

A PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT FOR THE COLUMBIA HEIGHTS APARTMENTS PROJECT

**PAR200034
RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

APN 438-220-002

Project Site Location: Section 12, Township 5 South, Range 1 West, San Bernardino Base and Meridian, as shown on the *Hemet* USGS Quadrangle Topographic Map

Prepared on Behalf of:

**Keith Tolliver
Ascendant Development Group, LLC
P.O. Box 2021
San Jacinto, California 92581
(951) 833-1283**

Prepared for:

**Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, California 92501
(951) 955-3200**

Prepared by:

**Andrew J. Garrison, M.A., RPA, and
Brian F. Smith, M.A., Principal Investigator
Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
14010 Poway Road, Suite A
Poway, California 92064
(858) 679-8218**



March 31, 2022

Fieldwork Performed: November 26, 2021

Key Words: 2.4 acres; archaeological survey; historic residence and ancillary structure; 25914 Columbia Avenue; not eligible for the CRHR; monitoring recommended.

Archaeological Report Summary Information

Authors: Andrew J. Garrison, M.A., RPA and Brian F. Smith, M.A.,
Principal Investigator

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

Report Date: March 31, 2022

Report Title: A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Columbia Heights Apartments Project (PAR200034), County of Riverside, California

Prepared on Behalf of: Keith Tolliver
Ascendant Development Group, LLC
P.O. Box 2021
San Jacinto, California 92581
(951) 833-1283

Prepared for: Riverside County Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
Riverside, California 92501
(951) 955-3200

Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 438-220-002

USGS Quadrangle: Section 12, Township 5 South, Range 1 West, San Bernardino Base and Meridian of the USGS *Hemet, California* (7.5-minute) Quadrangle.

Study Area: 2.4 acres

Key Words: Archaeological survey program; *Hemet* USGS topographic quadrangle; historic residence and ancillary structure at 25914 Columbia Street recorded as Temp-1; not eligible for listing on the CRHR; monitoring recommended.

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 MANAGEMENT SUMMARY/ABSTRACT	1.0–1
1.1 Purpose of Investigation	1.0–1
1.2 Major Findings.....	1.0–1
1.3 Recommendation Summary.....	1.0–2
2.0 INTRODUCTION	2.0–1
2.1 Previous Work	2.0–1
2.2 Project Setting	2.0–5
2.3 Cultural Setting	2.0–5
2.3.1 Introduction.....	2.0–6
2.3.2 Paleo Indian Period (Late Pleistocene: 11,500 to circa 9,000 YBP)	2.0–7
2.3.3 Archaic Period (Early and Middle Holocene: circa 9,000 to 1,300 YBP)	2.0–7
2.3.4 Late Prehistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1,300 YBP to 1790)	2.0–10
2.3.5 Protohistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1790 to Present)	2.0–10
2.3.6 Ethnohistoric Period (1769 to Present)	2.0–17
2.4 Research Goals.....	2.0–22
3.0 METHODOLOGY	3.0–1
3.1 Archaeological Records Search	3.0–1
3.2 Field Methodology.....	3.0–1
3.3 Report Preparation and Recordation	3.0–1
3.4 Native American Consultation.....	3.0–2
3.5 Applicable Regulations	3.0–2
3.5.1 California Environmental Quality Act.....	3.0–2
4.0 RESULTS	4.0–1
4.1 Records Search Results.....	4.0–1
4.2 Results of the Field Survey	4.0–8
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	5.0–1
6.0 CERTIFICATION	6.0–1
7.0 REFERENCES	7.0–1

Appendices

Appendix A – Qualifications of Key Personnel

Appendix B – Site Forms*

Appendix C – Archaeological Records Search Results*

Appendix D – NAHC Sacred Lands File Search Results*

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

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
Figure 2.0–1 General Location Map	2.0–2
Figure 2.0–2 Project Location Map.....	2.0–3
Figure 2.0–3 Conceptual Site Plan	2.0–4
Figure 4.1–1 1887 Hemet Land Co. Subdivision Map.....	4.0–4
Figure 4.2–1 Historic Resource Location Map	4.0–11
Figure 4.2–2 Historic Resource Location on Current Aerial	4.0–12

List of Plates

<u>Plates</u>	<u>Page</u>
Plate 2.3–1 The Estudillo Mansion, circa 1890	2.0–21
Plate 2.3–2 Old San Jacinto, circa 1890	2.0–21
Plate 4.1–1 1939 Aerial Photograph	4.0–5
Plate 4.1–2 1953 Aerial Photograph	4.0–6
Plate 4.1–3 Current Aerial Photograph	4.0–7
Plate 4.2–1 Overview of the project from the southeast corner.....	4.0–8
Plate 4.2–2 Overview of the project and main residence from the southwest corner.....	4.0–9
Plate 4.2–3 Western façade of the converted ancillary structure, facing northeast	4.0–9
Plate 4.2–4 View of the west façade of the main residence.....	4.0–13
Plate 4.2–5 View of the north and east façades of the residence showing the addition and altered windows	4.0–13
Plate 4.2–6 View of the western façade of the ancillary structure.....	4.0–14
Plate 4.2–7 View of the east and north façades of the ancillary structure	4.0–14

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 4.1–1 Archaeological Sites Located Within One Mile of the Columbia Heights Apartments Project.....	4.0–1

1.0 MANAGEMENT SUMMARY/ABSTRACT

The following report describes the results of the cultural resources survey conducted by Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. (BFSA) for the Columbia Heights Apartments Project (PAR200034). The project includes Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 438-220-002 and is located at 25914 Columbia Street, northeast of the intersection of Acacia Avenue and Columbia Street. The project is located within the former San Jacinto Viejo Land Grant, Section 12, Township 5 South, Range 1 West, of the San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute *Hemet, California* topographic quadrangle map. The survey included 2.4 acres situated just outside of the city of Hemet within unincorporated Riverside County, California. The project proposes to clear the project parcel for the construction of a multi-building apartment complex with associated open space, parking, and infrastructure. BFSA conducted this assessment to locate and record any cultural resources identified within the project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and County of Riverside Cultural Resource Guidelines.

1.1 Purpose of Investigation

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if any significant cultural resources would be affected by the proposed land development. This study consisted of the processing of a records search of previously recorded archaeological sites on or near the property and the completion of an archaeological survey of the project. The archaeological records search was requested on November 23, 2021 from the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California at Riverside (UCR). The results of the records search indicate that no resources are recorded within the project and that no previous studies included the subject property. However, the search did identify 26 historic resources that have been recorded within one mile of the project. In addition, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search. In accordance with the recommendations of the NAHC, BFSA contacted all Native American consultants listed in the NAHC response letter at least two weeks prior to the initiation of the field survey. BFSA specifically contacted the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians to invite them to voluntarily participate in the survey. Jacob Rose, a representative from the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, was present during the survey and actively participated in the survey process.

