

**A PHASE I CULTURAL  
RESOURCES SURVEY FOR THE  
945-995 MARKHAM STREET PROJECT**

**PERRIS, CALIFORNIA**

**APNs 314-170-009 and -010**

**Submitted to:**

**City of Perris  
Planning Division  
135 North D Street  
Perris, California 92570**

**Prepared for:**

**EPD Solutions, Inc.  
2355 Main Street, Ste 100  
Irvine, California 92614**

**Prepared by:**

**Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.  
14010 Poway Road, Suite A  
Poway, California 92064**



## **Archaeological Database Information**

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

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

***Report Date:*** June 1, 2022; Revised December 15, 2022; Revised February 17, 2023

***Report Title:*** A Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for the 945-995 Markham Street Project, Perris, California

***Prepared for:*** EPD Solutions, Inc.  
2355 Main Street, Ste 100  
Irvine, California 92614

***Submitted to:*** City of Perris  
Planning Division  
135 North D Street  
Perris, California 92570

***Submitted by:*** Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.  
14010 Poway Road, Suite A  
Poway, California 92064

***Assessor's Parcel Number(s):*** 314-170-009 and -010

***USGS Quadrangle:*** Section 1, Township 4 South, Range 4 West of the *Perris, California* (7.5-minute).

***Study Area:*** approximately four-acres

***Key Words:*** USGS *Perris* Quadrangle (7.5-minute); City of Perris archaeological survey; Historic features recorded as Temp-1; not eligible for the CRHR; monitoring of grading recommended.

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT SUMMARY .....	1
II. SETTING .....	1
<i>Natural Environment</i> .....	1
<i>Cultural Setting – Archaeological Perspectives</i> .....	5
<i>Introduction</i> .....	6
<i>Paleo Indian Period (Late Pleistocene: 11,500 to circa 9,000 YBP)</i> .....	7
<i>Archaic Period (Early and Middle Holocene: circa 9,000 to 1,300 YBP)</i> .....	7
<i>Late Prehistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1,300 YBP to 1790)</i> .....	10
<i>Protohistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1542 to circa 1769)</i> .....	10
<i>Ethnohistoric Period (1769 to Present)</i> .....	17
<i>History of the City of Perris</i> .....	21
<i>History of Development at the Subject Property</i> .....	23
<i>History of Ownership at the Subject Property</i> .....	31
III. SCOPE OF WORK .....	33
<i>Research Goals</i> .....	33
<i>Data Needs</i> .....	34
<i>Applicable Regulations</i> .....	34
<i>California Environmental Quality Act</i> .....	34
<i>Local Guidelines</i> .....	37
IV. RESULTS .....	38
<i>Background Research and Results of Records Searches</i> .....	38
<i>Field Reconnaissance</i> .....	40
V. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	47
VI. CERTIFICATION .....	51
VII. REFERENCES .....	51

**Appendices**

- Appendix A – Resumes of Key Personnel
- Appendix B – Site Forms\*
- Appendix C – Archaeological Records Search Results\*
- Appendix D – NAHC Sacred Lands File Search Results\*
- Appendix E – Assessor’s Lot Books
- Appendix F – PVCC Specific Plan FEIR Applicable Mitigation Measures

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

**List of Figures**

<b><u>Figure</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Figure 1      General Location Map .....	2
Figure 2      Project Location Map (USGS).....	3
Figure 3      Development Location Map .....	4
Figure 4      1857 GLO Plat Map.....	24
Figure 5      1893 Val Verde Tract Map .....	25
Figure 6      1910 Perry Resubdivision Tract Map .....	26
Figure 7      1974 Parcel Map .....	27
Figure 8      Cultural Resource Location Map .....	44

**List of Plates**

<b><u>Plate</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Plate 1      1938 Aerial Photograph .....	28
Plate 2      1953 Aerial Photograph .....	29
Plate 3      1962 Aerial Photograph .....	30
Plate 4      Overview of 945 West Markham Street, the 1976 residence, facing southwest.....	40
Plate 5      Overview of the eastern third of the project site, facing north .....	41
Plate 6      Overview of the project site from the southwest corner, facing east.....	42
Plate 7      Overview of 995 West Markham Street and historic ancillary structure, facing south.....	42



**List of Plates (continued)**

<b><u>Plate</u></b>		<b><u>Page</u></b>
Plate 8	Temp-1 on Current Aerial Map .....	45
Plate 9	Southern façade of ancillary structure, facing north.....	46
Plate 10	Overview of cement foundation remains, facing south .....	46
Plate 11	Overview of septic system, facing south .....	47

**List of Tables**

<b><u>Table</u></b>		<b><u>Page</u></b>
Table 1	Historic Ownership of the Property .....	32
Table 2	Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites Within a One-Mile Radius of the 945-955 Markham Street Project Site.....	38

## **I. INTRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT SUMMARY**

Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. (BFSA) has conducted this archaeological survey of the proposed 945-995 Markham Street Project site located within the northern part of the city of Perris, Riverside County, California. The approximately four-acre project site is located at 945-995 West Markham Street (Figure 1). The project site (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs] 314-170-009 and -010) is situated within Section 1, Township 4 South, Range 4 West of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) *Perris, California 7.5'* topographic quadrangle map (Figure 2). The project site is also located with the Perris Valley Commerce Center (PVCC) Specific Plan planning area of the city of Perris. The project includes the construction and operation of an industrial building (Figure 3).


The archaeological survey was conducted on May 10, 2022 in order to determine if cultural resources exist within the property. The survey of the property resulted in the discovery of a historic ancillary structure constructed between 1953 and 1962 along with associated foundation remains and septic system. The features were recorded as Site Temp-1 according to the Office of Historic Preservation's (OHP's) manual, *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*, using Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms. However, property research and evaluation of the resource has determined that Site Temp-1 is not eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

As a part of this study, a copy of this report will be submitted to the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California at Riverside (UCR). Qualifications of key BFSA staff involved in the preparation of this report can be found within Appendix A. All investigations conducted by BFSA related to this project conformed to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and City of Perris environmental guidelines, including the PVCC Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

## **II. SETTING**

### **Natural Environment**


Riverside County, including the city of Perris, lies in the Peninsular Ranges Geologic Province of southern California. This range, which lies in a northwest to southeast trend through the county, extends around 1,000 miles from the Raymond-Malibu Fault Zone in western Los Angeles County to the southern tip of Baja California. Regionally, the project lies within the Perris Block, a structural block bounded on the west by the Elsinore fault zone and on the east by the San Jacinto fault zone (Morton 2003).



**Figure 1**  
**General Location Map**  
 The 945-995 Markham Street Project  
 DeLorme (1:250,000)







**Figure 2**


**Project Location Map**

The 945-995 Markham Street Project

USGS *Perris* and *Steele Peak* Quadrangles (7.5-minute series)







**Figure 3**

**Development Location Map**

The 945-995 Markham Street Project



The geology mapped underlying the project site and immediate area indicates that the project site is underlain by lower Pleistocene (approximately 1.8 million to perhaps 200,000 to 300,000 years old) very old alluvial fan deposits (Morton 2001, 2003). These sediments are described as "... mostly well dissected, well-indurated, reddish-brown sand deposits. Commonly contains duripans and locally silcretes" (Morton 2003). According to Woodford et al. (1971), the alluvium overlying the granitic bedrock below the project is approximately 290 feet thick. Generally, the project site is flat with an average elevation of 1,490 feet above mean sea level.

The Perris Valley originally contained perennial grasses that have primarily been replaced by non-native weeds and grasses. Although not found within the subject property, the Riversidian sage scrub plant community is the most prevalent native vegetation found in the region. The Riversidian sage scrub is primarily found within adjacent Lakeview Mountains and Bernasconi Hills and includes desert encelia, brittle brush, sagebrush, black sage, white sage, buckwheat, foxtails, and cacti. Mammals within the region include mule deer, coyote, bobcat, mountain lion, ground squirrel, and quail; birds include hawks and eagles, owls, mourning dove, mockingbird, jay, heron, crow, finch, and sparrow.

During the prehistoric period, vegetation near the project site provided sufficient food resources to support prehistoric human occupants. Animals that inhabited the area during prehistoric times included mammals such as rabbits, squirrels, gophers, mice, rats, deer, and coyotes, in addition to a variety of reptiles and amphibians. The natural setting of the project site during the prehistoric occupation offered a rich nutritional resource base. Fresh water was likely obtainable from seasonal drainages and the San Jacinto River located southeast of the project site.

Historically, the property was utilized for agriculture or ranching/grazing of livestock. Currently, the project site contains a permanent residential structure along with an associated metal fabrication shop/structure within the eastern half of the property at 945 West Markham Street. The western half of the property, 995 West Markham Street, contains an unoccupied prefabricated modular structure and a corrugated metal-clad ancillary structures.

### **Cultural Setting – Archaeological Perspectives**

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

Despite this, a distinction exists between "emic" and "etic" ways of understanding material culture, prehistoric lifeways, and cultural phenomena in general (Harris 1991). While "emic" perspectives serve the subjective ways in which things are perceived and interpreted by the

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

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

### Introduction

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

Absolute chronological information, where possible, will be incorporated into this archaeological discussion to examine the effectiveness of continuing to interchangeably use these terms. Reference will be made to the geological framework that divides the archaeologically-

based culture chronology of the area into four segments: the late Pleistocene (20,000 to 10,000 years before the present [YBP]), the early Holocene (10,000 to 6,650 YBP), the middle Holocene (6,650 to 3,350 YBP), and the late Holocene (3,350 to 200 YBP).

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

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

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

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

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

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



similarities to more northern sites of the same period (Koerper et al. 1986). Other artifacts associated with Encinitas Tradition sites include stone bowls, doughnut stones, discoidals, stone balls, and stone, bone, and shell beads.

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

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

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

More recent work by Sutton has identified a more localized complex known as the Greven Knoll Complex. The Greven Knoll Complex is a redefined northern inland expression of the Encinitas Tradition first put forth by Mark Sutton and Jill Gardner (2010). Sutton and Gardner (2010:25) state that “[t]he early millingstone archaeological record in the northern portion of the interior southern California was not formally named but was often referred to as ‘Inland Millingstone,’ ‘Encinitas,’ or even ‘Topanga.’” Therefore, they proposed that all expressions of the inland Milling Stone in southern California north of San Diego County be grouped together in the Greven Knoll Complex.

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

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

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

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

The shifts in food processing technologies during each of these phases indicate a change in subsistence strategies; although people were still hunting for large game, plant-based foods eventually became the primary dietary resource (Sutton 2011a). Sutton’s (2011b) argument posits

that the development of mortars and pestles during the middle Holocene can be attributed to the year-round exploitation of acorns as a main dietary provision. Additionally, the warmer and drier climate may have been responsible for groups from the east moving toward coastal populations, which is archaeologically represented by the interchange of coastal and eastern cultural traits (Sutton 2011a).

