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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym/Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Assembly Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City of Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRHR</td>
<td>California Register of Historical Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGS</td>
<td>Department of General Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIC</td>
<td>Eastern Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSL</td>
<td>Haagen-Smit Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-</td>
<td>Interstate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>Most Likely Descendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHP</td>
<td>Office of Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Public Resources Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF</td>
<td>Sacred Lands File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-</td>
<td>State Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>shovel test pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>University of California, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) is proposing to relocate its air pollution testing facility from its current location in El Monte, Los Angeles County, to an approximately 18-acre site in the City of Riverside (City), Riverside County. The site is in the northeastern portion of the City and was part of the University of California, Riverside (UCR), West Campus. The site is located approximately 0.5 mile southwest of State Route (SR-) 60/Interstate (I-) 215 (from the University Avenue interchange) and 0.7 mile west of the UCR main campus. The site is relatively flat and consists of active agricultural land (primarily orange and avocado groves).

The scope of the current study was to review available archaeological, Native American, and historic literature covering the project site; to conduct a pedestrian survey of the area and a testing program and significance evaluation of the newly identified cultural resource; and to provide a cultural resources technical report. The regulatory framework for the project is California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Therefore, the purpose of this report is to identify all cultural resources within the proposed project site and to determine whether the proposed project would result in a significant impact to an historical resource under CEQA. The ARB will act as the CEQA lead agency.

Dudek conducted a California Historical Resources Information System records search at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) for the proposed project and surrounding 0.25 mile on December 16, 2015. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided results of its Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the proposed project site on December 22, 2015. Dudek conducted the Phase I intensive pedestrian survey for cultural resources on September 2, 2016, and the subsequent Phase II testing on September 20, 2016. Dudek completed its report in January 2017. Dudek revised the report in March 2017.

The SLF search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources within the immediate project site. The EIC records indicate that 13 cultural resources investigations have been conducted within 0.25 mile of the project site. Of these, two studies were mapped as overlapping the project site. Three of these consist of general overview reports. Neither of the two remaining studies resulted in the identification of cultural resources. There are no previously recorded cultural resources within the project site. The two cultural resources located within 0.25 mile of the project site consist of built environment resources: the Gage Canal (CA-RIV-4768) and the Weber House (P-33-9691). No built environment resources were identified within the project site as a result of the archival map review. One cultural resource was identified within the project site as a result of the pedestrian survey: a sparse and widely dispersed historic refuse scatter (temporarily designated as ARB-AD-01). The testing program initiated at ARB-AD-01 indicated that there is no subsurface cultural deposit associated with the historic refuse scatter.
As a result of the Phase II significance evaluation, the newly identified cultural resource was found not eligible for the listing on the CRHR and local register.

Although ARB-AD-01 is not a significant resource under CEQA and no intact deposits were encountered during the testing program, there remains the possibility that cultural deposits may be encountered during earth-moving activities. The testing program showed that substantial disturbance to the property was likely through extensive tilling of the land, resulting in a plow zone that had a mixing of historic-age and modern material. Excavations planned for the proposed project will likely extend beyond this plow zone, entering soils that may not have been disturbed during previous tilling activities. Dudek recommends that an archaeological monitor be present for the initial earth-moving activity on the project. Additionally, Dudek recommends that prior to grading activities commencing on site, ARB shall contact the consulting Native American tribe(s) that have requested monitoring, if any, through consultation during the Assembly Bill (AB) 52 process. ARB shall coordinate with the tribe(s) to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s), if necessary. Finally, Dudek recommends the standard measures to address unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources and human remains.
1 INTRODUCTION

The ARB with assistance from the Department of General Services (DGS) retained Dudek to conduct a cultural resources study in support of the proposed ARB Southern California Consolidation Project (proposed project). This report presents the results of (1) a cultural resources records search, (2) Native American coordination, (3) an intensive pedestrian survey of the proposed project site, and (4) a significance evaluation of the newly identified cultural resource. The project site consists of an approximately 18-acre parcel located within the City.

This report satisfies the requirements of CEQA, which requires lead agencies to determine whether a discretionary project may have a significant impact on historical resources. The ARB, as the designated lead agency, would implement and operate the proposed project. The purpose of this report is to identify all cultural resources within the proposed project site and to determine whether the proposed project would result in a significant impact to a historical resource under CEQA. This report meets the format and content requirements of the Archaeological Resource Management Report format and content guidelines recommended by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP 1995).

Archaeologist Adriane Dorrler, BA, co-authored this report, performed the records search at the EIC, initiated the preliminary Native American coordination, and conducted the cultural resources field survey and significance evaluation for this project. Dudek Senior Historic Preservation Specialist and Architectural Historian Kara Dotter, MSHP, prepared Section 2.2.2, Historic Overview, of the report. Quality assurance/quality control was provided by Archaeological Practice Lead Micah Hale, PhD, RPA. Mr. Hale meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards (Code of Federal Regulations Part 61) for archaeology.

