Appendix C

Cultural Resources Inventory for the Collier Commercial Properties Project

CONFIDENTIAL

Cultural Resources Inventory for the Collier Commercial Properties Project

City of Lake Elsinore, California

Prepared For:

Collier Commercial Properties, LLC
43 Golfview Drive
Dove Canyon, California 92679

Prepared By:

ECORP Consulting, Inc.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS
3838 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 370
San Diego, California 92108

April 2022

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Collier Commercial Properties, LLC retained ECORP Consulting, Inc. in 2021 to conduct a cultural resources inventory for the proposed Collier Commercial Properties Project (Project or Proposed Project) in Riverside County, California. Collier Commercial Properties, LLC proposes to develop three parcels (APNs 377-190-002, 377-190-003, and 377-190-004) on approximately 2.8 acres in the City of Lake Elsinore. The inventory included a records search, literature review, and field survey.

The records search indicated that 55 previous cultural resource studies have been conducted within 1 mile of the Project Area, none of which overlap the Project Area. The records search also indicated that no resources have previously been recorded within the Project Area; however, 197 resources have been recorded within 1 mile of the Project Area: five pre-contact resources, one multicomponent resource, and 191 historic-period resources.

A search of the Sacred Lands File was requested from the Native American Heritage Commission. The results of the Sacred Lands File records search were negative, indicating no recorded presence of Native American Sacred Lands within the Project Area.

No pre-contact or historic-period sites or isolated finds were identified as a result of the records search and field survey. The Project would, therefore, not result in any significant impacts to known Historical Resources under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations in 36 CFR 800. The archaeological sensitivity of the Project Area is believed to be moderate; however, there always remains a potential for ground-disturbing activities to expose previously unrecorded cultural resources. Recommendations for the management of unanticipated discoveries are provided.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1-1
1.1 Project Location 1-1
1.2 Project Description 1-1
1.3 Area of Potential Effects 1-1
1.4 Regulatory Context 1-3
1.5 Report Organization 1-4
2.0 SETTING 2-1
2.1 Environmental Setting 2-1
2.2 Geology and Soils 2-1
2.3 Vegetation and Wildlife 2-1
3.0 CULTURAL CONTEXT 3-1
3.1 Regional Precontact History 3-1
3.1.1 Paleo-Indian Period/Terminal Pleistocene (12,000 Before Present [BP] to 10,000 BP) 3-1
3.1.2 Early Archaic Period/Early Holocene (10,000 BP to 8,500 BP) 3-1
3.1.3 Encinitas Tradition or Milling Stone Period/Middle Holocene (8,500 BP to 1,250 BP) 3-1
3.1.4 Palomar Tradition (1,250 BP to 150 BP) 3-2
3.2 Ethnohistory 3-3
3.3 Regional History 3-4
3.4 Project Area History 3-5
4.0 METHODS 4-1
4.1 Personnel Qualifications 4-1
4.2 Records Search Methods 4-1
4.3 Sacred Lands File Coordination Methods 4-2
4.4 Field Methods 4-2
5.0 RESULTS 5-1
5.1 Records Search 5-1
5.1.2 Records 5-1
5.1.3 Map Review and Aerial Photographs 5-2
5.2 Sacred Lands File Results 5-3
5.3 Field Survey Results 5-3
6.0 MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS 6-1
6.1 Conclusions 6-1
6.2 Likelihood for Subsurface Cultural Resources 6-1

6.3 Recommendations 6-1
6.3.1 Contractor Awareness Training 6-1
6.3.2 Post-Review Discoveries 6-1
7.0 REFERENCES CITED 7-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1. Project Location and Vicinity 1-2
Figure 5-1. Project Area overview from southeastern corner (view west, March 23, 2022). 5-3
Figure 5-2. Project Area overview from northeastern corner (view south, March 23, 2022) 5-4
Figure 5-3. Overview of ground conditions (view detail, March 23, 2022) 5-4

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5-1. GLO Land Patent Records 5-2

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Sacred Lands File Coordination
Attachment B – Project Area Photographs
Attachment C – ***Confidential*** Cultural Resource Site Locations and Site Records

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Description
AB	Assembly Bill
APE	Area of Potential Effects
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BP	Before present
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
ECORP	ECORP Consulting, Inc.
EIC	Eastern Information Center
GLO	General Land Office
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
PRC	Public Resources Code
RPA	Registered Professional Archaeologist
SOI	Secretary of the Interior
U.S.	United States of America
USC	U.S. Code
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Collier Commercial Properties, LLC retained ECORP Consulting, Inc. in 2021 to conduct a cultural resources inventory for the proposed Collier Commercial Properties Project (Project or Proposed Project) in the City of Lake Elsinore in Riverside County, California. A survey of the property was required to identify potentially eligible cultural resources (archaeological sites and historic buildings, structures, and objects) that could be affected by the Project.

1.1 Project Location

The Project Area consists of approximately 2.8 acres of property located in the northeast quarter of Section 6, of Township 6 South, Range 4 West, San Bernardino Base and Meridian as depicted on the 1997 Lake Elsinore, California United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map (Figure 1-1). This property is an undeveloped partially paved area, bounded to the east by a reservoir, to the south by West Minthorn Street, to the north by Collier Avenue, and to the west by a commercial property.

