

# **Archaeological Resources Inventory Report for the Villa Serena Project**

---

## **San Bernardino County, California**

### **Prepared For:**

Robert D. Dalquest  
Development Services Director  
City of Upland, California 91786  
P: 909.931.4148  
rdalquest@ci.upland.ca.us

Joshua Winters  
Senior Planner  
City of Upland, California 91786  
P: 909.931.4143  
jwinter@uplandca.gov

### **Prepared By:**

 **ECORP Consulting, Inc.**  
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS  
215 North Fifth Street  
Redlands, California 92374

**March 2023**

## MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

---

The Colonies Partners, L.P. retained ECORP Consulting, Inc. in 2023 to conduct an updated cultural resources inventory for the Villa Serena Project (Project or Proposed Project) in San Bernardino County, California. Colonies Partners proposes to construct 65 single-family residential units across 23.21 acres of land north of east of Saint Elias Way, south of Upland Hills Drive South, west of Spyglass Drive, and north of (including portions of) East 15th Street, in the City of Upland, California.

The inventory included an updated records search, literature review, and field survey. The records search results indicated that 48 previous cultural resources studies have been conducted within 1 mile of the Project Area, of which two include portions of the Project Area. An additional report completed in 2018 that encompasses portions of the Project Area was supplied to ECORP but was not included as part of the CHRIS search. As a result of those studies, 37 sites have previously been recorded within 1 mile of the Project Area. Of those 37 sites, 9 are from the pre-contact period and associated with Native American culture, consisting of tool and processing remnants and lithic scatters, and 28 are from the historic period, consisting of early built structures including inns, restaurant adobes, and agriculture activities. None of these resources are located within the Project Area.

The field survey resulted in the observation of an existing detention basin that was constructed by 1967 but modified by 1985 to its current configuration. No archaeological resources were identified during the field survey. Recommendations for the management of unanticipated discoveries are provided.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.0	INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1	Project Location and Description.....	1
1.2	Area of Potential Effects.....	1
1.3	Regulatory Context.....	3
1.3.1	National Environmental Policy Act .....	3
1.3.2	National Historic Preservation Act.....	4
1.3.3	California Environmental Quality Act.....	5
1.4	Report Organization .....	6
2.0	SETTING.....	7
2.1	Environmental Setting.....	7
3.0	CULTURAL CONTEXT.....	7
3.1	Regional Pre-Contact History.....	7
3.1.1	Paleo-Indian Period/Terminal Pleistocene (12,000 to 10,000 BP).....	7
3.1.2	Early Archaic Period/Early Holocene (10,000 to 8,500 BP).....	7
3.1.3	Encinitas Tradition or Milling Stone Period/Middle Holocene (8,500 to 1,250 BP) .....	8
3.1.4	Palomar Tradition (1,250 to 150 BP) .....	9
3.2	Local Pre-Contact History .....	10
3.3	Ethnography.....	11
3.4	Regional History .....	12
3.5	History of Upland .....	12
4.0	METHODS .....	13
4.1	Personnel Qualifications.....	13
4.2	Records Search Methods .....	14
4.3	Sacred Lands File Coordination Methods .....	14
4.4	Other Interested Party Consultation Methods .....	15
4.5	Field Methods.....	15
5.0	RESULTS.....	15
5.1	Records Search.....	15
5.1.1	Previous Research .....	15
5.1.2	Records.....	16
5.1.3	Map Review and Aerial Photographs.....	17
5.2	Sacred Lands File Results .....	18
5.3	Other Interested Party Consultation Results.....	18

5.4	Field Survey Results.....	18
6.0	MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS.....	21
6.1	Conclusions .....	21
6.2	Likelihood for Subsurface Cultural Resources .....	21
6.3	Post-Review Discoveries.....	21
7.0	REFERENCES CITED .....	23

#### **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1. Project Location and Vicinity .....	2
Figure 2. APE Overview (view north; February 14, 2023). .....	19
Figure 3. APE Overview (view west; February 14, 2023). .....	19
Figure 4. 15th Street (view southwest; February 14, 2023). .....	20

#### **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1. Previous Cultural Studies within the Project Area.....	16
---	----

#### **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix A – Records Search Confirmation and Historical Society Coordination
Appendix B – Sacred Lands File Coordination
Appendix C – Project Area Photographs



## **LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

AB	Assembly Bill
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
APE	Area of Potential Effect
BP	Before Present
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHL	California Historical Landmarks
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPS	National Park Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OHP	California Office of Historic Preservation
PRC	Public Resources Code
Project	Villa Serena Project
RPA	Registered Professional Archaeologist
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resource
USGS	United States Geological Survey

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The Colonies Partners, L.P. retained ECORP Consulting, Inc. in 2023 to conduct an updated cultural resources inventory for the Villa Serena Project (Project or Proposed Project) in the City of Upland in San Bernardino County, California. A survey of the Project Area was required to identify potentially eligible cultural resources (i.e., archaeological sites and historic buildings, structures, and objects) that could be affected by the Project.

### **1.1 Project Location and Description**


The Project Area consists of 23.21 acres of property located in an unsectioned portion of the Cucamonga Land Grant in Township 1 South, Range 7 West, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian, as depicted on the 1967 (Photorevised 1981) Ontario, California U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map (Figure 1). It is also known as Assessor Parcel Number 1045-121-04-0000. The Project Area is located east of Saint Elias Way, south of Upland Hills Drive South, west of Spyglass Drive, and north of (including portions of) East 15th Street, in the City of Upland, California.

The proposed Project entails the construction of 65 single family residential units and associated recreational space.

### **1.2 Area of Potential Effects**

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) consists of the horizontal and vertical limits of a project and includes the area within which significant impacts or adverse effects to Historical Resources or Historic Properties could occur as a result of the project. The APE is defined for projects subject to regulations implementing Section 106 (federal law and regulations). For projects subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review, the term Project Area is used rather than APE. The terms Project Area and APE are interchangeable for the purpose of this document.

The horizontal APE consists of all areas where activities associated with a project are proposed and, in the case of this project, equals the Project Area subject to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and CEQA. This includes areas proposed for construction, vegetation removal, grading, trenching, stockpiling, staging, paving, and other elements in the official Project description. The horizontal APE is illustrated in Figure 1 and represents the survey coverage area.



**Figure 1. Project Location and Vicinity**



The vertical APE is described as the maximum depth below the surface to which excavations for project foundations and facilities will extend. Therefore, the vertical APE for this project includes all subsurface areas where archaeological deposits could be affected. The vertical APE also is described as the maximum height of structures that could impact the physical integrity and integrity of setting of cultural resources, including districts and traditional cultural properties. For this project, the above-surface vertical APE is up to 50 feet above the surface. The subsurface vertical APE varies across the project, depending on foundation, leveling, compaction, trenching and other requirements for the residential units. In the event that any obstacles are encountered, ground disturbance of up to 15 feet below the surface will be necessary. It could extend as deep as 20 feet below the current surface, and therefore, a review of geologic and soils maps was necessary to determine the potential for buried archaeological sites that cannot be seen on the surface.

### **1.3 Regulatory Context**

A review of the regulatory context is provided below; however, the inclusion of any of these laws and regulations in this report does not make a law or regulation apply when it otherwise would not. Similarly, the omission of any other laws and regulations from this section does not mean that they do not apply. Rather, the purpose of this section is to provide context in explaining why the study was carried out in the manner documented herein.

#### **1.3.1 National Environmental Policy Act**

NEPA establishes national policy for the protection and enhancement of the environment. Part of the function of the federal government in protecting the environment is to “preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage.” Cultural resources need not be determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) through the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended) to receive consideration under NEPA. NEPA is implemented by regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508).

The definition of *effects* in the NEPA regulations includes adverse and beneficial effects on historic and cultural resources (40 CFR 1508.8). Therefore, the *Environmental Consequences* section of an Environmental Impact Statement (see 40 CFR 1502.16(f)) must analyze potential effects to historic or cultural resources that could result from the proposed action and each alternative. In considering whether an alternative may “significantly affect the quality of the human environment,” a federal agency must consider, among other things:

- Unique characteristics of the geographic area, such as proximity to historic or cultural resources (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)), and
- The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)).

Therefore, because historic properties are a subset of *cultural resources*, they are one aspect of the *human environment* defined by NEPA regulations.

### 1.3.2 National Historic Preservation Act

The federal law that covers cultural resources that could be affected by federal undertakings is the NHPA 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 regulations that stipulate the procedures for complying with Section 106 are in 36 CFR 800. The Section 106 regulations require:

- definition of the APE;
- identification of cultural resources within the APE;
- evaluation of the identified resources in the APE using NRHP eligibility criteria;
- determination of whether the effects of the undertaking or project on eligible resources will be adverse; and
- agreement on and implementation of efforts to resolve adverse effects, if necessary.

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. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

- C. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory.

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.

### **1.3.3 California Environmental Quality Act**

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), and 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 United States;
- (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.

## **1.4 Report Organization**

The following report documents the study and its findings and was prepared in conformance with the California Office of Historic Preservation's (OHP) *Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format*. Appendix A includes a confirmation of the records search with the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and historical society coordination. Appendix B contains documentation of a search of the Sacred Lands File. Appendix C presents photographs of the Project Area.

## **2.0 SETTING**

### **2.1 Environmental Setting**

The Project Area is approximately 1,430 feet above mean sea level and is located south of the base of the San Gabriel Mountains. The Project Area is a mostly flat strip of vacant land oriented east–west that slopes down to the south. A housing complex is immediately to the south and a golf course to the north.

The soils in the Project Area consist of mostly Soboba stony loamy sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes. Less than two percent of the Project Area consists of Soboba gravelly loamy sand, 0 to 9 percent slopes. Both are excessively drained alluvium derived from granite. There exists the potential for buried pre-contact archaeological sites in the Project Area due to the presence of alluvium within the Project Area; however, the heavily disturbed nature of the Project Area suggests that the potential is low.

The dominant plant community within the Project Area includes the floating primrose-willow, hackberries, and American black nightshade. Wildlife species that may occur in the Project Area include the fox squirrel and the western fence lizard.

## **3.0 CULTURAL CONTEXT**

### **3.1 Regional Pre-Contact History**

#### **3.1.1 Paleo-Indian Period/Terminal Pleistocene (12,000 to 10,000 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 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).

#### **3.1.2 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 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 Before Present (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).

### **3.1.3 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 to 4,000 BP) has abundant manos and metates. Projectile points are few and are mostly Pinto points. Greven Knoll II (4,000 to 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 to 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.

### **3.1.4 Palomar Tradition (1,250 to 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 to 500 BP) and San Luis Rey II Phase (500 to 150 BP) pertain to the area occupied by the Luiseño at the time of Spanish contact. The Peninsular I (1,000 to 750 BP), II (750 to 300 BP), and III (300 to 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.

### **3.2 Local Pre-Contact History**

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 or Desert Serrano 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).

The material culture of the ancestors of the Gabrielino is termed the Del Rey Tradition (3,500 to 150 BP) (Sutton 2010). With the arrival of the Takic speakers, settlement and subsistence systems changed. Mobility was greatly decreased compared to the Encinitas Tradition and small groups of related people lived in semi-permanent residential bases near a water source. Subsistence changed from a mobile foraging pattern to a collector pattern (Binford 1980). People collected resources and brought them back to the residential base. When away from the residential base people stayed overnight in temporary camps.

Six phases have been defined on the mainland (Angeles I – Angeles VI) and four phases (Island I – Island IV) have been defined on the southern Channel Islands for the Del Rey Tradition (Sutton 2010). Angeles I, II, and III (3,500 to 1,250 BP) correspond with the Intermediate Horizon first defined by Wallace (1955). During this period mortars and pestles were first used which probably indicates the beginning of acorn exploitation. Acorns required greater processing time but were storable and contributed to a greater degree of sedentism. Lithic technology was more focused on making flake tools, rather than core tools, as in the previous Encinitas Tradition. Large projectile points, including Elko points, indicate that hunting was probably still accomplished with the *atlatl* or spear thrower.

Angeles IV, V, and VI (1,250 to 150 BP) correspond with the Late Prehistoric Horizon as originally defined by Wallace (1955). The complex hunter-gatherer cultures encountered by the Spaniards in southern California developed during the Late Prehistoric Period. People lived in villages of up to 250 people located near permanent water and a variety of food sources. Each village was typically located at the center of a defended territory from which resources for the group were gathered. Small groups left the village for short periods of time to hunt, fish, and gather plant foods. While away from the village, they

established temporary camps and created locations where food and other materials were processed. Archaeologically, such locations are evidenced by manos and metates for seed grinding, bedrock mortars for acorn pulverizing, and lithic scatters indicating manufacturing or maintenance of stone tools (usually made of chert) used in hunting or butchering. Overnight stays in field camps are evidenced by fire-affected rock used in hearths.

The beginning of Angeles IV is marked by the introduction of the bow and arrow, which made deer hunting more efficient. The bow and arrow was also used in wars for territorial defense. One of the most important food resources for inland groups was acorns gathered from oak groves in canyons, drainages, and foothills. Acorn processing was labor intensive, requiring grinding in a mortar and leaching with water to remove tannic acid (Basgall 1987). Many of the mortars are bedrock mortars. Seeds from sage and grasses, goosefoot, and California buckwheat were collected and ground into meal with manos and metates. Seeds were used as the storable staple in areas which lacked acorn-producing oak groves. Protein was supplied through the meat of deer, rabbits, and other animals, hunted with bow and arrow or trapped using snares, nets, and deadfalls. On the coast fish were obtained using shell fishhooks and nets.

Trade among local groups and inland and coastal groups was important as a means of obtaining resources from outside the local group's territory. Items traded over long distances included obsidian from the Obsidian Butte source in Imperial County and from the Coso source in Inyo County, steatite bowls and ornaments from Catalina Island, shell beads and ornaments from the Santa Barbara Channel area, rabbit skins and deer hides from the interior, and dried fish and shellfish from the coast. Acorns, seeds, and other food resources were probably exchanged locally.

### **3.3 Ethnography**

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 1978; 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 1978; 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 1978; 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 1978; McCawley 1996; Miller 1991). However, current descendants of the Gabrieliño are preserving Gabrieliño culture.

### **3.4 Regional History**

Spanish colonization of California began with the Portola Expedition of 1769 during which presidios (forts) and missions were established. The missions were established near the coast beginning with San Diego in 1769 and ending with the missions established in San Rafael and Sonoma in 1823 (Castillo 1978). The purpose of the missions was to convert and control the Native American population. Mission San Gabriel Archangel was founded in 1771 east of what is now Los Angeles in Gabrielino territory. An asistencia or outpost of the San Gabriel Mission, known as the San Bernardino Rancho Asistencia, was founded in 1819 in Serrano territory near present-day Redlands.

After Mexico became independent from Spain in the early 1830s, the Mexican government closed the missions. Former mission lands were granted to soldiers and other Mexican citizens for use as cattle ranches. The San Bernardino land grant was south of the Project Area and included what are now the towns of San Bernardino and Redlands. It was granted to Jose del Carmen Lugo, Jose Maria Lugo, Vicente Lugo, and Diego Sepulveda in 1842 (Aviña 1976:91).

The American period began when the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed between Mexico and the United States in 1848, ending the Mexican-American War. As a result of the treaty, California became part of the United States. The rapid increase in population resulting from the Gold Rush of 1849 allowed California to become a state in 1850. In 1851, the Lugos sold a portion of the San Bernardino land grant to 500 Mormon settlers from Salt Lake City who founded the town of San Bernardino. After only 5 years, most of the Mormons returned to Salt Lake City (California Genealogy 2008). San Bernardino County was formed from Los Angeles County in 1853 and San Bernardino became the county seat (Gudde 1969:280).

### **3.5 History of Upland**

In 1881, George Chaffey created the Etiwanda Irrigation company. By 1882, he had expanded his business to cover other areas of the former Ranch Cucamonga land grant. Upland was originally part of Chaffey's planned community called Ontario (Upland Heritage 2023). That same year, after some successful land speculation and having successfully founded the precursor of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, George Chaffey purchased 8,000 acres from the Cucamonga Rancho, developing what would eventually become the city of Ontario. In the process, he constructed Euclid Avenue, and a trolley line, which went to the area now known as Upland (Upland Public Library n.d.).

In 1892, mule-driven street cars pulled trolleys up an 8-mile-long track on a hill, this was later replaced by an electric trolley. By 1922 gasoline motor trucks were running the trolleys in the area (Popular Science 1922). In 1887, the AT&SF railroad selected their route through Upland. The Bedford Brothers built the Upland Railway station on Second Avenue. Numerous fruit packing houses soon sprang up nearby as well. Farms and houses near the railway station sprang up, as it allowed workers to commute to Los Angeles, or to ship their produce to large markets in Los Angeles (Upland Heritage 2023).

In 1888, Having created the Ontario Fruit Exchange, local resident Charles D. Adams created a new citrus association. Because fruit grown at higher elevations tended to be of better quality, he called the new association "Upland," marking the first time the area was thus designated (Upland Public Library n.d.b).

The City of Ontario incorporated in 1891, as 0.5 square mile. In 1902, when nearby cities also began to seek incorporation, Ontario attempted to annex a 10-square-mile area, which would cover the Upland railroad station, all the Upland railroad tracks, and the Upland post office. San Bernardino Board of Supervisors held a two-day hearing, deciding that a vote of incorporation for Upland should be undertaken before Ontario was allowed to expand. A vote was held, and Upland was incorporated on May 15, 1906 (Upland Heritage 2023). In 1935 the land originally claimed for annexation by Ontario was annexed by Upland (Upland Heritage 2023).

---

## **4.0 METHODS**

### **4.1 Personnel Qualifications**

Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) Sonia Sifuentes, who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historical archaeology, supervised this cultural resource investigation. Associate Archaeologist Julian Acuña, RPA conducted the fieldwork. Associate Archaeologist Evelyn Hildebrand, RPA prepared the technical report. Lisa Westwood, RPA provided technical report review and quality assurance.

Sonia Sifuentes, RPA is a Senior Archaeologist with more than 15 years of experience in cultural resources management, primarily in Southern California. Ms. Sifuentes holds an M.S. in Archaeology of the North and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology. She has participated in and supervised numerous surveys, test programs, data recovery excavations, and construction monitoring compliance for both prehistoric and historical sites; and has cataloged, identified, and curated thousands of artifacts. She has conducted evaluations of cultural resources for eligibility for the NRHP and CRHR. Ms. Sifuentes is experienced in the organization and execution of field projects in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and CEQA. She has contributed to and authored numerous cultural resources technical reports, research designs, and cultural resources management plans.

Julian Acuña, RPA is an Associate Archaeologist with more than 6 years of experience in cultural resources management. Mr. Acuña holds an M.A. in Applied Archaeology and a B.A. Cum Laude in Anthropology. He meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology. He has participated in various aspects of archaeological fieldwork including survey, test excavations, construction monitoring, the recording of both pre-contact and historic-period archaeological sites, and laboratory work for the analysis and cataloging of artifacts from multi-component sites.

Evelyn Hildebrand, RPA is an Associate Archaeologist with more than 5 years of experience working in cultural resource management across Southern California. She holds a B.A. in Anthropology with a focused curriculum in archaeology and an M.A. in Applied Archaeology. Ms. Hildebrand meets the

Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology and has participated in various aspects of archaeological fieldwork including survey, test excavation, data recovery, artifact analysis, construction monitoring, both as an archaeological monitor and field lead, and the recording and recovery of pre-contact and historic-period archaeological sites. She has also worked with Egypt's department of Antiquities in collaboration with the Wadi el-Hudi expedition in 2019 in the desert southeast of Aswan, Egypt using photogrammetry to record and create digital 3D models of sites.

Lisa Westwood, RPA has 27 years of experience and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historical archaeology. She holds a B.A. in Anthropology and an M.A. in Anthropology (Archaeology). She is the Director of Cultural Resources for ECORP.

## **4.2 Records Search Methods**

ECORP conducted a records search for the property at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) of the CHRIS at California State University, Fullerton on February 6, 2023 (Appendix A). The purpose of the records search was to determine the extent of previous surveys within a 1-mile (1,600-meter) radius of the Proposed Project location, and whether previously documented pre-contact or historic archaeological sites, architectural resources, or traditional cultural properties exist within this area.