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

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

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

*Protohistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1542 to circa 1769)*

Ethnohistoric and ethnographic evidence indicates that three Takic-speaking groups occupied portions of Riverside County: the Cahuilla, the Gabrielino, and the Luiseño. The geographic boundaries between these groups in pre- and proto-historic times are difficult to place, but the project is located well within the borders of ethnographic Luiseño territory. This group was a seasonal hunting and gathering people with cultural elements that were very distinct from Archaic Period peoples. These distinctions include cremation of the dead, the use of the bow and

arrow, and exploitation of the acorn as a main food staple (Moratto 1984). Along the coast, the Luiseño made use of available marine resources by fishing and collecting mollusks for food. Seasonally available terrestrial resources, including acorns and game, were also sources of nourishment for Luiseño groups. Elaborate kinship and clan systems between the Luiseño and other groups facilitated a wide-reaching trade network that included trade of Obsidian Butte obsidian and other resources from the eastern deserts, as well as steatite from the Channel Islands.

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

### ***Luiseño: An Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspective***

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

### ***Subsistence and Settlement***

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

The most important food source for the Luiseño was the acorn, six different species of which were used (*Quercus californica*, *Quercus agrifolia*, *Quercus chrysolepis*, *Quercus dumosa*, *Quercus engelmannii*, and *Quercus wislizenii*). Seeds, particularly of grasses, flowering plants, and mints, were also heavily exploited. Seed-bearing species were encouraged through controlled burns, which were conducted at least every third year. A variety of other stems, leaves, shoots, bulbs, roots, and fruits were also collected. Hunting augmented this vegetal diet. Animal species taken included deer, rabbit, hare, woodrat, ground squirrel, antelope, quail, duck, freshwater fish from mountain streams, marine mammals, and other sea creatures such as fish, crustaceans, and mollusks (particularly abalone, or *Haliotis* sp.). In addition, a variety of snakes, small birds, and rodents were eaten (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

### *Social Organization*

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

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

### *Material Culture*

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

Clothing was minimal; women wore a cedar-bark and netted twine double apron and men wore a waist cord. In cold weather, cloaks or robes of rabbit fur, deerskin, or sea otter fur were

worn by both sexes. Footwear included deerskin moccasins and sandals fashioned from yucca fibers. Adornments included bead necklaces and pendants made of bone, clay, stone, shell, bear claw, mica, deer hooves, and abalone shell. Men wore ear and nose piercings made from cane or bone, which were sometimes decorated with beads. Other adornments were commonly decorated with semiprecious stones including quartz, topaz, garnet, opal, opalite, agate, and jasper (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

### ***Cahuilla: An Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspective***

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

#### *Subsistence and Settlement*

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

1976).

The Cahuilla's use of plant resources is well documented. Plant foods harvested by the Cahuilla included valley oak acorns and single-leaf pinyon pine nuts. Other important plant species included bean and screw mesquite, agave, Mohave yucca, cacti, palm, chia, quail brush, yellowray goldfield, goosefoot, manzanita, catsclaw, desert lily, mariposa lily, and a number of other species such as grass seed. A number of agricultural domesticates were acquired from the Colorado River tribes including corn, bean, squash, and melon grown in limited amounts. Animal species taken included deer, bighorn sheep, pronghorn antelope, rabbit, hare, rat, quail, dove, duck, roadrunner, and a variety of rodents, reptiles, fish, and insects (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

### *Social Organization*

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

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

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

### *Material Culture*

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

Kroeber 1976).

Cahuilla clothing, like other groups in the area, was minimal. Men typically wore a loincloth and sandals; women wore skirts made from mesquite bark, animal skin, or tules. Babies wore mesquite bark diapers. Rabbit skin cloaks were worn in cold weather (Bean 1978; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

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

### ***Gabrielino: An Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspective***

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

### ***Subsistence and Settlement***

The Gabrielino lived in permanent villages and occupied smaller resource-gathering camps at various times of the year depending upon the seasonality of the resource. Larger villages were comprised of several families or clans, while smaller, seasonal camps typically housed smaller family units. The coastal area between San Pedro and Topanga Canyon was the location of primary subsistence villages, while secondary sites were located near inland sage stands, oak



groves, and pine forests. Permanent villages were located along rivers and streams and in sheltered areas along the coast. As previously mentioned, the Channel Islands were also the locations of relatively large settlements (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

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

### *Social Organization*

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

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

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

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

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

### *Material Culture*

Gabrielino houses were domed, circular structures made of thatched vegetation. Houses varied in size and could house from one to several families. Sweathouses (semicircular, earth-

covered buildings) were public structures used in male social ceremonies. Other structures included menstrual huts and a ceremonial structure called a yuvar, an open-air structure built near the chief's house (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

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

### *Ethnohistoric Period (1769 to Present)*

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

European exploration along the California coast began in 1542 with the landing of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo and his men at San Diego Bay. Sixty years after the Cabrillo expeditions, an expedition under Sebastian Viscaíno made an extensive and thorough exploration of the Pacific coast. Although the voyage did not extend beyond the northern limits of the Cabrillo track, Viscaíno had the most lasting effect upon the nomenclature of the coast. Many of his place names have survived, whereas practically every one of the names created by Cabrillo have faded from

use. For instance, Cabrillo named the first (now) United States port he stopped at “San Miguel”; 60 years later, Viscaíno changed it to “San Diego” (Rolle 1969). The early European voyages observed Native Americans living in villages along the coast but did not make any substantial, long-lasting impact. At the time of contact, the Luiseño population was estimated to have ranged from 4,000 to as many as 10,000 individuals (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

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

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

conflicts due to the introduction of an entirely new social order (Cook 1976).

Mexico achieved independence from Spain in 1822 and became a federal republic in 1824. As a result, both Baja and Alta California became classified as territories (Rolle 1969). Shortly thereafter, the Mexican Republic sought to grant large tracts of private land to its citizens to begin to encourage immigration to California and to establish its presence in the region. Although a number of similar land grants originally were issued under the Spanish, the Mexican government greatly expanded the process, issuing 50 land grants between 1822 and 1832 (Library of Congress, General Collections 2021). Part of the establishment of power and control included the desecularization of the missions circa 1832. These same missions were also located on some of the most fertile land in California and, as a result, were considered highly valuable. The resulting land grants, known as “ranchos,” covered expansive portions of California and by 1846, more than 600 land grants had been issued by the Mexican government (Library of Congress, General Collections 2021). Rancho Jurupa was the first rancho to be established and was issued to Juan Bandini in 1838. Although Bandini primarily resided in San Diego, Rancho Jurupa was located in what is now Riverside County (Pourade 1963). A review of Riverside County place names quickly illustrates that many of the ranchos in Riverside County lent their names to present-day locations, including Jurupa, El Rincon, La Sierra, El Sobrante de San Jacinto, La Laguna (Lake Elsinore), Santa Rosa, Temecula, Pauba, San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero, and San Jacinto Viejo (Gunther 1984). As was typical of many ranchos, these were all located in the valley environments within western Riverside County.

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

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

Native American culture had been disrupted to the point where they could no longer rely upon prehistoric subsistence and social patterns. Not only does this illustrate how dependent the Native Americans had become upon the missionaries, but it also indicates a marked contrast in the way the Spanish treated the Native Americans compared to the Mexican and United States ranchers. Spanish colonialism (missions) is based upon utilizing human resources while

integrating them into their society. The Mexican and American ranchers did not accept Native Americans into their social order and used them specifically for the extraction of labor, resources, and profit. Rather than being incorporated, they were either subjugated or exterminated (Cook 1976).

By 1846, tensions between the United States and Mexico had escalated to the point of war (Rolle 1969). In order to reach a peaceful agreement, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was put into effect in 1848, which resulted in the annexation of California to the United States. Once California opened to the United States, waves of settlers moved in searching for gold mines, business opportunities, political opportunities, religious freedom, and adventure (Rolle 1969; Caughey 1970). By 1850, California had become a state and was eventually divided into 27 separate counties. While a much larger population was now settling in California, this was primarily in the central valley, San Francisco, and the Gold Rush region of the Sierra Nevada Mountain range (Rolle 1969; Caughey 1970). During this time, southern California grew at a much slower pace than northern California and was still dominated by the cattle industry established during the earlier rancho period. However, by 1859, the first United States Post Office in what would eventually become Riverside County was set up at John Magee's store on the Temecula Rancho (Gunther 1984).

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

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

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

Shortly thereafter, with the start of World War I, the United States began to develop a military presence in Riverside County with the construction of March Air Reserve Base. During World War II, Camp Anza and Camp Haan were constructed, with the former located in the western part of the city of Riverside and the latter in what is now the current location of the National Veteran's Cemetery. In the decades that followed, populations spread throughout the county into Lake Elsinore, Corona, Norco, Murrieta, and Wildomar. However, a significant portion of the county remained largely agricultural well into the 1970s. Following the 1970s, Riverside saw a period of dramatic population increase as the result of new development, more than doubling the population of the county with a population of over 1.3 million residents (Patterson 1971).

### *History of the City of Perris*

The subject property is located just west of the Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Portrero land grant, which was granted to Miguel Pedorena by Mexican Governor Pío Pico in 1846 (Hoffman 1862). After Pedorena's death in 1850, the land grant passed to his heirs under the guardianship of T.W. Sutherland (Gunther 1984). In 1881, the California Southern Railroad laid the tracks for the transcontinental route of the Santa Fe Railway through what was referred to at that time as the San Jacinto Plains. Surveying and construction of the railroad route was led by Frederick Thomas Perris, for whom the city of Perris was named. The railroad was completed in 1882, which allowed hundreds of settlers to enter the area for homesteading, most of them settling in Pinacate to the south (City of Perris n.d.). While still part of San Diego County, Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Portrero was patented to Sutherland in 1883 (Robinson 1997). In 1885, the citizens of Pinacate created a more conveniently located station along the railroad route, and in 1886, the town site of Perris was established (City of Perris n.d.).

The subject property is located within an area traditionally known as Val Verde and subdivided in 1893 as the Val Verde Tract. The tract is situated just north of what would later become the city of Perris. As such, the Val Verde Tract was historically influenced by the nearby town. The Val Verde Tract was platted in 1893 about five miles northwest of Perris. One of the owners of the tract, J.R. Nance, was also instrumental in promoting the city of Perris and the Riverside Tract to the north of the subject property (Gunther 1984). The Val Verde community briefly flourished due to the establishment of a railway siding and station. The community had a post office between 1894 and 1904 and again from 1918 through 1930. The post office was discontinued twice, and mail was forwarded to Perris (Gunther 1984).