1.2 Major Findings

No prehistoric or archaeological resources were identified during the survey. However, the survey, identified two buildings within the project. Archival research revealed that the buildings are older than 50 years and were likely constructed in the late 1940s by Jesse H. and Annie Spencer. As such, the buildings were collectively recorded as Site Temp-1 according to the Office of Historic Preservation's (OHP's) manual, *Instructions for Recording Historical*

Resources, using Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms (Appendix B). Although the buildings at 25914 Columbia Street are older than 50 years, Site Temp-1 does not qualify as a significant resource under CEQA and is not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR).

1.3 Recommendation Summary

Although Temp-1 does not qualify as a significant resource under CEQA, there remains the potential for additional historic features or deposits associated with the historic use of the property to be uncovered during development. Therefore, it is recommended that a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be implemented as a condition of project approval. The MMRP should include archaeological monitoring of all excavation and grading activities associated with the project, in addition to a testing and significance evaluation should historic or prehistoric resources be encountered. A copy of this report will be permanently filed with the EIC at UCR. All notes, photographs, and other materials related to this project will be curated at the archaeological laboratory of BFSA in Poway, California.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

BFSA was retained by the applicant to conduct a cultural resources survey of the proposed Columbia Heights Apartments Project (PAR200034). The archaeological survey was conducted in order to comply with CEQA and County of Riverside Cultural Resource Guidelines with regards to development-generated impacts to cultural resources. The project is located in an area of moderate cultural resource sensitivity, as is suggested by known site density and predictive modeling. Due to prior development and prior agricultural use, many resources within the project vicinity are historic. Sensitivity for prehistoric cultural resources in a given area is usually indicated by known settlement patterns, which in Riverside County are concentrated around environments with accessible food and water.

The Columbia Heights Apartments Project proposes to develop a multi-family residential complex just outside of the city of Hemet limits within unincorporated Riverside County (Figure 2.0–1). The 2.4-acre project includes APN 438-220-002 and is located at 25914 Columbia Street, northeast of the intersection of Acacia Avenue and Columbia Street. The project can be found within the former San Jacinto Viejo Land Grant, Section 12, Township 5 South, Range 1 West, of the San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian on the USGS 7.5-minute *Hemet, California* topographic quadrangle map (Figure 2.0–2). The project proposes to clear the parcel for the construction of a multi-building apartment complex with associated open space, parking, and infrastructure (Figure 2.0–3).

Principal Investigator Brian F. Smith directed the cultural resources survey of the project. The archaeological survey was completed on November 26, 2021 by Project Archaeologist Andrew J. Garrison. The survey was conducted in five to 10-meter interval transects, and ground visibility was generally good. Andrew Garrison and Brian Smith prepared the technical report. Andrew Garrison created the report graphics, and Summer Forsman conducted technical editing and report production. Qualifications of key personnel are provided in Appendix A.

2.1 Previous Work

An archaeological records search for the project and the surrounding area within a one-mile radius was requested from the EIC at UCR on November 23, 2021. The records search results indicates that 26 historic resources were found within a one-mile radius of the project, none of which are located within the project's boundaries. A discussion of background research is provided in Section 4.1 of this report.




Figure 2.0–1
General Location Map
 The Columbia Heights Apartments Project

DeLorme (1:250,000)







Figure 2.0–2
Project Location Map

The Columbia Heights Apartments Project

USGS Hemet and San Jacinto Quadrangles (7.5-minute series)





2.2 Project Setting

Riverside County lies in the Peninsular Ranges Geologic Province of southern California. The range, which lies in a northwest to southeast trend through the county, extends some 1,000 miles from the Raymond-Malibu Fault Zone in western Los Angeles County to the southern tip of Baja California. Regionally, the project lies near the eastern edge of the Perris block of the Peninsular Ranges batholith (Morton and Matti 2005). The active San Jacinto fault zone lies one to two miles east of the project. Based upon geologic mapping by Lancaster et al. (2012), the project is located on Holocene to late Pleistocene-aged young alluvial fan deposits, consisting mostly of unconsolidated, undissected boulders, cobbles, gravel, sand, and silt. Morton and Matti (2005) refer to these deposits as the Holocene and late Pleistocene-aged young alluvial fan deposits of Bautista Canyon, Unit 1, predominately characterized as gravel, sand, and silt.

The subject property is located just east of the city of Hemet in the southeastern section of the San Jacinto Valley, south of Park Hill, and north of the Santa Rosa Hills. The San Jacinto Valley is surrounded by the Santa Rosa Hills and the San Jacinto Mountains. The San Jacinto River is formed at the western base of the San Jacinto Mountains; a section of the San Jacinto River passes near the Santa Rosa Summit leading to Lake Hemet.

The property is generally flat with elevations ranging from 1665 to 1675 feet above mean sea level. Historically, the property appears to have been utilized for agriculture containing a rural residence. Presently, the project contains two residential structures with vegetation primarily consisting of sparse non-native weeds and grasses along with some loquat trees. During the prehistoric period, vegetation in the general area of the project provided sufficient food resources to support prehistoric human occupants. The animals that inhabited the project during prehistoric times included mammals such as rabbits, squirrels, gophers, mice, rats, deer, and coyotes, in addition to a variety of reptiles and amphibians. Intermittent streams found throughout the area and the San Jacinto River would have provided easily accessible sources of fresh water.

2.3 Cultural Setting – Archaeological Perspectives

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

Despite this, a distinction exists between “emic” and “etic” ways of understanding material culture, prehistoric lifeways, and cultural phenomena in general (Harris 1991). While “emic” perspectives serve the subjective ways in which things are perceived and interpreted by the participants within a culture, “etic” perspectives are those of an outsider looking in hoping to attain

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

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

2.3.1 Introduction

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

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

(6,650 to 3,350 YBP), and the late Holocene (3,350 to 200 YBP).

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

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

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

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

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

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

balls, and stone, bone, and shell beads.

