Antonina Delu and Robert Reynolds	Cultural Resources Assessment for Kross, Bert, and Dauchy Roads in the Woodcrest Area of Riverside County, California	2000	No

Table 1. Previous Cultural Studies in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area				
Report Number	Author(s)	Report Title	Year	Includes Portion of the Project Area?
RI-04690	Patrick Maxon	Results of a Pre-Development Cultural Resources Inventory and Biological Survey/Constraints Analysis for the 2.2 Acre Lincoln Self Storage Property, City of Riverside, Riverside County, California	2002	No
RI-04858	Leslie Irish	An Archaeological Assessment of the Orangecrest Hills Specific Plan Amendment Area, a 520 Acre Project Located in the Community of Orangecrest, Riverside County	1991	No
RI-05169	Roger D. Mason	Phase I Archaeological Survey Report for the Chen Ta Project, Riverside County, California	2004	No
RI-05180	Roger D. Mason	Phase I Cultural Archaeological Survey Report for the Chen Ta North Project, Riverside County, California	2005	No
RI-05377	Bruce Love and Mariam Dahdul	Archaeological Testing at Sites CA-RIV-4739, -4740, -4741, and -4743	2001	No
RI-05565	James J. Schmidt	Pole Relocation Corridor for the Hawarden Development Along Cactus Avenue, West of Harrington Road, Riverside County, CA	2002	No
RI-05994	Mariam Dahdul, Daniel Ballester, and Josh Smallwood	Archaeological Testing at Sites CA-RIV-4736/H, Alta Cresta Specific Plan, Tentative Tract Map No.s 31237, 31238, 31360 TO 31362, Neat the City of Riverside, Riverside County	2003	No
RI-06268	Sara Bholat and Evelyn Chandler	Cultural resources Investigation of the 5.4-Acre Property Located South of Van Buren Boulevard, City and County of Riverside, California	2006	No
RI-06427	Bai Tang, Michael Hogan, Matthew Wetherbee, and John Eddy	Historical/Archaeological Resource Survey Report, Tentative Parcel Map No. 32443, in an Unincorporated Area Near the City of Riverside, Riverside County, CA	2004	No
RI-06951	Koral Ahmet and Cary Cotterman	Cultural Resources Evaluation of Prehistoric and Historic-Period Resources on a 5.4 Acre Property Located South of van Buren Boulevard, City and County of Riverside, California	2007	No
RI-07236	Rod McLean	Cultural Resource Assessment for Cingular Wireless Facility No. SB-307-01 in Riverside County, California	2004	No

Table 1. Previous Cultural Studies in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area				
Report Number	Author(s)	Report Title	Year	Includes Portion of the Project Area?
RI-07277	Robert S. White, Laura S. White, and David Van Horn	A Cultural Resources Assessment of A 4.71-Acre Parcel as Shown on TPM 33749 Situated West of the Intersection of Gardener Avenue and Littlestone Lane, Woodcrest, Unincorporated Riverside County	2006	No
RI-07500	Bonner, Wayne H. and Marnie Aislin-Kay	Letter Report: Cultural Resource Records Search Results and Site Visit for Royal Street Communications, LLC Facility Candidate LA2364A (SBC/ATT Woodcrest), 16991 Van Buren Boulevard, Riverside, Riverside County, California	2007	No
RI-07547	Nora Collins and Brian F. Smith	An Archaeological Survey for the Mission Ranch/Gamble Lift Station Project	2006	No
RI-07909	Pierson, Larry J.	A Cultural Resources Survey of the Cochran Lot Split Project, County of Riverside, California, TPM #31916	2004	No
RI-08131	Wayne H. Bonner	Letter Report: Cultural Resources Record Search and Site Visit Results for Royal Street Communications California, LLC Candidate LA2364B (Woodcrest Plaza), 17130-17086 Van Buren Boulevard, Riverside, Riverside County, California	2008	No
RI-08148	Michael Dice and Charles Bouscaren	Archaeological Testing Evaluation of the Woodcrest Project (APN 245-300-001), A Proposed Subdivision Located Near Chicago and Iris Avenues, County of Riverside, California	2004	Yes
RI-08740	Bai Tom Tang, Michael Hogan, Terri Jacquemain, and Daniel Ballester	Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report APNs 274-120-012, -017, -030, and 274-140-036	2013	No
RI-09489	Kristina Lindgren and Roger D. Mason	Cultural Resources Survey of a 1.44-Acre Property Located in the City and County of Riverside, California	2015	No
RI-09523	Andrew R. Pigniolo	Cultural Resources Survey Report For the 910 Highridge Street Project Riverside, California (APN 272-190-010-00)	2015	No
RI-09818	Hannah Hass, Breana Campbell, and Robert Ramirez	AFG Development LLC City Project Phase I Cultural Resources Study	2015	No