1.1 Project Location and Description

The proposed project site is located at the southwest corner of the Iowa Avenue/Everton Place intersection on the UCR campus within the City (Figure 1, Regional Map). The site is accessed by Iowa Avenue, which is accessed by either University Avenue or Martin Luther King Boulevard, both of which provide a direct connection to SR-60/I-215. The site is located in the University Neighborhood area of the City and is about 2 miles from downtown Riverside. There are a number of amenities such as restaurants, hotels, shopping areas, and other university-oriented land uses walking distance of the site. The project site is relatively flat and is currently cultivated with orange and avocado groves. Historically, University-owned land west of SR-60/I-215 has been devoted to agricultural research uses, including many acres of cultivated trees. The site is not developed with any permanent aboveground structures, although a salinity research station is on the southern boundary and two concrete pads with anchor bolts exist, with one each...
in the eastern and central portions of the site. The project site is situated in Section 30, Township 2 South, Range 4 West, within the Riverside East U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle (Figure 2, Vicinity Map).

ARB is a part of the California Environmental Protection Agency, an organization that reports directly to the Governor’s Office in the executive branch of the California state government. The mission of ARB is to promote and protect public health, welfare, and ecological resources through the effective and efficient reduction of air pollutants while recognizing and considering the effects on the economy of the state. The basis for all ARB programs is research into the causes of air pollution and their effects on public health and the environment. Since its inception, ARB has led the country by developing air quality standards based on these research efforts.

The existing ARB motor vehicle and emissions testing and research facility in El Monte, California, also referred to as the Haagen-Smit Laboratory (HSL), began operating in 1971. Over the course of the last 45 years, five adjacent office and industrial spaces were leased to provide additional space for the growing testing and operational administration needs of the HSL (approximately 135,000 square feet). Collectively, the HSL and the nearby leased office/industrial spaces are referred to as the “ARB El Monte facility.” Due to space limitations at the ARB El Monte facility, a heavy-duty testing facility was established in 1998 at the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) in downtown Los Angeles, approximately 10 miles west of the ARB El Monte facility. The approximately 4,000-foot space is governed under a Memorandum of Understanding between ARB and MTA.

ARB operations at the El Monte site have outgrown the existing original building. The MTA facility does not meet existing and future heavy-duty testing needs in an efficient manner. The existing state-owned property that ARB uses for motor vehicle and emissions testing in El Monte is too small to accommodate construction of a sufficiently sized replacement facility. Therefore, ARB is planning to build a new state-of-the-art testing and research campus on 18 acres in the City and will relocate the El Monte and MTA operations to this new facility.

The proposed project involves construction of a new motor vehicle and emissions testing and research facility that would meet today’s work and safety standards and be adequately sized to meet mandated air quality and climate change requirements. The new ARB testing and research facility would include office areas as well as large circulation spaces for testing operations. The campus would allow for material/equipment shipping/receiving and ingress/egress of large vehicles, trucks, and mechanical equipment. The proposed campus would include exterior parking for employees, fleet, and testing vehicles. The new facility would be designed to accommodate up to 460 employees. The proposed project would interconnect with existing water, sewer, storm drain, gas, electric, phone, and fiber-optic infrastructure in the City.
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INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
Project construction would take approximately 36 months to complete beginning with site preparation and ending with final landscaping (December 2017–November 2020). The site work may include access roads, demolition, parking lots, landscaping, sidewalks, fencing, utilities, and all appurtenances.

The first element of construction would entail site preparation. This effort would include removal of all existing vegetation, including the orchard trees, all existing irrigation equipment, and other associated infrastructure, including a small salinity research station and two concrete pads. The contractor would then grade the site and compact the soil to specifications set by the geotechnical engineer. Equipment that would be used for site preparation and demolition activities include excavator, backhoe, chainsaw, tree chipper, mulcher, jack hammer, and dump trucks.

This first element would also include trenching for underground utilities, which would require hauling of approximately 900 cubic yards of soil spoils resulting in approximately 150 truck trips. Trenches are expected to be approximately 3 feet deep. Trenching and underground utility work are anticipating to take approximately 65 days. Finally, building pads and foundations would be constructed that would take approximately 40 days to complete. Building construction would take approximately 350 days and necessitate a peak construction crew of up to approximately 350 workers. The final phase of on-site construction would entail landscaping, installation of signage, and pavement striping.

The second element of the proposed project would involve off-site infrastructure improvements. Improvements to Iowa Avenue and backbone infrastructure construction would last approximately 65 days. The improvements by Cranford Avenue include construction of backbone infrastructure, a pedestrian gate, and sidewalks, which would take approximately 10 days.

Construction would be performed by a qualified contractor. Plans and specifications would incorporate stipulations regarding standard State of California requirements and construction practices, including for grading and demolition, safety measures, vehicle operation and maintenance, excavation stability, erosion control, drainage alteration, groundwater disposal, traffic circulation, public safety, dust control, and noise generation.

1.2 Regulatory Framework

1.2.1 State

1.2.1.1 California Register of Historical Resources

In California, the term “historical resource” includes but is not limited to “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural,
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Educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California” (California Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 5020.1(j)). In 1992, the California legislature established the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) “to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state's historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (PRC, Section 5024.1(a)). The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), enumerated below. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In order to understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than 50 years old may be considered for listing in the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance (14 CCR 4852(d)(2)).

The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR, as are the state landmarks and points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

1.2.1.2 California Environmental Quality Act

As described further below, excerpts from the CEQA statute and CEQA Guidelines are of relevance to the analysis of archaeological, historic, and tribal cultural resources:

- PRC Section 21083.2(g) defines “unique archaeological resource.”
- PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) defines “historical resources.” In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) defines the phrase “substantial
adverse change in the significance of an historical resource”; it also defines the circumstances when a project would materially impair the significance of an historical resource.