1.2 Project Description

The Project proposes the construction of two buildings which include an office, conference room, storage, and an electrical room. Two driveways, parking spaces, a sidewalk, gravel fill, landscaping, and a block wall along the western boundary will also be installed with this Project. It is assumed that the entire 2.8-acre Project site will be developed.

1.3 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), 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 the current Project, equals the Project Area subject to environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act and CEQA. The horizontal APE is illustrated on Figure 1-1 and also represents the survey coverage area. It measures approximately 0.10 mile in length by 0.06 mile in width.



Map Date: 3/25/2022

Sources: Collier Commercial Property, Esri, USGS

Figure 1-1. Project Location and Vicinity

ECORP Consulting, Inc.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

2022-020 Collier Commercial

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 includes all subsurface areas where archaeological deposits could be affected. The subsurface vertical APE varies across the Project.

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. This study assumes the maximum height for structures will not exceed 30 feet.

1.4 Regulatory Context

This cultural resources investigation was conducted pursuant to the provisions for the treatment of cultural resources contained within Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and in CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] § 21000 et seq.) to meet the regulatory requirements of this Project. The goal of NHPA and CEQA is to develop and maintain a high-quality environment that serves to identify the significant environmental effects of the actions of a proposed project and to either avoid or mitigate those significant effects where feasible. CEQA pertains to all proposed projects that require state or local government agency approval, including the enactment of zoning ordinances, the issuance of conditional use permits, and the approval of development project maps. The NHPA pertains to projects that entail some degree of federal funding or permit approval.

The NHPA and CEQA (Title 54 U.S. Code [USC] Section 100101 et seq and Title 14, California Code of Regulations [CCR], Article 5, § 15064.5) apply to cultural resources of the historical and precontact periods. Any project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a cultural resource, either directly or indirectly, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. As a result, such a project would require avoidance or mitigation of impacts to those affected resources. Significant cultural resources must meet at least one of four criteria that define eligibility for listing on either the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR; PRC § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, § 4852) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP; 36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 60.4). Cultural resources eligible for listing on the NRHP are considered Historic Properties under 36 CFR Part 800 and are automatically eligible for the CRHR. Resources listed on or eligible for inclusion in the CRHR are considered Historical Resources under CEQA.

Tribal Cultural Resources 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 Tribal Cultural Resources and impacts thereto. Because ECORP does not meet the definition of a California Native American tribe, this report only addresses information for which ECORP 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 Tribal Cultural Resources. Should California Native

American tribes ascribe additional importance to or interpretation of archaeological resources described herein, or provide information about non-archeological Tribal Cultural Resources, that information is documented separately in the AB 52 tribal consultation record between the tribe(s) and lead agency, and summarized in the Tribal Cultural Resources section of the CEQA document, if applicable.

1.5 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's) *Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format*. Attachment A contains documentation of a search of the Sacred Lands File. Attachment B presents photographs of the Project Area, and Attachment C contains confidential cultural resource site locations and site records.

Sections 6253, 6254, and 6254.10 of the California Code authorize state agencies to exclude archaeological site information from public disclosure under the Public Records Act. In addition, the California Public Records Act (Government Code § 6250 et seq.) and California's open meeting laws (The Brown Act, Government Code § 54950 et seq.) protect the confidentiality of Native American cultural place information. Under Exemption 3 of the federal Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 5), because the disclosure of cultural resources location information is prohibited by the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 USC 470hh) and Section 307103 of the NHPA, it is also exempted from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. Likewise, the Information Centers of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) maintained by the OHP prohibit public dissemination of records search information. In compliance with these requirements, the results of this cultural resource investigation were prepared as a confidential document, which is not intended for public distribution in either paper or electronic format.

2.0 SETTING

2.1 Environmental Setting

Elevations within the Project Area range from 1,291 to 1,280 feet above mean sea level. The Project Area is open land bounded by commercial properties to the east, west, and south, and by Collier Avenue to the north. The Project Area is in the City of Lake Elsinore. It is approximately 1.08 miles north of Lake Elsinore, 3.22 miles southwest of Canyon Lake, 4.73 miles east of the Santa Ana Mountains, and 0.06 mile southwest of the I-15 Freeway.

2.2 Geology and Soils

Sediments within the Project Area consist of Holocene and late Pleistocene (Qya) young alluvial channel deposits described as fluvial deposits along canyon floors (Morton and Weber 2003). Pleistocene and Holocene sediments are known to be contemporaneous with human occupation of the region.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey website (NRCS 2021), three soil types are located within the Project Area: Waukena loamy fine sand, found on nearly level basin areas, that is moderately well to poorly drained; Cortina gravelly coarse sand loam, with 2 to 8 percent slopes, found on alluvial fans and floodplains; and Arbuckle gravelly loam, with 15 to 25 percent slopes, well drained soils, formed in alluvium.

2.3 Vegetation and Wildlife

No vegetation communities are present in the Project Area because the entire site is disturbed. The Project is located within an urban environment that is generally subjected to repeated and ongoing disturbance from human activities and development. The dominant plant species observed in the Project Area are nonnative or invasive weedy species. California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*) scrub is noted to be present in the area surrounding the Project Area, in addition to commercial landscaping.

Wildlife species that may occur in the Project Area are those who thrive within an urban or disturbed environment. These include mammals such as the California ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*), desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*), and Botta's pocket gopher; bird species include American pipit (*Anthus rubescens*), Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), and American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*).