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

This situation likely occurred for other small drainages (Buena Vista, Agua Hedionda, San Marcos, and Escondido creeks) along the central San Diego coast where low flow rates did not produce sufficient discharge to flush the lagoons they fed (Buena Vista, Agua Hedionda, Batiquitos, and San Elijo lagoons) (Byrd 1998). Drainages along the northern and southern San Diego coastline were larger and flushed the coastal hydrological features they fed, keeping them open to the ocean and allowing for continued human exploitation (Byrd 1998). Peñasquitos Lagoon exhibits dates as late as 2,355 YBP (Smith and Moriarty 1985) and San Diego Bay showed continuous occupation until the close of the Milling Stone Horizon (Gallegos and Kyle 1988). Additionally, data from several drainages in Camp Pendleton indicate a continued occupation of shell midden sites until the close of the period, indicating that coastal sites were not entirely abandoned during this time (Byrd 1998).

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

More recent work by Sutton has identified a more localized complex known as the Greven Knoll Complex. The Greven Knoll Complex is a redefined northern inland expression of the Encinitas Tradition first put forth by Mark Sutton and Jill Gardener (2010). Sutton and Gardener

(2010:25) state that “[t]he early millingstone archaeological record in the northern portion of the interior southern California was not formally named but was often referred to as ‘Inland Millingstone,’ ‘Encinitas,’ or even ‘Topanga.’” Therefore, they proposed that all expressions of the inland Milling Stone in southern California north of San Diego County be grouped together in the Greven Knoll Complex.

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

Phase I of the Greven Knoll Complex is generally dominated by the presence of manos and metates, core tools, hammerstones, large dart points, flexed inhumations, and occasional cremations. Mortars and pestles are absent from this early phase, and the subsistence economy emphasized hunting. Sutton and Gardener (2010:26) propose that the similarity of the material culture of Greven Knoll Phase I and that found in the Mojave Desert at Pinto Period sites indicates that the Greven Knoll Complex was influenced by neighbors to the north at that time. Accordingly, Sutton and Gardener (2010) believe that Greven Knoll Phase I may have appeared as early as 9,400 YBP and lasted until about 4,000 YBP.

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

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

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

which is archaeologically represented by the interchange of coastal and eastern cultural traits (Sutton 2011a).

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

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

Based upon Sutton’s model, the final Takic expansion would not have occurred until about 1,000 YBP, resulting in Vanyume, Serrano, Cahuilla, and Cupeño dialects. The model suggests that the Luiseño did not simply replace Hokan speakers, but were rather a northern San Diego County/southern Riverside County Yuman population who adopted the Takic language. This period is characterized by higher population densities and elaborations in social, political, and technological systems. Economic systems diversified and intensified during this period with the continued elaboration of trade networks, the use of shell-bead currency, and the appearance of more labor-intensive, yet effective, technological innovations. Technological developments during this period included the introduction of the bow and arrow between A.D. 400 and 600 and the introduction of ceramics. Atlatl darts were replaced by smaller arrow darts, including Cottonwood series points. Other hallmarks of the Late Prehistoric Period include extensive trade networks as far-reaching as the Colorado River Basin and cremation of the dead.

2.3.5 Protohistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1790 to Present)

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

nourishment for Luiseño groups. Elaborate kinship and clan systems between the Luiseño and other groups facilitated a wide-reaching trade network that included trade of Obsidian Butte obsidian and other resources from the eastern deserts, as well as steatite from the Channel Islands.

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

Luiseño: An Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspective

When contacted by the Spanish in the sixteenth century, the Luiseño occupied a territory bounded on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the east by the Peninsular Ranges mountains at San Jacinto (including Palomar Mountain to the south and Santiago Peak to the north), on the south by Agua Hedionda Lagoon, and on the north by Aliso Creek in present-day San Juan Capistrano. The Luiseño were a Takic-speaking people more closely related linguistically and ethnographically to the Cahuilla, Gabrielino, and Cupeño to the north and east rather than the Kumeyaay who occupied territory to the south. The Luiseño differed from their neighboring Takic speakers in having an extensive proliferation of social statuses, a system of ruling families that provided ethnic cohesion within the territory, a distinct worldview that stemmed from the use of datura (a hallucinogen), and an elaborate religion that included the creation of sacred sand paintings depicting the deity Chingichngish (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Subsistence and Settlement

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

The most important food source for the Luiseño was the acorn, six different species of which were used (*Quercus californica*, *Quercus agrifolia*, *Quercus chrysolepis*, *Quercus dumosa*, *Quercus engelmannii*, and *Quercus wislizenii*). Seeds, particularly of grasses, flowering plants,

and mints, were also heavily exploited. Seed-bearing species were encouraged through controlled burns, which were conducted at least every third year. A variety of other stems, leaves, shoots, bulbs, roots, and fruits were also collected. Hunting augmented this vegetal diet. Animal species taken included deer, rabbit, hare, woodrat, ground squirrel, antelope, quail, duck, freshwater fish from mountain streams, marine mammals, and other sea creatures such as fish, crustaceans, and mollusks (particularly abalone, or *Haliotis* sp.). In addition, a variety of snakes, small birds, and rodents were eaten (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Social Organization

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

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

Material Culture

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

Clothing was minimal; women wore a cedar-bark and netted twine double apron and men wore a waist cord. In cold weather, cloaks or robes of rabbit fur, deerskin, or sea otter fur were worn by both sexes. Footwear included deerskin moccasins and sandals fashioned from yucca fibers. Adornments included bead necklaces and pendants made of bone, clay, stone, shell, bear claw, mica, deer hooves, and abalone shell. Men wore ear and nose piercings made from cane or

bone, which were sometimes decorated with beads. Other adornments were commonly decorated with semiprecious stones including quartz, topaz, garnet, opal, opalite, agate, and jasper (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

Cahuilla: An Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspective

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

Subsistence and Settlement

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

The Cahuilla's use of plant resources is well documented. Plant foods harvested by the Cahuilla included valley oak acorns and single-leaf pinyon pine nuts. Other important plant

species included bean and screw mesquite, agave, Mohave yucca, cacti, palm, chia, quail brush, yellowray goldfield, goosefoot, manzanita, catsclaw, desert lily, mariposa lily, and a number of other species such as grass seed. A number of agricultural domesticates were acquired from the Colorado River tribes including corn, bean, squash, and melon grown in limited amounts. Animal species taken included deer, bighorn sheep, pronghorn antelope, rabbit, hare, rat, quail, dove, duck, roadrunner, and a variety of rodents, reptiles, fish, and insects (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

Social Organization

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

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

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

Material Culture

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

Cahuilla clothing, like other groups in the area, was minimal. Men typically wore a loincloth and sandals; women wore skirts made from mesquite bark, animal skin, or tules. Babies

wore mesquite bark diapers. Rabbit skin cloaks were worn in cold weather (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