Table 1. Previous Cultural Studies in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area				
Report Number	Author(s)	Report Title	Year	Includes Portion of the Project Area?
RI-09825	Robert Ramirez, Hannah Hass, and Breana Campbell	Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Residential Subdivision - TM 36763 Project, Riverside County, California	2015	No
RI-09900	Tracy A. Stropes and Brian F. Smith	Cultural Resource Report for the TR37177 Project, City of Riverside, Riverside County, California	2016	No
RI-10068	Jennifer Roland	Phase I Investigation for the Crown Castle SB307 PBRE - Van Buren Antenna Installation Project, Riverside, Riverside County, California	2016	No
RI-10394	Brian F. Smith	A Cultural Resources Assessment for TR 37177 City of Riverside County, California	2018	No
RI-10542	Andrew J. Garrison, Jennifer R.K. Stropes, and Brian F. Smith	Cultural Resource Report for the 18806 Van Buren Boulevard Project, City of Riverside, Riverside County, California	2018	No
RI-10776	Andrew Garrison and Brian F. Smith	A Cultural Resources Assessment for TR 37177, City of Riverside, Riverside County, California	2018	No

A review of the FCS 2015 records search determined one resource has been demolished and is no longer a listed cultural resource, with another resource not located within their 0.5-mile radius. Therefore, both resources were removed from the results. Incorporating the revised results of the FCS 2015 records search into the results of the 2022 records search update indicates that a total of [REDACTED] cultural resources have been recorded within 1 mile of the Project Area. A total of [REDACTED] cultural resources have been recorded within or adjacent to the Project Area. [REDACTED]. In addition, [REDACTED] previously recorded cultural resources are located within 1 mile of the Project Area (Table 2). Of these [REDACTED] previously recorded resources, [REDACTED] are located within 0.5 mile of the Project Area, and [REDACTED] are located within 0.25 mile of the Project Area. Documented resources are a mix of precontact and historic-period sites, with the majority of sites being precontact resources. In total, previously recorded precontact sites include [REDACTED]. In total, historic-period sites include 11 building/residence resources, three homesteads, three refuse deposits, and one utility pole/powerline segment.