3.0 CULTURAL CONTEXT

3.1 Regional Precontact History

3.1.1 Paleo-Indian Period/Terminal Pleistocene (12,000 Before Present [BP] 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, composed of large spear points or knives, are stylistically and technologically similar to the Clovis Paleo-Indian cultural tradition dated to this period elsewhere in North America (Moratto 1984). Archaeological evidence for this period in Southern California is limited to a few small temporary camps with fluted points found around late Pleistocene lake margins in the Mojave Desert and around Tulare Lake in the southern San Joaquin Valley. Single points are reported from Ocotillo Wells and Cuyamaca Pass in eastern San Diego County and from the Yuha Desert in Imperial County (Rondeau et al. 2007).

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

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

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

3.1.3 Encinitas Tradition or Milling Stone Period/Middle Holocene (8,500 BP 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 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 of 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 that 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 are divided into temporal phases. The Topanga I phase extends from 8,500 BP to 5,000 BP and Topanga II runs from 5,000 BP 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 BP to 4,000 BP) has abundant manos and metates. Projectile points are few and are mostly Pinto points. Greven Knoll II (4,000 BP to 3,000 BP) has abundant manos, 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 the consumption of foodstuffs 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 rounds included travel to the 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). 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, of which Lake Elsinore was one. 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 (until circa 1,000 BP). Greven Knoll III (3,000 BP 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, 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 BP to 150 BP)

The material culture of the inland areas — where Takic languages, which form a branch or subfamily of the Uto-Aztecan language family, were spoken at the time of Spanish contact — is part of the Palomar

Tradition (Sutton 2011). San Luis Rey I Phase (1,000 BP to 500 BP) and San Luis Rey II Phase (500 BP to 150 BP) pertain to the area occupied by the Luiseño at the time of Spanish contact. The Peninsular I (1,000 BP to 750 BP), Peninsular II (750 BP to 300 BP), and Peninsular III (300 BP 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:I-43). 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 Ethnohistory

Ethnographic accounts of Native Americans indicate that the Project Area lies predominantly within the original territory of the Luiseño. The Luiseño are a Takic-speaking people who occupied what is now western Riverside County and northern San Diego County (the San Luis Rey River drainage) in prehistoric and historic times. The term Luiseño was given by the Spanish to the native groups who were living in this area and who were forcibly removed to Mission San Luis Rey. The Luiseño believe the world was created in the area now known as Temecula and that they have been here since the beginning of time. Specifically, the region around Lake Elsinore was called *Etengvo Wumoma* – "Hot Springs by the Little Sea" and has been inhabited since as early as 6,000 years ago (City of Lake Elsinore 2011).

The Luiseño lived in sedentary and autonomous village groups, each with specific subsistence territories encompassing hunting, collecting, and fishing areas. Villages were typically located in valley bottoms, along streams, or along coastal strands near mountain ranges where water was available and village defense was possible. Inland populations had access to fishing and gathering sites on the coast, which they used during the winter months (Bean and Shipek 1978).

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

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

storage containers, manos and metates for grinding seeds, and ceramic jars for cooking (Bean and Shipek 1978).

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

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

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

3.3 Regional History

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

Colonization of California by Euro-Americans began with the Spanish Portolá land expedition. The expedition, led by Captain Gaspar de Portolá of the Spanish army and Father Junipero Serra, a Franciscan missionary, explored the California coast from San Diego to the Monterey Bay area in 1769. As a result of this expedition, Spanish missions to convert the native population, *presidios* (forts), and towns were established. The Franciscan missionary friars established 21 missions in Alta California (the area north of Baja California), beginning with Mission San Diego in 1769 and ending with the mission in Sonoma established in 1823. The purpose of the missions and presidios was to establish Spanish economic,

military, political, and religious control over the Alta California territory. Mission San Gabriel Archangel was founded in 1771, east of what is now Los Angeles, to convert the Tongva or Gabrielino. Mission San Luis Rey was established in 1798 on the San Luis Rey River (in what is now northern San Diego County) to convert the Luiseño (Castillo 1978). Some missions later established outposts in inland areas. An *asistencia* (mission outpost) of Mission San Luis Rey, known as San Antonio de Pala, was built in Luiseño territory along the upper San Luis Rey River near Mount Palomar in 1810 (Pourade 1961). A chapel administered by Mission San Gabriel Archangel was established in the San Bernardino area in 1819 (Bean and Smith 1978). The present *asistencia* within the western outskirts of present-day Redlands was built circa 1830 (Haenszel and Reynolds 1975).

The missions sustained themselves through cattle ranching and traded hides and tallow for supplies brought by ship. Large cattle ranches were established by Mission San Luis Rey at Temecula and San Jacinto (Gunther 1984). The Spanish also constructed *presidios*, or forts, at San Diego and Santa Barbara, and established a *pueblo*, or town, at Los Angeles. The Spanish period in California began in 1769 with the Portolá expedition and ended in 1821 with Mexican independence.

After Mexico became independent from Spain in 1821, what is now California became the Mexican province of Alta California. The Mexican government closed the missions in the 1830s and former mission lands were granted to retired soldiers and other Mexican citizens for use as cattle ranches. Much of the land along the coast and in the interior valleys became part of Mexican land grants or "ranchos" (Robinson 1948). The rancho owners lived in an adobe house on the rancho. The Mexican period includes the years 1821 to 1848.

