

**A**  
**PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY,  
35<sup>th</sup> STREET WEST AND AVENUE M-8,  
CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA**

**Submitted to:**

26 Global Infinity, LLC  
9595 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 708  
Beverly Hills, California 90212

**Keywords:**

Lancaster West 7.5' Quadrangle, City of Lancaster,  
California Environmental Quality Act

**Submitted by:**

*Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates*  
1405 Sutter Lane  
Bakersfield, California 93309

**Author:**

Scott M. Hudlow

**April 2022**

## **Management Summary**

At the request of 26 Global Infinity, LLC, a Phase I Cultural Resource Survey was conducted on approximately twenty acres. The property lies at the northwest corner at 35<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue M-8 in the City of Lancaster, California. The Phase I Cultural Resource Survey consisted of a pedestrian survey of the twenty-acre site and a cultural resource record search.

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

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

**Table of Contents**

Management Summary..... 2

Table of Contents ..... 3

List of Figures..... 3

1.0 Introduction ..... 4

2.0 Survey Location..... 4

3.0 Record Search ..... 4

4.0 Environmental Background ..... 4

5.0 Prehistoric Archaeological Context..... 4

6.0 Ethnographic Background ..... 10

7.0 Field Procedures and Methods. .... 13

8.0 Report of Findings. .... 13

9.0 Management Recommendations..... 13

10.0 References..... 14

Appendix I ..... 19

**List of Figures**

1 Project Area Location Map ..... 5

2 Project Area, View to the North ..... 7

3 Project Area, Construction Mounds, View to the Southeast..... 7

## **1.0 Introduction**

At the request of 26 Global Infinity, LLC, *Hudlow Cultural Resource Associates* conducted a Phase I Cultural Resource Survey on approximately twenty acres. The property lies at the northwest corner of 35<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue M-8, City of Lancaster, California. This project is being undertaken in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) with the City of Lancaster responsible as Lead Agency to implement CEQA. The Phase I Cultural Resource Survey consisted of a pedestrian survey and a cultural resource record search.

## **2.0 Survey Location**

The project area is in the City of Lancaster. The parcel is in the E ½ of the SE ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 6, T.7N., R.12W., San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian, as displayed on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Lancaster West 7.5-minute quadrangle map at the northwest corner of 35<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue M-8, City of Lancaster, California (Figure 1).

## **3.0 Record Search**



A record search of the project area and the environs within one-half mile was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center. Scott M. Hudlow conducted the record search on April 19, 2022. The record search revealed that sixteen cultural resource surveys have been conducted within one-half mile radius of the project area, including three surveys, which previously addressed the current project area (Tang, Hogan, and Smallwood 2006, Norwood 1989, and Singer 2004). One of these projects is a city-wide overview with no direct survey; the remaining two were partial surveys of the property. Six cultural resources have been recorded within one half-mile of the current project area: six historic sites including a water tank, and five trash scatters. No cultural resources have been identified within the current project area.

## **4.0 Environmental Background**

The project area is found northwest of Amargosa Creek and south of Quartz Hill in the Antelope Valley portion of the western Mojave Desert. the project area is found at elevations between 2525 and 2545 feet above mean sea level. The project area was found within a Joshua tree and juniper environmental zone; however, a large portion of the project area is covered in construction mounds (Figures 2 and 3).

## **5.0 Prehistoric Archaeological Context**

A generally accepted prehistoric cultural chronology for the western Mojave Desert region has yet to be developed, partially because sparse local chronometric data is available to use as a foundation. Consequently, most



**Figure 1**  
**Project Area Location Map**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

During the Gypsum Period, evidence of a millingstone culture becomes much more common. The mortar and pestle were probably introduced during this



**Figure 2**  
**Project Area, View to the North**



**Figure 3**  
**Project Area, Construction Mounds, View to the Southeast**

period (Wallace 1955:222-223; Warren 1984:4163). Wallace noted evidence of expanded subsistence activities where late period peoples around Mesquite Flat were believed to have extended their food-collecting activities into the surrounding mountains (Wallace 1977:121).

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

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

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

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

This period also marks the beginning of the Shoshonean period, named for the Shoshonean peoples who occupied the Western Mojave Desert during this period (Robinson 1977). The Numic and Tatic Shoshonean groups were expanding during this period. Both groups made use of a millingstone technology-- other aspects of their material culture include marine shell, bone, and perishable artifacts. Tatic sociopolitical organizations differ from those of Northern Numic groups. The Kitanemuk (a Tatic group) are reported as having well developed social ranking and prestige systems (Blackburn and Bean 1978).



Grover Krantz postulated that the Takic expansion to the south was stimulated by Northern groups who "...overran their neighbors for a considerable distance to the south" (Krantz 1978:64) in order to obtain acorn resources. This migration occurred at about 2000 B.P. (Sutton 1988:40).