In addition to the official records and maps for archaeological sites and surveys in San Bernardino County, the following historic references were also reviewed: Built Environment Resource Directory (OHP 2020); Historic Property Data File for San Bernardino County (OHP 2012); the National Register Information System (National Park Service [NPS] 2023); Office of Historic Preservation, California Historical Landmarks (CHL; OHP 2022); CHL (OHP 1996 and updates); California Points of Historical Interest (OHP 1992 and updates); Directory of Properties in the Historical Resources Inventory (OHP 1999); Caltrans Local Bridge Survey (California Department of Transportation [Caltrans] 2019); Caltrans State Bridge Survey (Caltrans 2018); and *Historic Spots in California* (Kyle 2002).

Other references examined include a RealQuest Property Search and historic General Land Office land patent records (Bureau of Land Management 2023). Historic maps reviewed include:

- 1897 USGS Cucamonga, California topographic quadrangle map (1:1,000 scale);
- 1942 USGS Ontario and Vicinity, California topographic quadrangle map (1:31,680 scale);
- 1954 USGS Ontario, California topographic quadrangle map (1:24,000 scale); and
- 1967 USGS Ontario, California topographic quadrangle map (1:24,000 scale).

ECORP reviewed historic aerial photographs taken in 1938, 1948, 1959, 1966, 1978, 1985, 1994, and 2010 for any indications of property usage and built environment.

## **4.3 Sacred Lands File Coordination Methods**

In addition to the records search, ECORP contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on January 30, 2023 to request a search of the Sacred Lands File for the Project Area (Appendix B). This search determines whether California Native American tribes within the Project Area have recorded

Sacred Lands, because the Sacred Lands File is populated by members of the Native American community with knowledge about the locations of tribal resources. In requesting a search of the Sacred Lands File, ECORP solicited information from the Native American community regarding TCRs, but the responsibility to formally consult with the Native American community lies exclusively with the federal and local agencies under applicable state and federal laws. The lead agencies do not delegate government-to-government authority to any private entity to conduct tribal consultation.

#### **4.4 Other Interested Party Consultation Methods**

ECORP mailed letters to the Upland Heritage Society on January 9, 2023 to solicit comments or obtain historical information that the repository might have regarding events, people, or resources of historical significance in the area (Appendix A).

#### **4.5 Field Methods**

ECORP subjected the APE to an intensive pedestrian survey on February 14, 2023 under the guidance of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Identification of Historic Properties* (NPS 1983) using 15-meter transects. ECORP expended 1 person-day in the field. ECORP examined the ground surface for indications of surface or subsurface cultural resources and inspected the general morphological characteristics of the ground surface for indications of subsurface deposits that may be manifested on the surface, such as circular depressions or ditches. Whenever possible, ECORP examined the locations of subsurface exposures caused by such factors as rodent activity, water or soil erosion, or vegetation disturbances for artifacts or for indications of buried deposits. ECORP did not conduct subsurface investigations or artifact collections during the pedestrian survey.

Standard professional practice requires that all cultural resources encountered during the survey be recorded using Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523-series forms approved by the California OHP. The resources are usually photographed, mapped using a handheld Global Positioning System receiver, and sketched as necessary to document their presence using appropriate DPR forms.

### **5.0 RESULTS**

---

#### **5.1 Records Search**

The records search consisted of a review of previous research and literature, records on file with the SCCIC for previously recorded resources, and historical aerial photographs and maps of the vicinity.

##### **5.1.1 Previous Research**

Forty-nine previous cultural resource investigations have been conducted within 1 mile of the property, covering approximately 80 percent of the total area surrounding the property within the records search radius (Appendix A). Of the 49 studies, three overlap with the Project Area (Table 1). One of these reports, completed in 2018 by Garfinkel and Landa, was provided separately from the CHRIS search. Appendix A provides a list of the reports located within 1 mile of the Project Area, in addition to the 2018 report provided ECORP which was not included in the CHRIS results. These studies revealed the presence of pre-



contact sites, including lithic scatters and habitation sites, and historical sites, including lithic scatters and sites associated with historic early buildings and agriculture activities. The previous studies were conducted between 1973 and 2018 and vary in size from 8 to 180 acres.

**Table 1. Previous Cultural Studies within the Project Area**

Report Number	Author(s)	Report Title	Year
SB-00702	Archaeological Associates	Archaeological Survey Report: Ultrasystems Project #4426	1978
SB-06667	Encarnacion, Deirdre	Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties: Northwest Recycled Water System Project, Cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland and Ontario, San Bernardino County, California	2009
NA	Garfinkel & Landa	Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for A proposed commercial development on 10-Acre site in the city of Upland, San Bernardino County, California	2018

The results of the records search indicate that approximately 80 percent of the Project Area has been previously surveyed for cultural resources; however, these studies were conducted in smaller segments, at different times, by different consultants, and as many as 45 years ago under obsolete standards. Therefore, ECORP conducted a pedestrian survey of the Project Area for the Project under current protocols.

The records search also determined that 37 previously recorded pre-contact and historic-era cultural resources are located within 1 mile of the Project Area. Of these, nine are believed to be associated with Native American occupation of the vicinity, and 28 are historic-era sites, associated with early buildings and structures including adobes, inns and restaurants, and citrus agriculture and early roads. There are no previously recorded cultural resources within the Project Area.

### 5.1.2 Records

The OHP's Built Environment Resource Directory for San Bernardino County (dated March 3, 2020) listed two properties within 1 mile of the Project Area (OHP 2020). None are within the Project Area.

The National Register Information System (NPS 2023) failed to reveal any eligible or listed properties within the Project Area. The nearest National Register properties are located 2 miles northwest of the Project Area in the City of Upland, California. None are within the Project Area.

ECORP reviewed resources listed as *California Historical Landmarks* (OHP 1996) by the OHP (2022) on February 13, 2023. The nearest listed landmark is #1028: the Madonna of the Trail in California (plaque located 1.25 miles southwest of the Project Area). None are within the Project Area.

A review of *Historic Spots in California* (Kyle 2002) mentions four trails that once crossed what is now Euclid Avenue, which is a long tree-lined drive that extends north and south through the modern cities of

Ontario and Upland. It also mentions the Madonna of the Trail, which is now a monument. None are within the Project Area.

A RealQuest online property search for Assessor Parcel Number 1045-121-04-0000 revealed the property consists of 9.13 acres of vacant land. No other property history information was on record with RealQuest.

The Caltrans Bridge Local Inventory (Caltrans 2019) listed one historic-period bridge within 1 mile of the Project Area. Local bridge #54C0222, named Cucamonga Creek Channel, is located 0.72 mile northeast of the Project Area. It was constructed in 1973 and was evaluated by Caltrans as a Category 5 bridge, not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C. The State Inventory (Caltrans 2018) did not list any historic bridges within 1 mile of the Project Area.

### **5.1.3 Map Review and Aerial Photographs**

The review of historical aerial photographs and maps of the Project Area provides information on the past land uses of the property and potential for buried archaeological sites. This information shows the property was left vacant and unused. Following is a summary of the review of historical maps and photographs.

- The 1897 USGS Cucamonga, California topographic quadrangle map (1:1,000 scale) depicts the Project Area as vacant land with no development surrounding it.
- 1942 USGS Ontario and Vicinity, California topographic quadrangle map (1:31,680 scale) depicts the Project Area as vacant land on a hillside with a downward north-to-south slope and undeveloped land around it.
- 1954 USGS Ontario, California topographic quadrangle map (1:24,000 scale) depicts the Project Area as it is depicted in the 1942 map: vacant land on a slope with undeveloped land around it.
- 1967 USGS Ontario, California topographic quadrangle map (1:24,000 scale) depicts the Project Area as a percolation basin with development to the southeast.
- Aerial photographs from 1938 and 1948 show the Project Area as mostly vacant land with sparse vegetation. Dirt roads are visible running in east–west directions across the western side of the Project Area without a pond. A cluster of trees is in the southeast portion of the Project Area and a square grid of unknown crops is in the northeastern portion.
- Aerial photographs from 1959 and 1966 show housing development to the south of the Project Area, while the project area remains undeveloped as in the previous photographs.
- Aerial photographs from 1978 and 1980 show additional housing development south of the Project Area and further west than in previous photographs. The Project Area remains unchanged.
- The aerial photograph from 1985 shows the Project Area has been modified to its current percolation basin configuration. Housing and road development are visible to the north of the Project Area.

- The aerial photographs from 1994, 2002, 2005, and 2010 show the Project Area in its current state as a percolation basin and cleared land that stretches east to west.

In sum, the property has been undeveloped and vacant from at least 1897 to between 1954 and 1967. After 1954, the property had been modified into a percolation basin, and that the housing development was constructed to the north of the Project Area. Later, the Project Area modified into its current green space landscaped design between 1980 and 1985.

## **5.2 Sacred Lands File Results**

A search of the Sacred Lands File by the NAHC resulted in a negative indication for the presence of Native American cultural resources in the Project Area. A record of all correspondence is provided in Appendix B.

## **5.3 Other Interested Party Consultation Results**

ECORP has not received any responses to the letters sent to the Upland Heritage Historical Society as of the date of the preparation of this document.

## **5.4 Field Survey Results**

ECORP surveyed the Project Area for cultural resources on February 14, 2023. Ground conditions were poor to fair and visibility ranged from 5 to 75 percent (Figures 2 and 3). Most of the Project Area was covered with vegetation, with the densest areas on the slopes of the southern access road/embankment and along the northern Project boundary (Figure 4). ECORP observed the presence of the percolation basin as configured in the 1985 aerial photograph. The bottom of the percolation basin is relatively flat, covered in low vegetation, and portions have standing water (Figure 3); three modern drainages are located on the northern and eastern boundaries.

ECORP did not observe archaeological resources during the survey. Project Area conditions appear unchanged since the 2018 survey conducted by Garfinkle and Landa.



**Figure 2. APE Overview (view north; February 14, 2023).**



**Figure 3. APE Overview (view west; February 14, 2023).**



**Figure 4. 15th Street (view southwest; February 14, 2023).**

## **6.0 MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

### **6.1 Conclusions**

ECORP did not identify any archaeological resources within the Project Area as a result of the records search and field survey. Until the lead agencies concur with the identification and evaluation of eligibility of cultural resources, no Project activity should occur.

### **6.2 Likelihood for Subsurface Cultural Resources**

Due to the amount of heavy disturbance within the Project Area caused by the construction of the basin, and due to the negative survey results, there exists a low potential for buried pre-contact archaeological sites in the Project Area.

### **6.3 Post-Review Discoveries**

There always remains the potential for ground-disturbing activities to expose previously unrecorded cultural resources. Both CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA require the lead agency to address any unanticipated cultural resource discoveries during Project construction. Therefore, ECORP recommends the lead agency adopt and implement the following mitigation measures to reduce potential adverse impacts to Less than Significant:

- If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 100-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:
  - If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately and no agency notifications are required.
  - If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a cultural resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, the archaeologist shall immediately notify the lead agencies. The agencies shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines or a historic property under Section 106 NHPA, if applicable. Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not a Historical Resource under CEQA or a Historic Property under Section 106; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.
  - If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, they shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (AB 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the San Bernardino County Coroner (per Section 7050.5



of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.98 of the California PRC, and AB 2641 will be implemented. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, the coroner will notify the NAHC, which then will designate a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for the Project (Section 5097.98 of the PRC). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (Section 5097.94 of the PRC). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (Section 5097.98 of the PRC). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

The Lead Agency is responsible for ensuring compliance with these mitigation measures. Section 15097 of Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 7 of CEQA, *Mitigation Monitoring or Reporting*, "The public agency shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. A public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity which accepts the delegation; however, until mitigation measures have been completed the lead agency remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program."

## 7.0 REFERENCES CITED

- Aviña, Rose H. 1976. *Spanish and Mexican Land Grants in California*. Arno Press, New York.
- Basgall, Mark E. 1987. Resource Intensification Among Hunter-Gatherers: Acorn Economies in Prehistoric California. *Research in Economic Anthropology* 9:21-52.
- Bean, Lowell J. and Charles R. Smith. 1978. Gabrielino. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California*, edited by R. F. Heizer, pp. 538-549. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Binford, Lewis R. 1980 "Willow Smoke and Dogs' Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation." *American Antiquity*, vol. 45, no. 1, 1980, pp. 4-20.
- Bureau of Land Management. 2023. Bureau of Land Management, General Land Office Records, Records Automation website. <http://www.glorerecords.blm.gov/>. Accessed February 13, 2023.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2019. Structure and Maintenance & Investigations, Historical Significance—Local Agency Bridges Database.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2019. Structure and Maintenance & Investigations, Historical Significance—State Agency Bridges Database 2019.
- California Genealogy. 2008. San Bernardino City History, California Genealogy. [http://www.californiagenealogy.org/sanbernardino/san\\_bernardino\\_city\\_history.htm](http://www.californiagenealogy.org/sanbernardino/san_bernardino_city_history.htm). Accessed February 13, 2023.
- 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.
- Erlandson, J. M. 1994. *Early Hunter-Gatherers of the California Coast*. Plenum Press, New York.
- 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, Erwin G. 1969. *California Place Names: The Origin and Etymology of Current Geographical Names*. Third Edition. University of California, Berkeley.



- Koerper, H. C., P. Langenwelter II, and 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 1969. The Sayles Complex. A Late Milling Stone Assemblage from Cajon Pass and the Ecological Implications of Its Scraper Planes. University of California Press.
- Kyle, Douglas. 2002. *Historic Spots in California*. Stanford University Press. Stanford, California.
- McCawley, William. 1996. *The First Angelinos: the Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles*. Malki Museum Press, Ballena Press, Banning, California.
- Miller, Bruce W. 1991. *The Gabrielino*. Sand River Press, Los Osos, California.
- Moratto, M. J. 1984. *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, Orlando.
- National Park Service (NPS). 2023. National Register of Historic Places, Digital Archive on NPGallery. <https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP>. Accessed February 13, 2023.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. *Archaeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*. 48 Federal Register 44716-68.
- Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). 2022. *Office of Historic Preservation California Historical Landmarks Website*. [http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=21387](http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21387). Accessed February 13, 2023.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2020. Office of Historic Preservation's Built Environment Resource Directory, dated March 3, 2020 for San Bernardino County.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File for San Bernardino County.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. Directory of Properties in the Historical Resources Inventory.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. California Historical Landmarks. California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, California.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. California Points of Historical Interest. California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, California.
- Popular Science. October 1922. From Mule to Motor Bus on Street Car Tracks. *Popular Science*, October 1922. <https://books.google.com/books?id=bioDAAAAMBAJ&pg=PA61#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
- 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, University of California, Los Angeles.

- 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.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. The Del Rey Tradition and Its Place in the Prehistory of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 44(2):1-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 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. and J. K. Gardner. 2010. Reconceptualizing the Encinitas Tradition of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 42(4):1-64.
- Upland Heritage. 2023. History of Early Upland, <https://uplandheritage.org/early-upland>. Accessed February 13, 2023.
- Upland Public Library. n.d.a. History of Ontario, CA. <http://uplandpubliclibrary.blogspot.com/p/history-of-ontario-ca.html>. Accessed February 13, 2023.
- Upland Public Library. n.d.b. History of Upland, CA. <http://uplandpubliclibrary.blogspot.com/p/history-of-upland-ca.html>. Accessed February 13, 2023.
- 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.
- Wagh, M. G. 1986. Intensification and Land-Use: Archaeological Indication of Transition and Transformation in a Late Prehistoric Complex in Southern California. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Davis.

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

---

Appendix A – Records Search Confirmation and Historical Society Coordination


Appendix B – Sacred Lands File Coordination

Appendix C – Project Area Photographs

Records Search Confirmation and Historical Society Coordination



Location: N:\2023\2023-006 Colonies Partners Upland\WAPS\Cultural Resources\Colonies.aprx - Colonies\_RS\_CHRS (trotellini - 1/9/2023)



Map Date: 1/9/2023  
Sources: ESRI, USGS



## Report List

Report No.	Other IDs	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation	Resources
SB-00171	NADB-R - 1060171; Voided - 73-7.6	1973	SIMPSON, RUTH and BETTY MOORE	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT: PROPOSED P.U.D., 4 UNITS/ACRE, CUCAMONGA (85-79), RED HILL CONDOMINIUM SITE	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	
SB-00178	NADB-R - 1060178; Voided - 73-8.5	1973	SMITH, GERALD A.	RESOURCE EVALUATION OF SITES WITHIN CUCAMONGA CREEK DEBRIS BASIN	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM	36-000270, 36-001593, 36-001607
SB-00194	NADB-R - 1060194; Voided - 73-12.3	1973	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SURVEY: RED HILL GREEN TRACT #8884	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	
SB-00203	NADB-R - 1060203; Voided - 74-0.2D	1974	ARCHER, MORSE G.	CASA DE RANCHO CUCAMONGA		
SB-00265	NADB-R - 1060265; Voided - 75-10.1	1975	WEAVER, RICHARD A.	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION: ARCHAEOLOGY OF PROPOSED ADDITIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS IN CUCAMONGA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH UNIT, UCR	
SB-00276	NADB-R - 1060276; Voided - 75-12.3	1975	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS, ARCHAEOLOGICAL VALUES, THE LAND DEVELOPING FIRM OF CROWELL AND LEVANTHAL, TRACT 9157 - CUCAMONGA	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	36-000902
SB-00302	NADB-R - 1060302; Voided - 76-2.4	1976	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS: ARCHAEOLOGICAL VALUES, FIRM OF LAKEWOOD ENGINEERING, TRACTS 9167 AND 9193 - CUCAMONGA	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	36-000901
SB-00316	NADB-R - 1060316; Voided - 76-4.1	1976	HARRIS, RUTH D.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL - HISTORICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT, TRACTS 9193 AND 9262, CUCAMONGA	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	36-000901
SB-00318	NADB-R - 1060318; Voided - 76-4.2A	1982	ALLEN, LAWRENCE P.	THE CHAFFEY HILLSIDE SITE, CA-SBR- 895; REPORT ON THE CULTURAL RESOURCE MITIGATION PROGRAM	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CORPORATION	36-000895
SB-00433	NADB-R - 1060433; Voided - 76-11.3	1976	HEARN, JOSEPH E.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL - HISTORICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT OF TENTATIVE TRACT 9589 LOCATED ON RED HILL IN CUCAMONGA	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	
SB-00545	NADB-R - 1060545; Voided - 77-8.15	1977	HEARN, JOSEPH E.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL - HISTORICAL RESOURCES EVALUATION OF VINEYARD PARK PROJECT, ALTA LOMA AREA	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	

## Report List

Report No.	Other IDs	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation	Resources
SB-00606	NADB-R - 1060606; Voided - 78-2.1	1978	HEARN, JOSEPH E.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL - HISTORICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT OF A PORTION OF LOT 1, CUCAMONGA VINEYARD TRACT SUBDIVISION "C"; ALTA LOMA AREA OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY MUSEUM ASSOCIATION	36-000902
SB-00642	NADB-R - 1060642; Voided - 78-5.3A	1977	WEAVER, RICHARD A.	ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT EVALUATION: TEST EXCAVATION AT BASE LINE - CARNELIAN STREET TO VINEYARD AVENUE, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH UNIT, UCR	36-000901, 36-000902
SB-00643	NADB-R - 1060643; Voided - 78-5.3B	1978	LIPP, DONALD	ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACT EVALUATION: TEST EXCAVATIONS AT SBR-902, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH UNIT, UCR	36-000902
SB-00702	NADB-R - 1060702; Voided - 78-11.5	1978	ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATES	ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT: ULTRASYSTEMS PROJECT #4426	ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATES	
SB-00806	NADB-R - 1060806; Voided - 79-7.1	1979	WILMOTH, STAN	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION: AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF BOTH SIDES OF SIXTEENTH STREET (BASELINE) IN THE CITY OF UPLAND, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH UNIT, UCR	
SB-01595	NADB-R - 1061595; Voided - 86-10.3	1986	BISSELL, RONALD M.	CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF CAMPUS AVENUE BETWEEN 19TH STREET AND 22ND STREET, CITY OF UPLAND, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA		
SB-01660	NADB-R - 1061660; Voided - 87-3.14	1987	GROSS, LORRAINE S., KEVIN J. PETER, and WILLIAM B. GILMOUR	CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCE INVESTIGATIONS OF THE LAKES AT SAN ANTONIO PROJECT, CITY OF UPLAND, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA	SCIENTIFIC RESOURCE SURVEYS	
SB-02059	NADB-R - 1062059; Voided - 90-1.6	1990	INFOTEC RESEARCH	COMPENDIUM OF RESULTS OF OBSIDIAN STUDIES FOR STUDY AREA SITES: APPENDIX TO PREHISTORIC SITES IN THE PRADO BASIN, CALIFORNIA: REGIONAL CONTEXT AND SIGNIFICANCE EVALUATION	INFOTEC	36-000270, 36-000895, 36-000901, 36-001000, 36-001543, 36-003690, 36-004032, 36-005245
SB-02070	NADB-R - 1062070; Voided - 90-2.3	1990	RECTOR, CAROL	REPORT ON TRIP TO RAINS HOUSE		

