

**CULTURAL RESOURCES STUDY REPORT
FOR THE
BEAUMONT MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN LINE 2, STAGE 1 PROJECT,
BEAUMONT, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

Prepared for:

**CITY OF BEAUMONT
Public Works Department
550 E. 6th Street
Beaumont, CA 92223**

Prepared by:

**CHAMBERS GROUP, INC.
9620 Chesapeake Drive, Suite 104
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 541-2800**

March 2025

This page intentionally left blank

NATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATABASE INFORMATION

Authors: Efrain S. Arroyo, MA, RPA; Richard D. Shultz, MA, RPA

Consulting Firm: Chambers Group, Inc.

Project Proponent: City of Beaumont

Report Date: March 2025

Report Title: Cultural Resources Survey for the Beaumont Master Drainage Plan Line 2, Stage 1 Project, Beaumont, Riverside County, California

Type of Study: Phase I Cultural Resources Study

New Resources Recorded: 0 resources

Previously Recorded Resources: 3 resources

USGS Quadrangles: *Beaumont*, California 7.5-minute quadrangle (2021)

Acreage: 12.55 acres

Permit Numbers: N/A

Keywords: Beaumont, Riverside County, California; Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Section 10, Section 11; San Bernardino Meridian; Beaumont 7.5-minute quadrangle; City of Beaumont; Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District; Cahuilla; Serrano; archaeological survey; cultural resources survey; negative survey; P-33-009498, CA-RIV-6381H; P-33-023484, CA-RIV-23484; P-33-028622; storm drain improvement plan

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Chambers Group, Inc. (Chambers Group) was contracted by EXP U.S. Services, Inc. (EXP), to complete a cultural resources study for the City of Beaumont's Master Drainage Plan (MDP) Line 2, Stage 1 Project (Project). The proposed Project includes the construction of approximately 5,000 linear feet of reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) within the existing right-of-way (ROW) 1) along 6th Street from Chestnut Avenue to Pennsylvania Avenue; 2) along Pennsylvania Avenue from East 6th Street to East 1st Street; and 3) along 1st Street from Pennsylvania Avenue to an existing earthen channel just east of Berkshire Avenue (Project site) in the City of Beaumont (City). This Phase I cultural resources survey and assessment was conducted in compliance with the applicable City policies, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

The purpose of this study was to gather and analyze information needed to assess the potential for effects to any historic properties within the Project site. This study included a cultural resources records search, literature review, and pedestrian field survey of the 12.55-acre Project site.

A records search of a half-mile radius study area centered on the Project site (study area) was conducted prior to the field survey. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) search identified no sacred sites within the Project site. The California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) records search identified four previous cultural resource studies and three previously recorded cultural resources within the Project site; however, no impacts to these resources are expected. Background research yielded no findings of cultural or archaeological significance.

Chambers Group conducted a pedestrian field survey of the entire Project site, on February 20, 2025. The Project site was surveyed by cultural resources principal investigator Efrain Arroyo, MA, RPA (Secretary of the Interior [SOI]-qualified archaeologist), and cultural resources specialist Kellie Kandybowicz, BA. Visual inspection of the surface revealed no evidence of cultural resources within the Project site.

Based on the results of the records search review, background research, and field survey, this study did not identify any historical resources, as defined per CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a), within the Proposed Project site. As such, no impacts to historical resources are expected. Considering the results of this study, Chambers Group also recommends a finding of *no adverse effect to historic properties* under Section 106 of NHPA, as no such historic properties, as defined under Section 106 of NHPA, were identified within the Project site. However, to ensure less than significant impacts to inadvertent findings of cultural resources during construction, Chambers Group recommends that a Qualified Archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior (SOI) Standards, shall be retained for the duration of the Project. Upon request and approval by the City, the Qualified Archaeologist shall also oversee the development and implementation of a Cultural Resources Mitigation Plan (CRMP), that further outlines protocols and procedures for monitoring, and mitigation or treatment protocols and procedures to appropriately manage inadvertent discovery of any potential cultural resources during the Project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATABASE INFORMATION.....	II
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	III
SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION 2.0 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION	2
2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
2.2 PROJECT LOCATION	2
2.3 AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS.....	2
SECTION 3.0 – REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	3
3.1 NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1996.....	3
3.1.1 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act	3
3.1.2 National Register of Historic Places	3
3.1.3 Traditional Cultural Properties.....	4
3.1.4 Protected Religious Practice	4
3.2 CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORIC RESOURCES.....	5
3.2.1 Assembly Bill 52	8
3.3 LOCAL.....	8
SECTION 4.0 – SETTING	10
4.1 PREHISTORY	10
4.2 ETHNOHISTORY.....	11
4.2.1 Cahuilla.....	11
4.2.2 Serrano.....	12
4.3 HISTORY	13
4.4 GEOLOGY	14
4.4.1 Geologic Units	14
4.4.2 Soils	15
SECTION 5.0 – METHODS.....	16
5.1 ARCHIVAL RESEARCH	16
5.2 FIELD SURVEY.....	16
5.3 PERSONNEL.....	17
SECTION 6.0 – RESULTS	18
6.1 PREVIOUS CULTURAL RESOURCES STUDIES WITHIN STUDY AREA	18
6.2 PREVIOUSLY RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN STUDY AREA.....	23
6.3 ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND RESEARCH	29
6.3.1 Built Environment	29
6.4 NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION AND AB 52 CONSULTATION.....	30
6.5 FIELD SURVEY RESULTS.....	31

SECTION 7.0 – RECOMMENDATIONS.....32

SECTION 8.0 – FIGURES AND PHOTOGRAPHS 34

SECTION 9.0 – REFERENCES 39

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A (CONFIDENTIAL) NAHC SLF Search Results and AB 52 Consultation

APPENDIX B (CONFIDENTIAL) CHRIS Records Search Results

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: USDA Soil Types within the Project Site	15
Table 2: Studies within a Half-Mile Radius.....	18
Table 3: Resources within a Half-Mile Radius	23

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Project Location and Vicinity Map.....	34
Figure 2: Area of Potential Effects Map.....	35

LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

Photograph 1: Undeveloped, disturbed parcel west of Pennsylvania Avenue. View to the northeast.....	36
Photograph 2: Undeveloped, disturbed parcel east of Pennsylvania Avenue. View to the northeast.....	36
Photograph 3: P-33-009498/CA-RIV-6381H, rail lines. View to the west.	37
Photograph 4: P-33-023484/CA-RIV-23484, SCE Memphis 12kV Distribution Line. View to the east.....	37
Photograph 5: P-33-028622, Stewart Sunnyslope Cemetery. View to the south from Project site.	38
Photograph 6: Pennsylvania Avenue, south of Interstate 10. View to the south.	38

SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

Chambers Group was contracted by EXP, to complete a cultural resources records search, literature review, and pedestrian field survey in support of the Beaumont MDP Line 2, Stage 1 Project. The Project requires Section 404 permits from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) and is subject to Section 106 of the NHPA.

The purpose of this cultural resource study was to assess the potential for significant cultural resources within the Project site and determine if the Project has the potential to affect any historic properties. The following study and evaluation were conducted in accordance with the applicable City policies, CEQA, and Section 106 of the NHPA. All identified cultural resources were previously evaluated for eligibility on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

This report outlines the findings of this cultural resources study and includes recommended mitigation measures to ensure less than significant impacts to inadvertent findings of cultural resources during construction.

SECTION 2.0 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Beaumont (City) proposes the construction of approximately 5,000 linear feet of RCP within the existing ROW along 6th Street from Chestnut Avenue to Pennsylvania Avenue; along Pennsylvania Avenue from East 6th Street to East 1st Street; and along 1st Street from Pennsylvania Avenue to an existing earthen channel just east of Berkshire Avenue (Project) in the City of Beaumont. The proposed pipe would begin at East 6th Street and Chestnut Avenue and terminate at East 1st Street and Berkshire Avenue where it would discharge to the existing earthen channel immediately east of Berkshire Avenue. A headwall would be constructed into the Berkshire Channel to accommodate the larger pipe diameter. The installation of drainage systems is required to safely convey storm runoff with minimal interruption to public services. Particularly, the installation of a channel would eliminate flood concerns for properties between East 1st Street and Interstate 10 (I-10) and future development projects in the area.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site is located in the City of Beaumont, in western Riverside County, California. The proposed Project is in Township 3 South, Range 1 West, Sections 10 and 11 of the San Bernardino Base and Meridian, and depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) *Beaumont*, California 7.5-minute quadrangle (2021) (Figure 1). The Project is sited along East 6th Street from Chestnut Avenue to Pennsylvania Avenue (approximately 420 meters [1378 feet]), proceeding along Pennsylvania Avenue from East 6th Street to East 1st Street (approximately 420 meters [1378 feet]), then along East 1st Street from Pennsylvania Avenue to an existing earthen channel just east of Berkshire Avenue (264 meters [866 feet]). Project elevation ranges between 2,610 and 2,560 feet above mean sea level (AMSL).