The Val Verde region along with much of the Perris Valley has traditionally been dominated by agricultural properties focusing upon grain, grapes, potatoes, melons, alfalfa, and green vegetables. However, the Val Verde Tract along with the nearby Riverside Tract suffered early on due to an inability to obtain a steady supply of water. In 1883, pioneer Frank E. Brown formed the Bear Valley Land and Water Company, which, by 1885, had successfully constructed the largest water reservoir in the county at the time (the Bear Valley Dam and Reservoir) to supply

water to the city of Redlands (City of Moreno Valley n.d.). With its now-ample water supply, the city of Redlands flourished, and Brown soon began expanding the Bear Valley Land and Water Company's holdings in order to provide water to the surrounding areas. Among those regions slated to receive Bear Valley water was the town site of Perris, and in 1890, a group of investors formed the Perris Irrigation District and established an agreement with the Bear Valley Land and Water Company to provide water to the region (Hinton 1892). However, "Frank Brown had overestimated the Bear Valley Dam and Reservoir's capability to supply the Inland Empire," and due to a period of drought between 1891 and 1893, the reservoir failed to meet all of its obligations for water delivery (Berba 2017; *Redlands Daily Facts* 2008). The lack of water severely affected farmers who had developed an agricultural base of deciduous and citrus fruit trees, and residents of the region were forced to leave the area for a more habitable environment. Although the Perris Irrigation District was not as successful as originally predicted, traditionally, the area did remain agricultural throughout the twentieth century.

The general area also was influenced by the development of March Field during the twentieth century. March Field was originally established on March 1, 1918 as the Alessandro Flying Training Field following the United States' entry into World War I (Gunther 1984). The name was officially changed to March Field on March 20, 1918 in honor of Peyton C. March, Jr., who had been killed in a training plane crash in Fort Worth, Texas earlier that year. The air field changed names many times throughout the 1940s. In 1941, the name was changed to March Army Air Field; in 1942, to March Army Air Base; in 1947, to March Army Air Force Base to reflect the establishment of the United States Air Force; and finally to March ARB in 1996 (March Field Air Museum 2020). Although the official name changed multiple times, residents have continued to refer to it as "March Field" (Gunther 1984).

The establishment of March Field was important to the region due to the role the local inhabitants would play during World War I and World War II. Farming continued to be important to the region which was aided by access to new water sources. A portion of the Colorado River Aqueduct was constructed through the region in 1939 to transport water from the Colorado river to nearby Lake Mathews. The alignment of the aqueduct within the Val Verde region was named the Val Verde Cut and the Val Verde Tunnel. The Val Verde Cut was the only portion of the aqueduct that was unlined, running for approximately one mile (Gunther 1984). Further, during the mid- to late twentieth century, the Riverside County Flood Control and the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) began to establish storm drains and new modern water conveyance systems. The establishment of these modern water conveyance systems along with the Val Verde Tunnel allowed farmers to better manage water on their land (City of Perris n.d.; Environmental Science Associates 2016; MWD n.d.).


Although the Perris region generally remained agricultural throughout the twentieth century, in recent years, the city has seen a growth in residential and industrial development. Today, many of the large agricultural fields have been developed into large logistics centers and warehouses servicing the greater southern California region. *History of Development at the Subject Property*

The 1857 Plat Map for the region shows the northwest-to-southeast-trending “Road to Temescal” west of the property, which is bisected by an unnamed northeast-to-southwest-trending trail that appears to pass near the southeastern corner of the project site (Figure 4). The roads are visible on subsequent plat maps from 1867 and 1883. According to the 1898 map, the road is no longer shown, likely because the subject property and surrounding area had been subdivided under the Val Verde Tract in 1893 (Gunther 1984). When first subdivided, the subject property was located within Lot 2 of Block 5 of the Val Verde Tract. Lot 2 of Block 5, like most lots within the Val Verde Tract, was 10 acres (Figure 5). As such, the current project site parcels included the northern half of the lot.

In 1910, the property was again subdivided under the “Perry Resubdivision of the Val Verde Tract.” As part of the new subdivision, the property became part of the 20-acre Lot 9 of the new tract (Figure 6). Lot 9 was further subdivided in 1925 into two 10 acre lots (north and south halves). In 1974, the property was subdivided again, establishing the parcels as they generally are today (Figure 7). Finally, County records show this area of Perris was annexed by the City in 1986.

Historic aerial photographs show that by 1938, at least one building, likely a residence, is situated within the northwestern corner of the project site (Plate 1). The 1942 7.5' *Perris* Quadrangle also shows structures in the northwest corner of the project site. By 1953, up to four structures had been added to the property, while the 1938 structure is still present (Plate 2). By 1962, more structures, up to seven, are located within the project site (Plate 3). The aerial photograph from 1978 shows that almost all structures had been removed and a residence along with new ancillary structures had been constructed within the eastern half of the property at 945 West Markham Street. Assessor’s data show that this residence was constructed in 1976. Subsequent photographs show the addition of ancillary non-permanent structures and use of the project site for the storing of equipment and building materials, primarily within the 995 West Markham Street parcel. Beginning in 2002, the far eastern third of the property appears to have been continuously graded and contoured to create dirt bike/ BMX tracks. Based upon the aerial photographs, the early 1938 structure and almost all other later structures were removed sometime before 1978. However, one ancillary barn-like structure, first visible on the 1962 aerial photograph, does appear to still be located within the project site. Given the historic occupation of the property, additional research into property owners was conducted at the Robert J. Fitch County of Riverside Archives.






**Figure 4**

**1857 GLO Plat Map**

The 945-995 Markham Street Project





**Figure 5**  
**1893 Val Verde Tract Map**  
 The 945-995 Markham Street Project





MB 71



**MAP OF THE PERRY RE-SUBDIVISION**

OF BLOCK 1, LOTS 1, 2, 3, 5 & 7 OF BLOCK 2, LOTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9 OF BLOCK 3, BLOCK 4, LOTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9 OF BLOCKS 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 OF BLOCK 10 OF THE VAL VERDE TRACT

AS RECORDED IN BOOK 1 OF RECORDS OF DEEDS OF HENNESSEE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA THE FRACTIONAL N 1/4 OF SE 1/4 OF S 1/4 SEC. 1 T. 4 S. 17. N. R. 10 E. S. 8 E. M.

Surveyed by Geo. M. Pearson, C.E. June, 1910. Scale 400 feet per inch.

**NOTE**  
 Existing redwood posts are set at all corners unless otherwise shown. The average is figured to the center of all streets, etc. and monuments. Cement points set are shown thus: [Symbol]. Bearings are derived from an observation on others.

I hereby certify that this map of the PERRY RE-SUBDIVISION is a correct representation of the survey made by me in June, 1910. Geo. M. Pearson, C.E. Licensed Land Surveyor.

I hereby certify that the original map of the PERRY RE-SUBDIVISION is deposited in the office of the County Clerk of HENNESSEE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of the Legislature of California, approved March 17, 1910.

Witness my hand and seal of office this 17th day of June, 1910. [Signature]

**Legend**  
 Project boundary

0 500 m  
 0 1000 2000 ft



**Figure 6**  
**1910 Perry Resubdivision Tract Map**  
 The 945-995 Markham Street Project


IN THE UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY OF THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA

# PARCEL MAP NO. 6304

BEING THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF LOT 9 OF THE PERRY RE-SUBDIVISION OF PORTIONS OF THE VAL VERDE TRACT AND THE FRACTIONAL N 1/2 OF THE NE 1/4 OF THE SE 1/4 OF SEC. 1 T 4 S, R 4 W SBB & M. MAP BOOK 7, PAGE 45.

MAP BY M. THORNTON

10-17-1974



27




Figure 7



1974 Parcel Map

The 945-995 Markham Street Project






**Legend**

-  Project boundary
-  N 1/2 of Lot 9, Perry Resubdivision




**Plate 1**  
**1938 Aerial Photograph**  
The 945-995 Markham Street Project



**Plate 2**  
**1953 Aerial Photograph**  
The 945-995 Markham Street Project





**Plate 3**  
**1962 Aerial Photograph**  
The 945-995 Markham Street Project

*History of Ownership at the Subject Property*

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) General Land Office (GLO) records indicate that just prior to the Val Verde Tract subdivision, the property was part of a large 98,330.04-acre patent granted to the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1891 (Document Number 18). However, the Assessor's Lot Books on file at the Robert J. Fitch County of Riverside Archives show that by 1892, the subject property, along with almost all of the Val Verde Tract, was owned by J.R. Nance. Again, Nance was instrumental in the subdivision of the Val Verde Tract and in promoting the city of Perris and the subdivision of the adjacent Riverside Tract to the north of the subject property (Gunther 1984).

Regardless, Nance did not own the property for long; in 1894, the subject property along with much of the surrounding Val Verde Tract lots were transferred to Joseph Eastman. Eastman quickly sold much of his holdings including the subject property to Hugh Lennox in 1895. By 1900, all of Lennox's holdings were transferred to Alex T. Crane. By 1910, Lewis B. Perry owned much of the Val Verde Tract including the subject property and resubdivided the tract into farm lots of various acreage. The resubdivision combined the original 10-acre Lot 2 of Block 5 with an adjacent 10-acre lot. As a result, the larger property containing the project site grew to 20 acres and was listed as Lot 9 of the Perry Resubdivision of the Val Verde Tract (see Figure 6 above).

Perry did not hold onto the new tract very long since by 1911, Theo Walker had acquired multiple lots within the Perry Resubdivision, including the subject property. In 1914, J.E. and Robert Marsh purchased the subject property, but by 1918, Val Verde Imp. CO. is listed as the owner of the project site and much of the surrounding lots. In 1923, Judson C. Rives purchased the property. Rives, like many of the previous owners of the property, owned large swaths of land surrounding the project site. Further, none of the previous owners were ever assessed for buildings on the subject property. The purchasing and selling of multiple lots was common during this period in the region as many of these early landowners appear to be land speculators.

In 1924, the subject property was transferred to Mitsura Fukuzawa. Fukuzawa also owned multiple lots in the surrounding area. However, in 1925, Fukuzawa split the 20-acre lot into two 10-acre properties (north and south halves). The splitting of the property appears to coincide with the acquisition of the project site by Nobujiro Kobata who is listed as the owner of both the north and south halves of Lot 9. Regardless, the current project site falls within the north half. In 1932, the property was transferred to Teruo Sasaki. The listed dates of assessments are not entirely clear; however, it appears the first assessment for buildings within the lot occurred either immediately just before or in conjunction with the transfer of the property to Sasaki. It appears as though in 1931, \$250.00 was assessed for buildings, while the next year, the assessed value had increased to \$720.00. These improvements are likely the residence structure visible on the 1938 aerial photograph.

In 1942, the property was assessed to Don B. and Ruby E. Smith. The Smiths are listed as the owners of the property through 1964 when the Assessor's Lot Books stopped being utilized. The lot books show that between the period of 1942 and 1964, the Smiths added several buildings



to the subject property. The assessed value for buildings and improvements within the lot was \$610.00 in 1942 and \$4,010.00 in 1961 when they cease being listed. This signifies a considerable increase in improvements to the property as the value of the assessed land only increased from \$700.00 to \$810.00 during the same period. Further, this increase coincides with the depiction of the property on the historic aerial photographs.