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

3.4 Project Area History

The Project Area is near the present-day city limits of the City of Lake Elsinore. The community was founded in 1883 on the northeast shore of La Laguna (Lake Elsinore), a shallow body of brackish water that expands and shrinks depending on inflow from the San Jacinto River. The land on which the historic town center is located was part of Rancho La Laguna, granted to Julian Manriquez by Governor Manuel Micheltorena in 1844. When Manriquez died a few years later, the rancho was inherited by his wife, Trinidad Manriquez, and their children. Señora Manriquez sold Rancho La Laguna to Abel Stearns in 1852, and Stearns sold the land to Augustin Machado in 1858. Augustin Machado died in 1865, leaving the

rancho to his widow, Ramona Machado, and their 12 children. Señora Machado and 11 of her children sold their interests in the land, comprising the majority of Rancho La Laguna, to Charles A. Sumner, an immigrant from England, in 1873. Two years later, Sumner mortgaged the rancho to the Temple and Workman Bank of Los Angeles; however, he defaulted on the mortgage and the bank foreclosed. In 1877, Frederick M. Sumner, Charles Sumner's brother, acquired Rancho La Laguna, but sold it to Arthur Scrivener as trustee for the London and San Francisco Bank in 1881. Two years later, the 12,832-acre rancho was purchased by Franklin Heald, Donald Graham, and William Collier for $24,000 (Gunther 1984; Hudson 1978).

Heald, Graham, and Collier intended to establish a town called Laguna, and requested a post office from the U.S. Government. The Post Office Department would not grant the name because *Laguna* was already taken by a settlement on the southern California coast. Collier's sister (Graham's wife), Margaret Collier Graham, suggested the name *Elsinore*, after the Danish setting of Shakespeare's Hamlet. The town and the lake were given the name, and the Elsinore Post Office opened in 1883 (Gunther 1984).

The City of Elsinore, in what was then San Diego County, was incorporated on April 9, 1888, supported by the tourist attraction of its hot springs, the nearby clay products industries of Alberhill and Terra Cotta City, ranching, and the farming of olives, apricots, citrus, and walnuts. Elsinore became one of the judicial townships and election districts of the new Riverside County, which was formed in 1893. The California Southern Railway reached Elsinore Junction in 1882 on its route from San Diego to San Bernardino. A spur to Elsinore from Elsinore Junction was subsequently built in 1895, with an extension to Alberhill in 1896 (Gunther 1984; Robertson 1998). The South Riverside Land and Water Company bought the lake itself from Heald, Graham, and Collier in 1893 with the intention of piping water to South Riverside (Corona) to irrigate citrus groves. Within five years, the project was stopped because the alkaline water was killing the trees (Gunther 1984; Hudson 1978).

Elsinore remained a small town for most of the 20th century, relying mostly on agriculture, the clay industry, and tourism for its economy. The lake completely dried and was filled again in the 1880s and 1890s. Flooding of the San Jacinto River caused the lake to overflow in 1916 and 1921. In the 1930s, the Great Depression nearly halted economic growth completely; however, after World War II, plans were initiated to capitalize on tourism and recreation. The Lake Elsinore Park and Recreation District was created in 1948 to stabilize the lake and market it for recreational use; however, the lake completely dried out in 1951. After partially filling in 1952, it was again dry by 1954. Efforts continued to establish a park and Governor Goodwin Knight established a $350,000 fund for the Lake Elsinore State Park Project in 1956. Heavy rains in 1958 partially filled the lake, but it was soon desiccated again. The Lake Elsinore State Recreation Area was dedicated in 1962. Colorado River water was purchased and pumped into the lake, which was refilled by 1964. Since then, the lake's level has been maintained by a combination of natural inflow and well water. Floods in 1978 and 1980 partially inundated the downtown section of the city (Gunther 1984; Hudson 1978).

In 1972, the Elsinore Chamber of Commerce suggested the city change its name to Lake Elsinore as a promotional tactic. The proposal was approved by residents in a vote held in November of the same year. The California Secretary of State and the U.S. Post Office approved the new name shortly thereafter and it was officially changed from Elsinore to Lake Elsinore on December 15, 1972 (Gunther 1984; Hudson 1978).

The completion of State Highway 74 and Interstate 15 through Lake Elsinore greatly improved transportation to the City of Riverside, as well as to San Diego, San Bernardino, and Orange counties. Increased residential and commercial development followed. The population of the City of Lake Elsinore was approximately 47,600 in 2007 (City of Lake Elsinore 2022).

4.0 METHODS

4.1 Personnel Qualifications

All phases of the cultural resources investigation were supervised by Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) John O'Connor, Ph.D., who meets the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI's) Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historical archaeology. Fieldwork was conducted by Staff Archaeologist Julian Acuña, M.A., RPA, who also served as co-author of this report. Senior Archaeologist Sonia Sifuentes, M.S., RPA served as co-author of this report. Lisa Westwood, M.A., RPA provided technical report review and quality assurance.