Land uses around the proposed Project consist of developed and undeveloped parcels and open spaces. East 6th Street is lined with commercial development. Pennsylvania Avenue features commercial and open spaces, with I-10 and the Union Pacific Railroad on the north end. East 1st Street consists of open spaces, commercial properties, and single-family residences.

2.3 AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) encompasses the Project site and Limits of Disturbance (LOD) boundaries as delineated by the City and depicted in Figure 2, ranging from approximately 24 to 34 meters (80 to 110 feet) in width throughout the entire proposed new alignment, expanding to approximately 139 meters (455 feet) at the two open parcels planned for laydown and storage yards just north of the I-10.

SECTION 3.0 – REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

3.1 NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1996

Enacted in 1966, the NHPA (54 United States Code [U.S.C.] 300101 et seq. [formerly 16 U.S.C. §§ 470 et seq.]) declared a national policy of historic preservation and instituted a multifaceted program, administered by the Secretary of the Interior, to encourage the achievement of preservation goals at the federal, state, and local levels. The NHPA authorized the expansion and maintenance of the NRHP, established the position of State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), provided for the designation of State Review Boards, set up a mechanism to certify local governments to carry out the purposes of the NHPA, assist Native American tribes in preserving their cultural heritage, and created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).

NHPA establishes the nation's policy for historic preservation and sets in place a program for the preservation of historic properties by requiring federal agencies to consider effects to significant cultural resources (i.e., historic properties) prior to undertakings.

3.1.1 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

Section 106 of the NHPA states that federal agencies with direct or indirect jurisdiction over federally funded, assisted, or licensed undertakings must take into account the effect of the undertaking on any historic property that is included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP and that the ACHP and SHPO must be afforded an opportunity to comment, through a process outlined in the ACHP regulations at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800, on such undertakings.

3.1.2 National Register of Historic Places

The NRHP was established by the NHPA of 1966 as “an authoritative guide to be used by federal, state, and local governments, private groups, and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.” The NRHP recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels. To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. A property is eligible for the NRHP if it is significant under one or more of the following criteria:

Criterion A: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

Criterion B: It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past.

Criterion C: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represents the work of a master; possesses high artistic values; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

Criterion D: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to the four National Register Criteria noted above, qualifying resources must retain aspects of integrity. Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. “The evaluation of integrity is

sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance" (NPS 1997:44). The National Park Service Bulletin 15 (NPS 1997) identifies seven aspects of integrity that a property should retain, and include: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling, and Association. While maintenance of all aspects of integrity is not required, a property should possess most of the aspects that are integral to its ability to convey its significance. Understandably, not all aspects of integrity are applicable across the range of buildings, structure, objects, or sites under evaluation. Aspects such as design, workmanship or feeling likely may not be integral to understanding the significance of an archaeological deposit, whereas these would be essential in understanding a significant building, or structure.

Cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historic figures; properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes; structures that have been moved from their original locations; reconstructed historic buildings; and properties that are primarily commemorative in nature are not considered eligible for the NRHP unless they satisfy certain conditions. In general, a resource must be at least 50 years of age to be considered for the NRHP, unless it satisfies a standard of exceptional importance.

3.1.3 Traditional Cultural Properties

Section 101(d)(6)(A) of the NHPA, as amended (1992), provides for properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to be determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. National Register Bulletin 38 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties* (Parker and King 1998) provides guidance on identifying, evaluating, and documenting ethnographic and other cultural resources that may qualify for listing on the National Register as a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP). In order for a resource to be eligible for consideration as a TCP it must meet the age criterion for listing and be "...eligible for inclusion in the National Register because of its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community's history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community" (Parker and King 1998:1).

3.1.4 Protected Religious Practice

Some resources may not meet the criteria for consideration as a TCP but are considered sacred by Native American traditional practitioners.

Executive Order 13007

Executive Order (EO) 13007 defines a sacred site as "...any specific, discrete, narrowly delineated location on Federal land that is identified by an Indian tribe, or Indian individual determined to be an appropriately authoritative representative of an Indian religion, as sacred by virtue of its established religious significance to, or ceremonial use by, an Indian religion." EO 13007 directs Federal agencies, to the extent practicable, permitted by law, and not clearly inconsistent with essential agency functions, to accommodate access to and ceremonial use of such sites, and to avoid adversely affecting their physical integrity.

American Indian Religious Freedom Act

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) of 1978 states that it is the policy of the United States to protect and preserve for Native Americans the inherent right to believe, express, and exercise their traditional religions, including but not limited to access to religious sites, use and possession of sacred

objects, and freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rites. The courts have determined that there is a compliance element implied within AIRFA that requires federal agencies to obtain the views of tribal leaders and to consider these when a proposed land use might conflict with traditional religious beliefs or practices.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990 sets provisions for the intentional removal and inadvertent discovery of human remains and other cultural items from federal and tribal lands. It clarifies the ownership of human remains and sets forth a process for repatriation of human remains and associated funerary objects and sacred religious objects to the Native American groups claiming to be lineal descendants or culturally affiliated with the remains or objects. It requires any federally funded institution housing Native American remains or artifacts to compile an inventory of all cultural items within the museum or with its agency and to provide a summary to any Native American tribe claiming affiliation.

3.2 CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Under the provisions of CEQA, including CEQA Statutes (Public Resources Code [PRC] §§ 21083.2 and 21084.1), CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR], § 15064.5), and PRC § 5024.1 (Title 14 CCR § 4850 et seq.), properties expected to be directly or indirectly affected by a proposed project must be evaluated for eligibility for listing in the CRHR; PRC § 5024.1).

The purpose of the CRHR is to maintain listings of the state's historical resources and to indicate which properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from material impairment and substantial adverse change. The term *historical resources* include resources listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR; resources included in a local register of historical resources; and any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (CCR § 15064.5[a]). The criteria for listing properties in the CRHR were expressly developed in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP. The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP 1995:2) regards "any physical evidence of human activities over 45 years old" as meriting recordation and evaluation.

According to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a), 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.
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k) or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g), 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 that 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 including the following:

- (1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
 - (2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - (3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values;
or
 - (4) 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, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to PRC Section 5020.1(k)), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in PRC Section 5024.1(g)) 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 Guidelines §15064.5(b), 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 on the environment. CEQA Guidelines define 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 PRC Section 5020.1(k) or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g), 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 Guidelines applies to effects on 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 an historical resource, it shall refer to the provisions of PRC Section 21084.1 and Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, and the limits contained in PRC Section 21083.2 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 PRC Section 21083.2, 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-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 an historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. It shall be sufficient that both the resource and the effect on 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) & (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 Native American Heritage Commission as provided in PRC Section 5097.98. 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 Native American heritage Commission. 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 California Coastal Act
- (e) In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps should be taken:
 - (1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:
 - (A) The coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and
 - (B) If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American:
 1. The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.

2. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.
 3. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code section 5097.98, or
- (2) Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.
- (A) The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.
- (B) The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation; or
- (C) The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

3.2.1 Assembly Bill 52

California Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) was enacted in 2014 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014), requiring analysis of potential impacts to tribal cultural resources (TCR) (PRC § 21074), and establishing a formal consultation process for California tribes within the CEQA process (PRC §§ 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2). The bill specifies that any project may affect or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR would require a lead agency to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditional and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” PRC § 21074(a)(1)(A) and (B) define TCRs as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” which meet either of the following criteria:

- Listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC § 5020.1(k).
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC § 5024.1 (in applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe).

3.3 LOCAL

In addition to State regulations, projects built in the City of Beaumont are also subject to the following goals and policies outlined in the City of Beaumont General Plan Update (2020), Chapter 8: Conservation + Open Space. Specifically, Chapter 8 of the General Plan outlines several policies relating to archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources driven by Goal 8.11.

Goal 8.11: A City where archaeological, cultural resources, tribal cultural resources, and historical places are identified, recognized, and preserved.

Policies:

- 8.11.1 Avoid or when avoidance is not feasible, minimize impacts to sites with significant archaeological, paleontological, cultural and tribal cultural resources, to the extent feasible
- 8.11.2 Comply with notification of California Native American tribes and organizations of proposed projects that have the potential to adversely impact cultural resources, per the requirements of AB52 and SB18.
- 8.11.3 Encourage the preservation of historic (i.e., non-archaeological) resources, when practical. When it is not practical to preserve a historic resource in its entirety, require the architectural details and design elements of historic structures to be preserved during renovations and remodels as much as feasible.
- 8.11.4 Require that any human remains discovered during implementation of public and private projects within the City be treated with respect and dignity and fully comply with the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, California Public Resources Code Amended Statutes 1982 Chapter 1492, California Public Resources Code Statutes 2006, Chapter 863, Section 1, CA Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 , Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, Public Resources Code Section 5097.94, SB 447 (Chapter 404, Statutes of 1987) and other appropriate laws.
- 8.11.6 Consider the establishment of an arts and culture district that encourages venues for the arts and entertainment, protects historical buildings and cultural resources, and enhances the City image.