The clearing of the property and construction of multiple buildings within the project site during the mid-twentieth century is tied to the ownership of Don B. and Ruby E. Smith. However, little information beyond them owning the property could be identified. Don B. Smith is listed in the 1950s United States Federal Census records as being born around 1911, while his wife Ruby is listed as being born around 1912. Their address is listed as the corner of Heacock and Markham streets in the city of Perris. However, it is likely the family resided within the project site as the larger historic lot (north half of Lot 9) is bound by Nevada and Webster avenues along Markham Street. Webster Avenue eventually changes to Heacock Street, north of the project site. The 1950s census lists Don and Ruby as residing in the region with two daughters (Donna and Anna) and two sons (Dennis and David). In addition, Ruby’s mother, Jeanie E. Stirewalt, and a farm hand, Johnus Butka, are listed as residing with them. Records available on Ancestry.com show Ruby and Don got divorced in 1967. Further, records show that Don passed away in 1987 when he was residing in Hemet.

**Table 1**  
Historic Ownership of the Property

Date	Block 5, Lot 2 (10 acres)
1892	J.R. Nance
1894	Joseph Eastman
1895	Hugh Lennox
1900	Alex T. Crane
1910	Lewis B. Perry
1910	Lot 9 of the Perry Resubdivision of the Val Verde Tract (20 acres)
1911	Theo Walker
1914	J.E. and Robert Marsh
1923	Judson C. Rives
1924	Mitsura Fukuzawa
1925	North ½ Lot 9 of the Perry Resubdivision of the Val Verde Tract (20 acres)
1926	Nobujiro Kobata
1932	Teruo Sasaki
1942-1964	Don B. and Ruby E. Smith

### **III. SCOPE OF WORK**

In order to determine the presence of cultural resources within the proposed project site, the archaeological investigation consisted of the following tasks:

- 1) An archaeological records search was conducted by BFSA at the EIC at UCR to gather any information regarding recorded cultural resources within or adjacent to the subject property.
- 2) A review of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) search was conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the property.
- 3) Additional archival research of the property was conducted, including historic maps, BLM GLO records, County of Riverside Robert J. Fitch Archives records, Riverside County Assessor's data, and Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Agency (TLMA) records.
- 4) The initial archaeological survey of the property was accomplished by conducting a systematic pedestrian survey that followed survey transects that were spaced 10 meters apart and paralleled the existing street directions. All areas of disturbed ground and any rodent burrows were analyzed for evidence of buried archaeological deposits.
- 5) This archaeological technical report was prepared to present the results of the field survey, impact analysis, assessment of any identified resources, and presentation of any mitigation measures required for project approval.

#### **Research Goals**

The primary goal of the research design is to attempt to understand the way in which humans have used the land and resources within the subject property over time, as well as to aid in the determination of resource significance. For the current project, the study area under investigation is the west-central portion of Riverside County. The scope of work for the archaeological program conducted for the 945-995 Markham Street Project included a survey of the approximately four-acre project site. Given the area involved and the narrow focus of the cultural resources study, the research design for this project was necessarily limited and general in nature. Since the main objective of the investigation was to identify the presence of and potential impacts to cultural resources, the goal here is not necessarily to answer wide-reaching theories regarding the development of early southern California, but to investigate the role and importance of the identified resources. Although survey-level investigations are limited in terms of the amount of information available, several specific research questions were developed that could be used to guide the initial investigations of any observed cultural resources. The following research questions take into account the size and location of the project site.

***Research Questions:***

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

***Data Needs***

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

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

***Applicable Regulations***

Resource importance is assigned to districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess exceptional value or quality illustrating or interpreting the heritage of Riverside County and the city of Perris in history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. A number of criteria are used in demonstrating resource importance. Specifically, criteria outlined in CEQA provide the guidance for making such a determination. The following sections detail the CEQA criteria that a resource must meet in order to be determined important.

***California Environmental Quality Act***

According to the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines) (§15064.5a), the term “historical resource” includes the following:

- 1) A resource listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources

Commission for listing in, the CRHR (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

- 2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey, meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- 3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript, which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14, Section 4852) including the following:
  - a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
  - b) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
  - c) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
  - d) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
- 4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined eligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1[k] of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

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

- 1) Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate

surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.

- 2) The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:
  - a) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the CRHR; or
  - b) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, 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 the 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 historical resource, it shall refer to the provisions of Section 21084.1 of the Public Resources Code, Section 15126.4 of the guidelines, and the limits contained in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code do not apply.
- 3) If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria defined in subsection (a), but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code, the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 21083.2. The time and cost limitations described in Public Resources Code 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 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 EIR, if one is prepared to address impacts on other resources, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.

Sections 15064.5(d) and 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines contain additional provisions regarding human remains. Regarding Native American human remains, paragraph (d) provides:

- (d) When an initial study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American human remains within the project, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC as provided in Public Resources Code 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 NAHC. Action implementing such an agreement is exempt from:
- 1) The general prohibition on disinterring, disturbing, or removing human remains from any location other than a dedicated cemetery (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5).
  - 2) The requirement of CEQA and the Coastal Act.

Local Guidelines

The project site is situated within the PVCC Specific Plan planning area of the city of Perris and is subject to the policies and regulations established within the Specific Plan. The required mitigation measures from the PVCC Specific Plan FEIR, as modified, have been incorporated into the project and are presented in Section VI of this report below. However, the PVCC Specific Plan FEIR does not establish any additional local level criteria for evaluating resources beyond the standard CEQA criteria. Rather, the Specific Plan reiterates that proposed projects within the PVCC planning area must adhere to the following two measures from the City of Perris General Plan – Conservation Element (2008) to assess the potential for significant resources within the subject property:

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Implementation Measure IV.A.2 | For all projects subject to CEQA, applicants will be required to submit results of an archaeological records search request through the Eastern Information Center, at the University of California, Riverside.                   |
| Implementation Measure IV.A.3 | Require Phase I Surveys for all projects located in areas that have not previously been surveyed for archaeological or historic resources, or which lie near areas where archaeological and/or historic sites have been recorded. |

## IV. RESULTS

### Background Research and Results of Records Searches

BFSA conducted a records search utilizing information obtained from the EIC at UCR (Appendix C). The records search did not identify any resources within the subject property; however, 24 resources are on file with the EIC located within one mile of the project (Table 2). The prehistoric resources identified during the records search consist of two prehistoric bedrock milling feature sites. The historic resources identified during the records search primarily are associated with the built environment.

**Table 2**  
 Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites  
 Within a One-Mile Radius of the 945-995 Markham Street Project Site

Site Number(s)	Site Description
RIV-3501 and RIV-12,873	Prehistoric bedrock milling site
RIV-1183	Historic railroad siding
RIV-8196H	Historic railway tracks
RIV-5516H	Historic March Air Force Base well house
P-33-007623	Historic Liberty Bell Café
P-33-007639	Historic residence
P-33-007650	Historic Camp Haan barracks
P-33-007674	Historic Val Verde School (demolished)
P-33-008700, RIV-10,260, and P-33-024092	Historic well
P-33-008701 and RIV-12,878	Historic water conveyance system
P-33-008702, P-33-008703, RIV-12,857, and RIV-12,858	Historic foundation(s)
RIV-8390	Historic foundations with associated trash scatter
P-33-028172	Historic trash scatter
P-33-024867	Historic canal/aqueduct
P-33-024868	Historic Webster Road segment
P-33-028621	Historic well and road segment
RIV-12,877	Historic utility poles

The records search results also indicated that there has been a total of 65 cultural resource studies conducted within a one-mile radius of the project site, one of which included the current project parcel (Tang et al. 2007). The Tang et al. (2007) study, conducted by CRM Tech, consisted of a large overview of resources within the North Perris Industrial Specific Plan, which would later become the current PVCC Specific Plan. The study included a focused survey, records search, literature review, and public outreach. No resources were identified within the subject property

during the 2007 study; however, no individual parcels were systematically surveyed as part of the CRM Tech study.

To better understand the historic use of the property and identify any potential resources, BFSA also reviewed the following historic sources:

- The National Register of Historic Places Index
- The OHP, Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility
- The OHP, Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File
- BLM GLO records
- The 30' USGS *Elsinore* topographic map (1901)
- The 15' USGS *Perris* topographic map (1942)
- The 7.5' USGS *Perris* topographic map (1953)
- Riverside County Assessor's parcel maps and lot books
- Riverside County TLMA records
- Aerial photographs (1938 through 2021) available from the University of California at Santa Barbara library, [Historicaerials.com](http://Historicaerials.com), and Google Earth

None of these additional sources identified any resources within the project site, and the research results of the historic use of the property is incorporated into the presented history of the project site above.

BFSA also requested a records search of the NAHC SLF. The SLF search was returned with positive results for the *Perris* and *Steele Peak* quadrangles. In accordance with the recommendations of the NAHC, BFSA contacted all tribal representatives listed in the NAHC response letter to request information on the existence of Native American cultural resources on or near the 945-995 Markham Street Project site. This request is not part of any formal Assembly Bill 52 Native American consultation. As of the date of this report, no response has been received. Original correspondence is provided in Appendix D.

Based upon the results of the records search and literature review, there is limited potential for archaeological resources to be located within the project site. Although two prehistoric bedrock milling features have been recorded within a mile of the project site, they are located over one-half-mile to the west near the bedrock-laden foothills surrounding Mead Valley. In contrast, the current project site is located within a valley setting devoid of any bedrock outcroppings. Based upon the records search results and survey of historic aerial maps and photographs, resources tied to the historic built environment are the most likely to be encountered within the project site.

### **Field Reconnaissance**

Principal Investigator Brian F. Smith directed the pedestrian survey of the subject property, which was conducted by Field Archaeologist David K. Grabski on May 10, 2022. Aerial photographs, maps, and a compass permitted orientation and location of the project boundaries.



Where possible, narrow transect paths were employed to ensure maximum lot coverage. All exposed ground was inspected for cultural materials. During the survey, particular attention was paid to areas with exposed ground surfaces, such as rodent burrows and areas around the base of vegetation. A survey form, field notes, and photographs documented the survey work undertaken.

At the time of the survey, the project site was characterized as two previously developed parcels. The eastern half of the property (945 West Markham Street, APN 314-170-010) contains the 1976 residence as well as associated modern ancillary structures that appear to be used for a metal fabrication business (Plate 4). The far eastern third of the property contains a dirt bike/BMX track (Plate 5).