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

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

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

Warren used the term "Protohistoric" to describe the period, which reflects a transition from the prehistoric to historic eras (Warren 1984). However, Arkush, noting this term has distinct cultural implications, argued this time is more properly designated the "Late Archaic," while many archaeologists colloquially call this period the "Late Prehistoric" (Arkush 1990:29). This period is also termed the "Shoshonean" Period (Warren 1984; Warren and Crabtree 1986), potentially clouding the culture history sequence by adding a name, which has cultural and linguistic meanings when describing modern groups. Whatever its name, the period markers are considered to be Desert Side-notched arrow points "...and various poorly defined types of brownware pottery including Owens Valley Brownware" (Warren and Crabtree 1986:191).

This period reflects a continuation of cultural developments established during the previous period, but with adaptive modifications. Trade along the Mojave River likely affected the people of the Eastern Antelope Valley, allowing active groups to acquire considerable amounts of wealth. Socioeconomic and sociopolitical organizations continued to increase in complexity. However, most Antelope Valley groups appear to have developed stronger ties with coastal groups rather than those of the eastern desert and Great Basin (Warren

1984:426). By approximately A.D. 1300, the Hakataya expansion reached its western extreme. Warren (1984) interprets the paucity of ceramic ware in Antelope Valley village sites as evidence that Hakatayan influence upon local groups was minimal.

## **6.0 Ethnographic Background**

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

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

The term "Protohistoric" is also sometimes used in this context. Arkush (1990:29) defined this Protohistoric Period as "...a distinct span of time during which native cultures were modified by the introduction of Euro-American diseases, material, and/or practices prior to intensive, face-to-face contact with whites." In fact, historical documents from explorers and others describe many tribes long before "intensive" contact occurred, and other groups experienced such contact without much, if any, historical documentation.

Just as the dates are hard to define, it is a challenge to determine which aboriginal groups inhabited the Antelope Valley, particularly the area, which is now Edwards AFB. Generally, people occupied core areas in the hills and mountains surrounding the valley and traveled into the desert to gather particular plants, or to escape mountain weather; consequently, the desert boundaries were neither strict nor firmly embedded in the "memory culture" of the ethnographic present. The peripatetic hunter-gatherers of the area do not

seem to have been particularly territorial. According to Earle, Harrington's informants indicated "...that all of the clan groups of Serrano/Haminat speech affiliation north of Cajon Pass and east of Soledad Pass constituted a single ethnic domain," although differences in dialect, social organization, and material culture are present (Earle 1990:97).

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

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

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

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

#### *Kitanemuk and Tataviam*

The Kitanemuk and the Tataviam occupied the western portion of the Antelope Valley, but no distinct line can be drawn between their lands. Kroeber's description of Tataviam (or, as he called them, "Alliklik") territory did not include the Antelope Valley, but clearly was centered on the nearby upper Santa Clara River in the mountains west of the valley (Kroeber 1925: 556). According to Kroeber, the Sawmill Mountains and adjacent Liebre Mountains at the western rim of the valley were the territory of the Kitanemuk. King and Blackburn rejected this division, agreeing that the Tataviam were centered on

the southern-facing slopes of the Santa Clara River drainage, but arguing it was the Tataviam whose "...territory extended over the Sawmill Mountains to the north [of the Santa Clara River] to include at least the southwestern fringes of the Antelope Valley" and Lake Elizabeth (King and Blackburn 1978:535-536). Their map placed the Tataviam south of Pastoria Creek, midway up the western edge of the Antelope Valley.

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

#### *Kawaiisu*

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

On the other hand, Zigmond illustrated a far more limited range for the Kawaiisu, encompassing a "core area" from the northern edge of the Tehachapis to the fork of the Kern River (Zigmond 1986:398). Zigmond's map also indicates a seasonal range extending east just north of Rosamond Lake but dipping southeast to encompass Rogers Lake and the central portion of the Mojave River. This outline roughly agrees with the northeastern border of the Kitanemuk as defined by Blackburn and Bean. These boundaries should not be considered mutually exclusive, however, as among the Kawaiisu, "...the concept of territory was weakly developed, and the idea of boundary was probably nonexistent.... The characteristic shifting about in relation to the seasons makes it impossible to devise a static map of land occupation" (Zigmond 1986:398)

#### *Vanyume*

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

Vanyume territory in their map, omitting the northern and western portions, which may have included the Antelope Valley.

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

## **7.0 Field Procedures and Methods**

On March 24, 2022, Scott M. Hudlow (for qualifications see Appendix I) conducted a pedestrian survey of the entire project area. Hudlow surveyed in north/south transects at 15-meter (33 feet) intervals. All archaeological material more than fifty years of age or earlier encountered during the inventory was recorded.