- PRC Section 21074(a) defines “tribal cultural resources.”
- PRC Section 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e): Set forth standards and steps to be employed following the accidental discovery of human remains in any location other than a dedicated ceremony.
- PRC Sections 21083.2(b)–(c) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4: Provide information regarding the mitigation framework for archaeological and historic resources, including examples of preservation-in-place mitigation measures; preservation-in-place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to significant archaeological sites because it maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context, and may also help avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the archaeological site(s).

More specifically, under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause “a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5(b)). If a site is either listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or if it is included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a historical resources survey (meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(q)), it is a “historical resource” and is presumed to be historically or culturally significant for purposes of CEQA (PRC, Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5(a)). The lead agency is not precluded from determining that a resource is a historical resource even if it does not fall within this presumption (PRC, Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5(a)).

A “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” reflecting a significant effect under CEQA 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” (14 CCR 15064.5(b)(1); PRC, Section 5020.1(q)). In turn, the significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project (14 CCR 15064.5(b)(2)):

1. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the CRHR.

2. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the
requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant.

3. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

Pursuant to these sections, the CEQA inquiry begins with evaluating whether a project site contains any “historical resources,” then evaluates whether that project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource such that the resource’s historical significance is materially impaired.

If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (PRC, Section 21083.2(a–c)).

Section 21083.2(g) of the PRC defines a unique archaeological resource as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.

2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.

3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Impacts to non-unique archaeological resources are generally not considered a significant environmental impact (PRC, Section 21083.2(a); 14 CCR 15064.5(c)(4)). However, if a non-unique archaeological resource qualifies as tribal cultural resource (PRC, Sections 21074(c), 21083.2(h)), further consideration of significant impacts is required.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. As described below, these procedures are detailed in PRC Section 5097.98.
1.2.1.3 California Health and Safety Code

California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods, regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area reasonably suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the Riverside County coroner has examined the remains (Section 7050.5b). PRC Section 5097.98 also outlines the process to be followed in the event that remains are discovered. If the coroner determines or has reason to believe the remains are those of a Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC within 24 hours (Section 7050.5c), and the NAHC will notify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner, the MLD may inspect the site of discovery. The inspection must be completed within 48 hours of notification of the MLD by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native Americans.

1.2.2 Local

As a state entity, ARB is not subject to local government planning; accordingly, any reference to local planning documents is for informational purposes only. However, local plans and policies can often serve as a good reference or “benchmark” to provide a sense of the planning setting in this area. For this reason, this report references the City of Riverside General Plan.

1.2.2.1 City of Riverside General Plan 2025

In 1994, the City’s General Plan was adopted and included historical preservation goals and policies that addressed preserving the City’s historical and architecturally significant structures and neighborhoods and supporting and enhancing its arts and cultural institutions. In 2007, with the General Plan 2025, the City adopted a new General Plan, while still maintaining a Historic Preservation Element. The proposed project would be consistent with the following objectives and policies from the City’s General Plan 2025 Historic Preservation Element:

- **Objective HP-1:** To use historic preservation principles as an equal component in the planning and development process.
  - **Policy HP-1.3:** The City shall protect sites of archaeological and paleontological significance and ensure compliance with all applicable State and federal cultural resources protection and management laws in its planning and project review process.
  - **Policy HP-1.4:** The City shall protect natural resources such as geological features, heritage trees, and landscapes in the planning and development review process and in park and open space planning.
• **Objective HP-5:** To ensure compatibility between new development and existing cultural resources
  
  o **Policy HP-5.1:** The City shall use its design and plot plan review processes to encourage new construction to be compatible in scale and character with cultural resources and historic districts.
  
  o **Policy HP-5.2:** The City shall use its design and plot plan review processes to encourage the compatibility of street design, public improvements, and utility infrastructure with cultural resources and historic districts.

**Cultural Resources Code (Riverside Municipal Code Title 20)**

Preservation of Riverside’s cultural resources fosters civic and neighborhood pride, forms the basis for identifying and maintaining community character, and enhances livability within the City. Title 20 of the City Municipal Code provides for the “identification, protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of improvements, buildings, structures, signs, objects, features, sites, places, areas, districts, neighborhoods, streets, works of art, natural features and significant permanent landscaping having special historical, archaeological, cultural, architectural, community, aesthetic or artistic value in the City” (City of Riverside 2007).
2 SETTING

2.1 Natural Setting

A series of hills and small mountains surround the project vicinity. These hills and mountains are between the two dominant San Jacinto and Santa Ana mountain ranges. They include La Sierra/Norco Hills, Mount Rubidoux, Box Springs Mountains, and the many smaller ranges south of the City. Within the City, surface elevations range from about 700 feet above mean sea level near the Santa Ana River to over 1,400 feet above mean sea level west of La Sierra (City of Riverside 2007). The ground surface of the project site is located approximately 1,000 feet above mean sea level and slopes gently to the west, with an average slope of approximately 5%–6%. The proposed project site is underlain entirely by Arlington fine sandy loam (USDA 2016). The Arlington fine sandy loam is a deep soil that generally develops on alluvial fans with slopes ranging between 2% and 9% percent (USDA 2016).