**Plate 4: Overview of 945 West Markham Street, the 1976 residence, facing southwest.**



**Plate 5: Overview of the eastern third of the project site, facing north.**

At the time of the survey, the western half of the project site (995 West Markham Street; APN 314-170-009) was being utilized for the storage of various vehicles, machinery, and building material, which limited visibility in this area (Plate 6). This parcel contained a modern prefabricated modular residence structure that was being stored on jack-stands. As identified in the survey of aerial photographs, one ancillary structure, first visible on the 1962 aerial photograph, is still present within this part of the project site (Plate 7). In addition to the still standing structure, some cement foundation remains and potentially historic septic system were also identified within the western portion of the project site.





**Plate 6: Overview of the project site from the southwest corner, facing east.**




**Plate 7: Overview of 995 West Markham Street and historic ancillary structure, facing south.**

The survey of the property did not identify any archaeological resources. However, one historic ancillary structure constructed between 1953 and 1962 and additional foundation remains and septic system were identified within the project site. The foundation remains are situated in the northwest corner of the project site and are likely associated with the original structure shown on the 1938 aerial photograph. Regardless, given the prolonged ownership of the property by the Smiths, the foundation remains along with the other historic features are most closely tied with their ownership of the project site.

Given that the ancillary features are older than 50 years, they were recorded as Site Temp-1 according to the OHP's manual, *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*, using DPR forms (Appendix B). Figure 8 and Plate 8 show the location of Temp-1 within the project site. The ancillary structure is a vernacular wood-framed barn-like structure covered in corrugated metal sheets. The side-gabled roof is also covered in corrugated metal sheets, while the entry doors on the southern façade consists of replaced plywood sheeting of various sizes cobbled together to restrict ingress and egress (Plate 9). The additional historic features consist of the foundation remains and a septic system generally located in the northwest corner of the project site (Plates 10 and 11).

Although the features at Site Temp-1 are over 50 years old, they would not qualify as significant resources under CEQA. The research of the property did not identify any significant events or individuals tied to the property and associated with the present features. Further, the foundation remains, septic system, or ancillary structure do not appear to be the work of a master builder or architect, and it is unlikely that Site Temp-1 would be able to provide any further research potential. Finally, the integrity of the building and structural remains has been severely compromised through the clearing of associated structures, modern development of adjacent properties, and expedient methods of repair (*e.g.*, the plywood doors) to maintain the building's function. As such, the resource is not eligible for the CRHR.





**Figure 8**  
**Cultural Resource Location Map**  
 The 945-995 Markham Street Project

USGS *Perris* and *Steele Peak* Quadrangles (7.5-minute series)







**Plate 8**  
**Temp-1 on Current Aerial Map**  
The 945-995 Markham Street Project





**Plate 9: Southern façade of ancillary structure, facing north.**



**Plate 10: Overview of cement foundation remains, facing south.**





**Plate 11: Overview of septic system, facing south.**

## **V. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The cultural resources study for the 945-995 Markham Street Project did not identify any significant cultural resources within the property. However, due to the known presence of structures being located historically within the property, the presence of one existing historic ancillary building constructed between 1953 and 1962, limited visibility due to excessive clutter within the western parcel, and previous disturbances, there still remains the potential for resources to be discovered during project construction activities. Therefore, it is recommended that an archaeological monitor be present during ground disturbances associated with the project. The archaeological monitor will periodically assess the potential for resources throughout the course of ground-disturbing activities and shall have the power to modify or reduce the level of monitoring should the potential to encounter resources be significantly reduced. Further, as evident by the records search results, the most typical resource types within the project vicinity are historic with prehistoric resources in the area tending to be associated with bedrock outcroppings within the neighboring foothills. As such, given the limited potential for prehistoric resources, Native American monitoring is not recommended. If, during the monitoring process, prehistoric artifacts or deposits are identified, tribal monitors will be contacted and included in the process.



The project site is located within the PVCC Specific Plan planning area of the city of Perris. As archaeological monitoring is recommended, the following cultural resources Mitigation Measures (MM) are proposed, which include mitigation measures outlined within the PVCC Specific Plan FEIR as updated by the City of Perris. MM 1 below implements PVCC Specific Plan FEIR mitigation measures MM Cultural 2 through MM Cultural 4, as subsequently revised by the City of Perris.

**MM 1** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project proponent/developer shall retain a professional archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Standards for Archaeology (U.S. Department of Interior 2012; Registered Professional Archaeologist, preferred). The primary task of the consulting archaeologist shall be to monitor the initial ground-disturbing activities at both the subject property and any off-site project-related improvement areas for the identification of any previously unknown archaeological and/or cultural resources. Selection of the archaeologist shall be subject to the approval of the City of Perris Director of Development Services and no ground-disturbing activities shall occur at the site or within the off-site improvement areas until the archaeologist has been approved by the City.

The archaeologist shall be responsible for monitoring ground-disturbing activities, maintaining daily field notes and a photographic record, and for reporting all finds to the developer and the City of Perris in a timely manner. The archaeologist shall be prepared and equipped to record and salvage cultural resources that may be unearthed during ground-disturbing activities and shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert ground-disturbing equipment to allow time for the recording and removal of the resources. The archaeological monitor will continually assess the potential for resources throughout the course of ground-disturbing activities and shall have the power to modify or reduce the level of monitoring should the potential to encounter resources be significantly reduced.

In the event that archaeological resources are discovered at the project or within the off-site improvement areas, the handling of the discovered resource(s) will differ, depending on the nature of the find. Consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(b) and Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014), avoidance shall be the preferred method of preservation for Native American/tribal cultural/archaeological resources. However, it is understood that all artifacts, with the exception of human

remains and related grave goods or sacred/ceremonial/religious objects, belong to the property owner. The property owner will commit to the relinquishing and curation of all artifacts identified as being of Native American origin. All artifacts, Native American or otherwise, discovered during the monitoring program shall be recorded and inventoried by the consulting archaeologist.

If any artifacts of Native American origin are discovered, all activities in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 50-foot radius) shall stop and the project proponent and project archaeologist shall notify the City of Perris Planning Division and interested Luiseño tribes. A designated Luiseño tribal representative shall be invited on the project site to assist the project archaeologist in the significance determination of the Native American resource as deemed possible. The designated Luiseño tribal representative will be given adequate time to examine the find. The significance of Native American resources shall be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and shall consider the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Luiseño tribe. If the find is determined to be of sacred or religious value, the Luiseño tribal representative will work with the City and consulting archaeologist to protect the resource in accordance with tribal requirements. All analysis will be undertaken in a manner that avoids destruction or other adverse impacts.

In the event that human remains are discovered at the project or within the off-site project improvement areas, MM 2 shall immediately apply and all items found in association with Native American human remains shall be considered grave goods or sacred in origin and subject to special handling.

Native American artifacts that are relocated/reburied at the project site would be subject to a fully executed relocation/reburial agreement with the assisting Luiseño tribe. This shall include, but not be limited to, an agreement that artifacts will be reburied on-site and in an area of permanent protection to be agreed upon between sponsor and the designated Native American representative, if requested, and that reburial shall not occur until all cataloging and basic recordation have been completed by the consulting archaeologist.

Native American artifacts that cannot be avoided or relocated at the project site shall be prepared for curation at an accredited curation facility in

Riverside County that meets federal standards (per 36 CFR Part 79) and available to archaeologists/researchers for further study. The project archaeologist shall deliver the Native American artifacts, including title, to the identified curation facility within a reasonable amount of time, along with applicable fees for permanent curation.

Non-Native American artifacts shall be inventoried, assessed, and analyzed for cultural affiliation, personal affiliation (prior ownership), function, and temporal placement. Subsequent to analysis and reporting, these artifacts will be subjected to curation, as deemed appropriate, or returned to the property owner.

Once grading activities have ceased or the archaeologist determines that monitoring is no longer necessary, monitoring activities can be discontinued following notification to the City of Perris Planning Division.

A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of artifacts, shall be prepared upon completion of the tasks outlined above. The report shall include all data outlined by the OHP guidelines, including a conclusion of the significance of all recovered, relocated, and reburied artifacts. A copy of the report shall also be filed with the City of Perris Planning Division, the University of California, Riverside [EIC], and the Luiseño tribe(s) involved with the project.

MM 2 below implements PVCC Specific Plan FEIR MM Cultural 6, as subsequently revised by the City of Perris.

**MM 2**

In the event that human remains (or remains that may be human) are discovered at the subject property or within the off-site improvement areas during ground-disturbing activities, the construction contractors, project archaeologist, and/or designated Luiseño tribal representative shall immediately stop all activities within 100 feet of the find. The project proponent shall then inform the Riverside County Coroner and the City of Perris Planning Division immediately, and the coroner shall be permitted to examine the remains as required by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b).

If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the coroner would notify the NAHC, which will identify the “Most Likely

Descendent” (MLD). Despite the affiliation with any Luiseño tribal representative(s) at the site, the NAHC’s identification of the MLD will stand. The MLD shall be granted access to inspect the site of the discovery of Native American human remains and may recommend to the project proponent means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete his or her inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The disposition of the remains will be determined in consultation between the project proponent and the MLD. In the event that there is disagreement regarding the disposition of the remains, State law will apply and median with the NAHC will make the applicable determination (see Public Resources Code Section 5097.98I and 5097.94(k)).

The specific locations of Native American burials and reburials will be proprietary and not disclosed to the general public. The locations will be documented by the consulting archaeologist in conjunction with the various stakeholders and a report of findings shall be filed with the [EIC].

## **VI. CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this archaeological report, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and have been compiled in accordance with CEQA criteria as defined in Section 15064.5.



---

Brian F. Smith  
Principal Investigator

February 17, 2023

Date

## **VII. REFERENCES**

Albert A. Web Associates

- 2011 Perris Valley Commerce Center (PVCC) Specific Plan Final EIR. Electronic document, [http://www.cityofperris.org/city-hall/specific-plans/PVCC/PVCC\\_MMRP\\_11-30%2011\\_rev.pdf](http://www.cityofperris.org/city-hall/specific-plans/PVCC/PVCC_MMRP_11-30%2011_rev.pdf), accessed March 6, 2019.

Bean, Lowell John

- 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 John and Florence C. Shipek

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

Bean, Lowell John and Charles R. Smith

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

Beattie, George W. and Helen P. Beattie

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

Berba, John Dominic

2017 *Booms and Busts: Water's Role in the Development of Perris*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California.

Brigandi, Phil

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

Byrd, Brian F.

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

California Natural Resources Agency

2022 *2022 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines*. Association of Environmental Professionals.

Caughey, John W.

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

Chapman, Charles E.

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

City of Moreno Valley

N.d. The History of Moreno Valley. Electronic document, <http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us/community/about.shtml>, accessed January 23, 2020.