## **8.0 Report of Findings**

No cultural resources were identified.

## **9.0 Management Recommendations**

At the request of 26 Global Infinity, LLC, a Phase I Cultural Resource Survey was conducted on approximately twenty acres. The property lies at the northwest corner at 35<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue M-8 in the City of Lancaster, California. The Phase I Cultural Resource Survey consisted of a pedestrian survey of the twenty-acre site and a cultural resource record search.

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

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

## 10.0 References

Arkush, Brooke S.

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

Bean, Lowell John and Charles R. Smith

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

Bettinger, Robert L., and R. E. Taylor

- 1974 "Suggested Revisions in Archaeological Sequences of the Great Basin in Interior Southern California". *Nevada Archaeological Survey Research Papers* 5: 1-26.

Blackburn, Thomas C., and Lowell John Bean

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

Campbell, E. W. C., and W. H. Campbell

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

Campbell, E. W. C., W. H. Campbell, E. Antevs, C. E. Amsden, J. A. Barbieri, F. D. Bode

- 1937 "The Archaeology of Pleistocene Lake Mojave," Los Angeles: *Southwest Museum Papers* pp. 11.

Campbell, Mark M.

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

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

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

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

- Cook, Sherburne F.  
 1955 "The Epidemic of 1830-1833 in California and Oregon." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 43(3):303-326.
- Cultural Systems Research, Inc.  
 1980 "Cultural Resources Narrative - Ethnography," in *Cultural Resources Overview for Edwards Air Force Base, Vol. I.* By Roberta S. Greenwood and Michael J. McIntyre. Report on file, AFFTC/EM, Edwards AFB, California, pp. 187-215.
- Earle, David D.  
 1990 "New Evidence on the Political Geography of the Antelope Valley and the Western Mojave Desert at Spanish Contact." In *Archaeology and Ethnohistory of the Antelope Valley and Vicinity. Antelope Valley Occasional Papers No. 2* Bruce Love and William H. DeWitt, editors, pp. 87-104. Lancaster, California.
- King, Chester D., and Thomas C. Blackburn,  
 1978 "Tataviam." In *The Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California*, Robert F. Heizer, ed. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., pp. 535-537.
- Krantz, Grover S.  
 1978 "Reply." In: *Method and Theory in California Archaeology*, Gary S. Breschini, ed. *Occasional Papers of the Society for California Archaeology* 2, pp. 62-64.
- Kroeber, Alfred L.  
 1925 "Handbook of the Indians of California." *Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 78. [Reprinted 1976, New York, New York, Dover Publications.]
- Lanning, Edward P.  
 1963 *Archaeology of the Rose Spring Site, INY-372.* University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 49(3): 237-336.
- Moratto, Michael J.  
 1984 *California Archaeology.* Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, Florida.
- Norwood, Richard H.  
 1987 "Prehistoric Archaeology at Edwards Air Force Base, California." In: *Prehistory of the Antelope Valley, California: An Overview*, R. W. Robinson, ed. *Antelope Valley Archaeological Society Occasional Paper* No. 1, pp. 91-106.

- 1989 *Cultural Resource Survey for GPA 88-16, Lancaster, California.*  
Report on file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton, Fullerton, California.
- Robinson, Roger W.  
1977 "The Prehistory of the Antelope Valley, California: An Overview."  
*Kern County Archaeological Society Journal* 1: 43-48.
- Shutler, R., Jr., M. E. Shutler, and J. S. Griffith  
1961 "Lost City, Pueblo Grande de Nevada." Carson City: Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers 5.
- Singer, Clay  
2004 *Phase I Cultural Resource survey and impact Assessment for Pacific Renaissance Hamlet II.* Report on file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton, Fullerton, California.
- Sutton, Mark Q.  
1988 "An Introduction to the Archaeology of the Western Mojave Desert, California." Salinas: *Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory* 14.
- Tang, Tom, Michael Hogan, and Josh Smallwood  
2006 *Cultural Resources Technical Report City of Lancaster General Plan Update.* Report on file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton, Fullerton, California.
- Wallace, W.  
1955 "A suggested chronology for southern California coastal archaeology." Albuquerque: *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11: 214-230.  
  
1977 *Death Valley National Monuments' prehistoric past: An Archaeological Overview.* Report on file, National Park Service, Western Archaeological Center, Tucson, Arizona.
- Warren, Claude N.  
1984 "The Desert Region." In *California Archaeology*, by Michael J. Moratto. Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, Florida, pp. 339-430.
- Warren, Claude N., and Robert H. Crabtree  
1986 "Prehistory of the Southwestern Area." In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 11, Great Basin. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., pp. 183-193.



Zigmond, Maurice L.

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



## Appendix I



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

## **Education**

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

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

## **Public Service**

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

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

## **Relevant Work Experience**

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

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

**Full resume available upon request.**