The proposed project site consists of active agricultural land, dominated by citrus trees, some avocado trees, and frequently tilled fields. The southeastern section contains an experimental plot of fairly large ornamentals, characterized by eucalyptus, pine trees, and mulberry trees, as well as other unidentified ornamental trees. Land uses immediately to the north include residential uses and to the west (on Chicago Avenue) are commercial uses.

Common wildlife species found within the project site include blue-gray gnatcatcher (*Polioptila caerulea*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*), Bewick’s wren (*Thryomanes bewickii*), Anna’s hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), western scrub jay (*Aphelocoma californica*), yellow-rumped warbler (*Setophaga coronata*), American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), white-crowned sparrow (*Zonotrichia leucophrys*), northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*), and black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*).

2.2 Cultural Setting

2.2.1 Prehistoric Context

Evidence for continuous human occupation in Southern California spans the last 10,000 years. Various attempts to parse out variability in archaeological assemblages over this broad period have led to the development of several cultural chronologies; some of these are based on geologic time, most are based on temporal trends in archaeological assemblages, and others are interpretive reconstructions. Each of these reconstructions describes essentially similar trends in assemblage composition in more or less detail. However, given the direction of research and differential timing of archaeological study following intensive development...
in Riverside County, chronology building in the Inland Empire must rely on data from neighboring regions to fill the gaps. To be more inclusive, this research employs a common set of generalized terms used to describe chronological trends in assemblage composition: Paleoindian (pre-5500 BC), Archaic (8000 BC–AD 500), Late Prehistoric (AD 500–1769), and Ethnohistoric (post-AD 1769).

**Paleoindian Period (pre-5500 BC)**

Evidence for Paleoindian occupation in the region is tenuous. Our knowledge of associated cultural pattern(s) is informed by a relatively sparse body of data that has been collected from within an area extending from coastal San Diego, through the Mojave Desert, and beyond. One of the earliest dated archaeological assemblages in coastal Southern California (excluding the Channel Islands) derives from SDI-4669/W-12 in La Jolla. A human burial from SDI-4669 was radiocarbon dated to 9,590–9,920 years before present (95.4% probability) (Hector 2006). The burial is part of a larger site complex that contained more than 29 human burials associated with an assemblage that fits the Archaic profile (i.e., large amounts of ground stone, battered cobbles, and expedient flake tools). In contrast, typical Paleoindian assemblages include large stemmed projectile points, high proportions of formal lithic tools, bifacial lithic reduction strategies, and relatively small proportions of ground stone tools. Prime examples of this pattern are sites that were studied by Emma Lou Davis (1978) on Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake near Ridgecrest, California. These sites contained fluted and unfluted stemmed points and large numbers of formal flake tools (e.g., shaped scrapers, blades). Other typical Paleoindian sites include the Komodo site (MNO-679)—a multicomponent fluted point site, and MNO-680—a single component Great Basined Stemmed point site (see Basgall et al. 2002). At MNO-679 and -680, ground stone tools were rare while finely made projectile points were common.

Warren et al. (2004) claimed that a biface manufacturing tradition present at the Harris site complex (SDI-149) is representative of typical Paleoindian occupation in the San Diego region that possibly dates between 10,365 and 8200 BC (Warren et al. 2004). Termed San Dieguito (see also Rogers 1945), assemblages at the Harris site are qualitatively distinct from most others in the San Diego region because the site has large numbers of finely made bifaces (including projectile points), formal flake tools, a biface reduction trajectory, and relatively small amounts of processing tools (see also Warren 1964, 1968). Despite the unique assemblage composition, the definition of San Dieguito as a separate cultural tradition is hotly debated. Gallegos (1987) suggested that the San Dieguito pattern is simply an inland manifestation of a broader economic pattern. Gallegos’s interpretation of San Dieguito has been widely accepted in recent years, in part because of the difficulty in distinguishing San Dieguito components from other assemblage constituents. In other words, it is easier to ignore San Dieguito as a distinct socioeconomic pattern than it is to draw it out of mixed assemblages.
The large number of finished bifaces (i.e., projectile points and non-projectile blades), along with large numbers of formal flake tools at the Harris site complex, is very different than nearly all other assemblages throughout the San Diego region, regardless of age. Warren et al. (2004) made this point, tabulating basic assemblage constituents for key early Holocene sites. Producing finely made bifaces and formal flake tools implies that relatively large amounts of time were spent for tool manufacture. Such a strategy contrasts with the expedient flake-based tools and cobble-core reduction strategy that typifies non-San Dieguito Archaic sites. It can be inferred from the uniquely high degree of San Dieguito assemblage formality that the Harris site complex represents a distinct economic strategy from non-San Dieguito assemblages.

San Dieguito sites are rare in the inland valleys, with one possible candidate, RIV-2798/H, located on the shore of Lake Elsinore. Excavations at Locus B at RIV-2798/H produced a toolkit consisting predominately of flaked stone tools, including crescents, points, and bifaces, and lesser amounts of groundstone tools, among other items (Grenda 1997). A calibrated and reservoir-corrected radiocarbon date from a shell produced a date of 6630 BC. Grenda (1997) suggested this site represents seasonal exploitation of lacustrine resources and small game and resembles coastal San Dieguito assemblages and spatial patterning.

If San Dieguito truly represents a distinct socioeconomic strategy from the non-San Dieguito Archaic processing regime, its rarity implies that it was not only short-lived, but that it was not as economically successful as the Archaic strategy. Such a conclusion would fit with other trends in Southern California deserts, where hunting-related tools were replaced by processing tools during the early Holocene (see Basgall and Hall 1990).