The presence of more than [REDACTED] [REDACTED] supports a pattern of precontact land use centered on the processing of local plant materials. Details of previously recorded resources within the records search radius are provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area					
P-33-	CA-RIV-	Recorder and Year	Age/ Period	Site Description	Within APE?
000112	000112	1979 (Larry Bowles and Charles L. Moser, Riverside Museum); 1982 (M. K. Lerch, G. A. Smith, San Bernardino County Museum Society); 1982 (L.L. Bowles, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
000853	000853	1982 (L.L. Bowles, n/a); 1989 (R.E. Parr, J. Goodman, R. Yohe, D. Everson, ARU, UCR); 2015 (H. Haas and B. Campbell, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
000899	000899	1982 (L.L. Bowles, n/a); 1989 (R.E. Parr, R. Yohe, B. Arkush, D. Everson, Archaeological Research Unit); 2015 (H. Haas and B. Campbell, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002060	002060	1980 (Salpas and Bowles, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002061	002061	1980 (Salpas and Bowles, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002062	002062	1980 (Salpas and Bowles, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002079	002079	1981 (L.L. Bowles, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002080	002080	1981 (L.L. Bowles, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002184	002184	1981 (Alan Davis, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002554	002554	1982 (M.K. Lerch, San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, CA.); 1988 (C.E. Drover); 1989 (R.E. Parr and D. Everson, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
002555	002555	1982 (M.K. Lerch, San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
002556	002556	1982 (M.K. Lerch, San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, CA.); 1988 (C.E. Drover)	Precontact	██████████	No
002557	002557	1982 (M.K. Lerch, San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, CA.); 1989 (R.E. Parr, B. Arkbush, D. Everson and J. Lehman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area					
P-33-	CA-RIV-	Recorder and Year	Age/ Period	Site Description	Within APE?
002558	002558	1982 (M.K. Lerch, San Bernardino RI-01649; County Museum Association, Redlands, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
002559	002559	1982 (M.K. Lerch, San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
002669	002669	1983 (Jean A. Salpas, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002670	002670	1983 (Jean A. Salpas, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002671	002671	1983 (Jean A. Salpas, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
002672	002672	1983 (Jean A. Salpas, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
003484	003484	1988 (C.E. Drover); 1989 (J. Goodman, K. Swope, J. Kent and D. Leavens, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003485	003485	1988 (C.E. Drover); 1989 (J. Goodman, K. Swope, J. Kent, G. Alcock and D. Leavens, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003486	003486	1988 (C.E. Drover); 1989 (J. Goodman, K. Swope, J. Kent, G. Alcock and D. Leavens, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003487	003487	1988 (C.E. Drover); 1989 (R. Parr, J. Goodman, K. Swope and J. Kent, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003488	003488	1988 (C.E. Drover); 1989 (J. Goodman, K. Swope and J. Kent, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003489	003489	1988 (C.E. Drover); 1989 (J. Goodman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003490	003490	1988 (C.E. Drover); 1989 (R.E. Parr and J. Torres, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area					
P-33-	CA-RIV-	Recorder and Year	Age/ Period	Site Description	Within APE?
003491	003491	1001 (Victor C. de Munck Archaeological & Ethnographic Field Associates, Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003556	003556	1989 (R. Parr and M. Hogan, RI-02391 Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003580	003580	1989 (J. Goodman and L. Weingartner, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.); 2018 (C. ACCARDY)	Precontact	██████████	No
003581	003581	1989 (R. Parr, J. Goodman, J. Torres, D. Leavens and L. Weingartner, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.); 2018 (C. ACCARDY)	Precontact	██████████	No
003582	003582	1989 (J. Goodman and L. Weingartner, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003583	003583	1989 (J. Goodman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████ ███	No
003584	003584	1989 (J. Goodman and L. Weingartner, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003585	003585	1989 (J. Goodman and L. RI-02391 Weingartner, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003586	003586	1989 (J. Goodman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003587	003587	1989 (J. Goodman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003588	003588	1989 (J. Goodman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003589	003589	1989 (J. Goodman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003590	003590	1989 (J. Goodman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003591	003591	1989 (J. Goodman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area					
P-33-	CA-RIV-	Recorder and Year	Age/ Period	Site Description	Within APE?
003617	003617	1989 (R. Parr and J. Goodman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003618	003618	1989 (R. Parr, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003619	003619	1989 (R. Parr, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003620	003620	1989 (R. Parr, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003621	003621	1989 (R. Parr, D. Everson and J. Lehman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003622	003622	1989 (R. Parr, D. Everson and J. Lehman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003623	003623	1989 (D. Everson, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003624	003624	1989 (R. Parr, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003625	003625	1989 (R. Parr, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003626	003626	1989 (R. Parr, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003627	003627	1989 (R. Parr, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003629	003629	1989 (R. Parr and R. Yohe, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.); 2021 (H. Haas and B. Campbell, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
003630	003630	1989 (R. Parr, R. Yohe, B. Arkush and D. Everson, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003631	003631	1989 (R. Parr, R. Yohe, B. Arkush and D. Everson, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003632	003632	1989 (R. Parr, R. Yohe, B. Arkush and D. Everson, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area					
P-33-	CA-RIV-	Recorder and Year	Age/ Period	Site Description	Within APE?
003633	003633	1989 (R. Parr and R. Yohe, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003642	003642	1989 (R. Parr and G. Alcock, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003643	003643	1989 (R. Parr and J. Lehman, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.)	Precontact	██████████	No
003648	003648	1978 (Larry Bowles, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
003859	003859	1989 (C.E. Drover and D.M. Smith, Christopher Drover)	Precontact	██████████	No
004020	004020	1990 (C. E. Drover and D. M. Smith, Christopher Drover)	Precontact	██████████	No
004021	004021	1990 (C. E. Drover and D. M. Smith, Christopher Drover)	Precontact	██████████	No
004732	004732	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover); 2006 (Britt W. Wilson, Morongo Band of Mission Indians); 2006 (Koral Ahmet & Sara Bholat, ECORP Consulting Inc.); 2007 (Koral Ahmet, ECORP Consulting, Inc.)	Precontact	██████████	No
004733	004733	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover); 2007 (Richard Greene, BFSA (Brian F. Smith & Associates)	Precontact	██████████	No
004734	004734	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover); 2007 (Richard Greene, BFSA (Brian F. Smith & Associates)	Precontact	██████████	No
004735	004735	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover)	Precontact	██████████	No
004736	004736	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, and T. Buckley, Christopher Drover); 2003 (Daniel Ballester, None indicated)	Precontact	██████████	No

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area					
P-33-	CA-RIV-	Recorder and Year	Age/ Period	Site Description	Within APE?
004737	004737	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover); 2003 (Daniel Ballester, None indicated)	Precontact	██████████	No
004739	004739	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover); 2001 (Michael Lozano, Victoria Avalos, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
004740	004740	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover)	Precontact	██████████	No
004741	004741	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover)	Precontact	██████████	No
004742	004742	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover)	Historic	██████	No
004743	004743	1992 (C.E. Drover, D.M. Smith, T. Buckley, Christopher Drover); 2001 (Michael Lozano, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
007813	N/A	1983 (Jim Warner, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	Historic	██████	No
007814	N/A	1983 (Jim Warner, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	Historic	██████	No
007818	007818	1983 (Jim Warner, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	Historic	██████	No
007819	007819	1983 (Jim Warner, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	Historic	██████	No
007821	N/A	1983 (Jim Warner, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	Historic	██████	No
007823	N/A	1983 (Jim Warner, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	Historic	██████	No
007824	N/A	1983 (Jim Warner, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	Historic	██████	No
010813	006530	2000 (Antonina Delu, LSA Associates, Inc.)	Precontact	██████████	No
012324	N/A	1989 (J. Goodman, J. Torres, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside)	Precontact	██████████	No