## Report List

Report No.	Other IDs	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation	Resources
SB-02086	NADB-R - 1062086; Voided - 90-5.4	1990	DEL CHARIO, KATHLEEN C.	AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE SYCAMORE VILLAGE PROJECT SITE, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CORP.	
SB-02101	NADB-R - 1062101; Voided - 90-5.5	1990	VAN WORMER, STEPHEN R.	AN HISTORICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE SYCAMORE VILLAGE PROJECT SITE, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CORP.	
SB-02266	NADB-R - 1062266; Voided - 91-0.1	1991	DONNELLY, CORDY	REVISION AND DISCOVERY IN A MILLING STONE HORIZON CONTEXT	Pomona College	36-000342, 36-000421, 36-000713, 36-000895, 36-000901, 36-001543, 36-005243
SB-02290	NADB-R - 1062290; Voided - 91-2.16	1991	HATHEWAY, ROGER G. and JOHN F. ROMANI	PRELIMINARY HISTORIC PROPERTY SURVEY REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED WIDENING OF FOOTHILL BOULEVARD BETWEEN GROVE AVENUE AND LION STREET, IN THE CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	HATHEWAY AND ASSOCIATES	
SB-02293	NADB-R - 1062293; Voided - 85-0.4	1985	SALLS, ROY A.	THE SCRAPER PLANE: A FUNCTIONAL INTERPRETATION	JOURNAL OF FIELD ARCHAEOLOGY 12 (1):99- 106	36-000901
SB-02294	NADB-R - 1062294; Voided - 90-0.6	1990	SALLS, ROY A.	CONCERNING WILLIAM FOLAN'S SCRAPER PLANES	JOURNAL OF FIELD ARCHAEOLOGY 17 (2):245-245	36-000901
SB-02444	NADB-R - 1062444; Voided - 91-8.1	1991	MCALLISTER, BERNICE LYONS	PROVENIENCE LOG FOR THE SBCM HA1 ASSEMBLAGE	CHAFFEY COLLEGE, SOCIAL SCIENCE DIVISION	
SB-02537	NADB-R - 1062537; Voided - 88-0.10	1988	SALLS, ROY A.	OBSIDIAN DATING OF THE LIBERTY GROVE SITE WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR SASSON AND CHAFFEY HILLSIDE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES		36-000895, 36-000901
SB-02561	NADB-R - 1062561; Voided - 83-4.14	1983	SALLS, ROY	THE LIBERTY GROVE SITE: ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF A LATE MILLINGSTONE SITE ON THE CUCAMONGA PLAIN		36-000901
SB-02763	NADB-R - 1062763	1993	ALEXANDROWICZ, J. STEPHEN, ANNE DUFFIELD-STOLL, and SUSAN R. ALEXANDROWICZ	URBAN HISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL INVESTIGATIONS AT FOOTHILL BLVD. & VINEYARD AVE., CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA	ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSULTING SERVICES	36-007351, 36-007395, 36-007396, 36-007397, 36-007398



## Report List

Report No.	Other IDs	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation	Resources
SB-02940	NADB-R - 1062940	1993	ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATES	HISTORICAL PROPERTY SURVEY REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED WIDENING OF FOOTHILL BLVD., BETWEEN GROVE AVE AND LION ST., IN THE CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA	ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATES	36-000897
SB-03082	NADB-R - 1063082	1976	IRVINE, KENNETH C.	FAUNAL ANALYSIS OF 4 EXCAVATION UNITS AT SBCM-133		36-000270
SB-03567	NADB-R - 1063567	2001	JENSEN, PETER	ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVENTORY SURVEY OF SB54XC412 CELL TOWER SITE, UPLAND MEMORIAL PARK, CITY OF UPLAND, CA. 9PP	JENSEN & ASSOCIATES	
SB-03568	NADB-R - 1063568	1979	KING, L.D.	EUCLID AVE. TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT PROJECT M-5083 INFORMATIONAL REPORT ON EFFECTS SEC 106-HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT. 75PP		36-002910, 36-018222, 36-018593, 36-018594, 36-018596, 36-018598, 36-018600, 36-018602, 36-018603, 36-018604
SB-03571	NADB-R - 1063571	2000	LAPIN, PHILLIPE	CULTURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT FOR PBMS FACILITY CM 354-01, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA. 4PP	LSA	
SB-03577	NADB-R - 1063577	2000	LAPIN, PHILLIPE	CULTURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT FOR PBW FACILITY CM 233-01, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA. 6PP	LSA	
SB-03582	NADB-R - 1063582	2000	DUKE, CURT	RESULTS OF THE CULTURAL RESOURCE RECORD SEARCH AND EXTENDED SURVEY FOR PBMS FACILITY CM 354-01, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA. 14PP	LSA	
SB-03593	NADB-R - 1063593	1998	ALEXANROWICZ, JOHN STEPHEN, S. ALEXANDROWICZ, D. WROBLESKI, R. KRAMER, A. STOLL, and T. BELL	HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY AT EL RANCHO DE CUCAMONGA, CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA, SAN BERNARDINO CO, CA 2 VOL. 560PP	ACS	36-007351, 36-007396, 36-007397, 36-007398
SB-04033	NADB-R - 1064033	2001	BUDINGER, FRED	PROPOSED WIRELESS DEVICE MONOPOLE & EQUIPMENT CABINET SITE, 8248 19TH ST, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA. 9PP	TETRA TECH	
SB-04162	NADB-R - 1064162	2002	DUKE, CURT	CULTURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT: AT&T WIRELESS SERVICES FACILITY NO. D121, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA. 9PP	LSA	

## Report List

Report No.	Other IDs	Year	Author(s)	Title	Affiliation	Resources
SB-04508	NADB-R - 1064508	2005	THAL, SEAN M.	STROKES/CA-8584B. 16PP	EARTHTOUCH, LLC	
SB-05358	NADB-R - 1065358	1976	Sider, W.A.	Cucamonga Creek 1776-1976 After 200 Years.		
SB-05489						
SB-05499	NADB-R - 1065499	2003	Hammond, Stephen R. and David Bricker	Historic Resources Compliance Report for the Relinquishment of State Route 66, City of Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernardino County, California.		36-002910
SB-05638						
SB-06083		2008	Wlodarski, Robert J.	Bechtel Wireless Telecommunications Site ES0258 (Upland Water Tanks) located at 580 East 15th Street, Upland California 91785	C.A.R.E.	
SB-06666	NADB-R - 1066666	2009	Encarnacion, Deirdre	Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties: Northwest Recycled Water System Project, Cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland and Ontario, San Bernardino County, California.		
SB-06667	NADB-R - 1066667	2009	Encarnacion, Deirdre	Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties: Northwest Recycled Water System Project, Cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland and Ontario, San Bernardino County, California.	CRM TECH	
SB-07448						

**Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment  
For a Proposed Commercial Development  
On a 10-acre Site in the City of Upland,  
San Bernardino County, California**

**(Township 1 South, Range 7 West,  
Section 5, Mt. Baldy, California  
USGS 7.5' Quadrangle)**

*Prepared for:*

**Frontier Communities**

*Prepared by:*

**Dr. Alan Garfinkel Gold, RPA,  
Principal Investigator /Cultural Resources Manager  
Alina Landa, B.S., Cultural Resources Specialist**

**RCA Associates, Inc.  
15555 Main Street, #D4-235  
Hesperia, CA 92345  
Randall C. Arnold, Jr.**



**Project: #2018-68**

**Type of Study: Phase 1 Cultural Resources Survey, Upland, San  
Bernardino County, Negative Report, Serrano, Cahuilla**

**July 16, 2018**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	2
INTRODUCTION .....	4
NATURAL SETTING.....	4
CULTURAL SETTING.....	6
Prehistory.....	6
Cultural Sequence.....	7
Ethnography.....	18
History.....	20
PERSONNEL.....	22
METHODS.....	22
Research .....	22
Field Survey.....	23
RESULTS.....	23
Native American Consultation .....	23
Cultural Resources Records Search .....	23
Field Survey .....	26
Shovel-test Pits.....	26
CONCLUSION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS.....	26
REFERENCES.....	28
Appendix A- Figures	
Appendix B- Native American Consultations	
Appendix C- Resumes	



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

RCA Associates, Inc. was contracted by Frontier Communities to conduct a Cultural Resources Survey for the proposed single-family home development that is situated on a 10-acre site in the City of Upland, APNs (1045-151-34), (1045-121-02), (0207-483-46) (Township 1 South, Range 7 West, Section 5, Mt. Baldy, CA USGS 7.5' Quadrangle) (Figures 1 and 2). The study was performed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A cultural resources records search, field survey, shovel-test pits and Native American consultation and coordination were all elements of this project and were included within the Scope of Work. Native American individuals and tribal groups were contacted by email and letter for their input. These communications and the outreach are provided in Appendix B. Field survey investigations were conducted on July 12, 2018 by RCA Associates, Inc. and did not result in the identification of any new cultural resources, including prehistoric or historic archaeological sites or buildings, structures or objects within the project boundaries. A cultural resources record search was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) on June 26, 2018 which did not identify cultural resources within the Project area. Two cultural resources surveys have been previously conducted within the Project area, however, no cultural resources had been previously recorded within the project boundaries. Seven cultural resources studies have been completed within a half-mile radius (buffer) of the Project. Three historic and prehistoric cultural resources have been previously recorded within a half-mile radius surrounding the project area.

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted regarding the project and they completed a Sacred Lands File Search, which yielded negative results for Sacred Lands in the Project. The NAHC also provided a list of potentially interested and affiliated Native American individuals and groups. All of these parties identified by the NAHC were contacted for further information and potential concerns regarding cultural resources within the project area.

Ms. Jessica Mauck, Cultural Resources Analyst of San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI), advised that the project is within the Serrano ancestral territory and overlaps with that of the Gabrieleno groups of the west. SMBMI expressed little concern regarding this project area. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians- Kizh Nation replied via email to express their interest in the project and would like to consult with the lead agency.

If previously undocumented cultural resources are identified during construction activities, a qualified archaeologist must be contacted to assess the nature and significance of the find. Construction activities shall be diverted. If human remains are encountered during the undertaking, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of the origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must also be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric or protohistoric

Native American in origin, the Coroner will notify the NAHC. The NAHC shall determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) that will consult with the Project Archaeologist and recommend the manner of treatment and disposition for any human remains and associated offerings.



## INTRODUCTION

RCA Associates, Inc. is under contract with Frontier Communities to conduct a Phase 1 Cultural Resources Survey of the proposed commercial development on a ten-acre property located in the City of Upland, California, APNs (1045-151-34) (1045-121-02) (0207-483-46) (Township 1 South, Range 7 West, Section 5) Mt. Baldy, California USGS 7.5' Quadrangle. This study was performed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires consideration of project impacts on archaeological or historical sites deemed to be "historical resources." Under CEQA, a substantial adverse change in the significant qualities of a historical resource is considered a significant effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, a "historical resource" is a resource listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources [Title 14 CCR §15064.5(a)(1)-(3)]. Historical resources may include, but are not limited to, "any object, building, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California" [PRC §5020.1(j)].

The eligibility criteria for the California Register are the definitive characteristics for assessing the significance of historical resources for purposes of CEQA (Office of Historic Preservation). Generally, a resource is considered "historically significant" if it meets one or more of the following criteria for listing on the California Register:

- (1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
- (2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
- (3) 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.
- (4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (PRC §5024.1(c))

## NATURAL SETTING

The project area is located immediately south of the Transverse Ranges and just west of the mouth of Cajon Pass. The Transverse Ranges are a California geomorphic province represented by a series of mountain ranges that trend in an east-west direction for about 300 miles. The range is often deemed a means of separating Central from Southern California. These Transverse Ranges connect with the Coast Ranges to the west and to the Sierra Nevada chain to the north.

The Mojave Desert lays to the north and east. Finally, the trough of the Salton Sea and the Colorado Desert and Peninsular Ranges are situated to the south. The Transverse Ranges incorporate a number of individually, distinctive mountain ranges – the Santa Ynez, Santa Monica, San Gabriel, San Bernardino, Eagle and the Orocopia mountains, just to identify some. The natural flora of the Transverse Ranges is described as a mixed chamise-chaparral plant community. Chaparral is a plant community of dense brush found on steep, rocky slopes. The dominant plants found in this vegetation zone include manzanita, chamise, scrub oak, and ceonothus.

The Mojave Desert incorporates an immense area of eastern California covering 31,000 square miles. This northern desert interfaces with the Sonoran Desert to the south and the Yuma Desert to the southeast. It is separated from the Great Basin along the Garlock Fault that traverses the base of the El Paso Mountains. Throughout the Mojave Desert there exists numerous broad playas or dry lake beds that drain internally. These playas can become shallow ephemeral lakes when occasional heavy rains fall. However, in general, the Mojave Desert is a water impoverished region with only four to 13 inches of rain annually. In Death Valley, in certain years, virtually no measurable rainfall appears (less than one inch of precipitation annually). Temperatures vary greatly in the Mojave Desert but summers can be exceedingly hot - with the highest ground temperature ever recorded on earth posted for Death Valley at 134 degrees Fahrenheit. However, night-time temperatures drop dramatically and snow fall occurs regularly at higher elevations.

The Mojave Desert characteristically exhibits large land areas containing the grey-green shrubs of the creosote bush (*Larrea tridentata*). Other areas exhibiting alkaline soils contain expressions of saltbush (*Atriplex* spp.). Plant species present in the general vicinity of the Project site include: juniper (*Juniperus californica*), annual bursage (*Ambrosia acanthicarpa*), Nevada jointfir (*Ephedra nevadensis*), bladder sage (*Scutellaria mexicana*), rabbitbrush (*Ericameria nauseosa*), and Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia*). Other plants noted in the general vicinity include saltbush (*Atriplex* sp.), schismus (*Schismus barbatus*), cholla (*Cylindropuntia echinocarpa*), bunchgrass (*Phleum pratense*), white bursage (*Ambrosia dumosa*), California buckwheat (*Ambrosia dumosa*), and brome grasses (*Bromus* sp.).

Typical Mojave Desert fauna include: bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*), mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus*), cottontail, coyote, pronghorn, various reptiles (including the venomous Mohave rattlesnake and the notable chuckwalla) and rodents. Other animals include various species of waterfowl and numerous birds.

A biological resources assessment report was prepared for the site and submitted under separate cover.



## CULTURAL SETTING

### Prehistory

Synthetic treatments of the prehistory of the Mojave Desert are found in a number of academic references. The latter sources include topical treatments in Basgall (1993), Basgall and Hall (1994), Basgall et al. (1988), Bettinger and Taylor (1974), Garfinkel (2007), Garfinkel and Williams (2011, 2015), Garfinkel et al. (2010), Gilreath and Hildebrandt (1997), Grayson (2011), Lengner (2013), Schneider et al. (2000), Sutton et al. (2007), Ugan and Rosenthal (2015), Van Tilburg et al. (2012), Warren (1984), Warren and Crabtree (1986), Whitley (1998), Ugan and Rosenthal (2015) and Yohe (1992).

Research into the prehistory of the Mojave Desert has a lengthy pedigree. Perhaps some of the earliest scientific investigations were those conducted by the husband-wife team of William and Elizabeth Campbell working out of the Southwest Museum (Campbell 1931; Campbell and Campbell 1935; Campbell et al. 1935). During this same general time period Malcolm Rogers was conducting studies through his association with the San Diego Museum of Man. His research emphasized the identification of the flaked stone artifacts and prehistoric cultures mainly found in the Colorado Desert but overlapping the Mojave Desert as well (Rogers 1939). Another very early researcher in the area was Mark Raymond Harrington. Harrington conducted archaeological studies at the Stahl Site, Stahl Site Cave and Fossil Falls sites in the Coso Range while engaged by the Southwest Museum (1948a, 1948b, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1957).

In the 1960's Edward Lanning working with the University of California, Berkeley and wrote up the previous research completed at Rose Spring (CA-INY-372) in the Coso Range and this work served as a critical benchmark and anchor to develop the regional chronology. Robert Yohe returned to the site much later and provided an even more detailed and well-supported chronology bolstered by a suite of precise radiocarbon dates for this physically and culturally stratified site (Yohe 1992).

Perhaps the most intensive early studies were at China Lake completed by Emma Lou Davis. Her work continued from the 1960s into the mid to late 1970s and included intensive surface explorations and pioneering geo-archaeological research (Davis 1978). Although her assertions of very early pre-Clovis age occupations have been widely rejected, her multidisciplinary methods have provided well-grounded insights on late Pleistocene and early Holocene aboriginal land use. Excavations at China Lake also uncovered fluted points in putative association with burned; extinct megafaunal remains (Davis 1978). However, recent reassessments (Basgall 2007a, 2007b; Garfinkel et al. 2008) of Davis' findings failed to support the idea that artifacts and megafaunal bones were consistently related or that aboriginal activity is contemporaneous with extinct megafauna.



Much of the scholarly research in the Mojave Desert has been completed under the umbrella of cultural resource management studies. Many federal and state agencies (Bureau of Land Management, California Department of Transportation, California Department of Parks and Recreation, and United States Department of Forests) and private developers (relating to the construction of renewable energy initiatives employing both solar and wind) have been the major proponents and financial underwriters for these investigations.

The Mojave Desert has seen more archaeological study than perhaps many other areas of California. It has also spawned some of the most contentious dialogues in professional archaeology with respect to competing models attempting to illuminate the nature and antiquity of various prehistoric cultural manifestations. The focus of these debates relates to the nature and timing of various cultural transformations. Such discussions hinge on the age and character of technological shifts, settlement-subsistence change, economic developments, artistic and ideological transitions, prehistoric population movements / replacements and various reconstruction of linguistic prehistory (cf. Garfinkel 2006, 2007; Garfinkel and Austin 2011; Garfinkel et al. 2007, 2009, 2010; Grant et al. 1968; Goldsmith and Garfinkel 2013; Gilreath 2007; Gilreath and Hildebrandt 2008, 2011; Hedges 2001; Hildebrandt and McGuire 2002; McGuire and Hildebrandt 2005; Stewart et al. 2005; Van Tilburg et al. 2012; Whitley 1987, 1998, 2003; Whitley and Dorn 1987, 2011). Given the central importance of chronological controls, the prehistoric cultural sequence and related temporal periods remain an important and salient topic for continuing research.

## **Cultural Sequence**

### ***Late Pleistocene: Paleo-Indian / Western Clovis Period***

Basally-fluted, projectile points of the Clovis (aka Western Clovis) cultural complex are generally considered to be the most dominant, hallmark of prehistoric occupation during the Late Pleistocene era. These Clovis points and their associated cultural materials have been the focus of intensive study and the general consensus is that they date from about 13,500 to 12,500 calibrated radiocarbon years (cal) before present (BP). Some researchers have tried to pinpoint the duration of the Clovis tradition to an even more exacting and narrower time span (12,800 to 13,200 cal BP) but recent critiques of that perspective support the notion that at least a millennium of time was necessary for the wide-ranging Clovis tradition to have developed and spread within the continental United States (cf. Goebel et al. 2008; Waters and Stafford 2007).

Until recently, the Clovis complex was considered to be the basement cultural expression in the Americas. However, reports from sites like Monte Verde (Chile), Paisley Cave (Oregon), the Schaefer and Hebior sites (Wisconsin), Meadowcroft Shelter (Pennsylvania), Page-Ladson (Florida), and the Debra L. Friedkin Site (Texas), have now provided substantial and persuasive evidence for pre-Clovis occupation dating to a period from about ca. 16,000 and 14,000 cal BP,



the latter archaeological complex having occurred some two to three thousand years before Clovis (Gilbert et al. 2008; Goebel et al. 2008; Waters et al. 2011b).