Archaic Period (8000 BC–AD 500)

The more than 2,500-year overlap between the presumed age of Paleoindian occupations and the Archaic period highlights the difficulty in defining a cultural chronology in Southern California. If San Dieguito is the only recognized Paleoindian component in the coastal Southern California, then the dominance of hunting tools implies that it derives from Great Basin adaptive strategies and is not necessarily a local adaptation. Warren et al. (2004) admitted as much, citing strong desert connections with San Dieguito. Thus, the Archaic pattern is the earliest local socioeconomic adaptation in the region (see Hale 2001, 2009).

The Archaic pattern, which has also been termed the Millingstone Horizon (among others), is relatively easy to define with assemblages that consist primarily of processing tools, such as millingstones, handstones, battered cobbles, heavy crude scrapers, incipient flake-based tools, and cobble-core reduction. These assemblages occur in all environments across the region with little variability in tool composition. Low assemblage variability over time and space among
Archaic sites has been equated with cultural conservatism (see Basgall and Hall 1990; Byrd and Reddy 2002; Warren 1968; Warren et al. 2004). Despite enormous amounts of archaeological work at Archaic sites, little change in assemblage composition occurred until the bow and arrow was adopted around AD 500, as well as ceramics at approximately the same time (Griset 1996; Hale 2009). Even then, assemblage formality remained low. After the bow was adopted, small arrow points appear in large quantities and already low amounts of formal flake tools are replaced by increasing amounts of expedient flake tools. Similarly, shaped millingstones and handstones decreased in proportion relative to expedient, unshaped ground stone tools (Hale 2009). Thus, the terminus of the Archaic period is equally as hard to define as its beginning because basic assemblage constituents and patterns of manufacturing investment remain stable, complemented only by the addition of the bow and ceramics.

**Late Prehistoric Period (AD 500–1769)**

The period of time following the Archaic and before Ethnohistoric times (AD 1769) is commonly referred to as the Late Prehistoric (Rogers 1945; Wallace 1955; Warren et al. 2004); however, several other subdivisions continue to be used to describe various shifts in assemblage composition. In general, this period is defined by the addition of arrow points and ceramics, as well as the widespread use of bedrock mortars. The fundamental Late Prehistoric assemblage is very similar to the Archaic pattern, but includes arrow points and large quantities of fine debitage from producing arrow points, ceramics, and cremations. The appearance of mortars and pestles is difficult to place in time because most mortars are on bedrock surfaces. Some argue that the Ethnohistoric intensive acorn economy extends as far back as AD 500 (Bean and Shipek 1978). However, there is no substantial evidence that reliance on acorns, and the accompanying use of mortars and pestles, occurred before AD 1400. In Riverside County and the surrounding region, millingstones and handstones persisted in higher frequencies than mortars and pestles until the last 500 years (Basgall and Hall 1990); even then, weighing the economic significance of millingstone-handstone versus mortar-pestle technology is tenuous due to incomplete information on archaeological assemblages.

**Ethnohistoric Period (post-AD 1769)**

The history of the Native American communities before the mid-1700s has largely been reconstructed through later mission-period and early ethnographic accounts. The first records of the Native American inhabitants of the region come predominantly from European merchants, missionaries, military personnel, and explorers. These brief, and generally peripheral, accounts were prepared with the intent of furthering respective colonial and economic aims and were combined with observations of the landscape. They were not intended to be unbiased accounts regarding the cultural structures and community practices of the newly encountered cultural
groups. The establishment of the missions in the region brought more extensive documentation of Native American communities, though these groups did not become the focus of formal and in-depth ethnographic study until the early twentieth century (Bean and Shipke 1978; Boscana 1846; Fages 1937; Geiger and Meighan 1976; Harrington 1934; Laylander 2000; Sparkman 1908; White 1963). The principal intent of these researchers was to record the pre-contact, culturally specific practices, ideologies, and languages that had survived the destabilizing effects of missionization and colonialism. This research, often understood as “salvage ethnography,” was driven by the understanding that traditional knowledge was being lost due to the impacts of modernization and cultural assimilation. Alfred Kroeber applied his “memory culture” approach (Lightfoot 2005, p. 32) by recording languages and oral histories within the region. Ethnographic research by Dubois, Kroeber, Harrington, Spier, and others during the early twentieth century seemed to indicate that traditional cultural practices and beliefs survived among local Native American communities.

It is important to note that even though there were many informants for these early ethnographies who were able to provide information from personal experiences about native life before the Europeans, a significantly large proportion of these informants were born after 1850 (Heizer and Nissen 1973); therefore, the documentation of pre-contact, aboriginal culture was being increasingly supplied by individuals born in California after considerable contact with Europeans. As Robert F. Heizer (1978) stated, this is an important issue to note when examining these ethnographies, since considerable culture change had undoubtedly occurred by 1850 among the Native American survivors of California.

Based on ethnographic information, it is believed that at least 88 different languages were spoken from Baja California Sur to the southern Oregon state border at the time of Spanish contact (Johnson and Lorenz 2006, p. 34). The distribution of recorded Native American languages has been dispersed as a geographic mosaic across California through six primary language families (Golla 2007). Since the project area is in the Riverside area, the Native American inhabitants of the region would have generally spoken the Gabrielino variety of Takic, although the Serrano variety would have likely been spoken as well, as the traditional boundary between the Serrano and Gabrielino groups is near the project area.