Dr. O'Connor, RPA has over 12 years of archaeological experience in North America and the Pacific Islands. His experience includes cultural resources management, academic research, museum collections management, and university teaching. Dr. O'Connor meets the SOI's Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology. He is well versed in the evaluation of impacts to cultural resources for CEQA and NHPA projects and has written or otherwise contributed to numerous environmental compliance documents. Dr. O'Connor serves as the Southern California Cultural Resources Manager for ECORP.

Sonia Sifuentes, RPA is a Senior Archaeologist at ECORP and has more than 14 years of experience in cultural resources management, primarily in southern California. Ms. Sifuentes holds a M.S. in Archaeology of the North and meets the SOI's Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology. She has participated in and supervised numerous surveys, test programs, and data recovery excavations 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 over six years of experience in cultural resources management. Mr. Acuña holds an M.A. in Applied Archaeology and a B.A. Cum Laude in Anthropology from California State University, San Bernardino. He meets the SOI'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.

Lisa Westwood, RPA meets the SOI's Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology and has 26 years of experience. 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 requested a records search for the property at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) of the CHRIS at University of California, Riverside on January 31, 2022. 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 Riverside County, the following historic references were also reviewed: Built Environment Resources Directory for Riverside County (OHP 2022); *The National Register Information System* (National Park Service [NPS] 2022); *Office of Historic Preservation, California Historical Landmarks* (OHP 2020); *California Historical Landmarks* (OHP 1996 and updates); and *Caltrans Local Bridge Survey* (California Department of Transportation [Caltrans] 2019).

Other references examined include historic GLO land patent records (Bureau of Land Management [BLM] 2022). Historic maps reviewed include:

- 1901 USGS Elsinore, California topographic quadrangle map (1:125,000 scale);
- 1942 USGS Elsinore, California topographic quadrangle map (1:62,500 scale);
- 1953 USGS Elsinore, California topographic quadrangle map (1:24,000 scale);
- 1960 USGS Santa Ana, California topographic quadrangle map (1:250,000 scale);
- 1974 USGS Elsinore, California topographic quadrangle map (1:24,000 scale);
- 1983 USGS Santa Ana, California topographic quadrangle map (1:100,000 scale); and
- 1997 USGS Lake Elsinore, California topographic quadrangle map (1:24,000 scale).

ECORP also reviewed historic aerial photos taken in 1967, 1978, 1980, 1994, 2002, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018 for any indications of property usage and built environment.

4.3 Sacred Lands File Coordination Methods

In addition to the record search, ECORP contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on February 4, 2022 to request a search of the Sacred Lands File for the APE (Attachment A). This search will determine whether Sacred Lands have been recorded by California Native American tribes within the APE, 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 Tribal cultural resources, but the responsibility to formally consult with the Native American community lies exclusively with the federal and local agencies under applicable state and federal law. ECORP was not delegated authority by the lead agencies to conduct tribal consultation.

4.4 Field Methods

On March 23, 2022, ECORP subjected the APE to an intensive pedestrian survey 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 one half person-day in the field. ECORP archaeologists 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, the archaeologists 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. No subsurface investigations or artifact collections were undertaken during the pedestrian survey.

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

5.0 RESULTS

5.1 Records Search

ECORP requested a records search of the CHRIS from the EIC on January 31, 2022. The EIC provided the results to ECORP on March 21, 2022.

5.1.1 Previous Research

Fifty-five previous cultural resource investigations have been conducted within 1 mile of the property, covering approximately 85 percent of the total area surrounding the property within the record search radius (Appendix C). The previous studies were conducted between 1978 and 2018. The results of the records search indicate that none of the property has been previously surveyed for cultural resources, and therefore, a pedestrian survey of the APE was warranted.

The records search also determined that 197 previously recorded pre-contact and historic-period cultural resources are located within 1 mile of the Project Area, none of which overlap the Project Area (Appendix C). A total of five pre-contact resources, one multicomponent resource, and 191 historic-period resources are located within 1 mile of the Project Area. The five previously recorded pre-contact resources consist of two lithic scatters, one pre-contact isolated flakes/tools, and two pre-contact isolated granitic manos. The multicomponent resource is the natural feature of Lake Elsinore. The remaining 191 historic-period resources consist of 106 residential properties, 61 commercial buildings, five religious buildings, four community center/social halls, two residential/hotel properties, two farms/ranches, two isolated historic-period glass fragments, one government building, one community park, one courtyard, one railroad, one theater, one school, one refuse scatter, one historic district, and one cemetery.

The historic district located within 1 mile of the Project Area is Lake Elsinore Downtown Historic District (P-33-007143). A total of 159 contributing elements to the Lake Elsinore Downtown Historic District are located within 1 mile of the Project Area.

5.1.2 Records

The *Built Environment Resources Directory* for Riverside County (OHP 2022) lists one historic district, Lake Elsinore Historical District, and 159 contributing historic properties associated with the historic district within 1 mile of the Project Area. The historic district, a mix of commercial and residential sections located in the downtown area of Lake Elsinore, has been evaluated and given a status code 5S2 – determined recognized as a historically significant by local government.