SECTION 4.0 – SETTING

4.1 PREHISTORY

It is generally agreed that human occupation of southern California began at least 10,000 years before present (BP). The archaeological record indicates that between approximately 10,000- and 6,000 years BP, a predominantly hunting and gathering economy existed, characterized by archaeological sites containing numerous projectile points and the remains of butchered large animals. The most heavily exploited species were likely those species still alive today. Bones of extinct species have been found in the region but, unlike other regions of the continent, are not definitively associated with cultural artifacts in California. Although small animal bones and plant grinding tools are rarely found within archaeological sites of this period, small game and vegetal foods were likely exploited on a widespread basis. A lack of intact stratified cultural deposits from this period suggests small groups practiced high residential mobility during this period (Wallace 1978).

The three major periods of prehistory for the greater Los Angeles Basin region have been refined by research using radiocarbon dates from archaeological sites in coastal southern California (Koerper and Drover 1983; Mason and Peterson 1994):

- Millingstone Period (6,000–1,000 BC, or about 8,000 to 3,000 years ago)
- Intermediate Period (1,000 BC–AD 650, or 3,000 to 1,350 years ago)
- Late Prehistoric Period (AD 650–about AD 1800, or 1,350 to 200 years ago)

Around 6,000 years BP, a shift in focus from hunting toward a greater reliance on vegetal resources occurred. Archaeological evidence of this trend consists of a much greater number of milling tools (e.g., metates and manos) for processing seeds and other vegetable matter (Wallace 1978). This period, known to archaeologists as the Millingstone Period, was characterized by small, mobile groups that likely relied on a seasonal round of settlements that included both inland and coastal residential bases. Seeds from sage and grasses provided calories and carbohydrates. Faunal remains from sites dating to this period indicate animals similar to the preceding period were hunted. Inland Millingstone sites are characterized by numerous manos, metates, and hammerstones. Shell middens are common at coastal Millingstone sites. Coarse-grained lithic materials, such as quartzite and rhyolite, are more common than fine-grained materials in flaked stone tools from this time. Projectile points are found in archaeological sites from this period, but they are far fewer in number than from sites dating to before 6,000 years BP. An increase in the size of groups and the stability of settlements is indicated by deep, extensive middens at some sites from this period (Wallace 1978).

In sites post-dating roughly 3,000 years BP, archaeological evidence indicates reliance on both plant gathering and hunting continued and was more specialized and locally adapted to particular environments. Mortars and pestles were added to metates and manos for grinding seeds and other vegetable material. Chipped-stone tools became more refined and specialized, and bone tools were more common. During this period, new peoples from the Great Basin began entering southern California. These travelers, who spoke an Uto-Aztecan language, seem to have displaced or absorbed the earlier population of Hokan-speaking peoples. The exact time of their entry into the region is not known; however, they were present in southern California during the final phase of prehistory. During this period, population densities were higher than before; and settlement became concentrated in villages and communities along the coast and interior valleys (Erlandson 1994; McCawley 1996). During the Intermediate Period, mortars and pestles appeared, indicating the beginning of acorn exploitation. Use of the acorn—a high-

calorie, storable food source—probably allowed greater sedentism and facilitated an increased level of social organization. Large projectile points from archaeological sites of this period indicate that the bow and arrow, a hallmark of the Late Prehistoric Period, had not yet been introduced; and hunting was likely accomplished using the *atlatl* (spear thrower) instead. Settlement patterns during this time are not well understood. The semi-sedentary settlement pattern characteristic of the Late Prehistoric Period may have begun during the Intermediate Period, although territoriality may not yet have developed partially because of lower population densities. Regional subcultures also started to develop, each with its own geographical territory and language or dialect (Kroeber 1925; McCawley 1996; Moratto 1984). These were most likely the basis for the groups encountered by the first Europeans during the eighteenth century (Wallace 1978). Despite the regional differences, many material culture traits were shared among groups, indicating a great deal of interaction (Erlandson 1994). The Late Prehistoric Period is better understood than earlier periods largely through ethnographic analogy made possible by ethnographic and anthropological research of the descendants of these groups in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

4.2 ETHNOHISTORY

The Project site is located within the northwestern ethnographic territory of the Cahuilla, immediately south of the southern margin of ethnographic territory of the Serrano, where overlaps between the two use areas are noted (Kroeber 1925; Bean 1972, 1978). The Project site is located approximately 12.5 miles (20 kilometers) northwest of the historically mapped boundary between the two groups (Bean 1978; Bean and Smith 1978); however, these boundaries are generally considered quite fluid and are not mapped with great certainty.

4.2.1 Cahuilla

The Cahuilla, along with the Luiseño and the Gabrielino, are one of the most southwesterly of the Shoshonean or Uto-Aztecan speakers. They are members of the Takic branch of this large language family. Traditional Cahuilla territory originally included western and part of central Riverside County and extended into northeastern San Diego and northwestern Imperial counties. The western boundary generally followed the Santa Ana, Elsinore, and Palomar mountains. The northern boundary extended north of Riverside to the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains. Cahuilla territory extended east to include the Coachella Valley and down the valley as far south as the approximate middle of the Salton Sea. The approximate southern territorial limits included Borrego Springs and the south end of the Santa Rosa Mountains. The Cahuilla territory consisted of the Mountain, the Pass or Western, and the Desert divisions (Bean 1978; Hooper 1920:316; Strong 1929).

According to Kroeber (1925), Cahuilla society consisted of two ceremonial divisions or moieties: wildcat and coyote. People were further divided into somewhat localized, patrilineal clans. Each clan had a chief: *net* in Cahuilla (Kroeber 1925). Some villages contained people of only one clan, but other villages had more than one clan. Also, people of one clan might live in more than one village. Chiefs were usually chosen by heredity. The chief typically was a religious leader of the larger social group, from which the chief drew certain wealth. A chief ordered ceremonies, but it was his assistant, the *paha'*, who executed them. Choice hunting and gathering areas were owned by the clan. The clan chief also settled intraclan disputes and met with other *nets* to solve interclan problems and organize ceremonies among clans.

The Cahuilla sustained themselves through hunting, gathering, and fishing. Major villages were fully occupied during the winter, but—during other seasons—task groups made periodic forays to collect

various plant foods, with larger groupings from several villages organizing for the annual acorn harvest (Bean and Saubel 1972). Bean and Saubel (1972) have recorded the use of several hundred species of plants used for food, building/artifact materials, and medicines. The major plant foods included acorns, pinyon nuts, and various seed-producing legumes. Agave, wild fruits and berries, tubers, cactus bulbs, roots and greens, and seeds complemented these.

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

Cahuilla material culture included dome-shaped to rectangular-type houses; aboveground granaries; baskets, pottery, and grinding implements; throwing sticks, clubs, nets, traps, dead falls with seed triggers, spring-poled snares, arrows, and self-backed and sinew-backed bows. They sometimes fired bush clumps to drive game out in the open and flares to attract birds at night. Baskets of various kinds were used for winnowing, leaching, grinding, transporting, parching, storing, and cooking. Pottery vessels were used for carrying water, storage, cooking, and serving food and drink. Cahuilla tools included mortars and pestles; manos and metates; fire drills; awls; arrow-straighteners; flint knives; wood, horn, and bone spoons and stirrers; scrapers; and hammerstones. Woven rabbit-skin blankets served to keep people warm in cold weather. Feathered costumes were worn for ceremonial events; and at these events the Cahuilla made music using rattles derived from insect cocoons, turtle and tortoise shells, and deer hoofs, along with wood rasps, bone whistles, bull-roarers, and flutes, to make music. They wove bags, storage pouches, cords, and nets from the fibers of yucca, agave, and other plants (Drucker 1937; Bean 1972, 1978).

4.2.2 Serrano

The Serrano language is classified as being within the Takic language family (Bean and Smith 1978). The Serrano traditional territory generally extended along the San Bernardino Mountains, from Antelope Valley in the west, to as far east as present-day Twentynine Palms; as far south as the Yucaipa Valley, and as far north across the Mojave Desert as Fort Irwin (Bean and Smith 1978). Traditionally, the Serrano organized into moieties made up of exogamous, patrilineal clans (Bean and Smith 1978). Lineage and clan leaders were hereditary ceremonial leaders who held responsibility for sacred bundles and directed the ceremonial life of the clan (Bean and Smith 1978; SMBMI 2024).

Estimates of the number of Serrano living in each village have not been well documented; however, the villages likely held only as many Serrano as could be accommodated by water sources (Stickel and Weinman-Roberts 1980). The villages of Guapiabit and “Amutskupiabit” (Muscupiabit), among others, were visited by Spanish expeditionaries, such as Father Garcés in 1776, and members of the Zalvidea and Palomares expeditions in 1806 and 1808 respectively. Garcés suggested an estimated 80 people were at Guapiabit, while Zalvidea indicated 46 at the time of his visit. Zalvidea also estimated that 17 to 20 people were residing at Muscupiabit during the same expedition (Sutton and Earle 2017).

Traditionally, Serrano dwellings were circular, domed structures built over an excavated area. These structures were built with fire pits and primarily served as sleeping areas. Ceremonial houses were the only other buildings in the villages and were normally occupied by the village’s ceremonial leader (Stickel and Weinman-Roberts 1980).