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

Gabrielino: An Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspective

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

Subsistence and Settlement

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

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

Social Organization

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

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

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

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

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

Material Culture

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

the chief's house (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

The Gabrielino had exclusive access to soapstone, or steatite, procured from Santa Catalina Island quarries. This highly prized material was used for making pipes, animal carvings, ritual objects, ornaments, and cooking utensils. The Gabrielino profited well from trading steatite since it was valued so much by groups throughout southern California (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

2.3.6 Ethnohistoric Period (1769 to Present)

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

European exploration along the California coast began in 1542 with the landing of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo and his men at San Diego Bay. Sixty years after the Cabrillo expeditions, an expedition under Sebastian Viscaíno made an extensive and thorough exploration of the Pacific coast. Although the voyage did not extend beyond the northern limits of the Cabrillo track, Viscaíno had the most lasting effect upon the nomenclature of the coast. Many of his place names have survived, whereas practically every one of the names created by Cabrillo have faded from use. For instance, Cabrillo named the first (now) United States port he stopped at "San Miguel"; 60 years later, Viscaíno changed it to "San Diego" (Rolle 1969). The early European voyages

observed Native Americans living in villages along the coast but did not make any substantial, long-lasting impact. At the time of contact, the Luiseño population was estimated to have ranged from 4,000 to as many as 10,000 individuals (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

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

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

Mexico achieved independence from Spain in 1822 and became a federal republic in 1824.

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

The treatment of Native Americans grew worse during the Rancho Period. Most of the Native Americans were forced off of their land or put to work on the now privately-owned ranchos, most often as slave labor. In light of the brutal ranchos, the degree to which Native Americans had become dependent upon the mission system is evident when, in 1838, a group of Native Americans from Mission San Luis Rey petitioned government officials in San Diego to relieve suffering at the hands of the rancheros:

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

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

By 1846, tensions between the United States and Mexico had escalated to the point of war

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

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

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

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

Shortly thereafter, with the start of World War I, the United States began to develop a military presence in Riverside County with the construction of March Air Reserve Base. During World War II, Camp Haan and Camp Anza were constructed in what is now the current location of the National Veteran's Cemetery. In the decades that followed, populations spread throughout the county into Lake Elsinore, Corona, Norco, Murrieta, and Wildomar. However, a significant

portion of the county remained largely agricultural well into the 1970s. Following the 1970s, Riverside saw a period of dramatic population increase as the result of new development, more than doubling the population of the county with a population of over 1.3 million residents (Patterson 1971).

General History of the Surrounding Communities: San Jacinto Valley

The property is situated within the San Jacinto Valley just east of the City of Hemet and traditionally has been within the sphere of influence of the city. In the early 1880s, Helen Hunt Jackson visited the San Jacinto Valley to conduct research for her upcoming book, *Ramona*. Although *Ramona* is a fictional dramatization of Native American mistreatment, the book sparked tourism within the San Jacinto Valley which would eventually lead to the creation of the California Historic Landmark (CHL) Ramona Bowl (CHL No. 1009), where the annual Ramona Pageant, a dramatization of the events depicted in the novel, was first performed in 1923 (OHP 1993).



Plate 2.3–1: The Estudillo Mansion, circa 1890. (Image courtesy of the City of San Jacinto archives)

Settlement in the area began with a 35,500-acre land grant given to José Antonio Estudillo in 1842, known as the Rancho San Jacinto Viejo Land Grant. Estudillo’s children began developing the ranch in the 1880s by constructing two two-story brick mansions, one of which is still located at Main and Seventh Street in San Jacinto, and raised cattle on the land (Plate 2.3–1). In 1889, 15,000 acres of the Rancho San Jacinto Viejo Land Grant was sold to a group of Los Angeles investors known as the San Jacinto Land Association. Prior to the secession of the acreage, these investors developed a rival town in 1883 just two miles away from San Jacinto. The



Plate 2.3–2: Old San Jacinto, circa 1890. (Image courtesy of the City of San Jacinto archives)

town, which called itself New San Jacinto, competed for dominance with Old San Jacinto (Plate 2.3–2). However, the battle was ultimately decided when the Santa Fe Railroad built a branch line that terminated in New San Jacinto. Old San Jacinto ultimately faded from existence by the twentieth century (City of San Jacinto 2020). “The San Jacinto Land Association originally wanted the region to be a Methodist temperance colony and had even gone as far as to state that deeds to land sold by the Association would contain a clause prohibiting the manufacture or sale of alcoholic beverages

upon land sold by the company. Nevertheless, it appeared as though such clauses were never initiated into the deeds” (Wiley 2018).

The valley land was divided into large farm lots, usually made up of one quarter of the sectioned land. Portions of the San Jacinto Land Association land were irrigated with water obtained in the San Jacinto Mountains to the east. However, the region still lacked a sufficient water supply to support agriculture on a larger scale, until:

Edward Mayberry, William Whitter, Albert H.H. Judson, Hancock M. Johnston, and Peter Potts formed the Lake Hemet Water Company and the Hemet Land Company after acquiring portions of Rancho San Jacinto. By 1895, the Lake Hemet Water Company had constructed a dam (Lake Hemet) that they planned to use to irrigate the holdings of the Hemet Land Company. The formation of the Lake Hemet Dam led to the incorporation of the city of Hemet in 1910. (Wiley 2018)

With the expanded irrigation capabilities, agriculture began to thrive in the San Jacinto Valley (City of San Jacinto 2020). Farming continued as an integral part of the San Jacinto Valley throughout the early twentieth century as settlements increased, giving rise to small family-owned agricultural businesses, and large-scale cattle ranching declined in popularity. Instead, “small-scale horticulture increased,” with many different crops grown throughout the San Jacinto Valley due to its relatively high water table (10 to 15 feet below the surface) and warm climate (Wiley 2018; Pitman 1976). “Citrus, alfalfa, corn, potatoes, oat hay, and walnut orchards all prospered in the early twentieth century” (Wiley 2018).

As the population of the valley grew, the demand for dairy products increased, and dairy farming became more prevalent within the San Jacinto Valley. By 1922, dairy farmers in the San Jacinto Valley were producing more than 500,000 gallons of milk yearly (Law 1922). The wide-open acreage and thorough irrigation allowed dairy cows in the San Jacinto Valley to free forage on ample fresh alfalfa, producing healthier cows and a better milk product, which could be shipped to Los Angeles daily on the railroad lines (City of San Jacinto 2020). Turkey ranching and lime kilns also added to the economy, along with tourism garnered by the draw of natural hot springs located within the north side of the valley. Tourism stimulated the growth of the area by ushering in the development of resorts and hotels. Notably, the Gilman and Soboba Hot Springs, which were developed in the late nineteenth century, drew increased tourism in the early twentieth century (City of San Jacinto 2020). These industries are still important to the economy of the San Jacinto Valley today.