In addition to the historic district and its contributors, 38 properties are located within 1 mile of the Project Area. Two properties are evaluated as 1S - individually listed in the National Register (NR) by the keeper; six properties are evaluated as 3S – appears eligible for NR individually through survey evaluation; two properties are evaluated as 3D – appears eligible for NR as a contributor to a NR eligible multi-component resource through survey evaluation; 10 properties are evaluated as 5S2 – determined individually eligible for local listing or designation; 11 are evaluated as 6Y – determined ineligible for the NRHP by consensus through Section 106 process; two properties are evaluated as 7N – needs to be

reevaluated; and five properties are evaluated as 7R – identified in reconnaissance level survey or in an area.

The National Register Information System (NPS 2022) failed to reveal any eligible or listed properties within the Project Area. The nearest National Register property, the Armory Hall at 252 North Main Street, is located 0.74 mile southeast of the Project Area.

ECORP reviewed resources listed as *California Historical Landmarks* (OHP 1996) and by the OHP (OHP 2022) on March 23, 2022. There are no landmarks listed within the Project Area.

Historic GLO land patent records from the BLM's patent information database (BLM 2022) revealed four separate patents for the APE (Township 6 South, Range 4 West). The surrounding area was first granted to Abel Stearns on September 3, 1872, under the authority of the Grant-Spanish/Mexican, (9 Stat. 631). The next two patents were granted to Thomas D Langstaff in 1888, under the jurisdiction of the Land Act of 1820. The last patent was the transfer of the land to the State of California on September 19, 1934 (Table 5-1).

Table 5-1. GLO Land Patent Records

Patentee	Patent Date	Serial Number	Patent Type/Authority
Stearns, Abel	9/3/1872	CACAAA 083219	March 3, 1851: Grant-Spanish/Mexican (9 Stat. 631)
Langstaff, Thomas D	1/25/1888	CA0520.149	April 24, 1820: Sale-Cash Entry (3 Stat. 566)
Langstaff, Thomas D	1/25/1888	CACAAA 083504	April 24, 1820: Sale-Cash Entry (3 Stat. 566)
California, State of	9/19/1934	CACAAA 014547 01	January 21, 1927: Indemnity Selections (44 Stat. 1022)

The Caltrans Bridge Local and State Inventories (Caltrans 2019) did not list any bridges of historical significance 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 provide information on the past land uses of the property and potential for buried archaeological sites. Based on this information, the property was undeveloped. Following is a summary of the review of historical maps and photographs.

The 1901, 1942, and 1953 Elsinore, California (1:125,000; 1:62,500; and 1:24,000 scale) and 1960 USGS Santa Ana, California (1:250,000 scale) topographic quadrangle maps show the Project Area as undeveloped with the vicinity continuing to expand its roads and commercial properties. The 1974 USGS Elsinore, California (1:24,000 scale) topographic quadrangle map shows the Project Area as undeveloped.

Aerial photography from 1967 shows the property as undeveloped. The Project Area is bounded by undeveloped land, what is now Collier Avenue and Minthorn Street, and by a commercial property.

The 1978 aerial photographs show the Project Area as unchanged from the 1967 photograph. Commercial properties are expanding in the vicinity of the Project Area.

On 1980 aerial photographs, the Project Area appears to be graded and all vegetation removed. Conditions remain unchanged to present day (NETROnline 2022).

5.2 Sacred Lands File Results

ECORP received the results of the Sacred Lands File by the NAHC on March 24, 2022. The search of the Sacred Lands File was negative and failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the Project Area. Correspondence between the NAHC and ECORP is included in Attachment A. Any additional comments received after the submission of this report will be forwarded to the Lead Agency for further consideration and appropriate action.

5.3 Field Survey Results

ECORP surveyed the Project Area for cultural resources on March 23, 2022. Ground visibility in the Project Area was approximately 5 percent due to recent introduction of imported surface gravel to the area. The Project Area is currently utilized as a laydown, stagging, and parking area for a nearby business. During survey efforts, a local worker informed ECORP personnel that the Project Area had been vacant for at least one year. Complete photography of the Project Area is included in Attachment B.



Figure 5-1. Project Area overview from southeastern corner (view west, March 23, 2022).



Figure 5-2. Project Area overview from northeastern corner (view south, March 23, 2022).



Figure 5-3. Overview of ground conditions (view detail, March 23, 2022).

As a result of the field survey, no cultural resources were encountered within the Project Area.

6.0 MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Conclusions

The records search and the 2022 field survey did not yield any historic-period or pre-contact cultural resources in the Project Area. No cultural resources were identified on the property as a result of field survey. Therefore, no Historic Properties under Section 106 of the NHPA or Historical Resources under CEQA will be affected by the Proposed Project. Until the lead agencies concur with the identification and evaluation of eligibility of cultural resources, no Project activities should occur.

6.2 Likelihood for Subsurface Cultural Resources

The Project Area contains Holocene alluvial deposits contemporaneous with human occupation of the region. Although no pre-contact resources were identified during the field survey, due to the presence of Holocene alluvial deposits within the Project Area and the proximity of the Project Area to Lake Elsinore, a location in which Native American populations were known to settle, there exists a moderate potential for buried pre-contact archaeological sites within the Project Area.

6.3 Recommendations

6.3.1 Contractor Awareness Training

The lead agency shall ensure that a Contractor Awareness Training Program is delivered to train equipment operators about cultural resources. The program shall be designed to inform construction personnel about: federal and state regulations pertaining to cultural resources and tribal cultural resources; the subsurface indicators of resources that shall require a work stoppage; procedures for notifying the lead agency of any occurrences; project-specific requirements and mitigation measures; and enforcement of penalties and repercussions for non-compliance with the program.