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area					
P-33-	CA-RIV-	Recorder and Year	Age/ Period	Site Description	Within APE?
012325	N/A	1989 (J. Goodman, G. Alcock, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside)	Precontact	██████████ ██████	No
013606	N/A	1982 (L.L. Bowles, n/a)	Precontact	██████████	No
014132	007754	2004 (Bergin, K. and D. Ferraro, Viejo California Associates); 2018 (C. ACCARDY)	Historic	██████████	No
015335	008097	2006 (Ahmet, Koral and Sara RI-06268, Bholat, ECORP Consulting, Inc.); 2014 (K. Lindgren, n/a)	Historic	██████	No
015336	008098	2006 (Ahmet, Koral and Sara RI-06268, Bholat, ECORP Consulting, Inc.); 2007 (BFSA, BFSA); 2007 (Ahmet, Koral, ECORP Consulting, Inc.)	Precontact	██████████	No
015705	N/A	2006 (White, Laura S., Archaeological Associates)	Historic	██████	No
017226	N/A	1989 (Keller, Jean A.)	Prehistoric	██████████	No
017917	N/A	2009 (Laura S. White, Archaeological Associates, Sun City, CA)	Historic	██████	No
020316	010257	2012 (Phillip de Barros, Professional Archaeological Services)	Historic	██████████	No
024669	N/A	2014 (Kristina Lindgren, ECORP Consulting, Inc.)	Historic	██████████ ██████	No
026876	006157	2015 (B. Campbell and H. Haas, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No
026877	006158	2015 (B. Campbell and H. Haas, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No
026878	006159	2015 (B. Campbell and H. Haas, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Historic	██████████	No
026879	006337	2015 (B. Campbell and H. Haas, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No
026880	006338	2015 (B. Campbell and H. Haas, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No
026881	006384	2015 (B. Campbell and H. Haas, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in or within 1 Mile of the Project Area					
P-33-	CA-RIV-	Recorder and Year	Age/ Period	Site Description	Within APE?
026882	007328	2015 (B. Campbell and H. Haas, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No
026883	007329	2015 (B. Campbell and H. Haas, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No
028057	N/A	2017 (Jeanette A. McKenna, Jeanette A. McKenna Consultant)	Historic	██████████ ██████████	No
028499	N/A	2018 (Courtney J. Accardy, Jennifer R.K. Stropes, Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.)	Historic	██████████ ██████████	No
028897	012945	2015 (H. Haas, B. Campbell, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No
028898	012946	2015 (H. Haas, B. Campbell, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No
028899	012947	2015 (H. Haas, B. Campbell, Rincon Consultants, Inc)	Precontact	██████████	No

ECORP searched the Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD) for Riverside County and revealed that there are six resources listed on the BERD within 1 mile of the Project Area. Of these six resources, two have been evaluated as eligible for listing on a local register. There are no NRHP or CRHR listed sites, and there are no California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, or National Historic Landmarks within the Project Area or within the 1-mile records search radius.

ECORP examined historic-period maps and aerial images of the Project Area. Historic-period aerials depict that the Project Area was undeveloped until the 1960s (NETROnline 2022; UCSB Library 2022). In the 1960 USGS Riverside 15-minute topographic quadrangle map, one unnamed, unpaved road is shown crossing through the Project Area. In the 1967 USGS Riverside East 7.5-minute quadrangle map, one building is depicted within the central portion of the Project Area.

Historic aerial photographs of the Project Area show that the Project Area was undeveloped until the 1960s. In the 1963 aerial photographs, the southern portion of the Project Area is agricultural land, specifically an orchard (UCSB Library 2022). By 1967, majority of the Project Area was utilized as an orchard (NETROnline 2022). These conditions remain unchanged in aerial photographs from 1978, 1985, 1994, 2002, and 2014 (NETROnline 2022). At least three buildings are observed during the 1960s and a visible change of the structures was observed by the 1985 aerial. This structure change correlates with the background research conducted during the FCS 2015 report, which stated that the original homestead on the property burnt down and were rebuilt by the 1980s. By 1970s, the Project Area became an orchard, which it remained until recently, when the orchard was removed.

In the 1978 aerial photographs, the northwestern portion of the Project Area, which has remained undeveloped open space, depicts increased OHV impacts (NETROnline 2022). Increased OHV impacts is observed in aerial photographs from 1985, 1994, and 2002, where conditions currently remain unchanged (NETROnline 2022).

FCS requested a search of the Sacred Lands File by the NAHC on March 5, 2015, as part of the 2015 Phase I study. The NAHC responded on March 17, 2015, and it noted that the Sacred Lands File search failed to indicate the presence of Native American sacred lands in the vicinity of the Project Area. The NAHC Sacred Lands File search failed to indicate the presence of Native American sacred lands in the vicinity of the Project Area. The NAHC provided FCS with a list of 24 Native American individuals and organizations with traditional ties to the Project Area. Letters were sent to these specific individuals on April 22, 2015, inquiring any further information regarding the Project Area they would be willing to share. A total of four contacts responded to this outreach: San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians, and Morongo Band of Mission Indians. The NAHC Sacred Lands File Search Results and may also be found in the 2015 report, attached as Appendix E.