Unfortunately, as of yet, there is no tangible and compelling evidence within California or the Great Basin for such early pre-Clovis discoveries. Yet, there have been a number of claims (Davis 1978; Leakey et al. 1968) based on heavily weathered and crude cobble and core tools as part of a pre-projectile point tradition (cf. Moratto 1984:29-73). However, such claims have not withstood the test of time.

Nevertheless, although the Mojave Desert has posted early claims of great human antiquity, even Clovis-like fluted points discoveries themselves are fairly rare (cf. Rondeau et al. 2007). When such finds are identified they are most frequently isolates and typically found in association with now dry Pleistocene lakebeds. Besides the limited discoveries of fluted points, we have little in the way of related diagnostic elements of Clovis technology that would provide a more complete picture of the entire archaeological assemblage. Complementary artifacts, such as prismatic blades and cores and bone tools are commonly described from the Clovis heartland in the American Southwest and Plains (however cf. Fenenga 2015).

Further, there is long-standing ambiguity in the age and sequence of terminal Pleistocene cultural complexes in eastern California and the Great Basin generally. Some researchers have expressed doubts as to whether the Clovis Complex per se has a temporally or geographically extensive presence in California and the Great Basin. Further, some researchers question the true antiquity of these putative earliest California and Great Basin projectile point forms. Finally, other confounding issues remain with respect to the chronological relationship of one point type to another (e.g. Western Fluted vs. Concave Base vs. Western Stemmed).

China Lake Basin and the adjacent Rose Valley are home to some of the largest concentrations of fluted and concave base points in California. The sites in Rose Valley are located on relict terraces of the Lower Pleistocene Owens River. The Rose Valley sites were initially recognized and studied by Ferris Borden and the Archaeological Survey Association (Borden 1971; Moratto et al. 2018). The China Lake sites were researched by Emma Lou Davis (Davis 1978). A number of the fluted and unfluted concave base points discovered in the Coso Basin have yielded putatively ancient obsidian hydration dates that would provide a tentative late Pleistocene age determination (cf. Garfinkel et al. 2008; Moratto et al. 2018). Yet, no direct and associated radiocarbon determinations exist that demonstrate the age of these early points and there are only a handful ( $n = 4$ ) of radiocarbon determinations dating to the Clovis age for any archaeological expressions in all of prehistoric California.

Nevertheless, recent obsidian hydration data provides a growing number of very large hydration rim measurements (greater than 16.0 microns) from several sites in the China Lake Basin and vicinity. These hydration measurements do support an age for both Western Fluted and Basally



Thinned Concave Base points dating to a time from about 12,000 to 13,500 cal BP. (Giambastiani and Bullard 2010; Rogers 2011; Garfinkel and Hopkins 2008; Garfinkel et al. 2016; Moratto et al. 2018). If those ages were further substantiated, that would imply a prehistoric California Paleoindian complex of equivalent age to the Clovis Tradition of the American Southwest and Plains. Significantly, the technological and typological elements for these early California projectile points appear slightly different and may represent a somewhat distinctive tradition - a bit different from their kindred artifacts in other areas of the United States.

In contradistinction to the above discussion, Beck and Jones (2010; see also Bryan 1988) argue, that Western Stemmed Points are in fact characteristic of the terminal Pleistocene and would be contemporaneous with the Clovis Complex. While it is widely assumed that fluted and unfluted concave-base points date to the terminal Pleistocene in the Mojave Desert, this has never been demonstrated radiometrically or chrono-stratigraphically. Nevertheless, recent finds at China Lake have noted that Fluted and Concave Base points have a different overall spatial distribution than Western Stemmed points. Finally, all three projectile point styles (Western Stemmed, Fluted and Concave Base) often occur in the same microenvironments, in closely similar depositional contexts, and at the very same sites (Basgall 1988, 2007; Basgall and Hall 1991; Giambastiani 2008, 2010; Giambastiani and Bullard 2010).

### ***Early Holocene: Mojave or Lake Mojave Period***

Significant environmental changes, correlating with broad shifts in regional temperature, occurred in the post-Pleistocene with only minor changes in rainfall. Increased runoff from glacial melting resulted in the infilling of valleys and basins by streams, marshes, and lakes. Initially these large bodies of water supported great amounts of biota – including big game animals (e.g., deer, antelope, and bighorn). During this time there exists an ancient, well-established and wide-ranging prehistoric tradition in the Mojave Desert dating from ca. 12,000 to 8,000 cal BP. This archaeological complex is a well-known expression and received its geographic referent from the landmark studies of the Campbells and their research associates (Campbell et al. 1937).

The Campbells and their collaborators worked along the relict shorelines of Pleistocene Soda Lake and Silver Lake in the eastern Mojave Desert near Baker, California. These early Holocene assemblages were recognized for their distinctive formalized flaked stone tool kits. The Lake Mojave flaked stone tools include large stemmed points (identified as either the larger Lake Mojave type or the smaller Silver Lake form) that are considered as chronological diagnostics. Associated with these temporally sensitive point/tool forms are other stone tools including bifacial crescents, heavily worked domed (steep-sided) unifaces (end scrapers and side scrapers), knives, bifaces, graters, plano-convex limaces, and larger core-cobble tools (cf. Beck and Jones 1997).

Throughout southern California and especially in eastern California Lake Mojave era sites have been recognized with a variety of other identifiers. In the Colorado Desert, Malcolm Rogers calls



similar traditions as his Playa Complex (Rogers 1939, 1966). In the San Diego area, the related assemblages have been designated as San Dieguito (Warren 1967; Warren and True 1961). William Wallace (1962) employs the Lake Mojave moniker for all such expressions throughout southern California.

Significantly, the majority of the Lake Mojave sites are exclusively surface expressions making them difficult to date, and only infrequently are they dated directly by employing radiocarbon assays. Nonetheless, Beck and Jones (1997, 2010; Willig et al. 1988) have assembled a series of radiocarbon dates for these stemmed points. Their research indicates that the Lake Mojave-related materials are older than 9500 cal BP and are possibly as ancient as 13,200 cal BP. If such dates were to apply in California they would be contemporaneous with the ages applied to the Clovis Tradition in the American Southwest and on the Plains. Yet, perhaps contrary to expectations, dates for the Lake Mojave materials at Fort Irwin cluster from 9,500 to 11,000 cal BP (Basgall 1993; Sutton et al. 2007).

Claude Warren and his colleagues (Warren 1967, 1984, 1986, 2008; Warren and Crabtree 1986; Warren and Schneider 2003; Warren et al. 1986) and other researchers (cf. Bedwell 1970) recognize that Western Stemmed point sites of the Lake Mojave Tradition were most often associated with extinct lakes. Since these materials were clustered around ancient shorelines the logical conclusion was that this early lifeway was lacustrine based and that artifacts would best be interpreted as representing a hunting emphasis on lakeshore resources. Further, since few artifacts were discovered that could be interpreting as milling equipment, only a very minor expression of plant food exploitation was indicated.

However, more recent research in the central and western Mojave Desert attests to a different perspective with a wider range of habitats for sites outside of lakeshore settings (Basgall 1993; Basgall and Hall 1994; Basgall et al. 1988; Sutton et al. 2007). Further, the faunal remains recovered from such sites attest to a dominant expression of small mammals (especially lagomorphs) and reptile exploitation rather than large game such as deer, pronghorn and bighorn sheep. Additionally, milling equipment, although evidently only a minor element in the Lake Mojave archaeological assemblages, are indeed a regular part of the documented cultural materials at such sites. The latter perhaps indicates that plant food was of some importance in the diet of these early Holocene peoples. Nevertheless, use-wear studies suggest that corms and bulbs, especially marshland taxa rather than small seeds, were the predominant plant foods processed (Basgall 1993, 2000).

Most researchers agree that high diversity of toolstone material and extensive curation and maintenance of Lake Mojave-age tools supports the conclusion that very large foraging areas and frequent residential moves were typical (Basgall 1989; Basgall and Hall 1994; Basgall and McGuire 1988; Delacorte 1999; Delacorte and McGuire 1993). It is posited that at this early time foraging groups were limited to a small number of family units and the groups themselves were



quite small. The food resources that were extracted would have been exhausted quickly causing people to move about the landscape often. Considering these frequent moves, the stone tool assemblages remained small and relatively homogenous (Kelly 1983, 1985, 1988; Shott 1986, 1989; Thomas 1983a, 1983b).

### *Middle Holocene: Little Lake or Pinto Period*

In the Middle Holocene during the time from ca. 8,000 to 4,000 cal BP temperature and aridity peaked. Lowland bodies of water shrank in size and associated plant communities dwindled - reaching a state that was incapable of supporting the former abundance of large game (Sutton et al. 2007). With the exception of certain rare refuge areas, human land use shifted to upland areas where a few relict streams and lakes remained. Correlating with these changes was the inception of a cultural expression known as the Pinto Complex.

Researchers have recognized that it has been challenging to clearly articulate the Middle Holocene cultural-historical traditions and settlement systems since few prehistoric sites date within this specific time frame. The latter circumstance may owe to a lack of geological visibility (Basgall 2009; Meyer and Rosenthal 2010) or alternatively this may be a reflection of the heightened aridity or a corollary demographic collapse (Elston 1982; Grayson 2011; Sutton et al. 2007; Warren 1986). From either perspective, there are a paucity of radiocarbon assays that fall within the Middle Holocene time and these expressions are especially absent during the waning years of this period - from ca. 5000 to 4000 cal BP (Sutton et al. 2007).

The Pinto Complex, rather than representing a different cultural group, was posited as an outgrowth of the former hunting tradition of the Lake Mojave Complex of the Early Holocene. Such a model was based on a variety of similarities in the two traditions. Spatial and temporal overlap in projectile point forms, the continued use of difficult-to-reduce toolstone (basalt and igneous fine-grained lithic materials) for bifacial tools - distinctly different from the use of cryptocrystalline and obsidian materials so common to later periods, continuity in the character of flaked stone production emphasizing percussion flaking in contrast with a later emphasis on pressure flaking, and the continued popularity of specialized tool forms (biface knives, ovate domed and keeled scrapers, and engravers) - all suggest a pattern of continuity.

Pinto Complex sites decline in number during the driest portion of the Middle Holocene era from 6500 to 4000 cal BP and are largely restricted to spring-side localities. Besides the differing land use patterns, the stone tool assemblage changes at this time from the formalized stone tool forms of the Early Holocene being replaced by flake scrapers, handstones, and milling slabs. Ground stone implements signal an important distinction and a growing emphasis on small seed use. Since hunting equipment persists, Claude Warren and others (Warren 1967, 1984, 1986) have suggested that large game procurement continued despite deteriorating climatic conditions and declining big game populations.



Archaeofaunal assemblages from Pinto sites attest to the fact that artiodactyls by this time are almost completely absent with small game, including tortoise, becoming the norm. Pinto populations, originally geared towards hunting, would have been hard-pressed to accommodate the changing environmental conditions and their adaptation may have ultimately failed. Populations may have either suffered extinction or perhaps migrated to more well-watered areas, abandoning their desert homes.

A few Middle Holocene sites in the southern Owens Valley and Rose Valley have produced assemblages similar to those in the Mojave Desert and appear to be consistent with generalized adaptations of highly mobile foragers with wide-ranging settlement patterns. However, substantial house floors discovered at Lubkin Creek (CA-INY-30) and the diverse array of occupational debris at the Stahl Site (CA-INY-182) at Little Lake (in the Coso Range) has led some to posit much greater residential stability and a degree of permanence in settlement pattern in some exceptional instances.

The hallmark and defining diagnostics for this period are large, heavy, bifurcate-stemmed dart points known as the Little Lake Series (Basgall and Hall 1992, 1994, 2000; Bettinger and Taylor 1974; Fitzgerald et al. 2005; Harrington 1957; Lanning 1963; Vaughan and Warren 1987). Researchers have recognized that these Pinto-like points were most frequent at the Stahl site near Little Lake (Harrington 1957).

The Pinto-like points that were discovered at Little Lake were originally thought to be morphologically distinct from Pinto points identified at the type site in the Pinto Basin in Riverside County in the southern Mojave Desert (Amsden 1937; Campbell and Amsden 1934; Campbell and Campbell 1935; Schroth 1994). In-depth research (Basgall and Hall 2000) relating to the questions of chronology and point classification suggests that the Little Lake points are largely indistinguishable from Mojave Desert examples typically identified as Pinto points.

The Basgall-Hall research redefined the Pinto Series indicating that there existed a larger, heavier, and more robust variant of this point style that has an age from 7500-4000 radiocarbon years before present (rcybp). A smaller, lighter, and more gracile form, more characteristic of the northern Great Basin, is equivalent with the Gatecliff Split-stem type previously identified by David Hurst Thomas (1981). Those latter artifacts are argued to date to a more recent vintage, consistent with a temporal range from ca. 5000-3200 rcybp. A further result of the Basgall-Hall Study was the discovery that there is considerable spatial overlap between both the robust and gracile variants with both forms having substantial representation in eastern California.

Other researchers disagree with the Basgall and Hall Pinto point chronology. Haynes (2004) argues that Pinto points range in age from 9,500 to 5,500 rcybp. Perhaps an age range of 11,000 to 3,500 cal BP is a more accurate representation for the full span of use of this rather enigmatic point form. Recent studies have led many researchers to conclude that Pinto points have a much

longer duration than has been typically applied. Pinto points, based on their most recent re-evaluations, are sometimes contemporaneous with Western Stemmed points (as above). However, Pinto points were infrequent during the earliest years of their introduction but flourished and endured for a much longer period time after Western Stemmed points ceased.

Heavily worn stone tools crafted from exotic toolstone suggests that prehistoric Middle Holocene Natives were still highly mobile. These patterns led Basgall and Hall (1992, 1994) to conclude that both early and middle Holocene adaptations in the Mojave Desert represent a more generalized subsistence orientation than conventionally portrayed by Warren (1967, 1984, 1986) and others.

### ***Late Holocene: Newberry Period or Gypsum Complex***

In the Late Holocene, beginning ca. 4000 / 3500 cal BP and continuing to about 2000 cal BP, significant interregional variability in aboriginal land use can be recognized. With respect to the local environmental conditions, Mehringer and Sheppard (1978) based on lake-core sampling at Little Lake, identify that available water increased about 3000 cal BP, with a subsequent dry period at about 2000 cal BP. Hence, cool winters and relatively wet intervals were characteristic of what is known as the Neo-Pluvial Period that occurred between 4000 and 2000 rcybp (Wigand and Rhode 2002).

In the Mojave Desert, Basgall and Hall (1992, 1994) identified cultural deposits from Fort Irwin that include a full complement of milling equipment, flaked stone tools, and the replacement of basalt and rhyolite by cryptocrystalline silicate toolstone. The occurrence of bifaces increases dramatically during this time. Nonetheless, prehistoric sites are often small and it has been argued that these settlements represent wide-ranging mobility oriented to short-term occupations rather than targeted procurement of specialized resources.

Many radiocarbon assays from houses and features are documented from the southern Owens Valley (Basgall and Delacorte 2012; Basgall and McGuire 1988; Byrd and Hale 2003). These well-built houses and associated remains provide robust data for chronological controls. These remains indicate an emphasis on cached and curated articles (including bifaces, bone tools, and milling equipment) and lend credence to the premise that these particular sites were seasonally re-occupied. Obsidian tool/debitage sources appear to indicate a wide-ranging and extremely expansive yet regularized annual settlement round. From food remains (faunal material and plant macrofossils) one may infer that forays were made to long-distance upland settings to procure specialized resources (pinyon nuts, bighorn sheep, and marmots) that were brought back to the base camp.

Warren et al. (1984) provide a contrasting view for this period and argue for the prominence of large game hunting due in part to their natural abundance based on ameliorating climatic conditions. Additional intensification in the use of plant foods is represented by increased



numbers of milling equipment. Warren and others identify a change in social organization from the smaller family-band units in earlier eras to multi-family groups. William Hildebrandt and Kelly McGuire (2002) similarly argue that settlements during the Late Holocene (Middle Archaic also known as the Newberry Period) may have been less mobile than originally implied and may be best interpreted as year-round occupations. They also argue that the characteristic settlement pattern appears to have incorporated sedentary occupations of ecological sweet spots where women remained at hamlets while men ranged to distant outlying areas for artiodactyl hunting.

One implication of this emphasis on artiodactyl exploitation was the necessity of serviceable hunting equipment. Stone tool reduction and particularly obsidian biface manufacture became critically important from about 2500 to 1500 cal BP. Amy Gilreath and William Hildebrandt (1997, 2011) argue that in the Coso Basin, obsidian stone tool reduction reached a peak level of task specialization where early stoneworkers produced stone bifaces in enormous numbers both for domestic use but mostly as surplus exports intended for trans-Sierran trade. During this same time span, an enormous number of rock drawings (petroglyphs) are recognized and appear to be associated with increase rites, revealing a level of socio-ceremonial complexity exceeding that of earlier and later periods (Garfinkel 2006; Garfinkel et al. 2009; Yohe and Garfinkel 2012).

Prehistoric settlements dating to the Late Holocene are marked by the occurrence of medium-sized to large stemmed and notched points. The most frequent forms are variants of the Elko, Humboldt (Concave Base and Basal-notched), and Gypsum Series. Heizer and Baumhoff (1961) were the first to define Elko points. This series is composed of large, heavy, notched points with variable stem characteristics (Heizer et al. 1968; O'Connell 1967). These include eared, corner- and side-notched specimens. Elko Contracting stem forms are often assigned to the Gypsum type having the same general chronological frame. In the western Great Basin, Elko points have often been found in contexts dating from 3750-1290 cal years B.P. (Basgall and McGuire 1988; Bettinger and Taylor 1974; Gilreath and Hildebrandt 1997; Heizer and Hester 1978; Justice 2002; Thomas 1981). Such a chronological position is supported by a plethora of radiocarbon, stratigraphic, and obsidian hydration data. However, it is becoming increasingly apparent that large, corner-notched and side-notched, variants of this Elko form sometimes occur in earlier contexts.

Gilreath and Hildebrandt (1997) observed that more robust Elko points, especially those thicker than 6.5 mm, regularly produce obsidian hydration dates that are more ancient than the Newberry Period. One explanation for this problem is the difficulty in identifying between earlier Pinto and the more recent look-alike Elko forms (Basgall and Hall 2000; Vaughan and Warren 1987). Finally, the Rose Spring site (CA-INY-372) on the western edge of the Coso Range is a culturally and naturally stratified deposit. Five separate successive units provided cultural material amenable to dating. The lower three strata range in age from ca. 4000 to 1700 cal BP and as such fall within this period (Clewlow et al. 1970; Yohe 1992).



### *Late Holocene: Haiwee, Rose Spring, Saratoga Springs Period*

The Mojave Desert witnessed a significant series of adaptation shifts beginning in this time period (ca. 2000 to 700 cal BP). During the onset of the period, a dramatic set of subsistence-settlement changes were documented. These changes include: the introduction of the bow and arrow replacing the dart and atlatl, a dramatic decrease in large game hunting, increased reliance on dryland hard seeds, the beginning of intensive green-cone piñon pine nut exploitation, and the development of sites emphasizing the acquisition of easily procured and abundant small game animals (especially with respect to large numbers of lagomorphs and grebes). These cultural changes may reflect a Numic (Great Basin Paiute-Shoshone) in-migration. Certain technological innovations and labor-intensive adaptive strategies are also broadly consistent with those of the intrusive Numic groups (Bettinger and Baumhoff 1982; Delacorte 1994, 1995).

In the western Mojave Desert, specialized sites first occur that are single component loci targeting small, easily-harvested, game animals harvested through communal hunts and mass capture that focus on jack rabbits and grebes (Gold 2005; Garfinkel 2006; McGuire et al. 1982). These sites and similar localities often contain abundant portable milling equipment, rock ring structures, bedrock milling, and plant food threshing features. These data reflect a shift to more intensive use of small game and local plants (dryland hard seeds) perhaps as a means of mitigating increasing human population pressure – consistent with the model presented by Bettinger and Baumhoff for Numic adaptations (1982).

Such an adaptation would have perhaps provided Numic peoples with a competitive advantage over existing pre-Numic populations since it would have enabled them to exploit a wider range of resources that were more costly to collect and process. Hence, resources with high extractive and processing costs would have been exploited only after the arrival of Numic groups in the area (cf. Bettinger and Baumhoff 1982; Delacorte and McGuire 1993).