The Serrano artifact assemblage is noted to be similar to that of the neighboring Cahuilla and includes musical instruments such as rattles and flutes, utensils, and ornaments such as fire drills, mortars, metates, pipes, beads, awls, and projectile points made from wood, shell, bone, and stone. The Serrano were talented pottery and basket makers. Their pots were made of coiled clay smoothed out with a paddle and set in the sun to dry before being fired in a pit. Serrano Brown ware was sometimes decorated with designs of circles and lines of either red or black (Stickel and Weinman-Roberts 1980).

The Serrano are also known to have created petroglyphs, which include abstract and geometric designs that are often seen with representational figures of sheep, lizards (zoomorphs), and human beings (anthropomorphs). Researchers have proposed that the petroglyphs were records of important events, rough maps, and artistic representations of native life (Stickel and Weinman-Roberts 1980).

After years of violent and force relocations, the Yuhaaviatam clan was resettled on the San Manuel Reservation, which was established under the Mission Relief Act in 1891, and the clan became known as the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. While the Tribe was ostensibly a self-determining nation, federal government agencies continued to dictate policies that strongly constricted the Tribe's way of life until the mid-1970s. With the establishment of gaming, San Manuel brought about a more secure economy and enabled the Tribe to rebuild its governance capacity (SMBMI 2024). Additionally, resulting funds have allowed San Manuel to better preserve its cultural heritage, and care for its properties under the aegis of the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer.

4.3 HISTORY

The first significant European settlement of California began during the Spanish Period (1769 to 1821) when 21 missions and four presidios were established between San Diego and Sonoma. Although located primarily along the coastal margin, the missions dominated economic and political life over the greater California region. The purpose of the missions was primarily for political control and forced assimilation into Spanish society and conversion of the Native American population to Catholicism, along with economic support to the presidios (Castillo 1978).

The Mexican Period (1821–1848) began with the success of the Mexican Revolution in 1821, but changes to the mission system were slow to follow. When the secularization of the missions occurred in the 1830s, their vast land holdings in California were divided into large land grants called ranchos. The Mexican government granted ranchos throughout California to Spanish and Hispanic soldiers and settlers (Castillo 1978; Cleland 1941). Even after the decree of secularization was issued in 1833 by the Mexican Congress, missionaries continued to operate a small diocesan church. In 1834, the San Gabriel Mission, including over 16,000 cattle, was turned over to the civil administrator (Hoover et al. 1990:150–177).

In 1848, The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ended the Mexican-American War and marked the beginning of the American Period (1848 to present). The discovery of gold that same year sparked the 1849 California Gold Rush, bringing thousands of miners and other new immigrants to California from various parts of the United States as well as the rest of the world, most of whom settled in the northern gold fields. For those settlers who chose to come to southern California, much of their economic prosperity was fueled by cattle ranching rather than by gold. This prosperity, however, came to a halt in the 1860s as a result of severe floods and droughts as well as legal disputes over land boundaries and property ownership, which put many rancho owners into bankruptcy (Castillo 1978; Cleland 1941).

The Project site is located approximately 5.75 miles northeast of Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero, and 8 miles southeast of a portion of Rancho San Bernardino. Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero was a 48,861-acre Mexican land grant given in 1846 by Governor Pío Pico to Miguel Pedorena. Rancho San Bernardino was a 35,509-acre Mexican land grant given in 1842 by Governor Juan B. Alvarado to José del Carmen Lugo, José María Lugo, Vicente Lugo, and Diego Sepulveda. Following the Mexican-American War, the Lugos and Sepulveda applied to have the grant confirmed by the Public Lands Commission in 1852; the property, however, was previously sold to members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1851 becoming the land surrounding the settlement of San Bernardino. The grant to the Lugos and Sepulveda was eventually confirmed and patented in 1865. Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero was part of the earliest configuration of San Diego County and was later made part of the County of Riverside when portions of both San Diego and San Bernardino counties were apportioned by the California Legislature in 1893 to form the new Riverside County.

City of Beaumont

The origin of the City of Beaumont has been reported by Gunther (1984), who describes that it began modestly in 1866 as a mail stop called “Summit Station,” the highest point on the passenger stage route through San Gorgonio Pass. The Summit Station mail stop became a railroad telegraph office for the Southern Pacific Company in 1876. The telegraph office name was changed to “San Gorgonio” in 1884 to coincide with the newly named town site that was established by George C. Egan in 1884. The Southern California Investment Company purchased Egan’s town site in 1886 and headed by H.C. Sigler from Beaumont, Texas, renamed the station “Beaumont” (“beautiful mountain” in French). The Beaumont town site was officially surveyed in 1886 by John Goldworthy and filed in San Bernardino County on March 15, 1887. When the County of Riverside was established in 1893, Beaumont was included within the Riverside County boundaries and, therefore, records before 1893 would be in the San Bernardino County Archives and records following 1893 would be in the Riverside County Archives. The City of Beaumont was later incorporated on November 18, 1912.

4.4 GEOLOGY

4.4.1 Geologic Units

The proposed Project is located in the City of Beaumont, within western Riverside County, as depicted on the USGS *Beaumont* 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle. The Beaumont quadrangle includes the southern margin of the Transverse Range, the northern margin of the San Jacinto Mountains, and the conjoining San Gorgonio Pass valley between the two mountainous segments. The San Gorgonio Pass links the San Gabriel Valley in the west with the Coachella Valley in the east. The San Gorgonio Pass is transected by the Banning Fault, a parallel branch of the San Andreas Fault.

Regionally, the Beaumont area is situated at the convergence of four geomorphic provinces: the Peninsular Range Geomorphic Province, including Palm Springs and Palm Desert to the south; the Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Province, which includes the San Bernardino Mountains, and its descent to the San Gorgonio Pass, to the north, along with the Little San Bernardino Mountains to the northeast; the Mojave Desert Geomorphic Province to the northeast; and the Colorado Desert Geomorphic Province, coinciding with the general extent of the Coachella Valley, from the Whitewater River to the Salton Sea. Thick sequences of Quaternary-age alluvial deposits are widespread in the San Gorgonio Pass.

Along the Transverse Ranges, sequences of Quaternary-age alluvial deposits are exposed along the southern margin of the San Bernardino and Little San Bernardino Mountains, where drainages and attendant alluvial fans issue from Cherry Canyon, Millard Canyon, Banning Canyon, as well as from other smaller catchments. The moderately sloping Pleistocene and Early Holocene fan deposits have been uplifted on the upper plate of the San Geronio Pass Fault Zone, forming terrace landforms, such as the Banning Bench. Late Holocene-age alluvial fans and washes exhibit bar and swale features indicative of more recent activity. Historic-Period flood and debris flows occur locally, as indicated by unvarnished boulder fields, and boulder-lined levees located near the fan apices. The various branches of the San Andreas Fault have created a complex series of active strike slip and reverse faults that have disrupted the continuity of these alluvial deposits (Lancaster et al. 2012).

The proposed Project is underlain by late Pleistocene period alluvial deposits. The predominate formations are Quaternary-era San Geronio Pass alluvial fan deposits (Qf) composed of sand and gravel of plutonic and gneissic detritus derived from the dissected lower southern margins of San Bernardino mountains to the north. Immediately south, and intersecting with Qf sediments, are dissected, crudely bedded, light reddish sand and gravel alluvial fan deposits (Qoa), which are derived from metamorphic sedimentary (San Timoteo Formation) and plutonic intrusions (e.g., quartz monzonite) to the south (Dibblee and Minch 2003).

4.4.2 Soils

A tightly buffered Area of Interest (AOI) review of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Web Soil Survey of the Project site resulted in the identification of three soil types (Table 1). These AOI surface sediments are indicative of sandy loam soils derived from exposed and underlying granitic bedrock, metasedimentary/metamorphic structures, and igneous intrusions. The greater soil development is represented by Ramona sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, at 73.9 percent of the Project site, and Ramona sandy loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes, at 29.9 percent of the Project site, representative of granitic-derived soils located within alluvial fans and terraces. Terrace escarpments, at 5.2 percent of the Project site, are representative of soils derived from unspecified lithic and sediment sources (USDA 2025).

Table 1: USDA Soil Types within the Project Site

Soil Type	Parent Material	% Project Site
Ramona sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, eroded (RaB2)	Alluvium derived from granite	73.9
Ramona sandy loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes, severely eroded (RaC3)	Alluvium derived from granite	20.9
Terrace escarpments (TeG)	Alluvium derived from mixed sources	5.2

SECTION 5.0 – METHODS

5.1 ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

Chambers Group requested a records search from the CHRIS SCIC at California State University, San Diego, on December 20, 2024. A records search of a half-mile radius study area was requested to provide additional context to the Project site and surrounding vicinity and inform this review. Sources consulted in conjunction with the records search included the NRHP, CRHR, California State Historical Landmarks, California State Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Statewide Historic Bridge Inventory, CHRIS Inventory, ethnographic information, local inventories, and historical literature, maps, and aerial imagery. Results of the records search are detailed below and attached in Confidential Appendix B.