ECORP requested an updated search of the Sacred Lands File by the NAHC in December 2021. The NAHC responded on February 24, 2022 and noted that the Sacred Lands File search failed to indicate the presence of Native American sacred lands in the vicinity of the Project Area. The NAHC provided ECORP with a list of 21 Native American individuals and organizations with traditional ties to the Project Area. Letters were sent to the 21 Native American individuals and organizations by U.S. Postal Service on March 15, 2022, inquiring as to the interest various tribal organizations may have in participating in the upcoming field survey. Notification letters sent to, and responses received by Native American individuals and organizations at the time of writing may be found in Appendix F. Only the Pechanga responded affirmatively, and participated in the field survey with ECORP.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The majority of the eastern portion of the Project Area has been active agricultural land since at least the 1960s and the surface of these areas has been repeatedly disturbed by farming activity throughout the years. Therefore, the prospect of encountering in-situ cultural resources within these portions of the Project Area is presumed to be low. In addition, although the historic-era orchard is no longer present, associated features and artifacts may be present on site. The likelihood that these are significant is low.

Finally, outreach to the Native American tribes resulted in four responses. On March 23, 2022, Jill McCormick of the Quechan responded to indicate no comments and deferred to more local tribes. On March 25, 2022, Paul Macarro of the Pechanga responded and accepted the invitation to participate in fieldwork. On April 18, 2022, Arysa Gonzales Romero of the Agua Caliente responded to indicate the Project is not within their traditional use area, but requested copies of technical information. On April 25, 2022, Cheryl Madrigal of the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians responded that the Project is located within the traditional use area of the Luiseño people and is within the Rincon's specific area of historic interest.

Rincon recommended working with Pechanga and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and requested a final copy of the cultural resources inventory report for review. All correspondence between ECORP and California Native American Tribes is provided in Appendix F and the County will follow up with consultation under AB 52.

b. Field Survey Results

The original 140-acre Project Area was surveyed by FCS in 2015. According to FCS (2015:25), "overall ground visibility ranged from 20 percent in the eastern orchards to 100 percent in the western portion with very sparse vegetation coverage." As described in Attachment A, FCS located P-33-012915/CA-RIV-7181 and P-33-012916/CA-RIV-7182, but "two additional previously recorded resources within the APE ([P-33-012917/CA-RIV-7183 and [P-33-012918/CA-RIV-7184) were not relocated because of the degradation of the sites by natural erosion factors and orchard maintenance activities."

ECORP conducted a field visit of the original 140-acre Project Area on February 17 and April 1, 2022 to document ground conditions and to confirm the presence of the previously recorded resources within the Project Area. The February 2022 field visit revealed that the previously documented orange grove in the FCS 2015 report has since been removed. The portions of the Project Area that were part of the orange grove were now covered with a thick layer of wood chips, impacting the ground surface visibility. The presence of the four previously recorded resources was confirmed within the Project Area.

ECORP conducted an intensive pedestrian survey on March 31, 2022, of the adjacent 20-acre Gless parcel that had not been included in FCS's 2015 survey. This property is located within an adjoining property that had been used for a citrus orchard, which has since been removed. The ground surface is covered with a thick layer of wood chips, impacting the ground surface visibility. The previously recorded boundary of P-33-012916/ CA-RIV-7182 indicated [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. As a result of the survey, the crew recorded two previously unrecorded resources: CA-001 and CA-002. [REDACTED] DPR 523 records for the two newly recorded resources are located in Confidential Appendix G.

Surface visibility during the survey ranged from poor (10 percent) to fair (60 percent) throughout the entire Project Area. Photos of the 20-acre addition to the Project Area can be found in Appendix H.

c.1 Previously Recorded Resources

Previously recorded sites consist of four [REDACTED] sites (P-33-012915, P-33-012916, P-33-012917, and P-33-012918). These resources are summarized below. Site records with locations, photographs, and sketch maps are provided in Appendix G. Appendix E includes additional field photographs.

P-33-012915/CA-RIV-7181

Description and Location

This site was originally recorded by Dice and Bouscaren in 2003 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Previous Testing

According to FCS (2015: 27), "CA-RIV-7181 underwent Phase II testing in 2004 that included a surface artifact collection as well as subsurface testing (Dice and Bouscaren 2004). [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] FCS notes that the original Phase II testing was made in 2004 and is no longer considered adequate for current use.

Previous Evaluation

Dice and Bouscaren (2004) evaluated the site and found it to be eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 4 and considered it a unique archaeological resource under CEQA. FCS (2015) concurred that the site is likely eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and CRHR under Criterion D/4. FCS recommended additional Phase II testing to better define the site boundaries and confirm eligibility findings.