From a careful study of the archaeological record, a pattern of lowland, intensive small-game hunting camps appears to have occurred with the development of large-scale, intensive, upland green-cone piñon pine nut exploitation. This pattern also is contemporaneous with an initial focus on the acquisition, mass processing, and storage of dryland seeds (Basgall and Delacorte 2003; Basgall and Giambastiani 1995). These seed camps routinely include rock rings, thought to be the foundations of brush structures. Many of these rock structures contain doorways facing toward the rising sun and are associated with numerous handstones, milling slabs, and bedrock grinding features.

Single-component Haiwee-age hunting camps are frequently located in “geographically isolated areas” (Delacorte 1994). Such localities provided access to a limited range of biotic communities and appear to have a rather specialized focus on a narrow array of subsistence resources. Hence, these settlements are a distinctly different group of sites from earlier or later occupations that tend

to overlap at the same settlements and hence evince a lack of continuity from earlier settlements.

Gilreath and Hildebrandt (1997) note that Coso obsidian lithic production shifts to major obsidian outcrops in Late Newberry (500 B.C. to A.D. 600) and this pattern continues into the Haiwee interval (A.D. 600 to 1300). Obsidian quarrying during this time is confined to a few massive exposures rather than the less plentiful but more widespread secondary deposits. In the Haiwee period, nearly exclusive use of the massive Sugarloaf Mountain Coso obsidian exposure occurs with other deposits largely ignored.

On the margins of Koehn Lake in Fremont Valley, south of the Indian Wells Valley and the Coso Range, Sutton (1987, 1991) reports on a village site (CA-KER-875) dating to this period. House structures with juniper center posts (*Juniperus* sp.) were documented. The site is well dated with radiocarbon assays and Coso obsidian hydration dates and appears to have been associated with a standing lake. The site was abandoned during the drying up of the area correlating with the initiation of a series of epic droughts known as the Medieval Climatic Anomaly (ca. AD 970 to 1350).

Rose Spring points are one of the key hallmarks of this time period. These points were originally recognized and described from the type-site of that same name, located in southern Owens Valley (also known as Rose Valley) on the western edge of the Coso Range (Lanning 1963; Yohe 1992, 1999, 2000). The Rose Spring arrow point is a small, narrow, triangular arrow point with a variety of stem forms. Rose Spring points are time markers and date primarily to the interval from ca. 2000-650 cal B.P. in the western Great Basin (Basgall and McGuire 1988; Bettinger and Taylor 1974; Garfinkel 2007; Gilreath and Hildebrandt 1997; Thomas 1981; Yohe 1992, 1999, 2000).

### ***Recent Holocene: Marana, Late Prehistoric***

This final cultural period (700 cal BP to the historic) represents the ethnographic occupation in the Mojave Desert by the Kawaiisu, Panamint Shoshone, Serrano, Chemehuevi, and Mohave. Desert Side-notched and Cottonwood arrow points are characteristic and brownware ceramics, imported soapstone beads, and pictographs also date to this time frame, as do many sites associated with systematic and intensive upland piñon exploitation (Bettinger 1978; Garfinkel and McGuire 1980; McGuire and Garfinkel 1976, 1980).

Resource intensification that began in the prior period continues and strengthens with settlements tied to seasonal differences in resource availability. The most spatially confined seasonal movement and the smallest foraging ranges occur during this time period. Region-wide expansion of diet breadth and intensification of small seed resources involved a change in the technology used in the collection and processing of these resources. It is argued that cutting and mass collecting of green, dryland, hard seeds provided a considerably higher return than was possible using the former method of seed beating. This pattern begins about 1300 cal BP but increases



substantially throughout the Late Prehistoric (650 cal BP – Contact) and into the Protohistoric era. Direct flotation evidence indicates mass harvesting and threshing of Indian rice grass (*Achnatherum hymenoides*), cattail (*Typha* spp.), goosefoot (*Chenopodium* spp.), and blazing star (*Mentzelia* spp.) seeds.

This time period also sees the final collapse of trans-Sierran trade in Coso obsidian. The early emphasis (ca. 8000-1000 cal B.P.) on biface preform or flake blank technology gives way to flake-based reduction. Large bifaces decrease in abundance, yet also diminish in size and formality ultimately being replaced by more numerous flake-based tools. Artiodactyl exploitation is dramatically reduced and replaced by procurement of small game including a tremendous increase in desert tortoise and reptile use. Evidence of increased contact with outside populations (e.g., the American Southwest) and the expansion of Numic-affiliated populations out of eastern California into most areas of the Great Basin, and much of the Mojave Desert are recognized during the last 1000 years (Bettinger and Baumhoff 1982; Fowler 1972; Lamb 1958).

**Table 2. Prehistoric Cultural Sequence for the Mojave Desert Region**

<b>Cultural Complex</b>	<b>Approximate Time Period in Calibrated Radiocarbon Years Before Present (cal B.P.) and Calendar Years Approximated as AD/BC</b>	<b>Artifact Characteristics</b>
Fluted and Concave Base points, Late Pleistocene Period (Paleoindian)	13,500 – 12,000 cal B.P.; 10,000 BC to 11,500 BC	Fluted points and Concave Base points (Western Clovis)
Lake Mojave Period	12,000 – 8,000 cal B.P.; 10,000 BC to 6,000 BC	Western Stemmed points (Lake Mojave and Silver Lake)
Little Lake (Pinto) Period	8,000 – 4,000 cal B.P.; 6,000 BC to 2000 BC	Pinto and Leaf-shaped points
Newberry (Gypsum) Period	4,000 – 2000 cal B.P.; 2000 BC to AD 1	Gypsum, Elko, and Humboldt Series points
Haiwee (Saratoga Spring) Period	2000 – 700 cal B.P.; A.D. 1 – 1300	Rose Spring, Eastgate, and Saratoga Springs points
Marana (Late Prehistoric) Period	700 cal B.P. – Historic; AD 1300 – Historic with European explorers ca. AD 1770	Desert Series (Cottonwood and Desert Side-notched) points and ceramics

(Based on discussions in Bettinger and Taylor 1974, Garfinkel 2007; Warren 1980, 1984.)

## Ethnography

Recent research by Earle (1990, 1997, 2004a, 2004b, 2005a, 2005b), King (2003), and Johnson and Lorenz (2006) have helped to clarify the ethnic identification of Mojave Desert Native American groups. Their work with the John Peabody Harrington notes combined with analysis of the Franciscan sacramental registries testify that Mojave Desert dwellers in the Upland area were speakers of a dialect of Serrano. Surviving vocabularies and word lists support the identification of desert groups known as Vanyume (Garces' term was Beneme) as related to the Serrano. It has been further verified that Native groups occupying villages on the Mojave River near Victorville and in the region east of Barstow maintained marriage ties to downriver communities and were Vanyume in ethnic and linguistic affiliation.

Earle (1990, 1997) supports King's revisions of earlier territorial boundaries asserting that Serrano territory included the northern slopes of the San Gabriel Mountains, the Mojave River, and Antelope Valley. It also appears from their research that both the south and north slopes of the San Gabriel Mountains were "owned" and occupied by Serrano speakers.

Early 20th century ethnographic fieldwork among the Serrano was conducted by Kroeber (1925), Gifford (1918), Strong (1929), Benedict (1924), and Harrington (1986). More recent research by Bean (1972), Bean and Smith (1978), and Bean, Vane, Lerch, and Young (1981) has helped to focus attention on key research questions in an attempt to clarify the relationship of Serrano land use patterns, territorial attributions, subsistence-settlement patterns, and social, ceremonial, and political organization.

The economic resource base of the Serrano was determined in part by the seasonal availability of key animals and plants exploited for basic subsistence (Earle 1992). Hunting activities supplemented a diet mainly emphasizing plants. Hunting excursions were both an individual affair but also incorporated communal drives, and trap lines to snare small animals (e.g., squirrels, rodents, tortoise, and chuckwalla). Some desert hunting areas to the east in the Mojave Desert and in the vicinity of the Mojave River may have been shared with adjacent groups (e.g., Chemehuevi and/or Mojave).

Mule deer were available in the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains. Deer would migrate to lower elevations during the winter and would be available in the lower foothills. Pronghorn frequented the valley floor year-round but were not consistently abundant and were hunted only occasionally using communal surrounds and group drives. The latter technique was also used to ensnare large numbers of jackrabbits during the fall when they were especially abundant. Mountain sheep were available in the higher mountains but would have been rarely procured. Waterfowl could be captured using bows and arrows and special nets. Ducks, quail, geese, and grebes would have been available in considerable numbers during their breeding seasons and in association with riparian settings.



Abundant stands of acorns, juniper, mesquite, and pinyon were available to extended gathering expeditions. These might involve several lineages collaborating under one leader's authority and would have entailed accessing the resource base of surrounding groups (Bean and Smith 1978; Benedict 1924:391-392; Drucker 1937). Cattail / bulrush seeds (*Typha* spp. and *Scirpus* spp.), various roots, shoots, bulbs, and other hard seeds were all principal plant foods. The most likely plant resources that were of significant economic importance that have been identified paleobotanically or noted in the immediate vicinity of the Project were Indian rice grass (*Achnatherum hymenoides*), chia (*Salvia columbariae*), blazing star (*Mentzelia* spp.), and goosefoot (*Chenopodium* spp.)

Edward W. Gifford conducted a detailed study of the marriage practices and sociopolitical organization of native southern California Native Americans during the time from 1916 through 1917 (Gifford 1918). Based on these studies, he developed a model of Serrano social organization (Earle 2004a, 2004b). William Duncan Strong (1929: 5-35) conducted even more extensive studies among the Serrano, Cahuilla, Luiseño, and Cupeño in 1925. His record is most significant as a very early observer of the Serrano kinship system. He indicated that the Serrano were an unusual California group possessing true patrilineal clans. A clan is a kin group based on descent from a common ancestor, as traced through the male or the female line. Clans are normally exogamous, marriage within the clan being regarded as incest.

Patrilineal clans are patterned such that all males, their descendants, and their wives were part of a single group. Clans may be segmented into subclans or lineages. A woman retained her own lineage name but upon marriage was incorporated into the clan of her husband. The transfer of women from one ceremonial affiliation to another, upon marriage, was characteristic of all southern California Takic (the linguistic subfamily of the Serrano) groups.

King's research provides compelling evidence that the Serrano exhibited a totemic moiety structure (contra Blackburn and Bean 1978). A moiety is either of two kinship groups based on unilateral descent that together make up a tribe or society. Totemic moieties are two-fold divisions of society with subgroups that identify themselves as descended from a prominent religious figure (mostly animal-humans) that are part of their oral traditions. In the Serrano case, their society was divided into two parts identified with either Coyote or Wildcat. The Coyote moiety had the most important political leaders. Moiety out-marriage excluded partners from half the neighboring Serrano settlements. Hence, only settlements of opposing moieties were interrelated through marriage.

Serrano villages were generally more dispersed in the Mojave Desert. This dispersed pattern resulted in marriages linking together very large areas. Many of the settlements had marriage ties with villages over 50 miles away and counter intuitive was the fact that the closest relationships were not necessarily with the nearest villages – but rather with settlements affiliated with opposing moieties further distant.



King's study of the mission registries indicates that there were many important hereditary positions among the Serrano. Each village contained a chief, ceremonial manager, two messengers, as well as various shamans, diviners, and other ritual specialists. Each of these leaders oversaw different elements of Serrano life involving festivals, dances, and warfare.

Ethnographic data attests that a major native trade and travel corridor facilitated a long-distance exchange system. Recent research has supported the importance of long distance trade linking coastal southern Californian Chumash tribes with inland groups including the Yokuts, Kawaiisu, Serrano, Chemehuevi, and the Mohave in California and the Walapai, Havasupai, and Hopi in Arizona (Earle 2005a). Shell bead trade was one of the mediums of exchange and was used as a kind of currency or money. This system was significant since it involved trade, travel, and exchange covering hundreds of miles and was a system of exchange of native goods that linked various ethnic groups politically and economically.

This trade and travel route ran from the American Southwest (principally the Hopi territory in Arizona), along the Colorado River to the Mojave River thence through the central Mojave Desert into the Antelope Valley and east to the Pacific Coast (Davis 1961; Farmer 1935; Sample 1950). These circuits of exchange cut across political and cultural boundaries. A number of researchers have argued that such an exchange system may have been an influential factor in facilitating semi-sedentary settlement and complex sociopolitical organization for the Serrano (Earle 2005a; Robinson 1977; Sutton 1980).

Davis (1961) after reviewing the available data on native California trade and exchange determined that in southern California the only Native group to travel great distances in trading expeditions were the Mohave. It appears that the Serrano developed long-standing political and social relationships with the Mohave. In fact, the Serrano were their exchange or trading partners and acted as hosts facilitating their travel through sometimes unfamiliar and potentially hostile territories.

## **History**

The Historic era of California is divided into the Mission or Spanish Period (1769 to 1831), the Mexican or Rancho Period (1821 to 1848), and the American Period (1848 to present).

### ***Spanish Period (1769-1831)***

The first known European explorers to pass through the Mojave Desert and travel into the San Bernardino Mountains were Lieutenant Pedro Fages and a party of soldiers in 1769. This group of explorers were led by a Spanish priest, Francisco Garces, who guided Juan Bautista de Anza through the high desert region. In 1771, De Anza led a group from Arizona to create a headquarters at the Mission San Gabriel near what is now the City of Pasadena. Mission San Gabriel Archangel was formally established in 1771, proved to be the most economically successful of all the

California missions. Its outlying ranch lands, grain fields, orchards and vineyards constituted a vast pastoral empire, eventually extending many miles inland into the San Bernardino Valley. From the time of the Anza expedition until the Mexican Rancho Period (see below), the land surrounding Ontario was employed as grazing land by the Mission. Cattle ranching during this time became a thriving industry. Cattle bred rapidly in this more amenable Mediterranean climate. Soon hundreds of thousands of head of cattle were ranging across the verdant pasture lands.

In 1772, Pedro Fages, a military commander, tracked deserters throughout San Bernardino County. In 1774, Juan Bautista de Anza led an expedition from Mexico and set up camp along San Antonio Creek. The Anza camp site was near present day Ontario. Anza named that place Arroyo de los Osos, or "Bear Gulch."

### *Mexican or Rancho Period (1831-1848)*

The notable Old Spanish Trail was established between southern California and Santa Fe, New Mexico in the 1830s (Beck and Haase 1974). Traders from New Mexico traveled for two months to cross the rugged terrain bringing woolen goods on mules and pack horses and trading them for horses, mules, silks and Chinese goods from California. The San Bernardino Valley provided as an excellent pasturage for the animals involved in these trading affairs.

Spanish rule was overthrown by Mexico in 1791, and eventually the missions lost their land holdings as the Mexican government passed the Secularization Act in 1833 (Beattie and Beattie 1974). Following the secularization of the missions, large land grants were provided to the most prestigious and well-connected citizens. This change in land tenure ultimately led to European settlement of the ranchos for raising cattle in the San Bernardino Valley.

The Rancho Period lasted from 1834 until the Mexican War of 1846. Colonists were encouraged to settle in the San Bernardino Valley to help protect the region from raids by local Indians. Recipients of the land grants included Spanish gentlemen (dons) from many of what came to be known as the first families of California, such as the Lugos, Sepulvedas, Yorbass, Bandinis, Tapias, Palomares, and Picos.

### *American Period (1848- Present)*

After the Mexican-American War in 1848 and the discovery of gold in California, the Old Spanish Road was widely-used trade route for the shipment of goods and Mexican mules and horses. This allowed travelers from Salt Lake City to Las Vegas to travel through the Cajon Pass to reach San Bernardino and Los Angeles.



In 1853 the County of San Bernardino was created and divided into three townships: San Bernardino, San Salvador and Chino. San Bernardino was designated as the county seat, with the Mormon Council House serving as the first courthouse.

Beginning in 1873, San Bernardino County saw many new railroad lines and train depots being constructed. By 1886, the San Bernardino Valley had two transcontinental railroad systems. In the 1870s and 1880s, cowboys continued to lead herds of cattle over trails through the valley to the railroads. In the 1870s and afterward, small towns in the high desert region and near the Calico Mountains were established as railway stops on the Santa Fe Railroad (Kyle 1990). A silver strike in the Calico Mountains brought upon a modest mining boom in 1881 (Schuiling 1984:95).

Another impetus to growth was the growing importance of citrus agriculture. The area exhibited especially favorable circumstances for citrus growing. These factors included the decomposed granite soil, good drainage, ready water, abundant sunshine, and cool winter nights. The completion of the railroads and the growing citrus industry facilitated a land boom. During the interval of the last two decades of the nineteenth century (188—1900), 30 new communities were initiated in the region.

## **PERSONNEL**

Dr. Alan Garfinkel Gold, RPA requested the staff at South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University, Fullerton to conduct a cultural resources records search. Following receipt of the data from SCCIC, a systematic pedestrian field survey was conducted. Following completion of the field survey, this report was prepared based on the results of the data search and the field investigations.

## **METHODS**

### **Research**

A cultural resources records search was conducted by the SCCIC on June 26, 2018. The results of the records search are summarized in this report. The records search details the previously documented cultural resources in the Project area and employs a half-mile buffer surrounding it. A Sacred Lands File Search was also conducted through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This search offers valuable contextual information regarding Native American traditional land use in the high desert region. Eleven interested parties of Native American heritage were identified as being associated with the area and were contacted for consultation. A copy of the transmittal letter and documentation of the RCA Associates outreach are provided in Appendix B.

## **Field Survey**

A comprehensive archaeological field survey was conducted by Dr. Gold and Alina Landa on July 12, 2018. The survey was conducted by walking roughly parallel transects in an east-west direction. The transects were spaced approximately 10 meters apart to provide thorough coverage of the Project site. 4 shovel-test pits were excavated to a depth of approximately 30 cm. The project site is located north of 15<sup>th</sup> Street and south of what is currently Upland Hills Country Club.

## **RESULTS**

### **Native American Consultation**

The NAHC conducted a Sacred Lands File Search and returned negative results for Sacred Lands in and near the proposed Project area. All potentially interested tribes identified by the NAHC were contacted for information regarding their knowledge of cultural resources that were within or near the Project area. These groups are: Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation, Gabrieleno /Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Gabrieleno /Tongva Nation, Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe, Morongo Band of Mission Indians (Chairperson and Cultural Resources Manager), Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians - Pauma and Yuima Reservation, San Fernando Band of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and Serrano Nation of Mission Indians.

Ms. Jessica Mauck, Cultural Resources Analyst of San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI) replied via email to advise RCA that the Project area is within Serrano ancestral territory and is of interest to the Tribe. However, SMBMI indicated that the Project is unlikely to have any major concerns with the area. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians- Kizh Nation, the Administrative Specialist replied via email to express their interest to consult with the City of Upland.

### **Cultural Resources Records Search**

The South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton conducted a record search of previously documented cultural resources sites and cultural resources surveys conducted on the property and within a half-mile radius (buffer) of the subject property. The search included a review of all historic and prehistoric archaeological resources and any built-environment resources as well. Additionally, this review includes an archival search of the existing cultural resources reports on file with the Information Center. The California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), California Register of Historical Resources (CALREG), National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and California State Historic Properties Directory (CHPD) were all reviewed for the project site. According to the Information Center results, two cultural resource studies have been previously conducted within the project area, however, no cultural resources were documented during these studies. Seven cultural resources reports have been completed and those studies identified three cultural



resources within the half-mile search radius (buffer) surrounding the project area. Table 3 shows the known cultural resources sites documented within a half-mile radius surrounding the project area.

**Table 3. Known Cultural Resources Within the Half-mile Buffer of the Project Area**

Primary Number	Trinomial/ Resource Name	Age	Type	Evaluation
P-36-000899	CA-SBR-000899/ Red Hill Site	Prehistoric	Milling Artifact Concentration	1975 (Crowley)
P-36-006255	CA-SBR-006255H	Historic	Wells/cisterns, Water conveyance system, Dam, Walls/fences, Standing Structures	1989 (Hammond/ Sutton, Caltrans); 2009 (Michael Dice, BA); 2014 (A. Myers, ECORP)
P-36-015497	Base Line Road	Historic	Highway/trail	1973; 2014 (Josh Smallwood, Helix)

#### **Site P-36-000899**

Site P-36-000899 consists of one metate, one metate fragment, and six manos.