Chambers Group conducted additional background research to help identify potentially significant cultural and archaeological signatures on the landscape. This research involved reviewing the Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD), GLO survey plats, publicly available data sources, and historical aerial photographs.

In addition to the above research, Chambers Group submitted a request to the California NAHC for a SLF search, on December 20, 2024. This search will identify if any resources important to Native Americans have been recorded within the Project site and surrounding vicinity. The NAHC will provide the results and a list of affiliated tribal representatives to contact for additional information.

5.2 FIELD SURVEY

Chambers Group conducted a pedestrian field survey of the entire Project site. The pedestrian survey included a systematic surface inspection, adjusting the intensity of visual inspection based on ground surface visibility and probability of cultural resources. The cultural resources survey was conducted pursuant to the County of Riverside Planning Department Cultural Resources Investigation Standards and in accordance with the professional standards, as outlined in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (NPS 1983). The Project site was surveyed using transects spaced no greater than 15 meters apart. Transects were conducted along both margins of the existing road surfaces throughout the entire APE corridor, which ranged from 24 to 34 meters wide within the existing ROW. This survey corridor was constrained by existing development and approved access, which did not include private lands outside the ROW. Additionally, both proposed staging areas were surveyed using transects with a maximum spacing of 15 meters.

All undisturbed or exposed ground surfaces within the Project site were examined for prehistoric (precontact) artifacts (e.g., flaked lithic tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools, ceramics, and fire-affected rock [FAR]), ecofacts (bone), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a cultural midden, soil depressions, and features indicative of the former presence of structures and buildings (e.g., standing exterior walls, postholes, foundations) or historic-era artifacts (e.g., metal, glass, and ceramics). Existing ground disturbances (e.g., cutbanks, ditches, burrows, et cetera) were also visually inspected. Photographs of the Project site, including current conditions, previously recorded cultural resources, connector pipes, catch basins, and other inlets, were documented using a digital camera.

All field notes, photographs, and records pertaining to the current study are on file at the Chambers Group San Diego office.

5.3 PERSONNEL

Chambers Group Cultural Resources Department Lead Lucas Tutschulte provided task management support. Chambers Group cultural resources specialists Efrain Arroyo, MA, RPA (Secretary of the Interior [SOI]-qualified archaeologist), and Kellie Kandybowicz, BA, conducted the pedestrian field survey of the entire Project site. Efrain Arroyo also served as a principal investigator and primary author of this report. Richard Shultz, MA, RPA, Qualified Archaeologist per SOI and Riverside County qualifications, served as Principal Investigator support for cultural resources, co-authored this report, and provided oversight throughout this study.

SECTION 6.0 – RESULTS

6.1 PREVIOUS CULTURAL RESOURCES STUDIES WITHIN STUDY AREA

The results of the records search were received from the SCIC on February 11, 2025. Results of the records search are detailed below and attached in Confidential Appendix B. The records search results identified 27 previous cultural resource studies (reports) within a half-mile radius of the Project site (Table 2), with four of those studies within the Project site and one adjacent to it, all of which are bolded in the table below.

Table 2: Studies within a Half-Mile Radius

Report No.	Year	Author(s)	Report Title	Affiliation	Resources
RI-02203	1987	Drover, Christopher E.	An Archaeological Assessment of the Hovchild Property, Riverside County, California		
RI-02210	1986	Underwood, J., J. Cleland, C.M. Wood, and R. Apple	Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey Report for the US Telecom Fiber Optic Cable Project, From San Timoteo Canyon to Socorro, Texas: The California Segment	Dames and Moore	33-000053, 33-000159, 33-000893, 33-001634, 33-001767, 33-001768, 33-003075, 33-003076, 33-003077, 33-012818, 33-012819, 33-012820, 33-012821
RI-02917	1989	Davis, McMillan	Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Sewer System for the City of Beaumont California.	RECON	33-002385, 33-002386
RI-03002	1990	Drover, Christopher E.	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Seneca Springs Project, Riverside County, Beaumont, California		33-004038
RI-03997	1996	Shepard, Richard S. and Jeanette A. McKenna	A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of a 3-Acre Parcel and Associated Pipeline, Beaumont, Riverside County, California	McKenna et al./EIP Associates	33-007898
RI-05136	2003	Archer. Gavin H. and Marian L. Kearin	Cultural Resource Inventory and Paleontologic Assessment Hovchild Property, City of Beaumont, County of Riverside, California	The Keith Companies	

Table 2: Studies within a Half-Mile Radius

Report No.	Year	Author(s)	Report Title	Affiliation	Resources
RI-06256	2006	Ahmet, Koral and Evelyn Chandler	Cultural Resources Survey of a 29-Acre Parcel, Located West of Manzanita Road Near the City of Beaumont, Riverside County, California	ECORP Consulting, Inc.	
RI-07052	2006	McKenna et al.	A Cultural Resources Investigation, of the Proposed San Gorgonio Village, Project Area, Approximately 23 Acres, of Land in the City of Beaumont, Riverside County, California.	McKenna et al.	
RI-07288	2007	Mariam Dahdul, Daniel Ballester, and Laura H. Shaker	Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties Recycled Water System in and Near the Cities of Beaumont and Calimesa, Riverside County, California	CRM Tech	33-009498, 33-015720
RI-07364	2007	Crews, Rachel G. and Jay K. Sander	Archaeological and Paleontological Monitoring of a 29.7-Acre Project Area at the Northwest Corner of the First Street and Commerce Way Beaumont, Riverside County, California	Chambers Group, Inc.	
RI-08886	2012	Bai "Tom" Tang and Michael Hogan	Historical/ Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Beaumont Distribution Center Project, City of Beaumont, Riverside County	CRM Tech	

Table 2: Studies within a Half-Mile Radius

Report No.	Year	Author(s)	Report Title	Affiliation	Resources
RI-09167	2013	Roderic McLean, Natalie Brodie, Jacqueline Hall, Shannon Carmack, Phil Fulton, Ingri Quon, Erin Martinelli, Richard Erickson, and Jay Michalski	Cultural Resources Assessment and Class III Inventory Volume I West of Devers Project San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California.	LSA	33-000179, 33-001296, 33-002262, 33-003446, 33-003449, 33-004213, 33-006015, 33-006103, 33-006107, 33-006109, 33-006156, 33-006168, 33-006219, 33-007296, 33-007870, 33-008334, 33-008347, 33-009498, 33-011265, 33-012642, 33-012643, 33-013427, 33-013429, 33-013430, 33-013431, 33-013432, 33-013433, 33-014871, 33-015033, 33-015035, 33-015183, 33-015184, 33-015185, 33-015186, 33-015189, 33-015720, 33-015760, 33-015843, 33-015845, 33-015992, 33-016898, 33-016904, 33-016907, 33-016961, 33-016993, 33-018123, 33-018648, 33-019671, 33-020721
RI-09183	2014	Carrie D. Wills, Sarah A. Williams, and Kathleen A. Crawford	Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile West, LLC Candidate IE04451A (CM451 Beaumont Civic Center), 550 East 6th Street, Beaumont, Riverside County, California	Environment al Assessment Specialists, Inc.	
RI-09460	2015	Bai "Tom" Tang and Michael Hogan	Phase I Historical/Archaeological Resource Survey Seasons at Beaumont Project City of Beaumont Riverside, California	CRM Tech	

Table 2: Studies within a Half-Mile Radius

Report No.	Year	Author(s)	Report Title	Affiliation	Resources
RI-09669	2015	Carrie D. Wills, Sarah A. Williams, and Kathleen A. Crawford	Cultural Resource Records Search for Cellco Partnership and their Controlled Affiliates as Verizon Wireless Candidate 'Lotus', 40 Pennsylvania Avenue, Beaumont, Riverside County, California	HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.	
RI-09984	1998	Roger D. Mason and Wayne H. Bonner	Cultural Resources Records Search And Literature Review For A Pacific Bell Mobile Services Telecommunications Facility: CM 451-11 City Of Beaumont, Riverside County, California	Chambers Group, Inc.	
RI-10449	2018	Gabriel Ocampo	Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment RV90XSB14A / 9CAB012642A, E. 6th Street & Palm Avenue, Beaumont, Riverside County, California 92223, EBI Project Number: 6117007121, TCNS Number 165348	EBI Consulting	
RI-10461	2015	William T. Eckhardt, Matthew M. DeCarlo, Doug Mengers, Sherri Andrews, Don Laylander, and Tony Quach	Archaeological Investigations and Monitoring for the Construction of the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 Transmission Line Project, Riverside County, California	ASM Affiliates	33-018128, 33-020289, 33-020290, 33-020294, 33-020317, 33-020318, 33-020319, 33-020320, 33-020321, 33-020322, 33-020323, 33-020324, 33-020325, 33-020336, 33-020409, 33-020410, 33-020975, 33-020976, 33-020977, 33-020978, 33-020979, 33-021001, 33-021014, 33-022103, 33-022105, 33-023799
RI-10478	2018	Jeanette A. McKenna	A Phase I CEQA/Class III NEPA (NHPA Section 106) Investigation for the 6th/Maple Septic Conversion Project in the City of Beaumont, Riverside Co., California	McKenna et al.	33-028614