2022 Update

The site was revisited by ECORP archaeologists on February 17, and April 1, 2022. The site was located, and updated site boundaries were collected. The overall site conditions have not changed since the initial recordation.

Additional Information Needed

The boundaries of the site are still in question, as the prior testing effort is documented by hand-drawn sketch maps and field notes alone and was performed to evaluate eligibility and not to define subsurface boundaries. Although ECORP gathered updated submeter GPS boundaries of the surface manifestations, the precise limits of subsurface deposits are unclear. A Phase II investigation will allow for a better understanding of the spatial limits of the site, and to assist in project design to maximize avoidance to the greatest extent possible.

P-33-012916/CA-RIV-7182

Description and Location

This site was originally recorded by Dice and Bouscaren in 2003 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

Previous Testing

According to FCS (2015: 27), "CA-RIV-7182 underwent Phase II testing in 2004 that included a surface artifact collection as well as subsurface testing (Dice and Bouscaren 2004). [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] FCS notes that the original Phase II testing was conducted in 2004 and is no longer considered adequate for current use,

Previous Evaluation

Dice and Bouscaren (2004) evaluated the site through subsurface testing and did not find buried intact deposits. The result was Dice and Bouscaren's recommendation that the site does not meet the criteria for inclusion in the CRHR under any criteria. FCS, however, disagreed and suggested that this site be considered eligible for the NRHP and CRHR under Criterion D/4. FCS recommended additional Phase II testing to better define the site boundaries and confirm eligibility findings.

2022 Update

The site was revisited by ECORP archaeologists on February 17 and April 1, 2022. The site was located, and updated site boundaries were collected. The site may have been impacted by the removal of the orange grove previously present in the Project Area.

Additional Information Needed

The boundaries of the site are still in question, as the prior testing effort is documented by hand-drawn sketch maps and field notes alone and was performed to evaluate eligibility and not to define subsurface boundaries. Moreover, two previous investigations conflicted in their recommendations of eligibility. Although ECORP gathered updated submeter GPS boundaries of the surface manifestations, the precise limits of subsurface deposits are unclear. A Phase II investigation will allow for a better understanding of the spatial limits of the site, will help confirm the eligibility of the site, and will assist in project design to maximize avoidance to the greatest extent possible.

P-33-012917/CA-RIV-7183

Description and Location

This site was originally recorded by Dice and Bouscaren in 2003 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Previous Testing

Dice and Bouscaren conducted Phase II testing in 2004 and observed and collected [REDACTED]

Previous Evaluation

Dice and Bouscaren (2004) evaluated the site through subsurface testing and did not find buried intact deposits. The result was Dice and Bouscaren's recommendation that the site does not meet the criteria for inclusion in the CRHR under any criteria.

2022 Update

Since that time, the orchard had been removed, and in 2022, ECORP successfully located the site. ECORP updated site boundaries but did not observe any associated artifacts on the surface. The site has been impacted by the removal of the orange grove previously present in the Project Area.

Additional Information Needed

The boundaries of the site are still in question, as the prior testing effort is documented by hand-drawn sketch maps and field notes alone and was performed to evaluate eligibility and not to define subsurface boundaries. Although ECORP gathered updated submeter GPS boundaries of the surface manifestations, the precise limits of subsurface deposits is unclear. A Phase II investigation will allow for a better understanding of the spatial limits of the site, and to assist in project design to maximize avoidance to the greatest extent possible.

P-33-012918/CA-RIV-7184

Description and Location

This site was originally recorded by Dice and Bouscaren in 2003 [REDACTED]

Previous Testing

This site was not subjected to Phase II testing by Dice and Bouscaren in 2004, based on their examination of the site and observation that topsoil in the site boundary is extremely thin (2004:36).

Previous Evaluation

Dice and Bouscaren (2004) evaluated the site based on survey level data alone and recommended that the site does not meet the criteria for inclusion in the CRHR under any criteria.

2022 Update

The site was revisited by ECORP archaeologists on February 17, and April 1, 2022. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The site was located, and updated site boundaries were collected.

Additional Information Needed

The boundaries of the site are still in question, as there are additional features that were not previously included in the original site record, and the site has not been subjected to subsurface testing. Although ECORP gathered updated submeter GPS boundaries of the surface manifestations, the precise limits of subsurface deposits is unclear. A Phase II investigation will allow for a better understanding of the spatial limits of the site, will assist in evaluating the site, and will assist in project design to maximize avoidance to the greatest extent possible.

c.2 Newly Identified Resources

CA-001. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Additional Information Needed

This site has not been subjected to subsurface testing. A Phase II investigation will allow for a better understanding of the spatial limits of the site, will assist in evaluating the site, and will assist in project design to maximize avoidance to the greatest extent possible.