Victor Golla has contended that one can interpret the amount of variability within specific language groups as being associated with the relative “time depth” of the speaking populations (Golla 2007, p. 80). A large amount of variation within the language of a group represents a greater time depth than a group’s language with less internal diversity. One method that he has employed is by drawing comparisons with historically documented changes in Germanic and Romantic language groups. Golla has observed that the “absolute chronology of the internal diversification within a language family” can be correlated with archaeological dates (2007, p.
This type of interpretation is modeled on concepts of genetic drift and gene flows that are associated with migration and population isolation in the biological sciences.

The tribes of this area have traditionally spoken Takic languages that may be assigned to the larger Uto–Aztecan family (Golla 2007, p. 74). These groups include the Gabrielino and Serrano. Golla has interpreted the amount of internal diversity within these language-speaking communities to reflect a time depth of approximately 2,000 years. Other researchers have contended that Takic may have diverged from Uto–Aztecan ca. 2600 BC–AD 1, which was later followed by the diversification within the Takic-speaking tribes, occurring approximately 1500 BC–AD 1000 (Laylander 2010).

The project is located with the area associated with the Gabrielino, a name derived from the association with the San Gabriel Mission, who are also known as the Tongva. According to the archaeological record, they were not the first inhabitants of the Los Angeles basin but displaced indigenous Hokan speakers around 500 BC. The Gabrielino shared boundaries with the Chumash to the west, the Tataviam to the north, Serrano to the northeast, the Cahuilla to the east, and the Luiseño and Juaneño to the southwest (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1925).

As with many Native groups, it is quite difficult to make population estimates for the Gabrielino, although one estimate gives village population ranges between 50 and 200 people for possibly more than 50 or 100 villages (Bean and Smith 1978). The arrival of the Spanish decimated Native peoples through disease and changed living conditions, leaving few Gabrielinos by the time ethnographic studies were conducted (Bean and Smith 1978). This makes it difficult to make definitive statements about their culture. The tribes of the region were organized into patrilineal clans or bands centered on a chief, each of which had its own territorial land or range where food and other resources were collected at different locations throughout the year. Place-names were assigned to each territory, often reflecting common animals, plants, physical landmarks, or cosmological elements that were understood as being related to that location. Marriages were sometimes arranged by parents or guardians, and chiefs occasionally had multiple wives (Bean and Smith 1978).

Shamanism was a major component in tribal life. Shamans, who derived their power through dreams or visions, served individual villages. They cured illness, using a variety of tools and plants. Some locations and natural resources were of cultural significance. Springs and other water-related features were thought to be related with spirits. These resources, often a component of origin stories, had power that came with a variety of risks and properties to those who became affected. Mourning ceremonies were similar throughout the region, generally involving and burning of the deceased’s possessions, dancing, and ritual wailing, followed by the burning of the deceased’s remaining items a year after death (Bean and Smith 1978).
2.2.2 Historic Overview

Post-contact history for the State of California is generally divided into three periods: the Spanish Period (1769–1821), Mexican Period (1821–1846), and American Period (1846–present). Although Spanish, Russian, and British explorers visited the area for brief periods between 1529 and 1769, the Spanish Period in California begins with the establishment in 1769 of a settlement at San Diego and the founding of Mission San Diego de Alcalá, the first of 21 missions constructed between 1769 and 1823. Independence from Spain in 1821 marks the beginning of the Mexican Period, and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, ending the Mexican-American War, signals the beginning of the American Period when California became a territory of the United States.

Spanish Period (1769–1821)

Spanish explorers made sailing expeditions along the coast of Southern California between the mid-1500s and mid-1700s. In search of the legendary Northwest Passage, Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo stopped in 1542 at present-day San Diego Bay. With his crew, Cabrillo explored the shorelines of present Catalina Island as well as San Pedro and Santa Monica Bays. Much of the present California and Oregon coastline was mapped and recorded in the next half-century by Spanish naval officer Sebastián Vizcaíno. Vizcaíno’s crew also landed on Santa Catalina Island and at San Pedro and Santa Monica Bays, giving each location its long-standing name. The Spanish crown laid claim to California based on the surveys conducted by Cabrillo and Vizcaíno (Bancroft 1885; Gumprecht 1999).

More than 200 years passed before Spain began the colonization and inland exploration of Alta California. The 1769 overland expedition by Captain Gaspar de Portolá marks the beginning of California’s Historic period, occurring just after the king of Spain installed the Franciscan Order to direct religious and colonization matters in assigned territories of the Americas. With a band of 64 soldiers, missionaries, Baja (lower) California Native Americans, and Mexican civilians, Portolá established the Presidio of San Diego, a fortified military outpost, as the first Spanish settlement in Alta California. In July of 1769, while Portolá was exploring Southern California, Franciscan Fr. Junípero Serra founded Mission San Diego de Alcalá at Presidio Hill, the first of the 21 missions that would be established in Alta California by the Spanish and the Franciscan Order between 1769 and 1823.

Included in the 21 missions is the Mission San Luis Rey de Francia at the Luiseño village of Temecula. In 1819, the Mission granted land to Leandro Serrano, the highest locally appointed official (or “mayordomo”) of San Antonio de Pala Asistencia, for the Mission of San Luis Rey for Rancho Temescal. From around 1819 until his death in 1852, Serrano built and occupied
three separate adobe residences in the county. In 1828, Leandro was elected as the mayordomo of Mission San Juan Capistrano. Serrano’s family resided in the third adobe residence until around 1898 (Elderbee 1918).