Table 2: Studies within a Half-Mile Radius

Report No.	Year	Author(s)	Report Title	Affiliation	Resources
RI-10617	2018	Sarah A. Williams, Carrie D. Wills, and Kathleen A. Crawford	Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile West, LLC IE04451A (CM451 Beaumont Civic Cent), 550 East Sixth Street, Beaumont, Riverside County, California	Environmental Assessment Specialists, Inc.	
RI-10960	2019	David Brunzell	Cultural Resources Assessment of the Beaumont Service Station Project, Beaumont, Riverside County, California	BCR Consulting, LLC	
RI-10998	2018	Bai Tang and Michael Hogan	Phase I Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey, Pennsylvania Avenue Widening Project, City of Beaumont, Riverside County, California	CRM Tech	
RI-10998	2021	Bai "Tom" Tang	Addendum to Phase I Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey: Pennsylvania Avenue Widening Project, City of Beaumont, Riverside County, California	CRM Tech	
RI-11024	2021	David Brunzell	Cultural Resources Assessment of the IE04451A Project, Beaumont, Riverside County, California (BCR Consulting Project No. ACE2112)	BCR Consulting, LLC	
RI-11188	2020	Dustin Merrick, Breana Campbell-King, and Christopher A. Duran	Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum for the 6th Street and Pennsylvania Gas Station and Convenience Store Project, City of Beaumont, Riverside County, California	Rincon Consultants, Inc.	

Table 2: Studies within a Half-Mile Radius

Report No.	Year	Author(s)	Report Title	Affiliation	Resources
RI-11322	2021	Ben Kerridge and Daniel Ballester	Paleontological Resources Assessment Report Pennsylvania Avenue Widening Project, City of Beaumont, Riverside County, California	CRM Tech	
RI-11342	2021	Ben Kerridge and Salvadore Boites	Phase I Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey: Second Street Improvement Project, City of Beaumont, Riverside County, California	CRM Tech	

Note: **Bold** text indicates studies within or adjacent to Project site

6.2 PREVIOUSLY RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN STUDY AREA

The records search results identified 53 previously recorded cultural resources within a half-mile radius of the Project site (Table 3), with three of those resources documented within the Project site (P-33-009498/CA-RIV-6381H, P-33-023484/CA-RIV-23484, P-33-028622). Resource P-33-009498/CA-RIV-6381H is a historical rail line, known as Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) (formerly the Southern Pacific Railroad [SPRR]), constructed in the 1870s. Resource P-33-023484/CA-RIV-23484 comprises historic-period wood-pole structures, part of the existing Southern California Edison (SCE), Memphis 12-Kilovolt (kV) Distribution Line. Resource P-33-028622 is a historic-period cemetery, known as the Stewart Sunnyslope Cemetery, constructed in the 1880s.

It should be noted that Confidential Figure 3 (Appendix B) does not depict all the cultural resources listed in Table 3. Figure 3 depicts a defined area (resource district) containing historic-period buildings, aggregated for visual clarity, while Table 3 lists all the historic-period buildings within that defined area.

Table 3: Resources within a Half-Mile Radius

Primary No.	Trinomial	Type	Age	Attribute Codes	Recorded By	Reports
P-33-001038	CA-RIV-001038	Site	Prehistoric	AP02; AP04; AP06	1953 (G.A. Smith, n/a); 1976 (Eastvold, n/a)	RI-00534
P-33-006094		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (G. Bronson, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	

Table 3: Resources within a Half-Mile Radius

Primary No.	Trinomial	Type	Age	Attribute Codes	Recorded By	Reports
P-33-006095		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (G. Bronson, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006096		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (G. Bronson, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006097		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (G. Bronson, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006098		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (G. Bronson, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006099		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (G. Bronson, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006100		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (G. Bronson, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006101		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (G. Bronson, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006102		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (G. Bronson, Riverside County Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006170		Building	Historic	HP03	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.); 1993 (Virginia A. Ross, San Geronimo Pass Historical Society)	
P-33-006171		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Jim Warner, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006172		Building	Historic	HP03	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006173		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Riv. Co. Historical Comm., Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006174		Building	Historic	HP03; HP41	1983 (Jim Warner, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	

Table 3: Resources within a Half-Mile Radius

Primary No.	Trinomial	Type	Age	Attribute Codes	Recorded By	Reports
P-33-006175		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006176		Building	Historic	HP16	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006177		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006178		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006179		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006180		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006183		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006186		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006187		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006188		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006189		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006190		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006191		Building	Historic	HP06	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006192		Building	Historic	HP16	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006193		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	

Table 3: Resources within a Half-Mile Radius

Primary No.	Trinomial	Type	Age	Attribute Codes	Recorded By	Reports
P-33-006194		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006195		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006197		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006198		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006199		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006200		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Jim Warner, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006201		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Jim Warner, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006202		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006203		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006204		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006212		Building	Historic	HP38	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006213		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006214		Building	Historic	HP06	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006215		Building	Historic	HP12; HP14; HP15	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.); 1999 (Judith Marvin, Foothill Resources, Ltd)	

Table 3: Resources within a Half-Mile Radius

Primary No.	Trinomial	Type	Age	Attribute Codes	Recorded By	Reports
P-33-006216		Building	Historic	HP06	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-006220		Building	Historic	HP02	1983 (Gwen Bronson, Riv. Co. Historical Comm.)	
P-33-009498	CA-RIV-006381	Structure	Historic	HP39	1966 (Ashkar, S., Jones & Stokes); 2003 (Carrie Chasteen, Myra L. Frank & Associates); 2005 (Taniguchi, Christeen, Galvin & Associates); 2009 (Wilson, S. and K. Chimel, ICF Jones & Stokes); 2012 (Scott Kremkau, SRI); 2015 (T. Baurley and J.M. Sanka, L&L Environmental, Inc.); 2016 (Daneil Leonard, HDR); 2017 (P. Moloney, R. Elder, W. Blodgett, Applied EarthWorks, Inc.)	RI-04427, RI-04430, RI-04771, RI-05452, RI-06258, RI-06259, RI-06583, RI-06615, RI-06707, RI-07288, RI-07586, RI-07770, RI-07802, RI-07970, RI-08012, RI-08374, RI-08491, RI-08538, RI-08581, RI-08844, RI-08861, RI-09151, RI-09167, RI-09734, RI-10040, RI-10374, RI-10435, RI-10652, RI-10798, RI-10806, RI-11171
P-33-020723	CA-RIV-010645	Site	Historic	AH07	2011 (Joshua Trampier, Statistical Research, Inc.)	
P-33-022386		Building	Historic	HP02	2013 (C. Morgan, LSA Associates, Inc)	

Table 3: Resources within a Half-Mile Radius

Primary No.	Trinomial	Type	Age	Attribute Codes	Recorded By	Reports
P-33-023484	CA-RIV-023484	Structure	Historic	HP11	2013 (LSA, LSA Associates, Inc.); 2014 (Audry Williams, Southern California Edison International)	RI-10157, RI-10435
P-33-023485		Building	Historic	HP02	2013 (LSA, LSA Associates, Inc.)	
P-33-023526		Building	Historic	HP03	2013 (LSA, LSA Associates, Inc.)	
P-33-028622		Building	Historic	HP40	2015 (K.A Crawford, Crawford Historic Services)	RI-10502

Note: **Bold** text indicates resources within the Project site

P-33-009498/CA-RIV-6381H

This resource, the UPRR and SPRR rail lines, was initially recorded by S. Ashkar and others of Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. in 1999, and subsequently updated in 2005 by C. Taniguchi, in 2009 by S. Wilson and K Chmiel, in 2012 by S. Kremkau, and in 2015 by A. Newcomb and J. Carvajal. The UPRR/SPRR rail lines were constructed in the 1870s and run from Los Angeles to Yuma, Arizona. The initial recording in 1999 consisted of the UPRR (historically the SPRR), which crosses California and includes the Southern Pacific, the Los Angeles and Salt Lake, the Pacific Electric, and the Los Angeles and San Pedro lines. In 2005, a 720-foot segment of the UPRR/SPRR in Coachella Valley was evaluated for NRHP eligibility and was recommended not eligible. In 2015, a 0.1-mile (0.1-kilometer, 528-foot) segment of the UPRR/SPRR was recorded in Whitewater and was determined, due to the general lack of integrity (from updates and changes to the rail line in the modern era), the segment would not contribute to the overall significance of the entire rail line should that property be determined eligible in the future.

P-33-023484/CA-RIV-23484

This resource, the Memphis 12 kV electrical distribution circuits, was initially recorded in 2013 by LSA Associates, Inc., and subsequently in 2014 by A. Williams of SCE International. The resource comprises historic-period wood-pole structures, part of the existing SCE electrical transmission and distribution lines. The initial recording in 2013 inventoried a telecommunications line segment in Redlands with approximately 22 structures dating from 1929 to 1967. In 2014, the Memphis 12kV electrical distribution circuit running through San Timoteo Canyon, Redlands, constructed in 1970, was evaluated and recommended ineligible for the NRHP/CRHR due to a lack of historical integrity of materials and its common and indistinctive nature as a functional and utilitarian wood-pole line.