City of Perris

- N.d History. Electronic document, <http://www.cityofperris.org/about/history.html>, accessed January 23, 2019.
- 2008 City of Perris General Plan – Conservation Element. Electronic document, [http://www.cityofperris.org/city-hall/general-plan/Conservation\\_Element\\_01-08-09.pdf](http://www.cityofperris.org/city-hall/general-plan/Conservation_Element_01-08-09.pdf), accessed June 29, 2020.

Cook, Sherburne F.

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

Engelhardt, Zephyrin

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

Environmental Science Associates

- 2016 DWR Perris Dam Emergency Release Facility Draft Environmental Impact Report. Prepared for the California Department of Water Resources. Electronic document, [https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/lakeperris/DEIR/3-9\\_Hydrology.pdf](https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/lakeperris/DEIR/3-9_Hydrology.pdf), accessed January 23, 2019.

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

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

Fagan, B.

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

Gallegos, Dennis

- 1987 A Review and Synthesis of Environmental and Cultural Material for the Batiquitos Lagoon Region. In *San Dieguito-La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*, edited by Dennis Gallegos. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.
- 1992 Patterns and Implications of Coastal Settlement in San Diego County: 9,000 to 1,300 Years Ago. In *Essays on the Prehistory of Maritime California*, edited by Terry Jones. Center for Archaeological Research, Davis, California.

Gallegos, Dennis R. and Carolyn E. Kyle

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

Gunther, Jane Davies

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

Handley, C.

- 1967 *The Sun City Story*. *Sun City News*, Sun City, California.

Harris, Marvin

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

Hinton, Richard J.

- 1892 *A Report on Irrigation and the Cultivation of the Soil Thereby, with Physical Data, Conditions, and Progress Within the United States for 1891, Accompanied by Maps, Illustrations, and Papers*. Office of Irrigation Inquiry, Department of Agriculture. Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C.

Hoffman, Ogden

- 1862 *Reports of Land Cases Determined in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California*, Numa Hubert, San Francisco.

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

- 1986 *Obsidian Exchange in Prehistoric Orange County*. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 22 (1):33-69.

Kowta, Makoto

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

Kroeber, A.L.

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

Laylander, Don (editor)

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

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

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

Library of Congress, General Collections

- 2021 Mexican California. In “California as I Saw It:” First-Person Narratives of California’s Early Years, 1849-1900. Electronic collection, <https://www.loc.gov/collections/california-first-person-narratives/articles-and-essays/early-california-history/mexican-california/>, accessed March 22, 2021.

March Field Air Museum

- 2020 History of March Air Reserve Base. Electronic document, <https://www.marchfield.org/visit/about-us/march-air-reserve-base-history/>, accessed May 18, 2020.

Martin, P.S.

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

Masters, Patricia M.

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

Meighan, Clement W.

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

Metropolitan Water District (MWD)

- N.d. Who We Are: 75 Years. Electronic document, <http://www.mwdh2o.com/WhoWeAre/History/75years/>, accessed January 23, 2019.

Miller, J.

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

Moratto, Michael J.

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

Moriarty, James R., III

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

Morton, D.M.

- 2001 Geologic map of the Steele Peak 7.5' quadrangle, Riverside County, California: U. S.



- Geological Survey Open-File Report 01-449, scale 1:24,000.
- 2003 Preliminary geologic map of the Perris 7.5' quadrangle, Riverside County, California: U. S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 03-270, scale 1:24,000.
- Moss, M.L. and J. Erlandson  
1995 Reflections on North American Coast Prehistory. *Journal of World Prehistory* 9(1):1-46.
- Patterson, Tom  
1971 *A Colony for California: Riverside's First Hundred Years*. Press-Enterprise, Riverside, California.
- Pourade, Richard F.  
1961 Time of the Bells. In *The History of San Diego* (Volume 2). Union-Tribune Publishing Company, San Diego, California.  
1963 The Silver Dons. In *The History of San Diego* (Volume 3). Union-Tribune Publishing Company, San Diego, California.
- Raven-Jennings, Shelly, Brian F. Smith and Johnna L. Buysse  
1996 The Results of a Cultural Resource Study at the 4S Ranch, Rancho Bernardo, County of San Diego. Unpublished report on file at the South Coastal Information Center at San Diego State University, San Diego, California.
- Redlands Daily Facts*  
2008 The Rise and Fall of Frank Brown. Electronic document, <https://www.redlandsdailyfacts.com/2008/08/09/the-rise-and-fall-of-frank-brown/>, accessed December 4, 2020.
- Robinson, John W.  
1997 Rancho San Jacinto Viejo and the Estudillo Family. In *Rancho Days in Southern California*, (Los Angeles: Los Angeles Corral of the Westerners), pp. 143-161.
- Rogers, Malcolm J.  
1939 Early Lithic Industries of the Lower Basin of the Colorado River and Adjacent Desert Areas. In *San Diego Museum Papers* (3) [1989 printing]. San Diego Museum of Man, San Diego, California.
- Rolle, Andrew F.  
1969 *California: A History* (Second Edition). Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York.
- Shumway, George, Carl L. Hubbs, and James R. Moriarty, III  
1961 Scripps Estate Site, San Diego, California: A La Jolla Site Dated 5,460-7,370 Years Before the Present. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 93(3).

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

- 1985 The Archaeological Excavations at Batiquitos Pointe and Batiquitos Bluffs. Unpublished report on file at the City of Carlsbad, Carlsbad, California.

Strong, William Duncan

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

Sutton, Mark Q.

- 2009 People and Language: Defining the Takic Expansion into Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 41(2&3): 33-93.
- 2011a The Palomar Tradition and Its Place in the Prehistory of Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 44(4):1-74.
- 2011b *A Prehistory of North America*. Routledge, New York.

Sutton, Mark Q. and Jill K. Gardener

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

Tang, Bai “Tom”, Michael Hogan, Clarence Bodmer, Josh Smallwood, and Melissa Hernandez

- 2007 Cultural Resources Technical Report, North Perris Industrial Specific Plan, City of Perris, Riverside County, California. CRM Tech. Unpublished report on file at Eastern Information Center at University of California Riverside, Riverside, California.

True, Delbert L.

- 1958 An Early Complex in San Diego County, California. *American Antiquity* 23(3).
- 1980 The Pauma Complex in Northern San Diego County. *The Journal of New World Archaeology* 3(4):1-39.

Wallace, William J.

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

Warren, Claude N.

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

Warren, Claude N. and D.L. True

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

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

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

Woodford, A.O., Shelton, J.S., Doehring, D.O., and Morton, R.K.

1971 Pliocene-Pleistocene history of the Perris Block, southern California. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 82, p. 3421–3448, 18 figs.

**APPENDIX A**

**Resumes of Key Personnel**

# Brian F. Smith, MA

## Owner, Principal Investigator

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



## Education

---

Master of Arts, History, University of San Diego, California	1982
Bachelor of Arts, History, and Anthropology, University of San Diego, California	1975

## Professional Memberships

---

Society for California Archaeology

## Experience

---

Principal Investigator Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.	1977–Present Poway, California
---	-----------------------------------

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

## Professional Accomplishments

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# Andrew J. Garrison, MA, RPA

## Project Archaeologist

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



## Education

---

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

## Professional Memberships

---

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

## Experience

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2005, 2008–2009  
Riverside, California

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

## Reports/Papers

---

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

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

## Presentations

---

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

**APPENDIX B**

**Site Forms**

*(Deleted for Public Review; Bound Separately)*

**APPENDIX C**

**Archaeological Records Search Results**

*(Deleted for Public Review; Bound Separately)*

**APPENDIX D**

**NAHC Sacred Lands File Search Results**

*(Deleted for Public Review; Bound Separately)*



**APPENDIX E**

**Assessor's Lot Books**


Val Verde Tract.

T.4S. R.4W.

Scale: 400ft=1in.



Schneider School District

Sections  
2, 1,  
11, 12.





# VAL VERDE TRACT



SCHNEIDER School District.



SEE PAGE 40 FOR LANDS SHOWN IN BLUE

Page 6





# Val verde tract









# PERRY RESUB and a portion of VAL VERDE TRACT

1" = 300'

Being portion of Blocks 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 + 10  
VAL VERDE TRACT  
and portion of Sec. 1, T. 4 S. R. 4 W. S. B. & M.

Ass'd on page 47.




B-16

Cor. to Sec. 1, 6, 7 + 12  
T. 4 S. R. 3 + 4 W. S. B. & M.

(6-4)







# PERRY RE-SUB.

## AND A PORTION OF VAL VERDE TRACT

BEING PORTIONS OF BLOCKS  
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, & 10 VAL VERDE  
TRACT AND A PORTION OF  
SEC. 1, T. 4 S., R. 4 W., S. B. & M.  
*the W. 1/2*

*Show existing red swaps  
of record*



12 7  
13 18





# PERRY RE-SUB


1" = 100'  
 ✓ = Parcels separately assessed for 1973  
 4/1/73



SEC. 2 SEC. 1  
 SEC. 11 SEC. 12



SEC. 1 SEC. 6  
 SEC. 12 SEC. 7



1  
 100  
 100  
 100  
 100  
 100








# INDEX PERRIS

Book 11

Book 14

Book 22

1 inch = 3000 Feet




See Book 16-A

Book 10

RANGE 5 W  
RANGE 4 W

EL SOBRIANTE DE SAN JACINTO

RANGE 3 W  
RANGE 2 W



Book 22



RIVERSIDE COUNTY Real Property Ownership Record

Table with columns for assessment years (1938-1944), descriptions, acreage, school districts, and land value. Includes entries for VAL VERDE TRACT MB1/6, PERRY RESUB MB7/45, and AMENDED MAP OF FIGADOTA FARMS NO 19 MB18/36.

22

1938

1939 ASSESSED TO

1940 ASSESSED TO

1941 ASSESSED TO

1942 ASSESSED TO

1943 ASSESSED TO

1944 ASSESSED TO

DESCRIPTION

SEC OF LOT, TWP, RANGE

SCHOOL DISTRICT

LAND VALUE 1939-1944

BUILDINGS 1939-1944

TREES, VINES, ETC. 1939-1944

Handwritten entries in left margin listing names (e.g., Strang Frank R, Sawyer Ella, Sasaki Teruo) and tax/assessment numbers.

Main body of handwritten entries containing parcel descriptions, acreage, and valuation data.



RIVERSIDE COUNTY Real Property Ownership Record

Table with columns for years (1943-1949), ASSESSED TO, DESCRIPTION, and LAND VALUE. Includes handwritten entries for names like 'VAL VERDE TRACT' and 'AT & SF RR'.



RIVERSIDE COUNTY Real Property Ownership Record

Table with columns for years (1943-1949), Description, Acres, School District, Land Value (1944-1949), Buildings (1944-1949), and Trees/Vines (1944-1949). Includes entries for Perry Resub, Figadota Farms, and CRA R/W.