**Mexican Period (1821–1846)**

It was in the early 1820s that Spain’s grip on its expansive subjugated territories began to unravel, which greatly affected the political and national identity of the Southern California territory. Mexico established its independence from Spain in 1821, secured California as a Mexican territory in 1822, and became a federal republic in 1824. After the Mexican independence and the 1833 confiscation of former Mission lands, Juan B. Alvarado became governor of the territory. In 1836, Alvarado began the process of subdividing the County of Riverside into large ranchos: Rancho Jurupa in 1838; El Rincon in 1839; Rancho San Jacinto Viejo in 1842; Rancho San Jacinto y San Gorgonio in 1843; Ranchos La Laguna, Pauba, and Temecula in 1844; Ranchos Little Temecula and Potreros de San Juan Capistrano in 1845; and Ranchos San Jacinto Sobrante, La Sierra (Sepulveda), La Sierra (Yorba), Santa Rosa, and San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero in 1846 (Brown and Boyd 1922; Fitch 1993). While these ranchos were established in documentation, the cultural and commercial developments of the Ranchos were punctuated and generally slow with little oversight or assistance from the government in Mexico. On May 22, 1840, Governor Alvarado granted the “11-league” Rancho Jurupa to Don Juan Bandini (Stonehouse 1965).

In 1843, La Placita de los Trujillos, or “La Placita” (also known as “San Salvador” and regionally nicknamed “Spanish Town”), was established in Riverside County and has been since recognized as one of the first non-native settlements in the San Bernardino Valley (Brown and Boyd 1922). A group of genízaro colonists from Abiquiú, New Mexico, arrived in the area in the early 1840s (Nostrand 1996). Don Juan Bandini donated a portion of Rancho Jurupa to them on the condition that they would assist in protecting his livestock from Indian raids. Lorenzo Trujillo led 10 of the colonist families to 2,000 acres on the “Bandini Donation” on the southeast bank of the Santa Ana River and formed the village of La Placita. In 1852, the same year that Leandro Serrano died, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors established a town called “San Salvador” encompassing a number of small, growing communities in the area initially known as “La Placita.” San Salvador was mainly a community of agriculture and animal husbandry until around the late 1860s with the occurrence of “the Great Flood of 1862” and a second flood later in 1886, causing the local population to abandon the immediate area, which had been largely a ghost town until the recent modern introduction of waste transferal and recycling facilities to the area (Elderbee 1918).
American Period (1846–Present)

In the late 1840s and early 1850s, after the arrival of a growing European-descended American and other foreign populations and the conclusion of the Mexican-American war with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, issues concerning the land rights immediately ensued with results that often largely favored newly introduced American interests (Starr 2007; Hale 1888). The California Gold Rush was in full steam with a heavy influx of new immigrants from not only across the United States but international travelers many from Asian and Latin American countries changing the dynamics of the local populations. Growth in the region’s population was inevitable with the major shifts in the popular social perceptions of potential economic opportunities that California had to offer during the 1850s. The local population growth was further facilitated by the creation of the Temescal Station of the Butterfield Overland Mail Route in 1857 and the organization of the first Temescal School District (Elderbee 1918).

2.2.3 City of Riverside

For a brief time, tin mining was a source of local development. Tin mining had been initiated in the 1850s by Able Stearns but proved largely unsuccessful and was stagnant for years due to litigation disputes that were not settled until 1888 by the U.S. Supreme Court. After the dispute settlement, miners converged on the region, swelling the immediate population while the tin mine enjoyed a 2-year run of operations, closing down for good in 1892 (Elderbee 1918). The growth of the area increased steadily as the region’s economic focus shifted from ranching/animal husbandry to a more fruit orchard/agricultural lifestyle greatly influenced by the idyllic Mediterranean climate and the introduction of large numbers of honey bees and hives (Elderbee 1918).

In March of 1870, John Wesley North issued a circular entitled “A Colony for California” to promote the idea of founding an agriculture-based colony in California. Prospective investors met in Chicago on May 18, and the interest expressed led to formation of the Southern California Colony Association. This success prompted North to head to Los Angeles. North arrived on May 26, initially intending to settle the colony there. However, the association directors decided on the Jurupa rancho along the banks of the Santa Ana River, purchasing it from the California Silk Association in August of that same year. North then took up residence on site for the purpose of surveying and developing the colony. He envisioned small-scale farmers growing fruits appropriate to paradise: oranges, lemons, figs, walnuts, olives, almonds, grapes, sweet potatoes, sorghum, and sugar beets (Stonehouse 1965). The community was originally called “Yurupa” but the name was changed to “Riverside” in December of 1870 (Stonehouse 1965; Patterson 1971; Wlodarski 1993). The citrus industry increased dramatically during the 1880s, with promotion of the area shifting to focus on the potential wealth to be had through agriculture (California Department of Transportation 2007).
Of particular note is the introduction of the navel orange to the budding California citrus industry. Two navel orange trees from Brazil’s Bahia Province were gifted to Eliza Tibbets by William Saunders, horticulturalist at the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Eliza and her husband, Luther, brought the trees to the Riverside colony and planted them in 1873. These parent trees produced sweet-tasting seedless fruits, sparking the interest of local farmers and becoming so popular that the fruits from these trees eventually became known as “Riverside Navel.” The fruit’s popularity helped establish Riverside as a national leader in cultivating oranges. One of the two original parent Washington navel orange trees is still extant, growing near the intersection of Arlington and Magnolia Avenue, and is “mother to millions of navel orange trees the world over;” the tree is designated as California Historical Landmark No. 20 (Hurt 2014).