P-33-028622

This resource, the Stewart Sunnyslope Cemetery, was recorded in 2015 by K.A. Crawford of Crawford Historic Services. The 13-acre cemetery, located in Beaumont, features a storage and utility area with a residential structure now used a garage facility, associated storage structures, arch structure with the cemetery name, and a large niche area. The Stewart family, one of the original non-native families to settle in Beaumont, created a family cemetery in the 1880s. The original six acres of land were donated to the city of Beaumont in 1888 for use as a cemetery for Beaumont residents. The Beaumont Public Cemetery District was formed in 1921 with Sunnyslope Cemetery as part of the district. The cemetery is currently part of the Summit Cemetery District, which was formed from several local cemetery districts in 1996. The resource and associated buildings were evaluated and recommended not eligible for the NRHP/CRHR as they did not meet any of the criteria for historical or architectural significance.

6.3 ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The GLO survey plats from 1857 and 1867 illustrate a ravine in the southeastern portion of Section 10 and the southwestern portion of Section 11. The 1880 survey plat depicts the SPRR crossing from Section 9 into Section 10. However, the 1897 survey plat does not illustrate any features within the half-mile radius study area. Aerial photographs from 1940 to 1972 reveal increased development within the Project site. Of particular note, aerial photographs from 1940 and 1953 indicate the presence of now-absent historic-period structures within the two open parcels of the Project site (NETR 2025; UCSB 2025).

6.3.1 Built Environment

Chambers Group reviewed properties listed on the BERD, General Land Office (GLO) survey plats, and historical aerial photographs. A search of the Riverside County BERD revealed no recorded built environment resources within the Project site, although properties were identified within the half-mile study area. A review of historical aerial photographs covering the Project site revealed historic-period structures within the open parcels that are no longer extant. The 1940 aerial photograph indicates the presence of a building in the northeast corner of the western open parcel, north of the I-10. The 1953 aerial photograph indicates a ranch in the center and northern sections and a house in the southern section of the same parcel. The 1953 aerial photograph also indicates an outbuilding in the southern section of the eastern open parcel. However, by 1967 these structures are no longer visible on historic aerial imagery and appear to have been demolished or removed. Between 1940 and 1972, there is increased development within the Project site, including buildings, paved roads, and anthropized landscape (NETR 2025; UCSB 2025).

6.4 NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION AND AB 52 CONSULTATION

The NAHC response provided contact information for 35 tribal representatives from 16 tribes that may have additional information regarding TCRs within or adjacent to the Project site. The 16 Native American Tribes identified by the NAHC include:

- Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
- Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians
- Cabazon Band of Cahuilla Indians
- Cahuilla Band of Indians
- Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla and Cupeño Indians
- Morongo Band of Mission Indians
- Pala Band of Mission Indians
- Pechanga Band of Indians
- Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe
- Ramona Band of Cahuilla
- Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians
- Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation
- Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians
- Serrano Nation of Mission Indians
- Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians
- Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians

On behalf of the City, Chambers Group sent AB 52 notification letters via email to the 35 tribal representatives on the Native American contact list, on January 31, 2025. Chambers Group supported the City with tracking responses received to date. These include responses from Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians, Pala Band of Mission Indians, Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe, Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation, Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians. All responses received to date and provided to Chambers Group for tracking support are included in Appendix A.

On February 25, 2025, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians sent via email a formal request to initiate AB 52 consultation with the City. The Tribe stated that the Project site, while outside of their reservation, lies within their traditional use areas, is considered culturally sensitive, and contains sites of potential impact. The Tribe requested that specifics be discussed in a confidential setting during consultation, due to the sensitive nature of the information involved. The Tribe states that they reserve the right to participate fully in all CEQA processes and look forward to working with the City to protect their cultural resources.

On February 27, 2025, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians sent via email a formal request to initiate AB 52 consultation with the City. The Tribe stated that the Project site, while outside of their reservation, lies within their traditional use areas. The Tribe requested a cultural resources inventory prior to any development activities, copies of the records search and any cultural resource documentation, and the presence of a cultural resource monitor during ground-disturbing activities.

As of this writing, the Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe stated they do not wish to comment on the Project and defer to local Tribes and support their determinations; the Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians stated they defer any comments to Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians; the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation

stated they will not request consulting party status due to the Project's location outside their ancestral territory; the Pala Band of Mission Indians stated they decline consultation and defer to local Tribes due to the Project's location outside their Traditional Use Area; Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians stated they are not aware of affected cultural resources and do not believe formal consultation is necessary at this stage; AB 52 consultation between the City and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians is ongoing; AB 52 consultation between the City and Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians is ongoing. Please refer to the Environmental Document prepared for the Project for further details and results regarding the ongoing AB 52 consultation.

6.5 FIELD SURVEY RESULTS

Chambers Group cultural resources specialists Efrain Arroyo, MA, RPA (Secretary of the Interior [SOI]-qualified archaeologist), and Kellie Kandybowicz, BA, conducted a pedestrian field survey of the entire Project site, including the proposed pipeline alignment and laydown and storage yards, on February 20, 2025. The Project site is primarily within a developed area, characterized by buildings, paved roads, traffic signals, utility lines, railroad tracks, and maintained landscapes, excluding two parcels of undeveloped, disturbed land. Modern refuse was observed throughout the Project site. Visual inspection of the surface revealed no evidence of prehistoric or historic-era resources within the Project site.

These two open parcels of undeveloped, disturbed land (Photographs 1 and 2), located approximately 80 meters (292 feet) south of the East 6th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue intersection, had 90 to 100 percent ground surface visibility. The western open parcel (comprises APN 418122021 and 418160006) is 1.4 acres, while the eastern open parcel (comprises APN 418123011, 418123012, and 418123003) is 1.2 acres. As noted earlier, the 1940 aerial photograph indicates the presence of a building in the northeast corner of the western open parcel, north of the I-10. The 1953 aerial photograph indicates a ranch in the center and northern sections and a house in the southern section of the same parcel. The 1953 aerial photograph also indicates an outbuilding in the southern section of the eastern open parcel (NETR 2025; UCSB 2025). However, the current survey found no evidence of these historic-period structures.

Approximately 50 meters (164 feet) south of I-10, the UPRR/SPRR rail lines (P-33-009498/CA-RIV-6381H) traverse the Project site (Photograph 3), spanning approximately 23 meters (75 feet). Moreover, the SCE Memphis 12kV Distribution Line (P-33-023484/CA-RIV-23484) traverses the Project site (Photograph 4), extending approximately 234 meters (768 feet) from the intersection of East 1st Street and Pennsylvania Avenue to the T-junction of East 1st Street and Berkshire Avenue. Furthermore, the northern boundary of Stewart Sunnyslope Cemetery (P-33-028622), located south of East 1st Avenue, slightly intersects the Project site (Photograph 5). Finally, at the southeast corner of the T-junction of East 1st Street and Berkshire Avenue, where the Project site terminates, an existing pipe discharges into an earthen channel.

No evidence of cultural resources was observed during the field survey.

SECTION 7.0 – RECOMMENDATIONS

Chambers Group conducted a cultural resources study of the Project site in compliance with CEQA and NHPA requirements and standards. Archival record searches, a pedestrian field survey, and background research of the Project site were conducted as part of this cultural resource study. The NAHC SLF search identified that there were no sacred land files within the study area. The CHRIS records search identified four previous cultural resource studies and three previously recorded cultural resources within the Project site. As presently designed, the proposed Project will not have direct impacts on the three previously documented resources that overlap with, or are directly adjacent to, the Project site. Further, the proposed Project, as currently designed, will have minimal permanent impacts or effects as the new drainage infrastructure will be installed underground with only temporary potential impacts during the construction phase. Once the new drainage infrastructure is installed, there will be very minimal visible changes to the overall conditions throughout the Project site. No evidence of previously undocumented cultural resources was observed during the field survey. Based on the results of the records search review, background research, and field survey, no impacts to cultural resources are expected.

Based on the results of this study, which did not identify any historic properties within the Project site, Chambers Group recommends a finding of *no adverse effect to historic properties* under Section 106 of NHPA. However, for post-review discoveries of cultural resources, the Project is required to adhere to 36 CFR 800.13(b), “discoveries without prior planning,” and industry-standard best management practices regarding the unanticipated discovery of cultural resources, detailed below.

If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area must halt and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (NPS 1983) will be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. Ground-disturbing activities will not resume until all the stipulations of 36 CFR 800.13(b) and (c) are satisfied and the lead permitting agency has authorized a continuance. If the discovery proves to be significant under NHPA, additional work such as data recovery excavation and Native American consultation may be necessary to mitigate any significant impacts.