#### **Site P-36-006255**

Site P-36-006255 consists of a historic-period water system constructed in the early 1930s. Hammond and Sutton recorded sixteen water features which includes two bridge-like water diversion structures, a water diversion, two concrete stand pipes, a horizontal riveted steel pipe, wire-bound rock, eight water spreading/distribution gates, and a horizontal concrete pipe (Hammond 1989). Michael Dice of Michael Brandman Associates updated this site record in 2009 as part of the San Antonio Trails project and included additional features. He identified an additional seven east-west trending, stream flow stabilizers of wire-wrapped rock. The site was determined not eligible for the NRHP in 2004 but was not evaluated for local listing (Dice 2009).

ECORP archaeologist revisited part of the recorded site and noted an additional five features associated with the expanded site boundaries. These include three water diversion structures, each one containing a wall with outward facing granite cobbles for support (Features 17-19). Feature 20 is a steel retaining wall made of heavy steel mesh grate. The steel mesh is held in place by vertical and horizontal sections of roughly-cut railroad track. The horizontal section of railroad track is marked CARNEGIE 1095 ET. One vertical rail section is marked EV STEEL XD. Feature 21 is an east-west trending low retaining wall composed of granite cobbles that are bound in a wire net (Dice 2009).

### Site P-36-015497

Site P-36-015497 is Baseline Road, constructed on the Southern California Baseline, which was surveyed by Col. Henry Washington in 1853. It is registered as California Point of Historical Interest No. 12 (Kaiser 1973). Baseline Road began as a dirt wagon road for freight traffic, and is today a modern, six-lane asphalt-concrete roadway with a landscaped center median. While Baseline Road is historically associated with the Southern California Baseline of 1853, the survey line itself is an imaginary map line, with no physical manifestation of it or the survey markers located within or adjacent to the Project alignment (George and Smallwood 2014).

Table 4 (below) provides a list of the two cultural resources survey reports identified with the Project site and also includes seven additional cultural resources survey reports completed within the half-mile buffer of the proposed Project.

**Table 4. Cultural Resources Survey Reports in the Project and within the ½ mile Buffer**

Info Center No.	Authors	Title	Year
SB-00702	Archaeological Associates	Archaeological Survey Report: UltraSystems Project #4426	1978
SB-00806	Wilmoth, Stan	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Both Sides of Sixteenth Street (Baseline) in the City of Upland, San Bernardino County, California	1979
SB-01660	Gross, Lorraine S., Kevin J. Peter, and William B. Gilmour	Cultural and Paleontological Resource Investigations of the Lakes at San Antonio Project, City of Upland, San Bernardino County, California	1987
SB-03558	Duke, Curt	Cultural Resource Assessment for PBMS Wireless Facility CM 264-02, County of San Bernardino, CA SPP	2000
SB-05358	Sider, W.A.	Cucamonga Creek 1776-1976 After 200 Years	1976
SB-06083	Wlodarski, Robert J.	Bechtel Wireless Telecommunications Site ES0258 (Upland Water Tanks) located at 580 East 15 <sup>th</sup> Street, Upland California 91785	2008
SB-06666	Encarnacion, Deirdre	Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties: Northwest Recycled Water System	2009



SB-06667	Encarnacion, Deirdre	Project, Cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland, and Ontario, San Bernardino County, California Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties: Northwest Recycled Water System Project, Cities of Rancho Cucamonga...	2009
SB-08257	Tang, Bai	Due-Diligence Historical/Archaeological Resources Study Inland Empire Utilities Agency Recharge Basin Maintenance Plan Chino Basin Area, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California CRM TECH Contract No. 2989	2016

### Field Survey

During the field survey, the Project area was carefully examined for the presence of any cultural resources, including prehistoric or historic archaeological sites or historic buildings. No cultural resources were discovered. The survey was conducted by walking parallel transects in an east-west direction. These transects were spaced approximately 10 meters apart. Five shovel-test pits were excavated. The site contains a percolation basin or trench, for water runoff. Constant soil hydration allowed vegetation to grow throughout the border of the site.

### Shovel-test Pits

Five shovel-test pits were excavated to further test for the presence of buried cultural resources deposits within the Project area. The test pits were excavated to a depth of approximately 30 centimeters (cm). No cultural resources (flaked stone, bone, charcoal, historic or prehistoric artifacts [e.g., projectile points, stone tools, shell or stone beads, ceramics, or historic artifacts [e.g., nails, china, etc.] were discovered. Figure 3 shows the locations of each test pit. Test pit locations were distributed in an east-west orientation and spread across the Project area.

## CONCLUSION AND CULTURAL RESOURCES RECOMMENDATIONS

This cultural study was completed pursuant to CEQA. Field survey investigations were conducted on July 12, 2018 and did not identify any cultural resources, including prehistoric or historic archaeological sites or historic buildings within the project area. Five shovel-test pits were completed on the site and provided no indication of buried cultural resources.

The NAHC was contacted to complete a Sacred Lands File Search of the property, which returned negative results. The NAHC also provided a list of potentially interested parties and affiliated Native American individuals and groups. These individuals were contacted for further outreach and to identify if there were any concerns related to cultural values and resources for the proposed project area. SMBMI advised via email that although the project area lies within Serrano ancestral territory, the location of the project area may not concern the Tribe. A representative from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation replied via email to express their interest to consult with the City of Upland regarding the proposed project. Their contact information, as well as a list of Native American Tribal contacts is referenced in Appendix B.

On June 26, 2018, SCCIC conducted a records search for the project area, including a search of the half-mile radius surrounding the property. Although two cultural resources survey reports have been completed within the project area, no cultural resources had been previously discovered. Within the half-mile search radius, site records indicate that seven cultural resources survey reports have been completed, and three cultural resources sites have been documented within this area. Site P-36-000899 consists of a prehistoric scatter of milling artifacts. Site P-36-006255 consists of historic-age wells/cisterns, a water conveyance system a dam, and a wall/fence feature. Site P-36-015497 consists of the historic Baseline Road highway/trail. Thorough investigation within the Project area did not result in discovery or identification of any cultural resources sites or artifacts.

The subject property remains a sensitive area based on previous archaeological and historical findings from the general area, as well as its proximity to the Cajon wash and surrounding traditional Native American land use areas.

If previously undocumented cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities, a qualified archaeologist should be contacted to assess the nature and significance of the find, diverting construction activities from the location of the discovery. If human remains are encountered during the undertaking, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her representative, the MLD may inspect the site of discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD shall make recommendations as the manner in which to treat the human remains and any associated offerings.



## REFERENCES

Archaeological Associates

- 1978 Archaeological Survey Report: UltraSystems Project #4426. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Basgall, Mark E.

- 1988 Archaeology of the Komodo Site, an Early Holocene Occupation in Central Eastern California. In *Early Human Occupation in Far Western North America: The Clovis-Archaic Interface*, edited by Judith A. Willig, C. Melvin Aikens, and John L. Fagan, pp. 103–119. Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers, Vol. 21. Nevada Department of Cultural Affairs, Division of Museums and History, Carson City, Nevada.
- 1993 *Early Holocene Prehistory of the North-central Mojave Desert*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.
- 2007a Another Look at the Ancient Californians: Resurvey of the Emma Lou Davis Stake Areas and Reassessment of Collections, Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, Kern County, California. On file, Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California.
- 2007b Prehistoric People in an Evolving Landscape: A Sample Survey of the China Lake Basin and its Implications for Paleoindian Land Use. On file, Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California.
- 2012 Middle Archaic Cultural Adaptations in the Eastern Sierra Nevada: Data Recovery Excavations at CA-INY-1384/H, INY-6249/H, INY-6250, and INY-6251/H. Submitted by Archaeological Research Center, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Sacramento. On file, California Department of Transportation, District 9, Bishop.

Basgall, Mark E. and Mark A. Giambastiani

- 1995 Prehistoric Use of a Marginal Environment: Continuity and Change in Occupation of the Volcanic Tablelands, Mono and Inyo Counties, California. *Center for Archaeological Research at Davis Publication* 12.

Basgall, Mark E. and Matthew C. Hall

- 1991 Relationship between Fluted and Stemmed Points in the Mojave Desert. *Current Research in the Pleistocene* 8:61–63.
- 1992 Fort Irwin Archaeology: Emerging Perspectives on Mojave Desert Prehistory. *Society for California Archaeology Newsletter* 26(5):1–7.
- 1994 Status Report on Cultural Resources Management at the National Training Center, Fort Irwin, 1993–1994: An Addendum to the Fort Irwin Historic Preservation Plan. Submitted by Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc., Davis, California.

- On file, United States Department of Defense, National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California.
- 2000      Morphological and Temporal Variation in Bifurcate-Stemmed Dart Points of the Western Great Basin. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 22(2):237-276.
- Basgall, Mark E. and Kelly R. McGuire  
 1988      The Archaeology of CA-INY-30: Prehistoric Culture Change in the Southern Owens Valley, California. On file, California Department of Transportation, Office of Environmental Analysis, Sacramento.
- Bean, Lowell John  
 1972      *Mukat's People: The Cahuilla Indians of Southern California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bean, Lowell John and Charles Smith  
 1978      Serrano. In Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, *California*, Robert F. Heizer, editor, pp. 570-574. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Bean, Lowell John, Sylvia Brakke Vane, Michael Lerch, and Jackson Young  
 1981      *Native American Places in the San Bernardino National Forest*. On file at the Department of Agriculture, United States Forest Service, South Zone Office, Arcadia, California.
- Beck, Warren A., and Ynez D. Haase  
 1974      *Historical Atlas of California*. Oklahoma City: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Beck, Charlotte and George T. Jones  
 1997      The Terminal Pleistocene/Early Holocene Archaeology of the Great Basin. *Journal of World Prehistory* 11(2):161-236.
- 2010      Clovis and Western Stemmed: Population Migration and the Meeting of Two Technologies in the Intermountain West. *American Antiquity* 75(1):81-116.
- Bedwell, Stephen F.  
 1970      *Prehistory and Environment of the Pluvial Fork Rock Lake Area of South-Central Oregon*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Benedict, Ruth  
 1924      A Brief Sketch of Serrano Culture. *American Anthropologist* 26(3):366-392.
- Bettinger, Robert L.  
 1978      Alternative Adaptive Strategies in the Prehistoric Great Basin. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 34(1):27-46.



- Bettinger, Robert L. and Martin A. Baumhoff  
1982 The Numic Spread: Great Basin Cultures in Competition. *American Antiquity* 47(3):485-503.
- Bettinger, Robert L. and R. Ervin Taylor  
1974 Suggested Revisions in Archaeological Sequences of the Great Basin and Interior Southern California. *Nevada Archaeological Survey Research Papers* 5:1-26. Reno, Nevada.
- Blackburn, Thomas C. and Lowell John Bean  
1978a Kitanemuk. In Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, *California*, Robert F. Heizer, editor, pp. 564-569. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- 1978b Serrano. In Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, *California*, Robert F. Heizer, editor, pp. 570-574. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Borden, Ferris W.  
1971 The Use of Surface Erosion Observations to Determine Chronological Sequence in Artifacts from a Mohave Desert Site. *Archaeological Survey Association of Southern California Papers* 7.
- Bryan, Alan L.  
1988 The Relationship of the Stemmed Point and Fluted Point Traditions in the Great Basin. *Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers* 22:53-74.
- Byrd, Brian F., and Micah Hale  
2003 Lacustrine Lifestyles along Owens Lake: National Register Historic Places (NRHP) Evaluation of 15 Prehistoric Sites for the Olancho/Cartago Four-Lane Project, United States Route 395, Inyo County, California. On file, California Department of Transportation, District 6, Fresno.
- Campbell, Elizabeth W. Crozer  
1931 An Archaeological Survey of the Twenty-Nine Palms Region. *Southwest Museum Papers* 7:1-93.
- Campbell, Elizabeth W. Crozer and William H. Campbell  
1935 The Pinto Basin Site: An Ancient Aboriginal Camping Ground in the California Desert. *Southwest Museum Papers* 9:1-51.
- Campbell, Elizabeth W. Crozer, Ernst Antevs, Charles E. Amsden, Joseph A. Barbieri, and Francis D. Bode  
1937 The Archaeology of Pleistocene Lake Mohave: A Symposium. *Southwest Museum Papers* 11.
- Clewlow, C. William, Jr., Robert F. Heizer, and Rainer Berger  
1970 An Assessment of the Radiocarbon Dates for the Rose Spring Site (CA-Iny-372), Inyo County, California. In *Papers on Anthropology in the Great Basin*, pp. 19-27. *University of California Archaeological Research Facility Contributions* 7.

- Crowley, S.  
1975 Site Record for P-36-000899. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- Davis, Emma Lou  
1978 The Ancient Californians: Rancholabrean Hunters of the Mojave Lakes Country. *Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County*, Science Series 29. Los Angeles.
- Davis, James T.  
1996 Trade Routes and Economic Exchange among the Indians of California. Berkeley: *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* No. 54.
- Drucker, Philip  
1937 Culture Element Distributions V: Southern California. *University of California Anthropological Records* 1(1):1-52. Berkeley.
- Earle, David D.  
1990 New Evidence on the Political Geography of the Antelope Valley and Western Mojave Desert at Spanish Contact. In *Archaeology and Ethnohistory of Antelope Valley and Vicinity*, edited by Bruce Love and William H. DeWitt, pp. 87-104. *Antelope Valley Archaeological Society Occasional Papers* Number 2.  
  
2005a The Mojave River and the Central Mojave Desert: Native Settlement, Travel, and Exchange in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 25(1):1-38.  
  
2005b Chemehuevi Population Movements and the Numic Frontier in the Western and Central Mojave Desert after European Contact. In *Papers in Antelope Valley Archaeology and Anthropology* edited by Roger W. Robinson, pp. 135-146. *Antelope Valley Archaeological Society Occasional Papers* Number 4.
- Delacorte, Michael G.  
1994 Late Prehistoric Resource Intensification in the Numic Heartland. Paper presented at the 24th Annual Great Basin Anthropological Conference, Elko, Nevada.  
  
1995 Desert Side-notched Points as a Numic Population Marker in the West-Central Great Basin. Paper presented at the 29th Annual Meeting of the Society for California Archaeology, Eureka, California.
- Dice, Michael H  
2009 Site Record for P-36-0006255. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- Driver, Harold E  
1937 Culture Element Distributions, VI: Southern Sierra Nevada. *University of California Anthropological Records* 1(2):53-154. Berkeley.



Duke, Curt

- 2000 Cultural Resource Assessment for PBMS Wireless Facility CM 264-02, County of San Bernardino, California. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Eerkens, Jelmer W.

- 2004 Privatization, Small-Seed Intensification, and the Origins of Pottery in the Western Great Basin. *American Antiquity* 69:653-670.

Elston, Robert G.

- 1982 Good Times, Hard Times: Prehistoric Culture Change in the Western Great Basin. In *Man and Environment in the Great Basin*, edited by David B. Madsen and James F. O'Connell, pp. 186-206. *Society for American Archaeology Papers* No. 2, Washington, D.C.

Encarnacion, Deirdre

- 2009 Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties: Northwest Recycled Water System Project, Cities of Rancho Cucamonga, Upland and Ontario, San Bernardino County, California. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Farmer, Malcolm F.

- 1935 The Mojave Trade Route. *Masterkey* 9(5):154-157.

Fenenga, Gerrit

- 2013 Clovis Blade Technology at the Witt Site, Tulare Lake, California. Paper presented to the Sacramento Archaeology Society, West Sacramento California.

Fitzgerald, Richard T., Terry L. Jones, and Adella Schroth

- 2005 Ancient Long-distance Trade in Western North America: New AMS Radiocarbon Dates from Southern California. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 32(3):423-434.

Fowler, Catherine

- 1972 Some Ecological Clues to Proto-Numic Homelands. In *Great Basin Cultural Ecology: A Symposium*, Don D. Fowler, editor, pp. 105-122. *Desert Research Institute Publication in the Social Sciences* 8, Reno.

Garfinkel, Alan P.

- 2006 Paradigm Shifts, Rock Art Theory, and the Coso Sheep Cult of Eastern California. *North American Archaeologist* 27(3):203-244.
- 2007 Archaeology and Rock Art of the Eastern Sierra and Great Basin Frontier. *Maturango Museum Publication* 22. Maturango Museum, Ridgecrest, California.

Garfinkel, Alan P. and Donald R. Austin

- 2011 Reproductive Symbolism in Great Basin Rock Art: Bighorn Sheep Hunting, Fertility, and Forager Ideology. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 21(3):453-471.



- Garfinkel, Alan P., Donald R. Austin, David Earle, and Harold Williams  
2009 Myth, Ritual and Rock Art: Coso Decorated Animal-Humans and the Animal Master. *Rock Art Research* 26(2):179-197.
- Garfinkel, Alan P., Jerry N. Hopkins, and Craig E. Skinner  
2008 Ancient Stones of Black Glass: Tracing and Dating Paleoindian Obsidian Artifacts from China and Tulare Lakes. In *Contributions to Tulare Lake Archaeology IV: Ice-age Stone Tools from the San Joaquin Valley*, edited by Jerry N. Hopkins and Alan P. Garfinkel, pp. 59-97. Coyote Press Publications, Salinas, California.
- Garfinkel, Alan P., Geron Marcom, and Robert A. Schiffman  
2007 Culture Crisis and Rock Art Intensification: Numic Ghost Dance Paintings and Coso Representational Petroglyphs. *American Indian Rock Art* 33:83-103.
- Garfinkel, Alan P., Robert A. Schiffman and Kelly R. McGuire  
1980 Archaeological Investigations in the Southern Sierra Nevada: The Lamont Meadow and Morris Peak Segments of the Pacific Crest Trail. *Cultural Resources Publications, Archaeology*. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Bakersfield District, Bakersfield, California.
- Garfinkel, Alan P. and Harold Williams  
2011 *Handbook of the Kawaiisu: A Sourcebook and Guide to Primary Resources on the Native Peoples of the far southern Sierra Nevada, Tehachapi Mountains, and southwestern Great Basin*. Wa-hi Sina'avi Publications, Bakersfield, California.
- 2015 *The Handbook of the Kawaiisu: A Sourcebook and Guide to Primary Resources on the Native Peoples of the far southern Sierra Nevada, Tehachapi Mountains, and southwestern Great Basin*. Revised Second Edition. Wa-hi San'avi Publications and the Tehachapi Heritage League, Tehachapi, California.
- Garfinkel, Alan P., David A. Young, and Robert M. Yohe  
2010 Rock Art, Resource Depression, and Ritual Bighorn Hunting in the Coso Range of Eastern California: A Simulation Model. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 37:42-51.
- George, Joan, and Josh Smallwood  
2014 Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Etiwanda Pipeline North Liner Repair Project, Cities of Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernardino County, California. Prepared for Helix Environmental Planning, La Mesa, CA. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- Giambastiani, Mark A.  
2008 An Archaeological Survey of 10,121 Acres in the Spangler Hills Open Area and on Adjacent Lands within Searles Valley, Inyo County, California. On file, Bureau of Land Management, Ridgecrest, California.
- 2011 An Archaeological Inventory of Approximately 2,700 Acres in the Lost Cabin, Water Canyon, and Pyramid Point Areas, North and South Ranges, Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, Inyo and San Bernardino Counties, California. Submitted by

ASM Affiliates, Inc., Reno, Nevada. On file, Environmental Planning and Management Department, Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California.

Giambastiani, Mark A. and Thomas Bullard

- 2010 Terminal Pleistocene-Early Holocene Occupations on the Eastern Shoreline of China Lake, California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 43 (1-2):50-70.

Gifford, Edward

- 1918 Clans and Moieties in Southern California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 23(1):1-122.

Gilreath, Amy J.

- 2007 Rock Art in the Golden State: Pictographs and Petroglyphs, Portable and Panoramic. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture and Complexity* edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 273-290. Alta Mira Press, New York.

Gilreath, Amy J. and William R. Hildebrandt

- 1997 Prehistoric Use of the Coso Volcanic Field. *Contributions of the University of California No. 56*. University of California, Berkeley.
- 2008 Coso Rock Art within its Archaeological Context. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 28(1):1-22.
- 2011 Current Perspectives on the Production and Conveyance of Coso Obsidian. In *Perspectives on Prehistoric Trade and Exchange in California and the Great Basin*, edited by Richard E. Hughes, pp. 171-188. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Goebel, Ted, Michael R. Waters, and Dennis H. O'Rourke

- 2008 The Late Pleistocene Dispersal of Modern Humans in the Americas. *Science* 319(5869):1497-1502.