The training shall be prepared by a qualified professional archaeologist and may be provided either through a brochure, video, or in-person tailgate meeting, as determined appropriate by the archaeologist. The training shall be provided to all construction supervisors, forepersons, and operators of ground-disturbing equipment. All personnel shall be required to sign a training roster. The construction manager is responsible for ensuring that all required personnel receive the training. The Construction Manager shall provide a copy of the signed training roster to the lead agency as proof of compliance.

6.3.2 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 following mitigation measures be adopted and implemented by the lead agency 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 pre-contact and historic archaeologist, 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 CEQA agency, and landowner. 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, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines 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 Riverside County Coroner (per § 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, § 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 (§ 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 (§ 5097.94 of the PRC). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§ 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 because damage to significant cultural resources is in violation of CEQA and Section 106. 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

Bean, L. J. and F. C. Shipek. 1978. Luiseño. In *Handbook of North American Indians*, *Volume 8, California*. Edited by R. F. Heizer, pp. 550-563. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, L. J. and C. R. Smith. 1978. Serrano. In: *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8: California*. 8: California. Heizer Robert F., editor. p. 570-574. Published by Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Boscana, G. 1933. *Chinigchinich: A Revised and Annotated Version of Alfred Robinson's Translation of Father Geronimo Boscana's Historical Account of the Belief, Usages, Customs and Extravagancies of the Indians of San Juan Capistrano Called the Acagchemem Tribe*. Fine Arts Press, Santa Ana.

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2022. Bureau of Land Management, General Land Office Records, Records Automation website. http://www.glorecords.blm.gov/. Accessed online on March 23, 2022.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2019. Structure and Maintenance & Investigations, Historical Significance–Local Agency Bridges Database March 2019. https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/maintenance/documents/f0009165-hs-local-a11y.pdf. Accessed online on March 24, 2022.

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.

City of Lake Elsinore. 2022. City Timeline. A Brief Chronology of Lake Elsinore Valley. http://www.lake-elsinore.org/visitors/history/city-timeline . Accessed 1/18/2022.

_____. 2011. City of Lake Elsinore General Plan. http://www.lake-elsinore.org/home/showdocument?id=7301. Accessed online on March 24, 2022.

Cleland, Robert G. 1941. The Cattle on a Thousand Hills: Southern California, 1850-1870. Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

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 *Perspectives in California Archaeology 1*, edited by J. M. Erlandson and R. H. Colton, pp. 19-41. Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Goldberg, S. E. 2001. *Eastside Reservoir Project: Final Report of Archaeological Investigations* (Five volumes). Applied Earthworks, Inc., Hemet, California.

Grenda, D. R. 1997. *Continuity and Change: 8,500 Years of Lacustrine Adaptation on the Shores of Lake Elsinore: Archaeological Investigations at a Stratified Site in Southern California*. Statistical Research Technical Series No 59. Statistical Research, Inc., Tucson, Arizona.

Gudde, E. G. 1998. *California Place Names: The Origin and Etymology of Current Geographical Names*. Revised from first edition, 1949. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Gunther, J.D. 1984. *Riverside County, California, Place Names: Their Origins and Their Stories*. Rubidoux Printing Company, Riverside, California.

Haenszel, Arda M. and Jennifer Reynolds. 1975. *The Historic San Bernardino Mission District*. San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, California.

Hudson, T. 1978. Lake Elsinore Valley: Its Story, 1776-1977. Published for Lake Elsinore Downtown Business Association and City of Lake Elsinore Centennial.

Koerper, H. C., P. Langenwalter 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, Perspectives in California Archaeology, Volume 1*, edited by R. H. Colten and J. M. Erlandson, pp. 81-88. Published by Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA.

Kowta, M. 1969. *The Sayles Complex: A Late Milling Stone Assemblage from Cajon Pass and the Ecological Implications of Its Scraper Planes*. University of California Publications in Anthropology.

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

Morton, D.M., and F.H. Weber. 2003. Preliminary geologic map of the Elsinore 7.5' quadrangle, Riverside County, California. U.S. Geological Survey. Open-File Report OF-2003-281, scale 1:24,000. Accessed online on February 4, 2022.

National Park Service (NPS). 2022. National Register of Historic Places, Digital Archive on NPGallery https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/BasicSearch/. Accessed March 23, 2022.

_____. 1983. Archaeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. 48 FR (Federal Register) 44716-68.

Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC (NETROnline). 2022. Historic aerial photography of the Oildale area from 1956 to present.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2021. Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey. http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm. Accessed February 4, 2022.

Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). 2022. Built Environment Resource Directory. https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1068/files/San%20Bernardino.csv. Accessed March 24, 2022.

_____. 2022. Office of Historic Preservation California Historical Landmarks Website. http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21387, accessed September 2, 2021.

_____. 1996. California Historical Landmarks. California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, California.