2.4 Research Goals

The primary goal of the research design is to attempt to understand the way in which humans have used the land and resources within the project area through time, as well as to aid in the determination of resource significance. For the current project, the study area under investigation is the western portion of Riverside County. The scope of work for the archaeological

program conducted for the Columbia Heights Apartments Project included the survey of 2.4 acres. Given the area involved and the narrow focus of the cultural resources study, the research design for this project was necessarily limited and general in nature. Since the main objective of the investigation was to identify the presence of and potential impacts to cultural resources, the goal is not necessarily to answer wide-reaching theories regarding the development of early southern California, but to investigate the role and importance of the identified resources. Although survey-level investigations are limited in terms of the amount of information available, several specific research questions were developed that could be used to guide the initial investigations of any observed cultural resources. The following research questions take into account the size and location of the project.

Research Questions:

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

Data Needs

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

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

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The archaeological program for the Columbia Heights Apartments Project consisted of an institutional records search, a NAHC SLF search, an intensive pedestrian survey of the 2.4-acre project parcel, and preparation of a technical study. This archaeological study conformed to County of Riverside Cultural Resource Guidelines. Statutory requirements of CEQA and subsequent legislation (Section 15064.5) were followed in evaluating the significance of cultural resources. Specific definitions for archaeological resource type(s) used in this report are those established by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO; March 1995).

3.1 Archaeological Records Search

An archaeological records search was requested from the EIC on November 23, 2021. The records search indicates that 26 historic resources that have been recorded within one mile of the project. Land Patent records held by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and accessible through the BLM General Land Office (GLO) website were also reviewed for pertinent project information. In addition, archival research was conducted utilizing historic maps, aerial photographs, newspapers, the Robert J. Fitch County of Riverside Archives, County Assessor's data, and Ancestry.com. Further, the BFSa research library was also consulted for any relevant historical information.

3.2 Field Methodology

In accordance with the County and CEQA review requirements, an intensive pedestrian reconnaissance was conducted that employed a series of parallel survey transects spaced at five to 10-meter intervals to locate archaeological sites within the project. The archaeological survey of the project was completed on November 26, 2021. The entire project was covered by the survey process and photographs were taken to document project conditions during the survey (see Section 4.2). Visibility throughout the property was generally good. However, ground visibility was obscured in a few locations by residential development and pockets of non-native weeds and grasses. No other constraints were encountered during the field survey.

3.3 Report Preparation and Recordation

This report contains information regarding previous studies, statutory requirements for the project, a brief description of the setting, research methods employed, and the overall results of the survey. The report includes all appropriate illustrations and tabular information needed to make a complete and comprehensive presentation of these activities, including the methodologies employed and the personnel involved. A copy of this report will be placed at the EIC at UCR.

3.4 Native American Consultation

BFSa requested a review of the SLF by the NAHC to determine if any recorded Native

American sacred sites or locations of religious or ceremonial importance are present near the project. The NAHC SLF results were negative for the presence of sacred sites or locations of religious or ceremonial importance near the project. However, in accordance with previous recommendations of the NAHC, BFSA contacted all Native Americans listed in NAHC response letters from previous projects in the project vicinity at least two weeks before the pedestrian survey was conducted. This request is not part of any Assembly Bill 52 Native American consultation. All correspondence with the tribes is summarized within Section 4.1 and provided in Appendix D.

3.5 Applicable Regulations

Resource importance is assigned to districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess exceptional value or quality illustrating or interpreting the heritage of Riverside County in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. Criteria outlined in CEQA provide the guidance for making such a determination. Provided below is the CEQA criteria that a resource must meet in order to be determined important.

3.5.1 California Environmental Quality Act

According to CEQA (§15064.5a), the term “historical resource” includes the following:

- 1) A resource listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing in the CRHR (Public Resources Code [PRC] SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR. Section 4850 et seq.).
- 2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or identified as significant in an historical resource survey, meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- 3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript, which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR (PRC SS5024.1, Title 14, Section 4852) including the following:
 - a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
 - b) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

- c) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
 - d) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
- 4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the CRHR, or not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1[k] of the PRC), or not identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1[g] of the PRC), does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

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

- 1) Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.
- 2) The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:
 - a) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the CRHR; or
 - b) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey, meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or,
 - c) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

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

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

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

- (d) When an Initial Study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood of, Native American human remains within the project, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC as provided in PRC SS5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC. Action implementing such an agreement is exempt from:
 - 1) The general prohibition on disinterring, disturbing, or removing human remains from any location other than a dedicated cemetery (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5).
 - 2) The requirement of CEQA and the Coastal Act.

4.0 **RESULTS**

4.1 **Records Search Results**

An archaeological records search for the project and the surrounding area within a one-mile radius was requested from the EIC at UCR on November 23, 2021. The records search indicates that 26 resources were found within a one-mile radius of the project, none of which are located within the project's boundaries. All of the resources found within one mile of the project are historic and consist of 23 single-family residences, one foundation/structure pads, one church, and one concrete reservoir.

Table 4.1-1

Cultural Resources Located Within One Mile of the Columbia Heights Apartments Project

Site	Description	Distance From the Project (m)
P-33-006247	Historic single-family residence	1,256.94
P-33-006248		1,184.06
P-33-006249		786.39
P-33-006250		562.31
P-33-006251		701.37
P-33-006253		1,502.50
P-33-006268		359.99
P-33-006273		1,276.46
P-33-006274		1,299.65
P-33-006278		301.95
P-33-006300		1,483.31
P-33-006301		1,351.81
P-33-006348		1,604.88
P-33-006350		1,609.34
P-33-006353		1,440.39
P-33-006361		1,200.25
P-33-006363		1,535.64
P-33-006365		561.92
P-33-014281		1,524.94
P-33-016649		1,112.27
P-33-023609		1,003.44
P-33-023610		990.85
P-33-023611		941.02
P-33-020418	Historic foundation/structure pads	1,192.56
P-33-006252	Historic Pilgrim Congregational Church	1,276.46
P-33-014317	Historic concrete reservoir	1,389.88

The records search results also indicates that 19 studies have been conducted within one mile of the project's boundaries, none of which include the project. The complete records search results can be found in Appendix C.