Chambers Group recommends the following measures and related protocols, in conformance with 36 CFR 800.13(b), “discoveries without prior planning,” and industry-standard best management practices regarding the unanticipated discovery of cultural resources, as well as the City’s General Plan Update Goal 8.11 and related policies, to be further outlined and incorporated into a CRMP for the associated Project construction activity. If any cultural resources are identified, they would need to be evaluated for eligibility for the CRHR and NRHP. Evaluation for archaeological sites consists of an archaeological testing program. If determined eligible for CRHR or NRHP (a historical resource, per CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a)), by the CEQA lead agency or the SHPO, or a historic property (as defined under Section 106 of NHPA), further management, consisting of the appropriate mitigation, treatment, or data recovery for archaeological sites and documentation for historical structures, would be required if avoidance is not feasible.

Chambers Group recommends the following mitigation measures to be implemented as part of Project approval to ensure that potential impacts to cultural resources are less than significant.

- MM CUL-1** The City shall retain the services of a Qualified Archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior Standards. The Qualified Archaeologist shall remain on-call throughout the Project. Upon approval or request by the City, a Cultural Resources Mitigation Plan (CRMP) shall be prepared to outline more specific protocols and procedures for monitoring cultural resources,

emphasizing higher probability areas within the Project site. The CRMP shall also provide further protocols and procedures for any necessary mitigation, treatment, and data recovery of unanticipated discovery of cultural resources. The CRMP shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. The development and implementation of the CRMP shall include consultations with the City, any Native American Tribal groups that may be participating in the Project and shall be overseen by the Qualified Archaeologist retained for the Project.

MM CUL-2 In the event of the discovery of previously unidentified and/or potential cultural resources, the City and/or its Contractor shall immediately cease all work activities within an exclusion area of no less than 50 feet radius surrounding the discovery. The City or its Contractor shall immediately contact the City and the City-retained on-call Qualified Archaeologist. Except in the case of cultural items that fall within the scope of the California Health and Safety Code 7050.5, CEQA Section 15064.5, or California PRC Section 5097.98, the discovery of any cultural resource within the Project site shall not be grounds for a project-wide “stop work” notice or otherwise interfere with the Project’s continuation except as set forth in this mitigation measure. Additionally, all consulting Native American Tribal groups that requested notification of any unanticipated discovery of cultural resources on the Project shall be notified appropriately. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of cultural resources during construction, the City-retained Qualified Archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the materials prior to resuming any construction-related activities in the vicinity of the find. If a CRMP is prepared for the Project, the protocols for monitoring, mitigation, or treatment of any unanticipated discovery of cultural resources will be implemented. In all cases, if the Qualified Archaeologist determines that the discovery constitutes a significant historical resource, as defined per CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a), and/or a historic property, as defined under Section 106 of NHPA, and it cannot be avoided, the City shall implement an archaeological data recovery program.

MM-CUL-3 If a CRMP is prepared and implemented with monitoring conducted, or if cultural resources are discovered during the Project, the Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a report summarizing the monitoring program and/or addressing any prehistoric or historic archaeological finds. All reporting shall be submitted to the SCIC, as required.

HUMAN REMAINS – LEGAL REQUIREMENTS. In the event that human remains are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, then the Project would be subject to California Health and Safety Code 7050.5, CEQA Section 15064.5, and California PRC) Section 5097.98. If human remains are found during ground-disturbing activities, State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Medical Examiner-Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Medical Examiner-Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American ancestry, the Medical Examiner-Coroner shall notify the NAHC, which shall notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials (NPS 1983).

Figure 2: Area of Potential Effects Map



PHOTOGRAPHS



Photograph 1:
Undeveloped,
disturbed parcel west
of Pennsylvania
Avenue. View to the
northeast.



Photograph 2:
Undeveloped,
disturbed parcel east of
Pennsylvania Avenue.
View to the northeast.



Photograph 3: P-33-009498/CA-RIV-6381H, rail lines. View to the west.



Photograph 4: P-33-023484/CA-RIV-23484, SCE Memphis 12kV Distribution Line. View to the east.



Photograph 5: P-33-028622, Stewart Sunnyslope Cemetery. View to the south from Project site.



Photograph 6: Pennsylvania Avenue, south of Interstate 10. View to the south.

SECTION 9.0 – REFERENCES

Bean, Lowell J.

1972 *Mukat's People*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

1978 Cahuilla. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 575-587. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, Lowell J., and Katherine S. Saubel

1972 *Temalpakh (from the Earth): Cahuilla Indian Knowledge and Usage of Plants*. Malki Museum Press, Banning, California.

Bean, Lowell J., and Charles R. Smith

1978 Serrano. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 570-574. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP)

1995 *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources: Introduction*. California Department of Transportation with the California Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento: 2.

Castillo, Edward D.

1978 The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 8, California*, edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 99-127. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Cleland, Robert G.

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

Crawford, K.A.

2015 DPR Site Record for P-33-028622. On file at the South Coastal Information Center, California State University, San Diego.

Dibblee, Thomas W., and John A. Minch

2003 *Geological Map of the Beaumont Quadrangle, Riverside County, California*. Dibblee Geological Foundation, Dibblee Foundation Map DF-114. 1:24,000.

Drucker, Philip

1937 Culture Element Distributions V: Southern California. *University of California Anthropological Records* 1(1):1-52. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Erlandson, Jon M.

1994 *Early Hunter-Gatherers of the California Coast*. Plenum Press, New York.

General Land Office (GLO)

1857 (1867, 1880, 1897) Township 3 South, Range 1 West, San Bernardino Meridian. Survey Plat.
U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.
<https://glorerecords.blm.gov/default.aspx>.

Gunther, Jane Davies

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

Hooper, Lucille

1920 *The Cahuilla Indians. American Archaeology and Ethnology*. University of California
Press, Berkeley.

Hoover, Mildred Brooke, Hero Eugene Rensch, Ethel Grace Rensch, and William N. Abeloe

1990 *Historic Spots in California*. Edited by Douglas E. Kyle. Stanford University Press.
Stanford, California. 4th Edition.

Kroeber, Alfred L.

1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78.
Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

Koerper, Henry C., and Christopher E. Drover

1983 *Chronology Building for Coastal Orange County: The Case from CA-ORA-119-A. Pacific
Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 19(2):1-34.

Lancaster, Jeremy T., Cheryl A. Hayhurst, and Trinda L. Bedrossian

2012 *Preliminary Geologic Map of Quaternary Surficial Deposits in Southern California Palm
Springs 30' x 60' Quadrangle*. California Geological Survey Special Report 217, Plate 24.

Leonard, Daniel

2016 DPR Site Record for P-33-009498/CA-RIV-6381H. On file at the South Coastal Information
Center, California State University, San Diego.

LSA Associates, Inc.

2013 DPR Site Record for 023484/CA-RIV-23484. On file at the South Coastal Information
Center, California State University, San Diego.

Mason, Roger D., and Mark L. Peterson

1994 *Newport Coast Archeological Project: Newport Coast Settlement Systems, Analysis and
Discussion*, Volume I. Prepared for Coastal Community Builders, Newport Beach. The
Keith Companies Archaeological Division, Costa Mesa. On file, Chambers Group, Inc.,
Irvine.

McCawley, William

1996 *The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino of Los Angeles*. Malki Museum Press. The University
of Michigan.

Moratto, Michael J.

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

National Park Service (NPS)

1983 Archeology and Historic Preservation; Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. 48 FR 44716-42.

1997 *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. National Register Bulletin 15. Department of the Interior, Washington D. C.

Nationwide Environmental Title Research (NETR)

2025 *NETRonline: Historic Aerial Images*. Aerial Images: 1966, 1967, 1972, 1978, 1980, 1985, 1996, 2002, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018, 2020, 2022. Accessed February 2025 at <https://www.historicaerials.com/>.

Newcomb, Alyssa, and Julia Carvajal

2015 DPR Site Record for P-33-009498/CA-RIV-6381H. On file at the South Coastal Information Center, California State University, San Diego.

Parker, Patricia L., and Thomas F. King

1998 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties. *National Register Bulletin 38*, National Park Service.

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI)

2024 *History*. Electronic file accessed at <https://sanmanuel-nsn.gov/culture/history>.

Stickel, Gary E., and Lois J. Weinman-Roberts

1980 An Overview of the Cultural Resources of the Mojave Desert. Prepared for the Bureau of Land Management, Riverside.

Strong, William D.

1929 Aboriginal Society in Southern California. *University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology* 26:1-358.

Sutton, Mark Q., and David E. Earle

2017 The Desert Serrano of the Mojave River. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 53(2-3):1-61.

University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB)

2025 Flight C_1940D, Frame D-16, 1 January 1940; Flight AXM_1953B, Frame 4K-95, 1 January 1953; Flight AXM_1967, Frame 1HH-217, 1 January 1967. Courtesy of UCSB Library Geospatial Collection.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)

2025 *Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey*. Accessed January 2025 at <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>

United States Geological Survey (USGS)

2021 *Beaumont*, California 7.5-minute Topographic Quadrangle.

Wallace, William

- 1978 Post-Pleistocene Archaeology, 9000 to 2000 B.C. In *California*, edited by R. F. Heizer. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Williams, Audry

- 2014 DPR Site Record for 023484/CA-RIV-23484. On file at the South Coastal Information Center, California State University, San Diego