Pourade, Richard. 1961. *The History of San Diego: Time of the Bells*. San Diego Historical Society. http://www.sandiegohistory.org/books/pourade/time/timechapter9.htm

Robertson, Donald B. 1998. *Encyclopedia of Western Railroad History, Volume IV, California.* The Caxton Printers, Caldwell, Idaho

Robinson, W. W. 1948. *Land in California: The Story of Mission Lands, Ranchos, Squatters, Mining Claims, Railroad Grants, Land Scrip, Homesteads*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Rondeau, M. F., J. Cassidy, and T. L. Jones. 2007. Colonization Technologies: Fluted Projectile Points and the San Clemente Island Woodworking/Microblade Complex. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by T. L. Jones and K. A. Klar, pp. 299-315. Altamira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Salls, R. A. 1983. The Liberty Grove Site: Archaeological Interpretation of a Late Milling Stone Horizon Site on the Cucamonga Plan. M.A. Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles.

Strong, W. D. 1929. *Aboriginal Society in Southern California*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

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.

Sutton, M. Q. and J. K. Gardner. 2010. Reconceptualizing the Encinitas Tradition of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 42(4):1-64

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*, *1*, edited by Cynthia Irwin-Williams, pp. 1-14. Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology, Portales, New Mexico.

_____. 1967. The San Dieguito Complex: a Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity* 32:168-185.

Waugh, M. G. 1986. *Intensification and Land-Use: Archaeological Indication of Transition and Transformation in a Late Prehistoric Complex in Southern California* [Ph.D.]. [University of California, Davis. UMI Dissertation Services, ProQuest, Ann Arbor]: University of California, Davis.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Sacred Lands File Coordination

Attachment B – Project Area Photographs

Attachment C – ***Confidential*** Cultural Resource Site Locations and Site Records

ATTACHMENT A

Sacred Lands File Coordination

From: Julian Acuna
To: nahc@nahc.ca.gov
Cc: Robert Cunningham
Subject: Sacred Lands File search request for Collier Commercial Properties 2022-020
Date: Monday, January 31, 2022 10:28:00 AM
Attachments: sacred-lands-file-na-contact-form.pdf
Collier_RS_V1(draft01).pdf
image001.jpg

Hello,
ECORP is requesting a Sacred Lands File search for the proposed development of three parcels in the City of Lake Elsinore, Riverside County. I have attached a copy of the Sacred Lands File contact form above along with a map showing the project area. The results of this search can be sent to me at joconnor@ecorpconsulting.com. They can also be faxed to my attention at (858) 279-4043. Please reference the project number 2022-020 on all
correspondence. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.
Thanks,

Julian E. Acuña, M.A., RPA
Associate Archaeologist
ECORP Consulting, Inc.

Federal Small Business
California Small Business for Public Works (SB-PW)

All ECORP offices will be closed for Thanksgiving from Thursday, November 25, 2021 through Friday, November 26, 2021. We will reopen on Monday, November 29, 2021.

215 N. Fifth Street, Redlands, CA 92374
Ph: 909.307.0046 ◆ Cell: 909.649.8587
wblumel@ecorpconsulting.com ◆ www.ecorpconsulting.com
Rocklin ◆ Redlands ◆ Santa Ana ◆ San Diego ◆ Chico ◆ Flagstaff, AZ ◆ Santa Fe, NM

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

Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File

Search **Project:** 2022-020 Collier Commercial Properties

County: Riverside

USGS Quadrangle Name: Lake Elsinore (1997, NAD27)

Township: 6S **Range:** 4w **Section(s):** 6

Company/Firm/Agency: ECORP Consulting, Inc.

Street Address: 3838 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 370

City: San Diego **Zip:** 92108

Phone: (858) 279-4040

Fax: (858) 279-4043

Email: joconnor@ecorpconsulting.com

Project Description: ECORP is requesting a Sacred Lands File search for the proposed development of three parcels in the City of Lake Elsinore, Riverside County. I have attached a copy of the Sacred Lands File contact form above along with a map showing the project area. The results of this search can be sent to me at joconnor@ecorpconsulting.com. They can also be faxed to my attention at (858) 279-4043. Please reference the project number 2022-020 on all correspondence.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Thanks,



Location: N:\2022\2022-020 Collier Commercial\MAPS\Cultural_Resources\Collier_RS_V1.mxd (MAG)-nguidry 1/25/2022

Map Date: 1/25/2022

iService Layer Credits: Copyright:© 2013 National Geographic Society, i-cubed

ECORP Consulting, Inc.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Records Search

2022-020 Collier Commercial

ATTACHMENT B

Project Area Photographs

PHOTOLOG

Project Name: Collier Commercial properties

Project Number: 2022-020

Camera	Photo No.	Description	Facing	Date	Initials
Samsung	104451	Project area from southeast corner	West	3/23/22	JEA
	104457	Project from southeast corner	NW		
	104501	Project from southeast corner	North		
	104541	Ground conditions	Detail		
	104920	Construction materials southwest corner	South		
	104925	Project from southwest corner	North		
	105100	Project from southwest boundary	North		
	110619	Project from northeast corner	South		
	110626	Project from northeast corner	South		
	110628	Project from northeast corner	West		
	110637	Ground conditions	Detail		
	110900	Project from northwest corner	East		
	110906	Construction equipment	Southeast		
	110912	Project from northeast corner	Southeast		



20220323_104451



20220323_104457



20220323_104501



20220323_104541



20220323_104920



20220323_104925



20220323_105100



20220323_110619



20220323_110626



20220323_110628



20220323_110637



20220323_110900



20220323_110906



20220323_110912
























SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA
GRADING