Gold, Alan (Garfinkel)

- 2005 Linguistic Archaeology: Prehistoric Population Movements and Cultural Identity in the Southwestern Great Basin and far southern Sierra Nevada. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Prehistoric Forager Ecology. University of California, Davis.

Goldsmith, Paul and Alan P. Garfinkel

- 2013 *Talking Stone: Rock Art of the Cosos*. E-book, documentary film and photographic archive. Bradshaw Foundation, London.

Grant, Campbell, James. W. Baird, and J. Kenneth. Pringle

- 1968 Rock Drawings of the Coso Range, Inyo County, California: An Ancient Sheep-hunting Cult Pictured in Desert Rock Carvings. *Maturango Museum Publication* 4. China Lake, California.

Grayson, Donald K.

- 2011 *The Great Basin: A Natural Prehistory*. Revised and expanded edition. University of California Press, Berkeley.



Gross, Lorraine S., Kevin J. Peter and William B. Gilmour

- 1987 Cultural and Paleontological Resource Investigations of the Lakes at San Antonio Project, City of Upland, San Bernardino County, California. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Hammond, Steve

- 1989 Site Record for P36-000625. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Harrington, John P.

- 1986 *John P. Harrington Papers, Volume 3: Southern California / Basin*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, National Anthropological Archives. [Microfilm edition, Millwood, New York, Kraus, International Publications].

Harrington, Mark R.

- 1948a An Ancient Site at Borax Lake, California. *Southwest Museum Papers* 16. Southwest Museum, Los Angeles.
- 1948b A New Pinto Site. *Masterkey* 22(4):116-118.
- 1949 A New Pinto Site at Little Lake. *Masterkey* 23(5):135-136.
- 1950a Pinto Man at Little Lake. *Desert Magazine* 13(11):22-24. Los Angeles.
- 1950b A Storage Cave Near Walker Pass. *Masterkey* 24(3):89-90.
- 1951 A Colossal Quarry. *Masterkey* 25(1):15-18.
- 1952 The Fossil Falls Site. *Masterkey* 26(6):191-195.
- 1953 A Cave Near Little Lake. *Masterkey* 27(3):77-82.
- 1957 A Pinto Site at Little Lake, California. *Southwest Museum Papers* No. 17.

Haynes, Gregory M.

- 2004 An Evaluation of the Chronological Relationship between Great Basin Stemmed and Pinto Series Projectile Points in the Mojave Desert. In *Proceedings of the Millennium Conference: The Human Journey and Ancient Life in California's Deserts: Proceedings from the 2001 Millennium Conference*, edited by Mark W. Allen and Judyth Reed, pp. 117-128. Maturango Museum Publication Number 15, Ridgecrest, California.

Hedges, Ken

- 2001 Traversing the Great Gray Middle Ground: An Examination of Shamanistic Interpretations of Rock Art. *American Indian Rock Art* 27:123-136.



- Heizer, Robert F. and Martin A. Baumhoff  
1961 The Archaeology of Wagon Jack Shelter. *University of California Anthropological Records* 20(4):119-138. Berkeley.
- Heizer, Robert F., Martin A. Baumhoff, and C. William Clewlow, Jr.  
1968 Archaeology of South Fork Shelter (NV-EL-11), Elko County, Nevada. *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* 71:1-58. Berkeley.
- Heizer, Robert F. and Thomas R. Hester  
1978 Great Basin. In *Chronologies in New World Archaeology*, edited by R. Ervin Taylor and Clement W. Meighan, pp. 147-199. Academic Press, New York.
- Hildebrandt, William R. and Kelly R. McGuire  
2002 The Ascendance of Hunting during the California Middle Archaic: An Evolutionary Perspective. *American Antiquity* 67(2):231-256.
- ICF International  
2013 Archaeological Survey Report for the High Desert Corridor, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, California, 07-LA/ 08-SBD, SR-14 to SR-18. EA 116720. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- Johnson, John R. and Joseph G. Lorenz  
2006 Genetics, Linguistics, and Prehistoric Migrations: An Analysis of California Indian Mitochondrial DNA Lineages. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 26(1):33-64.
- Justice, Noel D.  
2002 *Stone Age Spear and Arrow Points of California and the Great Basin*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Kaiser, Kathryn H.  
1973 Point of Historical Interest, "Baseline Road". On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- Kelly, Robert L.  
1983 Hunter-Gatherer Mobility Strategies. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 39:277-306.  
1985 *Hunter-Gatherer Mobility and Sedentism: A Great Basin Study*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.  
1988 Three Sides of a Biface. *American Antiquity* 53:717-734.
- King, Chester  
2003 *Japchibit Ethnohistory*. On file at the United States Department of Agriculture, Angeles National Forest.

- Kroeber, Alfred. L.  
1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Washington, D.C.
- Kyle, D.E.  
1990 *Historic Spots in California*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Lamb, Sydney  
1958 Linguistic Prehistory in the Great Basin. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 24(2):95–100.
- Lanning, Edward P.  
1963 The Archaeology of the Rose Spring Site (INY-372). *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 49(3):327–336. Berkeley.
- Leakey, Louis S. B., Ruth D. Simpson, and Thomas Clements  
1968 Excavations at Nine Prehistoric Sites in the Calico Mountains, California: Preliminary Report. *Science* 160:1022–1033.
- Lengner, Kenneth R.  
2013 *A Prehistory and History of the Death Valley Region's Native Americans and the Environments IN Which They Lived*. Deep Enough Press, Pahrump, Nevada.
- McGuire, Kelly R. and Alan P. Garfinkel  
1976 The Development of Pinyon Exploitation in Central Eastern California. *The Journal of California Anthropology* 3(2):83–85.
- 1980 Archaeological Investigations in the Southern Sierra Nevada: The Bear Mountain Segment of the Pacific Crest Trail. *Cultural Resources Publication, Archaeology*. Bureau of Land Management, Bakersfield, California. Reprinted by Coyote Press, Salinas, California.
- McGuire, Kelly R., Alan P. Garfinkel, and Mark E. Basgall  
1982 Archaeological Investigations in the El Paso Mountains of the Western Mojave Desert: The Bickel and Last Chance Sites, CA-Ker-250, -261. On file, Bureau of Land Management, Ridgecrest, California.
- McGuire, Kelly R. and William R. Hildebrandt  
2005 Re-thinking Great Basin Foragers: Prestige Hunting and Costly Signaling During the Middle Archaic Period. *American Antiquity* 70:695–712.
- Mehring, Peter J., Jr. and J. C. Sheppard  
1978 Holocene History of Little Lake, Mojave Desert, California. In *The Ancient Californians: Rancholabrean Hunters of the Mojave Lakes Country*, edited by Emma Lou Davis, pp. 153–166. Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Science Series 29.



- Meyer, Jack and Jeffrey S. Rosenthal  
2010 Filling the Middle Holocene Gap. *California Archaeology* 2(2):279-283.
- Moratto, Michael J.  
1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.
- Moratto, Michael, Garfinkel, Alan P., Robert M. Yohe, II, Alexander K. Rogers, Tim R. Carpenter, Craig Skinner, Jeff Rosenthal, Michael F. Rondeau, and Jon M. Erlandson  
2018 Clovis in the Far West: Classification and Chronology of Western Fluted and End-thinned Points from the Rose Valley Sites, Inyo County, California. *Journal of California Archaeology* 10(1):27-60.
- O'Connell, J. F.  
1967 Elko Eared/Elko Corner-notched Projectile Points as Time Markers in the Great Basin. *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* 70:129-140. Berkeley.
- Robinson, Roger  
1977 The Prehistory of the Antelope Valley, California. An Overview. *Kern County Archaeological Society Journal* 1:43-48.
- Rogers, Malcolm J.  
1939 Early Lithic Industries of the Lower Basin of the Colorado River and Adjacent Desert Areas. *San Diego Museum of Man Archaeological Papers* 3. San Diego, California.
- 1966 How Stones Became Tools and Weapons. In *Ancient Hunters of the Far West*, pp. 139-192. Union-Tribune Publishing Company, San Diego.
- Rondeau, Michael, Jim Cassidy, and Terry 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 Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 63-70. Alta Mira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Sample, L. L.  
1950 Trade and Trails in Aboriginal California. Berkeley: *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* 8.
- Schneider, Joan S., H. C. L. Brewer, and Matthew C. Hall  
2000 Research, Inventory, and Management Strategies for At-Risk and Other Prehistoric Cultural Resources, Death Valley National Park, California: Program Design Report. On file, Eastern California Information Center, University of California, Riverside.
- Schroth, Adella B.  
1994 *The Pinto Point Controversy in the Western United States*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Riverside, California.



- Schuiling, Walter C.  
1984 *San Bernardino County: Land of Contrasts*. Windsor Publications, Woodland Hills, California.
- Shott, Michael J.  
1986 Technological Organization and Settlement Mobility: An Ethnographic Examination. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 42(1):15-51.  
1989 On Tool-Class Use Lives and the Formation of Archaeological Assemblages. *American Antiquity* 54(1):9-30.
- Sider, W.A.  
1976 Cucamonga Creek 1776-1976 after 200 Years. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- Stewart, Richard, Russell Kaldenberg, and Alexander Rogers  
2005 Petroglyphs as Story-Boards: Providing Text for Ritual and Tradition and Recounting the "Power" Experience. In *Something Resembling an Archaeologist: Papers in Memory of Paul H. Ezell*, edited by Russell Kaldenberg. *San Bernardino County Museum Quarterly* 54(4):209-220. San Bernardino County Museum; Redlands.
- Strong, William Duncan  
1929 Aboriginal Society in Southern California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 26(1):1-358.
- Sutton, Mark Q.  
1980 Some Aspects of Kitanemuk Prehistory. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 2(2):214-225.
- Sutton, Mark Q., Mark E. Basgall, Jill K. Gardner, and Mark W. Allen  
2007 Advances in Understanding Mojave Desert Prehistory. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture and Complexity* edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 229-246. Alta Mira Press, New York.
- Tang, Bai  
2016 Due-Diligence Historical/Archaeological Resources Study Inland Empire Utilities Agency Recharge Basin Maintenance Plan Chino Basin Area, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California CRM TECH Contract No. 2989. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- Thomas, David H.  
1981 How to Classify the Projectile Points from Monitor Valley, Nevada. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 3(1):7-43.  
1983a The Archaeology of Monitor Valley 1: Epistemology. *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History* 58(1). American Museum of Natural History, New York.

- 1983b The Archaeology of Monitor Valley 2: Gatecliff Shelter. *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History* 59(1). American Museum of Natural History, New York.
- Ugan, Andrew S. and Jeffrey S Rosenthal
- 2013a Archaeological Testing and National Register Evaluations of 40 Sites within Airport Lake, Charlie, and George Target Ranges, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, Inyo and Kern Counties, California. Submitted by Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Inc., Davis, California. On file, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southwest Division, San Diego, California.
- Van Tilburg, Jo Anne, Gordon E. Hull, and John C. Bretney (editors)
- 2012 *Rock Art at Little Lake: An Ancient Crossroads in the California Desert*. Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Vaughan, Sheila J. and Claude N. Warren
- 1987 Toward a Definition of Pinto Points. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 9:199–213.
- Wallace, William J.
- 1962 Prehistoric Cultural Development in the Southern Californian Deserts. *American Antiquity* 28(2):172–180.
- Warren, Claude N.
- 1967 The San Dieguito Complex: A Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity* 32(2):168–185.
- 1984 The Desert Region. In *California Archaeology*, by Michael J. Moratto, pp. 339–430. Academic Press, Orlando, Florida.
- 1986 Projectile Points. In *Flood, Sweat, and Spears in the Valley of Death: Site Survey and Evaluation in Tiefert Basin, Fort Irwin, California*, edited by Dennis L. Jenkins, pp. 195–218. Coyote Press, Salinas, California.
- 2008 The Age of Clovis Points at China Lake, California. In *Avocados to Millingstones: Papers in Honor of D. L. True*, edited by Georgie Waugh and Mark E. Basgall. *Monographs in California and Great Basin Anthropology* Vol. 5, Archaeological Research Center, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Sacramento.
- Warren, Claude N. and Robert H. Crabtree
- 1986 Prehistory of the Southwestern Area. In *Great Basin*, edited by Warren L. d'Azevedo, pp. 183–193. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 11, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.
- Warren, Claude N. and Joan S. Schneider
- 2003 Pleistocene Lake Mojave Stratigraphy and Associated Cultural Material. *Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology* 16:61–74.



- Warren, Claude N., Delbert Leroy True and A. A. Eudey  
 1961 Early Gathering Complexes of Western San Diego County: Results and Interpretations of an Archaeological Survey. *University of California, Los Angeles, Archaeological Survey Annual Report 1960-1961*:1-106.
- Waters, Michael R. and Thomas W. Stafford  
 2007 Redefining the Age of Clovis: Implications for the Peopling of the Americas. *Science* 315:1122-1126.
- Waters, Michael R., Thomas W. Stafford, H. G. McDonald, C. Gustafson, M. Rasmussen, E. Cappellini, J. V. Olsen, D. Szklarczyk, L. J. Jensen, M. Thomas P. Gilbert, and E. Willerslev  
 2011 Pre-Clovis Mastodon Hunting 13,800 Years Ago at the Manis Site, Washington. *Science* 334:351-353.
- Whitley, David S.  
 1987 Comment on the Signs of All Times by J. D. Lewis-Williams and T. A. Dowson. *Current Anthropology* 29(2):238.
- 1998 History and Prehistory of the Coso Range: The Native American Past on the Western Edge of the Great Basin. In *Coso Rock Art: A New Perspective*, edited by Eva Younkin, pp. 29-68. Ridgecrest: Maturango Press.
- 2003 What is Hedges Arguing About? *American Indian Rock Art* 29:83-104.
- Whitley, David S. and Ronald I. Dorn  
 1987 Rock Art Chronology in Eastern California. *World Archaeology* 19:150-164.
- 2010 The Coso Petroglyph Chronology. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 43: 135-157.
- Wigand, Peter E. and Rhode, David  
 2002 Great Basin Vegetation history and aquatic systems: The last 150,000 years. In *Great Basin Aquatic Systems History*, edited by R. Hershler, David R. Madsen, and D. R. Currey, Smithsonian Contributions to the Earth Sciences 33:309.
- Willig, Judith A. and C. Melvin Aikens  
 1988 The Clovis-Archaic Interface in Far Western North America. In *Early Human Occupation in Western North America: The Clovis-Archaic Interface*, edited by Judith A. Willig, C. Melvin Aikens and John L. Fagan, pp. 1-40. *Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers*. Vol. 21. Carson City, Nevada.
- Wilmoth, Stan  
 1979 Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Both Sides of Sixteenth Street (Baseline) in the City of Upland, San Bernardino County, California. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.



Wlodarski, Robert J.

2008 Bechtel Wireless Telecommunications Site ES0258 (Upland Water Tanks) located at 580 East 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Upland, California 91785. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center. California State University, Fullerton.

Yohe, Robert, II


1992 A Re-evaluation of Western Great Basin Cultural Chronology and Evidence for the Timing of the Introduction of the Bow and Arrow to Eastern California Based on New Excavations at the Rose Spring Site (CA-INY-372). Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Riverside.

# APPENDIX A

## FIGURES


# Figure 1

Regional Vicinity Map





**Figure 2**  
Topographic Map






# Figure 3

Cultural Shovel Test Pit Locations



0.025 0 0.025 0.05 0.075 mi



## Legend

- Property Border
- Cultural Shovel Test Pits





## SITE PHOTOS



View North





View East



View West





Channel Water



## APPENDIX B

### NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

## Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

### Native American Heritage Commission

1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100

West Sacramento, CA 95691

916-373-3710

916-373-5471 – Fax

[nahe@nahe.ca.gov](mailto:nahe@nahe.ca.gov)

*Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File Search*

**Project** Frontier communities development

**County:** San Bernardino

**USGS Quadrangle Name:** Ontario, California 2015 7.5 USGS

**Township:** 1 south    **Range:** 7 west    **Section(s):** 5

**Company/Firm/Agency:** RCA Associates/ Frontier Communities/ City of Upland

**Street Address:** APNs (1045-151-34) (1045-121-02) (0207-483-46) North of 15<sup>th</sup> street

**City:** Upland    **Zip:** 92407

**Phone:** 760-596-0017

**Fax:** 760-956-9212

**Email:** alinalanda@ymail.com

**Project Description:** Frontier Homes development on a currently vacant real estate property approximately 9.16 acres.

## NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

Cultural and Environmental Department  
1550 Harbor Blvd., Suite 100  
West Sacramento, CA 95691  
(916) 373-3710



June 15, 2018

Alina Landa  
RCA Associates

Sent by E-mail: alinalanda@ymail.com

RE: Proposed Frontier Communities Upland Colonies 59 Development Project, City of Upland  
Ontario USGS Quadrangle, San Bernardino County, California

Dear Ms. Landa:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) *Sacred Lands File* was completed for the area of potential project effect (APE) referenced above with negative results. Please note that the absence of specific site information in the *Sacred Lands File* does not indicate the absence of Native American cultural resources in any APE.

Attached is a list of tribes culturally affiliated to the project area. I suggest you contact all of the listed Tribes. If they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. The list should provide a starting place to locate areas of potential adverse impact within the APE. By contacting all those on the list, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the NAHC requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact via email: [gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gayle Totton".

Gayle Totton, M.A., PhD.  
Associate Governmental Program Analyst  
(916) 373-3714

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.



**Native American Heritage Commission  
Native American Contact List  
San Bernardino County  
6/15/2018**

**Gabrieleno Band of Mission  
Indians - Kizh Nation**

Andrew Salas, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 393  
Covina, CA, 91723  
Phone: (626) 926 - 4131  
admin@gabrielenoindians.org

Gabrieleno

**Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel  
Band of Mission Indians**

Anthony Morales, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 693  
San Gabriel, CA, 91778  
Phone: (626) 483 - 3564  
Fax: (626) 286-1262  
GTTribalcouncil@aol.com

Gabrieleno

**Gabrielino /Tongva Nation**

Sandonne Goad, Chairperson  
106 1/2 Judge John Aiso St.,  
#231  
Los Angeles, CA, 90012  
Phone: (951) 807 - 0479  
sgoad@gabrielino-tongva.com

Gabrielino

**Gabrielino Tongva Indians of  
California Tribal Council**

Robert Dorame, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 490  
Bellflower, CA, 90707  
Phone: (562) 761 - 6417  
Fax: (562) 761-6417  
gtongva@gmail.com

Gabrielino

**Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe**

Charles Alvarez,  
23454 Vanowen Street  
West Hills, CA, 91307  
Phone: (310) 403 - 6048  
roadkingcharles@aol.com

Gabrielino

**Morongo Band of Mission  
Indians**

Robert Martin, Chairperson  
12700 Pumarra Road  
Banning, CA, 92220  
Phone: (951) 849 - 8807  
Fax: (951) 922-8146  
dtorres@morongo-nsn.gov

Cahuilla  
Serrano

**Morongo Band of Mission  
Indians**

Denisa Torres, Cultural Resources  
Manager  
12700 Pumarra Road  
Banning, CA, 92220  
Phone: (951) 849 - 8807  
Fax: (951) 922-8146  
dtorres@morongo-nsn.gov

Cahuilla  
Serrano

**Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians  
- Pauma & Yuima Reservation**

Temet Aguilar, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 369  
Pauma Valley, CA, 92061  
Phone: (760) 742 - 1289  
Fax: (760) 742-3422  
bennaecalac@aol.com

Luiseno

**San Fernando Band of Mission  
Indians**

Donna Yocum, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 221838  
Newhall, CA, 91322  
Phone: (503) 539 - 0933  
Fax: (503) 574-3308  
ddyocum@comcast.net

Kitanemuk  
Serrano  
Tataviam

**San Manuel Band of Mission  
Indians**

Lee Clauss, Director of Cultural  
Resources  
26569 Community Center Drive  
Highland, CA, 92346  
Phone: (909) 864 - 8933  
Fax: (909) 864-3370  
lclauss@sanmanuel-nsn.gov

Serrano

**Serrano Nation of Mission  
Indians**

Goldie Walker, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 343  
Patton, CA, 92369  
Phone: (909) 528 - 9027

Serrano

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Frontier Communities Upland Colonies 59 Development Project, San Bernardino County.