BFSA reviewed the following sources to help facilitate a better understanding of the historic use of the property:

- The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Index
- The OHP Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD)
- County of Riverside Assessor's data
- BLM GLO land records
- The *Hemet, California* 15' topographic quadrangle (1943 and 1952) and *Hemet, California* 7.5' topographic quadrangle (1953)
- Historic aerial photographs (1939, 1953, 1967, 1972, 1978, 1996, 2011, 2012, 2021)
- Property data including current information found online through the Riverside County Map My County portal and historic assessor's lot books held at the County of Riverside Robert J. Fitch Archives.

No properties listed in the NRHP or the BERD are located within the project boundary.

The BLM GLO records confirm the subject property was originally part of the San Jacinto Viejo Land Grant. The property was subdivided in 1887 and part of a 10-acre lot: Lot 3 Block 112 of the Lands of the Hemet Land Company (Figure 4.1–1). Online property information available from the County of Riverside lists structures within the subject property with a build date of 1931. However, the 1939 aerial shows the property as vacant agricultural land. It is not until the 1953 USGS *Hemet, California* Quadrangle and 1953 aerial photograph that structures are visible within the western half of the project (Plates 4.1–1 and 4.1–2). Based upon the 1953 aerial photograph, the property at that time contained three structures that appear to be a residence and two ancillary buildings, while the eastern half of the project consisted of agricultural groves of trees. The only noticeable change to the property in the subsequent 1967 photograph is that the residence appears to have been modified with an addition to the eastern façade, and the grove within the western half of the project had been cleared. Little change to the property is visible until one of the ancillary structures was removed from the property between 2011 and 2012. Current aerial photographs show that the main residence and one ancillary structure are still located within the subject property (Plate 4.1–3).

Since the current aerial photograph shows structures within the project that are older than 50 years of age, additional archival research was conducted for the property at the County of Riverside Robert J. Fitch Archives. Based upon the results of the archival research, in 1930, the larger 10-acre lot was owned by C.S. Moore until 1931 when the First National Bank of Hemet acquired the property.

The property changed owners a few times until late 1946 when the larger 10-acre lot was

subdivided into smaller lots. When divided, the current project consisted of two lots, and by 1947, both halves of the property had been acquired by Jesse H. and Annie Spencer. The Spencers emigrated from England in 1920 (Ancestry.com n.d.) and appear to have come to the San Jacinto Valley after World War II since a 1942 draft card lists Spencer and his family as living in New York at that time (Ancestry.com n.d.). It appears the Spencers constructed the structures within the property around that time as improvement values within the eastern half increased between 1947 and 1948 from \$100 to \$780, while values within the western half of the property increased from \$400 in 1947 to \$1090 in 1948 and then again to \$1740 in 1949. The Spencers are listed as owners of the project parcel through 1963 (the last available lot book at the archives). Searches of Ancestry.com and historic newspapers identified very little additional information on the family beyond Jesse's death in 1968 and reference to a son, John R. Spencer, who was born in 1927 and passed away in 2011.

BFSA requested a review of the SLF by the NAHC to determine if any recorded Native American sacred sites or locations of religious or ceremonial importance are present near the project. The NAHC SLF results were negative for the presence of sacred sites or locations of religious or ceremonial importance near the project. However, in accordance with previous recommendations of the NAHC, BFSA contacted all Native Americans listed in NAHC response letters from previous projects in the project vicinity at least two weeks before the pedestrian survey was conducted. Responses were received from the Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians and the Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation. The Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians indicated that they were unaware of specific cultural resources that may be affected by the proposed project but requested they be contacted should any cultural resources be discovered. The Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation stated that they have no comments on this project and deferred to other local tribes. All correspondence is provided in Appendix D.

DECEMBER 1887 BY
 AISE PURCELL C.E.

measurements and acreage
 to the center of streets




Figure 4.1-1
1887 Hemet Land Co. Subdivision Map
 The Columbia Heights Apartments Project





Legend

 Project Boundary



Plate 4.1–1
1939 Aerial Photograph
The Columbia Heights Apartments Project



Legend

 Project Boundary



Plate 4.1–2
1953 Aerial Photograph
The Columbia Heights Apartments Project



Plate 4.1–3
Current Aerial Photograph
 The Columbia Heights Apartments Project

4.2 Results of the Field Survey

Project Archaeologist Andrew Garrison, M.A., RPA conducted the pedestrian survey of the project on November 26, 2021. Aerial photographs, maps, and a compass facilitated orientation and location of project boundaries. Jacob Rose, a representative from the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, was present during the survey and actively participated in the survey process. The entire property was surveyed in five to 10-meter interval transects, and ground visibility was generally good. All exposed ground surfaces were carefully inspected, including rodent burrows and disturbed areas. A survey form, field notes, and photographs documented the survey work undertaken.

The pedestrian survey confirmed that the property has been disturbed by previous land modifications resulting from the agricultural use and residential development. At the time of the survey, the property was almost entirely devoid of vegetation except for pockets of non-native vegetation and sporadic loquat trees (Plate 4.2–1). The survey identified two residential structures within the project (Plate 4.2–2): the residential structure originally identified on the 1953 aerial photograph and the remaining ancillary structure appear, which appears to have been modified to accommodate residential habitation (Plate 4.2–3).



Plate 4.2–1: Overview of the project from the southeast corner.



Plate 4.2–2: Overview of the project and main residence from the southwest corner.



Plate 4.2–3: Western façade of the converted ancillary structure, facing northeast.

No archaeological sites or artifacts were identified during the survey. However, the two structures within the project are older than 50 years since they were constructed between 1939 and 1953. The structures were likely constructed during the late 1940s as indicated by the data found within the County Assessor's lot books. As such, they were collectively recorded as Site Temp-1 according to the OHP's manual, *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*, using DPR forms (Appendix B). Figures 4.2-1 and 4.2-2 show the location of the structures within the project.

Site Temp-1 fits within a pattern of residential development common after World War II generally identified as the Post-War Building Boom between 1945 and 1970. However, architecturally, the buildings within the subject property are not good examples of post-war residences. The main residence at 25914 Columbia Street does not convey a distinctive architectural style. The simple low-pitched front gabled home with a full-width porch is reminiscent of Craftsman style homes that generally predate the construction of this residence (McAlester 2015) (Plate 4.2-4). However, multiple modifications to the home, including an addition to the east façade, covering the entire exterior in stucco, and replacement of windows and doors, has removed almost all potentially original character-defining features (Plate 4.2-5). Only the southern façade still contains original double-hung wood sashed windows. Further, it appears as though the original front door on the western façade has been replaced by a modern sliding door (See Plate 4.2-4).