16-24-01 24a

# RIVERSIDE COUNTY Real Property Ownership Record

LINE NO.	ASSESSOR	ASSESSMENT YEARS					LINE NO.	DESCRIPTION	SECTION OR LOT	TWP. OR BLOCK	RANGE	SCHOOL DIST. CODE AREA	DATE SOLD FOR TAXES	1950			1951			1952			1953			TAXES
		1950	1951	1952	1953	1954								LAND	IMP.	T&V	LAND	IMP.	T&V	LAND	IMP.	T&V	LAND	IMP.	T&V	
2	Smith Dan B (Ruby E)						2	N 1/2 10 AC	9				850	220		850	220		850	220		850	220			
3	Isbide George						3	S 1/2 10.01 AC	9				1500	1250		1500	1250		1500	1250		1500	1250			
4	Kalozawa Mitsuo						4	BEG 98 FT E OF SW COR E 50 FT X N 40 FT					3000		3000		3000		3000							
5	Alston Edward & Fleming M A						5	EXC BER 98 FT E OF SW COR E 50 FT X N 40 FT 19.95 AC	10				3320	700	3320	700	3320	700	3320	700		3320	700			
6	Smith Donald B (Ruby E)						6	38.98 AC	11				210		210		210		210			210				
8	Teth Joe W & Charles						8	8.12 AC	13				210		210		420		420			420				
9	Clark Ira W (Burlat M)						9	10.35 AC	14				420	30	420	30	1050		1050							
10	Teth Joe W & Charles						10	14.25 AC	15				1450		1450		450		450			450				
12	Alston Edward & Fleming M A						12	N 7 AC	17				450		450		1350		1350			1350				
13	do						13	S 3 AC OF N 10 AC	17				1350		1350		2700		2700			2700				
14	do						14	S 9.04 AC OF N 19.04 AC	17				2700		2700											
16	do						16	S 19.7 AC EXC BEG INT CL MARTIN ST AND NE* LINE WADE AVE TH E 133.65 FT N 417.76 FT W 283.43 FT TO WADE AVE SE TO BEG	17				1000	3050	1000	3050										
19	Laufer Paul C & Marie Fern E						X 19	BEG INT CL MARTIN ST AND NE LINE WADE AVE TH E 133.65 FT N 417.76 FT W 283.43 FT TO WADE AVE SE 443.8 FT TO BEG EXC SW 20 FT) 1.70 AC	17				850		850		850		850			850				
22	Smith Donald B (Ruby E)						22	N 10 AC	18				1500		1500		1500		1500			1500				
23	Alston Edward & Fleming M A						23	S 10 AC	18				50		50		2250		2250							
24	do						24	do	19				2250		2250		3050		3050							
25	do						25	N 15 AC	20				3900	1800	3900	1800	3900	1800	3900	1800		3900	1800			
26	do						26	S 20.30 AC	20				1540		1540		750	1400	750	1400		750	1400			
27	do						27	25.84 AC	21				1500	540	1500	540	1500	540	1500	540		1500	540			
28	Iwata Tatsumi						28	N 10.29 AC	22				750	2770	750	2770	750	2770	750	2770		750	2770			
29	Handy Alice C						29	S 5 AC	22																	
30	Alston Edward & Fleming M A						30	10.04 AC	23																	
31	Smith Arch S (Keith R)						31	N 5 AC OF S 10 AC 5 AC	22																	
41	Hicks Emily D (Jep)						41	S OF MWD R/W 48.42 AC	I																	
42	Metropolitan Water D. of S. C.						X 44	CRA R/W 139/12/6 5.30 AC	I				910		910		910		910			910				





with Donald D (Ruby E)  
 Life Est 1071-12/49  
 Anna  
 Barbara 1125-7/46  
 Barbara 1125-7/46  
 Joe W & Charles 1660-1/45  
 Joe W & Charles 1660-1/45  
 Joe W & Charles 1660-1/45  
 Joe W & Charles 1660-1/45  
 A F 3441  
 Joe W & Charles 1660-1/45  
 Jose Jos G (Margaret A) 993-9/46  
 Fleming MA 33961-7/53  
 Joe W & Charles 1660-1/45  
 Fleming MA 33961-7/53  
 Joe W & Charles 1660-1/45  
 Cont Ag 3341-2/50  
 Homer C (Rosalee) 27154  
 Charles & Joe W 1077-12/45  
 George (Eleanor) 1130-10/48  
 RR  
 RR  
 RR  
 RR

13120-3/54  
 Joe & Charles  
 13120-3/54  
 Joe & Charles  
 13120-3/54

15921-22-3/55  
 Donald B & Ruby E

40169-8/54  
 John

40169-8/54  
 John

11354-55-56-57-58-60/56  
 Keel A. J.

11394-11355-56-57-58-59  
 R/56

13454-2/56  
 Kennedy Forest J (Barbara A)

Clark Ira W & Young John  
 Blaha Beatie & Guadalupe

Clark Ira W & Young John  
 Clark Ira W & Young John  
 Clark Ira W & Young John  
 Clark Ira W & Young John  
 Clark Ira W & Young John  
 Clark Ira W & Young John

Clark Ira W & Young John

Mcumber Arthur D (Dorothy E)

Bashe Carl E  
 Fleming J V

Bashe Carl E  
 Bashe Carl E

Clark Ira W & Young John

VAL VERDE TR MB 1/6  
 13.78 AC  
 E 10 AC  
 W 5.25 AC  
 10.96 AC  
 10.81  
 10.95 AC  
 10 AC  
 4.60 AC  
 BEG NE COR LOT II PERRY  
 330 FT X S 132 FT. 1 AC  
 BEG NW COR E 333.98 FT S  
 283.34 FT N 150 FT ALG  
 POR TO ST HWY CO RD  
 8.21 AC  
 E 3.5 AC.  
 W 6.5 AC  
 10.99 AC  
 E 1/2. 4.67 AC  
 W 1/2. 4.66 AC  
 POR LOT 7 W OF PERRY  
 EXC POR BEG NW COR E  
 W 283.34 FT N 150 FT  
 EXC STATE HWY. 8.01  
 LOTS 7 AND 8. 20 AC  
 7.98 AC  
 LOT I ALSO LOT 6 E  
 EXC bet SW COR Lot 6 E 297.01'  
 7.36 AC  
 EXC S 40 FT. 15 A  
 Beg SW Cor E 297.01' x 112.4'  
 S 1/2 OF SE 1/4  
 18.75 AC  
 SW 1/4 OF SW 1/4  
 SBE 804 33 17 P  
 SBE 804 33 17  
 SBE 804 33 17  
 SBE 804 33 17  
 SBE 804 33 17  
 SBE 804 33 17  
 SBE 804 33 17















RESUB MB 7/45

LOT 10 EXC BEG 98' E OF SW COR E 50' X N 40'

ALSO LOT 17 EXC S 19.7 AC, ALSO S 10 AC OF LOT 18

10.32 AC M/L 10 AC ±

EVANS EDWARD H ET AL  
PERRY RESUB MB 7/45

FLAG CR.

10.29 AC EXC POR TO ST HWY, 9.65 AC

HANDY ALLIE C  
PERRY RESUB MB 7/45

5 AC EXC POR TO ST HWY, 4.61 AC

LEMON I M  
PERRY RESUB MB 7/45

10.04 AC

SMITH ARCH S & KEITH R  
PERRY RESUB MB 7/45

5 AC OF S 10 AC EXC POR TO ST HWY, 4.62 AC

KEEL A J  
PERRY RESUB MB 7/45

POR TO ST HWY, LOT 20 &

17

18

22

22

23

22

98-10

98-10

98-10

98-10

98-10

98-1

98-



DESCRIPTION

RIVERSIDE COUNTY Real Property Ownership Record

BOOK 16 MAP 24 PAGE 001

SECTION OR LOT	TWP. OR BLOCK	RANGE	SCHOOL DISTRICT CODE AREA	YEAR SOLD FOR TAXES	LINE NO.	1960 ASSESSED TO		1961 ASSESSED TO		1962 ASSESSED TO		1963 ASSESSED TO		1964 ASSESSED TO		1960		1961		1962		1963		1964	
						LAND	IMP.	LAND	IMP.	LAND	IMP.	LAND	IMP.	LAND	IMP.	LAND	IMP.	LAND	IMP.	LAND	IMP.	LAND	IMP.	LAND	IMP.
1964 DONALD B & RUBY E RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		02																				
TOSHIO ET AL RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		03																				
MELVIN J & VERNA RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		04																				
E OF SW COR E 50' X N 40'			98-10		06																				
DONALD B & RUBY E RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		08																				
IRA W & YOUNG JOHN RESUB MB 7/45			98-14		09																				
IRA W & PAULINE M RESUB MB 7/45			98-14		10																				
IRA W & YOUNG JOHN RESUB MB 7/45			98-14	1958	19																				
STATE OF CALIF RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		17																				
CL MARTIN ST & NE LINE WADE AVE																									
E SE 443.8' TO BEG EXC SW 20' 1.70 AC																									
DONALD B & RUBY E RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		22																				
MON I M RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		27																				
EXC BEG 98' E OF SW COR E 50' X N 40'																									
LOT 17 EXC S 19.7 AC, ALSO S 10 AC OF LOT 18																									
AC M/L																									
EVANS EDWARD H ET AL RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		28																				
9 AC EXC POR TO ST HWY, 9.65 AC																									
HANDY ALLIE C RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		29																				
EXC POR TO ST HWY, 4.61 AC			98-10		30																				
MON I M RESUB MB 7/45																									
AC			98-10		31																				
SMITH ARCH S & KEITH R RESUB MB 7/45			98-10		32																				
K OF S 10 AC EXC POR TO ST HWY, 4.62 AC																									
KEEL A J RESUB MB 7/45																									
AC OF LOT 17 EXC ANY POR TO ST HWY, LOT 20 &																									
LOT 21 LYING E OF E LN OF ST HWY																									
POR TO CO 69.56 AC M/L																									
YOUNG C S & JERI MAP OF FIGADOTA FARMS #19 MB 18/36																									
RR R/W & S OF MWD R/W 8 AC M/L																									
METROPOLITAN WATER D OF S C MAP OF FIGADOTA FARMS #19 MB 18/36																									
R/W 139/12/6, 5.30 AC																									

*Nefti Shann J. (Margaret G.)*

*William Edward B. (Elizabeth)*

*Mark Deacons & Co*

*Clark Don (Barbara) Agnella Anthony M*

*Clark Robert Young John*

*61939-61938-759 Keel A J William Edward B. (Elizabeth)*

*61940-774 61939-759 Smith Donald B. Ruby E. William Edward B. (Elizabeth)*

*61939-759 Keel A J William Edward B. (Elizabeth)*

*61939-759 Evans Don G. (Audrey) Clardy James E. (Elizabeth)*

*William Edward B. (Elizabeth)*

*Young Jerr J*

*67212-8*

*9126 98-14*

*9126 98-14*

*X*



**APPENDIX F**

**PVCC Specific Plan FEIR  
Applicable Mitigation Measures**



Biological Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/ Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	at least 90 percent avoidance of areas providing long-term conservation value for the NEPSSA and CAPSSA target species. If avoidance is not feasible, then such implementing projects will require the approval of a DBESP including appropriate mitigation.	conjunction with development applications as part of the CEQA process  Approval of a DBESP will be required as part of the CEQA process	Planning Division				

Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/ Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> .	<b>MM Cultural 1:</b> Prior to the consideration by the City of Perris of implementing development or infrastructure projects for properties that are vacant, undeveloped, or considered to be sensitive for cultural resources by the City of Perris Planning Division, a Phase I Cultural Resources Study of the subject property prepared in accordance	In conjunction with development applications, and prior to issuance of grading permits	Submittal of a Phase I Cultural Resources Study and issuance of grading permits	City of Perris Planning Division			



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>with the protocol of the City of Perris by a professional archeologist<sup>1</sup> shall be submitted to the City of Perris Planning Division for review and approval. The Phase I Cultural Resources Study shall determine whether the subject implementing development would potentially cause a substantial adverse change to any significant paleontological, archaeological, or historic resources. The Phase I Cultural Resources Study shall be prepared to meet the standards established by Riverside County and shall, at a minimum, include the results of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Records searches at the Eastern Information Center (EIC), the National or State Registry of Historic Places and any appropriate public, private, and tribal archives.</li> <li>2. Sacred Lands File record search with the NAHC followed by project scoping with tribes recommended by the NAHC.</li> <li>3. Field survey of the implementing</li> </ol>						

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this measure, the City of Perris considers professional archaeologists to be those who meet the United States Secretary of the Interior’s standards for recognition as a professional, including an advanced degree in anthropology, archaeology, or a related field, and the local experience necessary to evaluate the specific project. The professional archaeologist must also meet the minimum criteria for recognition by the Register for Professional Archaeologists (RPA), although membership is not required.



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>development or infrastructure project site.</p> <p>The proponents of the subject implementing development projects and the professional archaeologists are also encouraged to contact the local Native American tribes (as identified by the California Native Heritage Commission and the City of Perris) to obtain input regarding the potential for native American resources to occur at the project site.</p> <p>Measures shall be identified to mitigate the known and potential significant effects of the implementing development or infrastructure project, if any. Mitigation for historic resources shall be considered in the following order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Avoidance.</li> <li>2. Changes to the structure provided pursuant to the Secretary of Interior's Standards.</li> <li>3. Relocation of the structure.</li> <li>4. Recordation of the structure to Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)/Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standard if demolition is allowed.</li> </ol>						



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>Avoidance is the preferred treatment for known significant prehistoric and historical archaeological sites, and sites containing Native American human remains. Where feasible, plans for implementing projects shall be developed to avoid known significant archaeological resources and sites containing human remains. Where avoidance of construction impacts is possible, the implementing projects shall be designed and landscaped in a manner, which will ensure that indirect impacts from increased public availability to these sites are avoided. Where avoidance is selected, archaeological resource sites and sites containing Native American human remains shall be placed within permanent conservation easements or dedicated open space areas.</p> <p>The Phase I Cultural Resources Study submitted for each implementing development or infrastructure project shall have been completed no more than three (3) years prior to the submittal of the application for the subject implementing development project or the start of construction of an implementing infrastructure project.</p>						



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p><b>MM Cultural 2:</b> If the Phase I Cultural Resources Study required under <b>MM Cultural 1</b> determines that monitoring during construction by a professional archaeologist is needed for the implementing development project; the project proponent shall retain a professional archaeologist prior to the issuance of grading permits. The task of the archaeologist shall be to verify implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the approved Phase I Cultural Resources Study and to monitor the initial ground-altering activities<sup>2</sup> at the subject site for the unearthing of previously unknown archaeological and/or cultural resources. Selection of the archaeologist shall be subject to the approval of the City of Perris Planning Manager and no grading activities shall occur at the site until the archaeologist has been approved by the City.</p> <p>The archaeological monitor shall be responsible for maintaining daily field notes, a photographic record, and reporting all finds in a timely manner. The archaeologist shall also be</p>	In conjunction with development applications, and prior to issuance of grading permits	Retention of professional archaeologist/ongoing monitoring/submittal of Report of Findings, if applicable	City of Perris Planning Division			
	<p>equipped to record and salvage cultural resources that may be unearthed during initial ground-altering activities. The archaeologist</p>						11.0-24



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p><b>MM Cultural 3</b> If the Phase I Cultural Resources Study required under <b>MM Cultural 1</b> determines that monitoring during construction by both a professional archaeologist and a Native American representative is needed for the implementing development project, the project proponent shall retain a professional archaeologist and a Native American representative of Luiseño descent prior to the issuance of grading permits. The professional archaeologist and Native American observer shall be required on site during all initial ground-altering activities. The Native American observer shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect, or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow the evaluation of cultural resources with the project archaeologist. The evaluation and treatment provisions of mitigation measure <b>MM Cultural 2</b> shall apply to this measure.</p>	<p>Monitors retained prior to issuance of grading permits.</p> <p>Monitoring shall take place during all initial ground-altering activities</p>	<p>Retention of professional archaeologist/ongoing monitoring/submittal of Report of Findings, if applicable</p>	<p>City of Perris Planning Division</p>			
	<p><b>MM Cultural 4</b> In the event that cultural resources are discovered at a development site that is not monitored by a professional</p>	<p>Ongoing during construction</p>	<p>Retention of professional archaeologist/ongoing monitoring/submittal of</p>	<p>City of Perris Planning</p>			

<sup>2</sup> For the purpose of this measure, ground-altering activities include, but are not limited to, debris removal, vegetation removal, tree removal, grading, trenching, or other site preparation activities. Initial ground-altering activities refer to the first time that the existing materials are altered by construction-related activities. Materials that have already been disturbed by construction-related activities do not require subsequent monitoring.



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	archaeologist, all activities in the immediate vicinity of the find shall stop, the project developer shall notify the City of Perris Planning Division, and the project developer shall retain a professional archaeologist to analyze the find for identification as prehistoric and historical archaeological resources. The evaluation and treatment provisions of mitigation measure <b>MM Cultural 2</b> shall apply to this measure.		Report of Findings, if applicable	Division			
The project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	<p><b>MM Cultural 5:</b> Prior to grading for projects requiring subsurface excavation that exceeds five (5) feet in depth, proponents of the subject implementing development projects shall retain a professional paleontologist to verify implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the approved Phase I Cultural Resources Study and to monitor the subsurface excavation that exceed five (5) feet in depth. Selection of the paleontologist shall be subject to the approval of the City of Perris Planning Manager and no grading activities shall occur at the site until the paleontologist has been approved by the City.</p> <p>Monitoring should be restricted to undisturbed subsurface areas of older alluvium, which might be present below the surface. The</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading permits</p> <p>Ongoing monitoring during subsurface excavation</p>	Retention of professional paleontologist/ongoing monitoring/submittal of Report of Findings, if applicable	City of Perris Planning Division			



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>paleontologist shall be prepared to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays. The paleontologist shall also remove samples of sediments which are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. The paleontologist shall have the power to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for removal of abundant or large specimens.</p> <p>Collected samples of sediments shall be washed to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils. Recovered specimens shall be prepared so that they can be identified and permanently preserved. Specimens shall be identified and curated and placed into an accredited repository (such as the Western Science Center or the Riverside Metropolitan Museum) with permanent curation and retrievable storage.</p> <p>A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of recovered specimens, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. The report shall include a discussion of the significance of all recovered specimens. The report and inventory, when submitted to the City of Perris Planning Division, will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts</p>						



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	to paleontological resources.						
The project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> .	<p><b>MM Cultural 6:</b> In the event that human remains (or remains that may be human) are discovered at the implementing development project site during grading or earthmoving, the construction contractors shall immediately stop all activities in the immediate area of the find. The project proponent shall then inform the Riverside County Coroner and the City of Perris Planning Division and the coroner will be permitted to examine the remains.</p> <p>If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the coroner will notify the NAHC and the Commission will identify the “Most Likely Descendent” (MLD).<sup>3</sup> Despite the affiliation of any Native American representatives at the site, the Commission’s identification of the MLD will stand. The MLD shall be granted access to inspect the site of the discovery of the Native</p>	During construction activities	Coroner and NAHC contacted and submittal of Report of Findings, if applicable	City of Perris Planning Division			

<sup>3</sup> The “Most Likely Descendent” (“MLD”) is a reference used by the California Native American Heritage Commission to identify the individual or population most likely associated with any human remains that may be identified within a given project area. Under California Public Resources Code section 5097.98, the Native American Heritage Commission has the authority to name the MLD for any specific project and this identification is based on a report of Native American remains through the County Coroner’s office. In the case of the City of Perris, the Native American Heritage Commission may identify any Luiseño descendent, but generally names the Soboba or Pechanga bands of Mission Indians (both Luiseño populations) and alternates between the two groups. The City of Perris will recognize any MLD identified by the Native American Heritage Commission without giving preference to any particular population. In cases where the Native American Heritage Commission is not tasked with the identification of a Native American representative, the City of Perris reserves the right to make an independent decision based upon the nature of the proposed project.



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	<p>American human remains and may recommend to the project proponent means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The disposition of the remains will be determined in consultation with the City of Perris, the project proponent, and the MLD. The City of Perris will be responsible for the final decision, based upon input from the various stakeholders.</p> <p>If the human remains are determined to be other than Native American in origin, but still of archaeological value, the remains will be recovered for analysis and subject to curation or reburial at the expense of the project proponent. If deemed appropriate, the remains will be recovered by the coroner and handled through the Coroner's Office.</p> <p>Coordination with the Coroner's Office will be through the City of Perris and in consultation with the various stakeholders.</p> <p>The specific locations of Native American burials and reburials will be proprietary and not</p>						



Cultural Resources							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
	disclosed to the general public. The locations will be documented by the consulting archaeologist in conjunction with the various stakeholders and a report of findings shall be filed with the Eastern Information Center (EIC).						

Geology and Soils							
Impact/Threshold	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Timing/Frequency	Action Indicating Compliance	Monitoring Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
Expose people or property to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.  Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the proposed project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence,	<b>MM Geo 1:</b> Concurrent with the City of Perris' review of implementing development projects, the project proponent of the implementing development project shall submit a geotechnical report prepared by a registered geotechnical engineer and a qualified engineering geologist to the City of Perris Public Works/Engineering Administration Division for its review and approval. The geotechnical report shall assess the soil stability within the implementing development project affecting individual lots and building pads, and shall describe the methodology (e.g., overexcavated, backfilled, compaction) being used to implement the	In conjunction with development applications, and prior to issuance of grading permits	Submittal of geotechnical report	City of Perris Public Works/Engineering Division			