15555 Main Street, #D4-235  
Hesperia, California 92345  
(760) 956-9212 fax (760) 244-0791  
rca123@aol.com  
www.rcaassociatesllc.com

June 21, 2018

Donna Yocum, Chairperson  
San Fernando Band of Mission Indians  
P.O. Box 221838  
Newhall, CA 91322

Dear Ms. Yocum,

I am writing you to bring to your attention a proposed project in compliance with CEQA and the City of Upland, California. The proposed project is located on APNs (1045-151-34) (1045-121-02) and (0207-483-46). (Township 1 south, Range 7 west, Section 5) Ontario, California USGS 2015. The proposed project by Frontier Communities is to construct single-family home developments located north of 15<sup>th</sup> street.

As part of the cultural resources study for the project, I am requesting your insight on potential Native American cultural properties and resources in or near the area of potential effect. Please respond at your earliest convenience if you have any information to consider for this study.  
Thank you.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alina Landa". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Alina Landa  
Cultural Resources Specialist  
RCA Associates, Inc.  
alinalanda@ymail.com

## RESUMES

Dr. Alan Philip Garfinkel Gold, R.P.A.  
[avram1952@yahoo.com](mailto:avram1952@yahoo.com)  
805.312.2261

### Positions:

Principal Archaeologist  
RCA Associates, LLC  
Hesperia, California

Founder and Director  
California Rock Art Foundation  
<http://www.carockart.org>

Senior Cultural Resource Specialist  
AECOM (<http://www.aecom.com>)  
Camarillo, California (Total time 3 years)

Freelance Cultural Resource Management Consultant  
(Total time 20 years)

Environmental Planner, Cultural Resources  
California Department of Transportation  
(Total time 18 years)

### Education:

Bachelor of Arts, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Northridge,  
(*magna cum laude*), 1974  
Master of Arts, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis, 1977  
Doctor of Philosophy, Prehistoric Forager Ecology, University of California, Davis, 2005

### Representative Cultural Resource Management Projects

Cultural Resource Management Director for North Sky Wind Energy Project. Identified 76 cultural resource sites. Collected, excavated and documented sites including intensive data recovery effort resulting in a collection of 5,000 artifacts. Managed up to 25 Native American Monitors concurrently for the 102 wind turbine 15,000 acre study area. Resulted in project approval through NEPA and CEQA compliance and approved federal tax credit. Senior author for the resulting 2,769 page report.

Identification and evaluation of potential effects for the Red Rock Canyon Bridge Replacement Project. Identified and evaluated historic properties within the project area, developed historic background for the Red Rock Railroad historic resource. Completed Historic Property Survey Report including the documentation of identification (Prehistoric Archaeological and Historic Archaeological Survey) and evaluation efforts (Geoarchaeological Study). Consultation completed with local museums, Red Rock Canyon State Park, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Native American groups identified. Area had been listed as a Sacred Site by NAHC. Result: no historic properties within area of potential effects (APE).

Black Creek Site (CA-CAL-789) eligibility evaluation, testing, data recovery, and public interpretation. Contracted with Far Western and Sonoma State for data recovery and construction phase of systematic late discovery identification. Coordinated and consulted with Advisory Council, State Historic Preservation Office, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Calaveras Band of Mi-Wuk. Significant and eligible site fully mitigated from adverse effects



of road realignment through data recovery and public interpretation projects that included website, interpretive booklet, public presentations at conferences and public schools.

Project received California Governor's Award for Historic Preservation in 2008.

The Applegate Site (CA-AMA-56) eligibility, data recovery, negotiation of reburial arrangement with the Lone Band of the Miwok, presentation of history and character of cultural resource studies in public program sponsored by Far Western Anthropological Research Group, State Historic Preservation Office, California Department of Transportation, and the Lone Band of the Miwok. Worked out program for dealing with eligible site that had received impacts from Caltrans over the course of 50 years of impacts. Dealt with major issues with human remains and associated mortuary offerings.

East Sonora Bypass archaeological studies. Developed program to mitigate adverse effects of numerous eligible historic and prehistoric archaeological sites. Consultation with Mi-Wuk on one of the most controversial Caltrans projects in the history of their cultural resource program due to the pattern of late discoveries and lack of thorough consultation with Native Americans. Coordination with State Historic Preservation Office concerning Memorandum of Agreement, Data Recovery Program, Programmatic Agreement, and Treatment Plan, Supplemental Historic Property Survey Report.

Development of a management plan and National Register nomination for the Fossil Falls/Little Lake Archaeological District for the Bureau of Land Management. Resulted in protective actions, road closures, interpretation, and identification of resources for inclusion in the National Register nomination and the resulting report was published by the Bakersfield District Office of the Bureau of Land Management.

Project Archaeologist with the Desert Planning Staff, Bureau of Land Management, Riverside, California.

Alina Landa  
alinalanda@ymail.com  
(909) 543-9442

### Experience

**RCA Associates, Inc., Victorville, California**  
**Cultural Resources Specialist**

**January 2017-Present**

Survey properties in the California high desert region. Correspond with Native American Tribes. Contact Native American Heritage Commission and California Historical Resources Information Center. Prepare CEQA Phase I cultural reports under a certified archaeologist.

### Education

**Cal Poly Pomona, Pomona, California**

**June 2016**

Bachelor of Science, General Anthropology  
Cultural Resource Management, Applied Anthropology

**Chaffey College, Rancho Cucamonga, California**

**June 2013**

Associate of Arts: Social Sciences

### Relevant Coursework

**Archaeology Field Class, Lake Arrowhead, California**

**Spring 2015**

Conducted excavations in a small group overseen by Dr. Mark W. Allen.  
Documented unit elevations and used basic excavations skills such as troweling and dry screening.

**Cultural Resources Management Class**

**Winter 2015**

Studied the basic laws regarding the protection of historic properties.  
Involved in a group effort to nominate the Santa Anita Racetrack to be on the National Register of Historic Properties.

**California Archaeology Class**

**Winter 2015**

Presented research paper on human behavioral ecology during the Medieval Climatic Anomaly.  
Studied prehistoric California culture ways to understand subsistence patterns and inter-tribal communications.

### Leadership

**San Bernardino County Library Page, Fontana, California**

**June 2017- Present**

Lewis Library and Technology Center

**San Bernardino County Museum Volunteer**

**February 2016- June 2016**

Upland Heritage P.O. Box 1828 Upland, CA 91785 US



(909) 981-0280



Upland Heritage "Making a Difference Preserving  
Upland History Since 1989"

Contact Us



Thank you for your inquiry! We will get back to you within 48 hours.

UPLAND HERITAGE

P.O. Box 1828 Upland, CA 91785 US

(909) 981-0280

Today Closed ✓

Board Meetings are held the 3rd Thursday of every month, except in July, August and December, at 7 pm at the Cooper Museum in Downtown Upland. Please feel free to join us and join in on the fun!



---

Copyright © 2022 Upland Heritage - All Rights Reserved.

Powered by GoDaddy Website Builder

PRIVACY POLICY  
TERMS AND CONDITIONS

## Michael DeGiovine

---

**From:** Sonia Sifuentes  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 10, 2023 8:16 AM  
**To:** Upland Heritage  
**Cc:** Evelyn Hildebrand  
**Subject:** RE: Contact Form: Contact Us  
**Attachments:** Colonies\_LnV(draft01).pdf

Good morning,

Please see the attached map for the project we reached out to you about, The Colonies Upland. Please let us know if you need any further information from us to help with this request. Thank you!

Sincerely,  
Sonia

-----Original Message-----

From: support=1cee3593-9fbe-4b30-9155-7acaab021685.mail.conversations.godaddy.com@mail.conversations.godaddy.com <support=1cee3593-9fbe-4b30-9155-7acaab021685.mail.conversations.godaddy.com@mail.conversations.godaddy.com> On Behalf Of Upland Heritage  
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 8:01 PM  
To: Sonia Sifuentes <ssifuentes@ecorpconsulting.com>  
Subject: Re: Contact Form: Contact Us

Hi, I didn't see a map attached. Can you send again. Thank you





## Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

### Native American Heritage Commission

1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100

West Sacramento, CA 95691

916-373-3710

916-373-5471 – Fax

[nahc@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:nahc@nahc.ca.gov)

*Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File Search*

**Project:** 2023-006 Colonies Partners Upland

**County:** San Bernardino

**USGS Quadrangle Name:** Ontario CA (1978) unsectioned Cucamonga Land Grant, SBBM

**Township:** 01S **Range:** 07W **Section(s):** 8

**Company/Firm/Agency:** ECORP Consulting Inc.

**Street Address:** 215 North 5th Street


**City:** Redlands **Zip:** 92374

**Phone:** (909) 307-0046

**Fax:** (909) 307-0056

**Email:** ssifuentes@ecorpconsulting.com

**Project Description:** Proposed residential development in the City of Upland on 10 acres.  
Please refer to project number 2023-006 on all correspondence



Map Date: 1/9/2023  
Sources: ESRI, USGS



**ECORP Consulting, Inc.**  
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

**Records Search**

2023-006 Colonies Partners Upland





## NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

January 30, 2023

Evelyn Hildebrand  
ECORP Consulting Inc

Via Email to: [ehildebrand@ecorpconsulting.com](mailto:ehildebrand@ecorpconsulting.com)

CHAIRPERSON  
**Laura Miranda**  
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON  
**Reginald Pagaling**  
Chumash

SECRETARY  
**Sara Dutschke**  
Miwok

COMMISSIONER  
**Isaac Bojorquez**  
Ohlone-Costanoan

COMMISSIONER  
**Buffy McQuillen**  
Yokayo Pomo, Yuki,  
Nomlaki

COMMISSIONER  
**Wayne Nelson**  
Luiseño

COMMISSIONER  
**Stanley Rodriguez**  
Kumeyaay

COMMISSIONER  
**[Vacant]**

COMMISSIONER  
**[Vacant]**

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
**Raymond C.  
Hitchcock**  
Miwok/Nisenan

**NAHC HEADQUARTERS**  
1550 Harbor Boulevard  
Suite 100  
West Sacramento,  
California 95691  
(916) 373-3710  
[nahc@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:nahc@nahc.ca.gov)  
[NAHC.ca.gov](http://NAHC.ca.gov)

### Re: 2023-006 Colonies Partners Upland Project, San Bernardino County

Dear Ms. Hildebrand:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information you have submitted for the above referenced project. The results were negative. However, the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

Attached is a list of Native American tribes who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated; if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call or email to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify me. With your assistance, we can assure that our lists contain current information.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: [Cameron.vela@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:Cameron.vela@nahc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

*Cameron Vela*

Cameron Vela  
Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment



**Native American Heritage Commission  
Native American Contact List  
San Bernardino County  
1/30/2023**

**Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians**

Reid Milanovich, Chairperson  
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Cahuilla  
Palm Springs, CA, 92264  
Phone: (760) 699 - 6800  
Fax: (760) 699-6919  
laviles@aguacaliente.net

**Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians**

Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Director  
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Cahuilla  
Palm Springs, CA, 92264  
Phone: (760) 699 - 6907  
Fax: (760) 699-6924  
ACBCI-THPO@aguacaliente.net

**Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians**

Amanda Vance, Chairperson  
84-001 Avenue 54 Cahuilla  
Coachella, CA, 92236  
Phone: (760) 398 - 4722  
Fax: (760) 369-7161  
hhaines@augustinetribe.com

**Cabazon Band of Mission Indians**

Doug Welmas, Chairperson  
84-245 Indio Springs Parkway Cahuilla  
Indio, CA, 92203  
Phone: (760) 342 - 2593  
Fax: (760) 347-7880  
jstapp@cabazonindians-nsn.gov

**Cahuilla Band of Indians**

Daniel Salgado, Chairperson  
52701 U.S. Highway 371 Cahuilla  
Anza, CA, 92539  
Phone: (951) 763 - 5549  
Fax: (951) 763-2808  
Chairman@cahuilla.net

**Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation**

Andrew Salas, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 393 Gabrieleno  
Covina, CA, 91723  
Phone: (626) 926 - 4131  
admin@gabrielenoindians.org

**Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians**

Anthony Morales, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 693 Gabrieleno  
San Gabriel, CA, 91778  
Phone: (626) 483 - 3564  
Fax: (626) 286-1262  
GTTribalcouncil@aol.com

**Gabrielino /Tongva Nation**

Sandonne Goad, Chairperson  
106 1/2 Judge John Aiso St., Gabrielino  
#231  
Los Angeles, CA, 90012  
Phone: (951) 807 - 0479  
sgoad@gabrielino-tongva.com

**Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council**

Christina Conley, Tribal  
Consultant and Administrator  
P.O. Box 941078 Gabrielino  
Simi Valley, CA, 93094  
Phone: (626) 407 - 8761  
christina.marsden@alumni.usc.edu

**Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council**

Robert Dorame, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 490 Gabrielino  
Bellflower, CA, 90707  
Phone: (562) 761 - 6417  
Fax: (562) 761-6417  
gtongva@gmail.com

**Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe**

Charles Alvarez,  
23454 Vanowen Street Gabrielino  
West Hills, CA, 91307  
Phone: (310) 403 - 6048  
roadkingcharles@aol.com

**Juaneno Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation - Belardes**

Matias Belardes, Chairperson  
32161 Avenida Los Amigos Juaneno  
San Juan Capistrano, CA, 92675  
Phone: (949) 293 - 8522  
kaamalam@gmail.com

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed 2023-006 Colonies Partners Upland Project, San Bernardino County.

**Native American Heritage Commission  
Native American Contact List  
San Bernardino County  
1/30/2023**

**Juaneno Band of Mission  
Indians Acjachemen Nation -  
Belardes**

Joyce Perry, Tribal Manager  
4955 Paseo Segovia  
Irvine, CA, 92603  
Phone: (949) 293 - 8522  
kaamalam@gmail.com

Juaneno

**Juaneno Band of Mission  
Indians Acjachemen Nation 84A**

Heidi Lucero, Chairperson  
31411-A La Matanza Street  
San Juan Capistrano, CA, 92675  
Phone: (562) 879 - 2884  
hllucero105@gmail.com

Juaneno

**Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla  
and Cupeño Indians**

Ray Chapparosa, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 189  
Warner Springs, CA, 92086-0189  
Phone: (760) 782 - 0711  
Fax: (760) 782-0712

Cahuilla

**Morongo Band of Mission  
Indians**

Ann Brierty, THPO  
12700 Pumarra Road  
Banning, CA, 92220  
Phone: (951) 755 - 5259  
Fax: (951) 572-6004  
abrierty@morongo-nsn.gov

Cahuilla  
Serrano

**Morongo Band of Mission  
Indians**

Robert Martin, Chairperson  
12700 Pumarra Road  
Banning, CA, 92220  
Phone: (951) 755 - 5110  
Fax: (951) 755-5177  
abrierty@morongo-nsn.gov

Cahuilla  
Serrano

**Pala Band of Mission Indians**

Shasta Gaughen, Tribal Historic  
Preservation Officer  
PMB 50, 35008 Pala Temecula  
Rd.  
Pala, CA, 92059  
Phone: (760) 891 - 3515  
Fax: (760) 742-3189  
sgaughen@palatribe.com

Cupeno  
Luiseno

**Pechanga Band of Indians**

Paul Macarro, Cultural Resources  
Coordinator  
P.O. Box 1477  
Temecula, CA, 92593  
Phone: (951) 770 - 6306  
Fax: (951) 506-9491  
pmacarro@pechanga-nsn.gov

Luiseno

**Pechanga Band of Indians**

Mark Macarro, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 1477  
Temecula, CA, 92593  
Phone: (951) 770 - 6000  
Fax: (951) 695-1778  
epreston@pechanga-nsn.gov

Luiseno

**Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma  
Reservation**

Manfred Scott, Acting Chairman  
Kw'ts'an Cultural Committee  
P.O. Box 1899  
Yuma, AZ, 85366  
Phone: (928) 750 - 2516  
scottmanfred@yahoo.com

Quechan

**Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma  
Reservation**

Jill McCormick, Historic  
Preservation Officer  
P.O. Box 1899  
Yuma, AZ, 85366  
Phone: (760) 572 - 2423  
historicpreservation@quechantribe.com

Quechan

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed 2023-006 Colonies Partners Upland Project, San Bernardino County.

**Native American Heritage Commission  
Native American Contact List  
San Bernardino County  
1/30/2023**

***Ramona Band of Cahuilla***

Joseph Hamilton, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 391670 Cahuilla  
Anza, CA, 92539  
Phone: (951) 763 - 4105  
Fax: (951) 763-4325  
admin@ramona-nsn.gov

***Serrano Nation of Mission Indians***

Wayne Walker, Co-Chairperson  
P. O. Box 343 Serrano  
Patton, CA, 92369  
Phone: (253) 370 - 0167  
serranonation1@gmail.com

***Ramona Band of Cahuilla***

John Gomez, Environmental  
Coordinator  
P. O. Box 391670 Cahuilla  
Anza, CA, 92539  
Phone: (951) 763 - 4105  
Fax: (951) 763-4325  
jgomez@ramona-nsn.gov

***Serrano Nation of Mission Indians***

Mark Cochrane, Co-Chairperson  
P. O. Box 343 Serrano  
Patton, CA, 92369  
Phone: (909) 528 - 9032  
serranonation1@gmail.com

***Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians***

Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson  
One Government Center Lane Luiseno  
Valley Center, CA, 92082  
Phone: (760) 749 - 1051  
Fax: (760) 749-5144  
bomazzetti@aol.com

***Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians***

Isaiah Vivanco, Chairperson  
P. O. Box 487 Cahuilla  
San Jacinto, CA, 92581 Luiseno  
Phone: (951) 654 - 5544  
Fax: (951) 654-4198  
ivivanco@soboba-nsn.gov

***Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians***

Cheryl Madrigal, Tribal Historic  
Preservation Officer  
One Government Center Lane Luiseno  
Valley Center, CA, 92082  
Phone: (760) 297 - 2635  
crd@rincon-nsn.gov

***Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians***

Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural  
Resource Department  
P.O. BOX 487 Cahuilla  
San Jacinto, CA, 92581 Luiseno  
Phone: (951) 663 - 5279  
Fax: (951) 654-4198  
jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov

***San Manuel Band of Mission Indians***

Jessica Mauck, Director of  
Cultural Resources  
26569 Community Center Drive Serrano  
Highland, CA, 92346  
Phone: (909) 864 - 8933  
Jessica.Mauck@sanmanuel-  
nsn.gov

***Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians***

Cultural Committee,  
P.O. Box 1160 Cahuilla  
Thermal, CA, 92274  
Phone: (760) 397 - 0300  
Fax: (760) 397-8146  
Cultural-  
Committee@torresmartinez-  
nsn.gov

***Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians***

Lovina Redner, Tribal Chair  
P.O. Box 391820 Cahuilla  
Anza, CA, 92539  
Phone: (951) 659 - 2700  
Fax: (951) 659-2228  
lsaul@santarosa-nsn.gov

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed 2023-006 Colonies Partners Upland Project, San Bernardino County.



---

## **APPENDIX C**

### Project Area Photographs

# PHOTOLOG

Project Name:Upland Colonies

Project Number:2023-006

Project Number:

Camera	Photo No.	Description	Facing	Date	Initials
Samsung	082115	Project addition from southwest corner	East	2/14/23	JEA
	082136	Project south access road	East	2/14/23	JEA
	082215	Ground conditions south boundary	Detail	2/14/23	JEA
	082804	Ground conditions south boundary	Detail	2/14/23	JEA
	083514	Project east boundary	North	2/14/23	JEA
	083518	Project from southeast corner	Northwest	2/14/23	JEA
	085205	Modern drainage center project	North	2/14/23	JEA
	085408	Ground conditions north boundary	West	2/14/23	JEA
	085946	Modern drainage northeast corner	Northeast	2/14/23	JEA
	092418	Project from northeast corner	Southwest	2/14/23	JEA
	092447	Northeast drainage	Northeast	2/14/23	JEA
	092454	Project north boundary	West	2/14/23	JEA
	093942	Field check area southwest corner	Southeast	2/14/23	JEA
	094028	Field check area center basin	East	2/14/23	JEA
	094032	Field check area from northwest corner	Northeast	2/14/23	JEA
	094115	Field check area, west portion on 15 <sup>th</sup> street	Southwest	2/14/23	JEA



20230214\_082115



20230214\_082136



20230214\_082215



20230214\_082804



20230214\_083514




20230214\_083518



20230214\_085205



20230214\_085408



20230214\_085946



20230214\_092418



20230214\_092447



20230214\_092454



20230214\_093942



20230214\_094028



20230214\_094032



20230214\_094115