As with the main residence, the ancillary structure turned secondary residence, does not convey a distinct architectural style. The building is also clad primarily in stucco with all modern windows (Plate 4.2-6). The roof line has been severely altered to a shed-style roof with the original walls extended by use of pressboard (Plate 4.2-7).

Although Site Temp-1 is older than 50 years, it would not qualify for inclusion within the CRHR or as a significant resource under CEQA. Research of the property owners, primarily the Spencers who were responsible for the construction of the buildings, did not identify them as historically significant individuals. Further, although the construction of Temp-1 may loosely be tied to the Post-War Building Boom, the buildings are not good examples of residences constructed during the period, and their integrity has been severely diminished through multiple alterations. Further, the buildings are not the work of a master builder, and it is unlikely they would be able to provide any further research potential.






Figure 4.2–2
Historic Resource Location On Current Aerial
 The Columbia Heights Apartments Project





Plate 4.2–4: View of the west façade of the main residence.



Plate 4.2–5: View of the north and east façades of the residence showing the addition and altered windows.



Plate 4.2-6: View of the western façade of the ancillary structure.



Plate 4.2-7: View of the east and north façades of the ancillary structure.

5.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Phase I cultural resources survey of the Columbia Heights Apartments Project did not identify any prehistoric archaeological sites; however, one historic resource, Site Temp-1, was documented and recorded (Appendix B). Site Temp-1 consists of a residence and ancillary structure that has been converted into a secondary residence. Based upon archival research and architectural evaluation of the resource, Site Temp-1 is not eligible for listing on the CRHR and is not significant under CEQA criteria.

Since Site Temp-1 is evaluated as not significant and ineligible for listing on the CRHR, no additional research or survey tasks will be required. However, based upon the presence of historic resources within the property, as well as the documented historic development and decades of disturbance within the parcel, there remains a potential for buried or masked archaeological deposits to be present within the project boundaries. Based upon the potential to encounter buried or masked cultural deposits, it is recommended that a MMRP be implemented as a condition of project approval. The MMRP should include archaeological monitoring of all excavation and grading activities associated with the project in addition to a testing and significance evaluation should historic or prehistoric resources be encountered.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)

A MMRP to mitigate potential impacts to undiscovered buried cultural resources within the Columbia Heights Apartments Project shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the lead agency. This program shall include, but not be limited to, the following actions:


- 1) Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide written verification in the form of a letter from the project archaeologist to the lead agency stating that a certified archaeologist has been retained to implement the monitoring program.
- 2) The certified archaeologist shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the monitoring program.
- 3) During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the archaeological monitor(s) shall be on-site, as determined by the consulting archaeologist, to perform periodic inspections of the excavations. The frequency of inspections will depend upon the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The consulting archaeologist shall have the authority to modify the monitoring program if the potential for cultural resources appears to be more or less than anticipated.
- 5) Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits will be minimally documented in the field so the monitored grading can proceed.
- 6) In the event that previously unidentified cultural resources are discovered, the archaeologist shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operation in the area of discovery to allow for the evaluation of potentially significant

cultural resources. The archaeologist shall contact the lead agency at the time of discovery. The archaeologist, in consultation with the lead agency, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The lead agency must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the consulting archaeologist and approved by the lead agency before being carried out using professional archaeological methods. If any human bones are discovered, the county coroner and lead agency shall be contacted. In the event that the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the NAHC, shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains.

- 7) Before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The project archaeologist shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis.
- 8) All cultural material collected during the grading monitoring program shall be processed and curated according to the current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
- 9) A report documenting the field and analysis results and interpreting the artifact and research data within the research context shall be completed and submitted to the satisfaction of the lead agency prior to the issuance of any building permits. The report will include DPR Primary and Archaeological Site Forms.

6.0 CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this archaeological report, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.



Brian F. Smith

Principal Investigator

County of Riverside Registration #168

March 31, 2022

Date

7.0 **REFERENCES**

Ancestry.com

N.d. Online database. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.

Bean, Lowell John

1978 Cahuilla. In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8. California, edited by Robert F. Heizer. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, Lowell John and Charles R. Smith

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

Bean, Lowell John and Florence C. Shipek

1978 Luiseño. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 550-563. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8. William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Beattie, George W. and Helen P. Beattie

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

Bureau of Land Management/General Land Office

Various dates. Land patent records and plat maps. Accessed online at <http://www.glorerecords.blm.gov>.

Brigandi, Phil

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

Byrd, Brian F.

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

Caughey, John W.

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

Chapman, Charles E.

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

City of San Jacinto

2020 Explore San Jacinto: History. Electronic document, <http://www.ci.san-jacinto.ca.us/>

explore/history.html, accessed July 1, 2020.

Cook, Sherburne F.

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

Engelhardt, Zephyrin

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

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

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

Fagan, B.

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

Gallegos, Dennis

- 1987 A Review and Synthesis of Environmental and Cultural Material for the Batiquitos Lagoon Region. In *San Dieguito-La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*. Editor. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper 1.
- 1992 Patterns and Implications of Coastal Settlement in San Diego County: 9000 to 1300 Years Ago. In *Essays on the Prehistory of Maritime California*, edited by Terry Jones. Center for Archaeological Research, Davis, California.

Gallegos, Dennis R. and Carolyn E. Kyle

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

Gunther, Jane Davies

- 1984 *Riverside County, California, Place Names*. Rubidoux Printing, Riverside, California.

Handley, Charles

- 1967 The Sun City Story. *Sun City News* 2 February:6, 15-19. Sun City, California.

Harris, Marvin

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

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

- 1986 Obsidian Exchange in Prehistoric Orange County. *Pacific Coast Archaeological*

Society Quarterly 22(1):33–69.

Kowta, Makoto

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

Kroeber, A.L.

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

Lancaster, J.T., C.A. Hayhurst, and T.L. Bedrossian

- 2012 Preliminary geologic map of Quaternary surficial deposits in southern California. Palm Springs 30' x 60' quadrangle; *in*, Geologic compilation of Quaternary surficial deposits in southern California. California Geological Survey Special Report 217: pl. 24 (scale 1:100,000).

Law, George

- 1922 San Jacinto's Achievement in Dairying. *Los Angeles Times*. 23 April. Los Angeles, California.

Laylander, Don (editor)

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

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

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

Martin, P.S.

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

Masters, Patricia M.