CA-002. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Additional Information Needed

This site has not been subjected to subsurface testing. A Phase II investigation will allow for a better understanding of the spatial limits of the site, will assist in evaluating the site, and will assist in project design to maximize avoidance to the greatest extent possible.

c.3 Potential for Unidentified Surface and Subsurface Resources

The study area has the potential to contain unidentified resources on the surface that were obscured by dense vegetation around drainages, or by a dense layer of woodchips in areas of former citrus groves. The

records search update revealed that approximately 95 percent of the Project Area has been surveyed in the past. As a result of those surveys, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Geologic maps show that the study area contains cretaceous plutonic rock composed of quartz diorite (qdi). Given the age and likely erosional rather than depositional environment of the plutonic rock terrain the Project Area is unlikely to contain deep subsurface deposits, although shallow deposits are possible in areas between the rocky outcrops that have soil formation, and surface artifact deposits may have also been moved and buried by agricultural activity.

VII RECOMMENDED MITIGATION

ECORP recommends additional Phase II studies be conducted to determine the spatial extent of each site and to complete the evaluations of significance. Until that occurs, and until the project designs are refined, recommendations for mitigation would be premature. ECORP recommends the following:

- P-33-012915/CA-RIV-7181: Phase II testing to define subsurface site boundaries and update DPR record
- P-33-012916/CA-RIV-7182: Phase II testing to define subsurface site boundaries and confirm eligibility, and associated update to DPR record
- P-33-012917/CA-RIV-7183: Phase II testing to define subsurface site boundaries and update DPR record
- P-33-012918/CA-RIV-7184: Phase II testing to define subsurface site boundaries and evaluate the site under criterion D/4, and associated update to DPR record
- CA-001: Phase II testing to define subsurface site boundaries and evaluate the site under criterion D/4, and associated update to DPR record
- CA-002: Phase II testing to define subsurface site boundaries and evaluate the site under criterion D/4, and associated update to DPR record

Following the completion of a Phase II program, ECORP will advance recommended mitigation for consideration.

VIII CERTIFICATION

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.

DATE: April 27, 2022

SIGNED:



PRINTED NAME: John T. O'Connor, Ph.D., RPA

COUNTY REGISTRATION #(added to the approved consultants list by David L. Jones on September 30, 2019)

IX REFERENCES CITED

- Bean, L. J. 1978. Cahuilla. Handbook of North American Indians. 8.
- _____. 1972. Mukat's People: The Cahuilla Indians of Southern California. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles. Bean, L. J. and F. C. Shipek. 1978. Luiseño. In Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California. Edited by R. F. Heizer, pp. 550-563. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Bean, L. J. and K.S. Saubel. 1972. Temalpakh (from the Earth): Cahuilla Indian Knowledge and Usage of Plants. Malki Museum Press., Banning.
- Bean, L. J. and F. C. Shipek. 1978. Luiseño. In Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California. Edited by R. F. Heizer, pp. 550-563. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. Bean, Lowell J. and Charles R. Smith. 1978a. Gabrielino. In Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California, edited by R. F. Heizer, pp. 538-549. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Bean, Lowell J. and Charles R. Smith. 1978b. Serrano. In Handbook of North American Indians, volume 8: California, edited by R. F. Heizer. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Boscana, G. 1933. Chinigchinich: A Revised and Annotated Version of Alfred Robinson's Translation of Father Geronimo Boscana's Historical Account of the Belief, Usages, Customs and Extravagancies of the Indians of San Juan Capistrano Called the Acagchemem Tribe. Fine Arts Press, Santa Ana.
- Castillo, Edward D. 1978. The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement. In Handbook of North American Indians, volume 8, California, edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 99-127. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
- Cleland, Robert G. 1941. The Cattle on a Thousand Hills: Southern California, 1850-1870. Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
- Dice, M. and C. Bouscaren 2004. Archaeological Testing Evaluation of the Woodcrest Project (APN # 245-300-001), A Proposed Subdivision Located Near Chicago and Iris Avenues, County of Riverside, California. Prepared for P&F Investment Company. Michael Brandman Associates, Irvine.
- Dibblee, Jr., Thomas W. 2003. *Geologic Map of the Riverside East / South 1/2 of San Bernardino South Quadrangles, San Bernardino County, California*. Dibblee Geology Center Map #DF-109: First Printing, December 2003. Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.
- Erlandson, J. M. 1994. Early Hunter-Gatherers of the California Coast. Plenum Press, New York.
- First Carbon Solutions. 2015. *Section 106 Cultural Resources Assessment and Paleontological Review, Woodcrest Project, Unincorporated Riverside County, California*. Prepared for Diversified Pacific Development.
- Gallegos, D. 1991. Antiquity and Adaptation at Agua Hedionda, Carlsbad, California. In *Hunter-Gatherers of Early Holocene Coastal California*, edited by J. M. Erlandson and R. H. Colten, pp. 19-41. Perspectives in California Archaeology, Volume 1. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Goldberg, S. 2001. *Eastside Reservoir Project: Final Report of Archaeological Investigations* (Five volumes). Applied Earthworks, Inc., Hemet, California.