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

McAlester, Virginia Savage

- 2015 *A Field Guide to American Houses (Revised): The Definitive Guide to Identifying and Understanding America's Domestic Architecture*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Meighan, Clement W.

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

Miller, J.

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

Moratto, Michael J.

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

Moriarty, James R., III

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

Morton, D.M. and J.C. Matti

- 2005 Preliminary geologic map of the Hemet 7.5' quadrangle, Riverside County, California. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 04-1455.

Moss, M.L. and J. Erlandson

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

Office of Historic Preservation

- 1993 Ramona Bowl, Site of the Ramona Pageant, California Historical Landmark No. 1009. Electronic document, <https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/Detail/1009>, accessed July 23, 2020.

Patterson, Tom

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

Pitman, Leon

- 1976 Domestic Tankhouses of Rural America. *Pioneer America* Vol. 8, pp. 84-97.

Pourade, Richard F.

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

- 1963 The Silver Dons. In *The History of San Diego* (Volume 3). Union-Tribune Publishing

Company, San Diego, California.

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

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

Rogers, Malcolm J.

- 1939 Early Lithic Industries of the Lower Basin of the Colorado River and Adjacent Desert Areas. In *San Diego Museum Papers* (No. 3 – 1989 printing). San Diego Museum of Man, San Diego, California.

Rolle, Andrew F.

- 1969 *California: A History*. 2nd ed. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York.

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

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

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

- 1985 An Archaeological Reconnaissance of San Diego Motor Racing Park, Otay Mesa, San Diego. Unpublished report on file at the City of San Diego, Environmental Analysis Division, San Diego, California.

State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)

- 1995 *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*. Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento.

Strong, William Duncan

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

Sutton, Mark Q.

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

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

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

Sutton, Mark Q. and Jill K. Gardner

- 2010 Reconceptualizing the Encinitas Tradition of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 42(4):1-64.

True, Delbert L.

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

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

Wallace, William J.

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

Warren, Claude N. (editor)

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

Warren, Claude N. and D.L. True

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

Warren, Claude N., D.L. True, and Ardith A. Eudey

1961 Early Gathering Complexes of Western San Diego County: Results and Interpretations of an Archaeological Survey. *Archaeological Survey Annual Report 1960-1961*. University of California, Los Angeles.

Wiley, Nancy Anastasia

2018 Report of Findings from a Record Search Conducted for Assessor's Parcel Number 436-600-012, 013, -014. SRSinc. Unpublished report on file at the City of San Jacinto, California.

APPENDIX A

Qualifications of Key Personnel

Brian F. Smith, MA

Owner, Principal Investigator

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



Education

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

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

Professional Memberships

Society for California Archaeology

Experience

Principal Investigator
Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.

1977–Present
Poway, California

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

Professional Accomplishments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Andrew J. Garrison, MA, RPA

Project Archaeologist

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



Education

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

Professional Memberships

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

Experience

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2005, 2008–2009
Riverside, California

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

Reports/Papers

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

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

Presentations

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

**NOTIFICATION TO COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE OF CONSULTANT
TO PREPARE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT**

Notification to the County of Riverside is hereby made that Ascendant Development Group, LLC, project sponsor, has entered into a contract with Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. for the preparation of an archaeological report to be submitted to the County of Riverside in satisfaction of a request made by the County for additional environmental information prior to completion of an environmental assessment for the property and development proposal, if any, described below:

Assessor's Parcel Number(s) (APN) :

438-220-002

Development Proposal Case Number(s):

PAR200034

In accordance with the notice of additional environmental information provided by the County, the scope of work for the report will be as follows:

Archaeological Reports (Standardized - Check those that apply):

☒ Phase 1 ☐ Phase 2 ☐ Phase 3

Both the Consultant and the project sponsor acknowledge that the consultant may not submit reports to the County for use in completing initial environmental assessments or EIR's for development proposals unless the consultant has been previously qualified by the County to submit such reports and unless the consultant has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the County governing the preparation and handling of such reports. The project sponsor hereby acknowledges that they have been furnished a copy of the MOU, have read it, and understand the responsibilities of both the county and the consultant as set forth therein.

Project sponsor acknowledges that the report for which notification is hereby made is the:

X 1st, 2nd OR _____ (specify number) archaeological report for which contractual arrangements have been made under the direction of the project sponsor for the property described above.

PROJECT SPONSOR AND CONSULTANT are to execute the following:

I hereby affirm that all information provided above, is, to the best of my knowledge, true, correct, and complete.

Project sponsor:  Dated: 12/10/2021

Consultant: _____ Dated: _____

A Riverside County Planning Department "Date Received" stamp hereon shall acknowledge receipt of this Notice by the County.

LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE CHECKLIST
For Archaeological Resources
(Must be attached to report)

APN: 438-220-002		Project No: PAR200034		EA Number:	
☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☒ Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	☐ Less than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact		

(Check the level of significance that applies)

Historic Resources -Temp-1

Would the project:

- a) Alter or destroy a historic site? Yes.
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations §15064.5? No.
- c) Is the resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1)? No.

Findings of Fact: Site Temp-1 does not qualify for inclusion within the CRHR or as a significant resource under CEQA. Research of the property owners did not identify them as historically significant individuals. Further, although the construction of Temp-1 may loosely be tied to the Post-War Building Boom, the buildings are not good examples of residences constructed during the period, and their integrity has been severely diminished through multiple alterations. Further, the buildings are not the work of a master builder, and it is unlikely they would be able to provide any further research potential.

Proposed Mitigation: A MMRP to mitigate potential impacts to undiscovered buried cultural resources within the Columbia Heights Apartments Project shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the lead agency.

Monitoring Proposed: Based upon the presence of historic resources within the property, as well as the documented historic development and decades of disturbance within the parcel, there remains a potential for buried or masked archaeological deposits to be present within the project boundaries. Based upon the potential to encounter buried or masked cultural deposits, it is recommended that a MMRP be implemented as a condition of project approval.

Archaeological Resources - None


Would the project:

- a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site? No.
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations §15064.5? No.
- c) Disturb and human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? No.
- d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? No.

Findings of Fact: N/A

Proposed Mitigation: N/A

Monitoring Proposed: N/A

Prepared By:  Date: 2/3/22

County Use Only

Received By: _____ Date: _____

PD-A# _____ Related Case# _____

APPENDIX B

Site Forms

(Deleted for Public Review; Bound Separately)

APPENDIX C

Archaeological Records Search Results

(Deleted for Public Review; Bound Separately)

APPENDIX D

NAHC Sacred Lands File Search Results

(Deleted for Public Review; Bound Separately)