- Golla, V. 2011. *California Indian Languages*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Grenda, D. R. 1997. *Continuity and Change: 8,500 Years of Lacustrine Adaptation on the Shores of Lake Elsinore: Archaeological Investigations at a Stratified Site in Southern California*. Statistical Research Technical Series No 59. Statistical Research, Inc., Tucson, Arizona.
- Gudde, E. G. 1998. *California Place Names: The Origin and Etymology of Current Geographical Names*. Revised from first edition, 1949. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Gunther, Jane Davies. 1984. *Riverside County, California, Place Names: Their Origins and Their Stories*. Rubidoux Printing Company, Riverside.
- Haenszel, Arda M. and Jennifer Reynolds. 1975. *The Historic San Bernardino Mission District*. San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, California.
- Haggland, M. H. 1983. Don José Antonio Aguirre. In *The Journal of San Diego History*. San Diego Historical Society Quarterly. Winter 1983, Volume 29, Number 1.
- Johnson, Kim Jarrell. 2020. Back in the day: Woodcrest named for people, housing. Press Enterprise. <https://www.pe.com/2013/07/26/back-in-the-day-woodcrest-named-for-people-housing/>. Accessed online on February 16, 2022.
- Koerper, H. C., P. Langenwalter II, A. Schroth. 1991. Early Holocene Adaptations and the Transition Problem: Evidence from the Allan O. Kelly Site, Agua Hedionda Lagoon. In *Hunter-Gatherers of Early Holocene Coastal California*, edited by J. M. Erlandson and R. H. Colten, pp. 81-88. Perspectives in California Archaeology, Volume 1. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Kowta, M. 1969. *The Sayles Complex: A Late Milling Stone Assemblage from Cajon Pass and the Ecological Implications of Its Scraper Planes*. University of California Publications in Anthropology 6. Berkeley.
- Kroeber, A. L. 1925. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bulletin 78. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of American Ethnology. p. 7.
- McCawley, William. 1996. *The First Angelinos: the Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles*. Malki Museum Press, Morongo Indian Reservation, Banning, California.
- Miller, Bruce W. 1991. *The Gabrielino*. Sand River Press, Los Osos, California.
- Moratto, M. J. 1984. *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, Orlando.
- Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC. (NETROnline). 2022. *Historic Aerials*. Electronic document. <http://www.historicaerials.com/>, accessed July 2, 2019.
- Pourade, Richard. 1961. *The History of San Diego: Time of the Bells*. San Diego Historical Society. <http://www.sandiegohistory.org/books/pourade/time/timechapter9.htm>
- Robinson, W. W. 1948. *Land in California: The Story of Mission Lands, Ranchos, Squatters, Mining Claims, Railroad Grants, Land Scrip, Homesteads*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

- Rondeau, M. F., J. Cassidy, and T. L. Jones. 2007. Colonization Technologies: Fluted Projectile Points and the San Clemente Island Woodworking/Microblade Complex. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by T. L. Jones and K. A. Klar, pp. 299-315. Altamira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Salls, R. A. 1983. *The Liberty Grove Site: Archaeological Interpretation of a Late Milling Stone Horizon Site on the Cucamonga Plain*. M.A. Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Soilweb. 2022. Online Soil Survey Browser. <https://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/gmap/> accessed March 8, 2022.
- Strong, W. D. 1929. Aboriginal Society in Southern California. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology.
- Sutton, M. Q. 2011. The Palomar Tradition and Its Place in the Prehistory of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 44(4):1-74.
- _____. 2009. People and Language: Defining the Takic Expansion into Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 41(2 and 3):31-93.
- Sutton, M. Q., Gardner J. K. 2010. Reconceptualizing the Encinitas Tradition of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly*. 42(4):1-64.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS). 1904. Indio, California, 30-minute quadrangle.
- University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) Library. 2022. Aerial Photographs, Special Research Collections. <https://www.library.ucsb.edu/src/airphotos>
- Wallace, W. J. 1955. A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11:214-230.
- Warren, C. N. 1968. Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. In *Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States*, edited by Cynthia Irwin-Williams, pp. 1-14. Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology 1. Portales, New Mexico.
- _____. 1967. The San Dieguito Complex: a Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity* 32:168-185.
- Waugh, M. G. 1986. *Intensification and Land-Use: Archaeological Indication of Transition and Transformation in a Late Prehistoric Complex in Southern California*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis. UMI Dissertation Services, ProQuest, Ann Arbor.

LIST OF APPENDICES

- A. *CONFIDENTIAL* First Carbon Solutions Report
- B. Project Location and Vicinity Map
- C. Staff Qualifications
- D. *CONFIDENTIAL* CHRIS Results
- E. NAHC
- F. Tribal Correspondence
- G. *CONFIDENTIAL* DPR Records
- H. Survey Photographs