North originally intended that the colony would build, own, and operate its own irrigation system, but the desert mesa location made such a venture prohibitively expensive. Thus, the Southern California Company Association joined forces with the Silk Center Association to develop the irrigation project. After completing a canal survey, work began in October 1870 to construct a canal 12 feet wide, narrowing to 8 feet at the base, and 3 feet deep (Stonehouse 1965). With continued growth of the area, a second canal was constructed and by 1878 the Riverside Canal Company was formed, only to be superseded, due to litigation, by the Riverside Water Company in 1886 (Bailey 1961). Further growth in the region led to construction of a third major canal, called the “Gage Canal,” built during 1882–1888 (Guinn 1907; Wlodarski 1993). Development of such a stable water supply bolstered the agricultural industry, helping facilitate the booming citrus industry in Riverside. By 1895, around 20,000 acres of navel orange groves had been planted and the citrus industry became the primary economic influence for the region well into the turn of the century (Guinn 1907; Brown 1985). This rapid growth of such a vibrant citrus industry led to Riverside becoming the wealthiest city per capita in the United States by 1895 (March Field Air Museum 2011). The growing citrus industry was in turn stimulated by another major factor that would strongly influence the cultural development of Riverside: the advent of the railroad, in particular the Transcontinental railroad.

In the later-nineteenth century, the railroad industry began to connect vast swaths of the county with a rail-line transportation system that had previously required extremely slow travel and often with dangerous travel conditions. The initial rail line developed in the region around 1882 was the California Southern railroad, which then connected with the Santa Fe transcontinental line in 1885. In 1887, C.W. Smith and Fred Ferris of the California Southern Railroad and J.A. Green incorporated the Valley Railway to serve the region. The San Jacinto Valley Railroad was constructed the next year, in 1888; it traveled southeast from Perris, then east across the valley, gradually curving northeast to its terminus at San Jacinto (George and Hamilton 2009). With the
combination of rail transportation, the packing industry, and cold storage facilities, Riverside was able to yield over one-half million boxes of oranges by 1890 (Wlodarski 1993).

The towns of Winchester and Hemet were quickly established along the line. The railroad connected the eastern part of the valley to Perris, where it met the California Southern Railroad. This ensured transportation of valley products to markets in Los Angeles and San Diego. The Hemet-San Jacinto Growers’ Association Cannery was located adjacent to the railroad; the canned fruit was loaded directly onto railcars for shipment outside of the valley (George and Hamilton 2009). In addition, many of the ranches that were located along the rail line had their own sidings, where the farm products were directly loaded onto the trains. The railroad also provided passenger service to Los Angeles. The construction of modern highways in the 1950s lessened the importance of the railroad. Later the route was taken over by the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad, and then the Burlington Northern Santa Fe.

During this time in Southern California history, counties were established and the area today known as Riverside County was divided between Los Angeles County and San Diego County. In 1853, the eastern part of Los Angeles County was used to create San Bernardino County. Between 1891 and 1893, several proposals and legislative attempts were put forth to form new counties in Southern California. These proposals included one for a Pomona County and one for a San Jacinto County; however, no proposals were adopted to create Riverside County until the California Board of Commissioners filed the final canvass of the votes and the measure was signed by Governor Henry H. Markham on March 11, 1893.

After the turn of the Twentieth Century, during the years just before the United States’ involvement in World War I, the U.S. War Department began building up its strength in anticipation of involvement in the war and announced plans for several new military bases. A group of local Riverside business owners and investors received approval to construct the Alessandro Flying Training Field, which opened on March 1, 1918 (March Field Air Museum 2011). Sited on the plateau overlooking Riverside, the Alessandro Flying Training Field was renamed March Field after 2d Lieutenant Peyton C. March, Jr., the deceased son of then-Army Chief of Staff General Peyton C. March. Approximately 1 month after Alessandro field was opened, Lieutenant March Jr. was killed in an air crash in Texas just 15 days after being commissioned and March Field was renamed in his honor.

March Field served as a base for primary flight training with an 8-week course that could accommodate a maximum of 300 students per course. With the end of World War I in November 1918, the future operational status of March Field was, for a short time, undetermined. While initial demobilization began after World War I, March Field remained an active Army Air Service station, and then as a U.S. Army Air Corps installation throughout the interwar period.
However, with the United States’ entrance in World War II, March Field quickly became a major installation of the U.S. Army Air Forces, training air units for action in the Pacific theater. Following the end of World War II (1945) and the establishment of the U.S. Air Force in 1947, March Field was renamed March Air Force Base. Throughout the Cold War, March Air Force Base was a key installation of the Strategic Air Command and in 1996, it was transferred to the Air Force Reserve Command and utilized as a base for the Air Force Reserve and the California Air National Guard.

After World War II, Riverside diversified its economy, developing a significant manufacturing sector. Largely light industry, the manufacturing sector generates a range of products, including aircraft components, automotive parts, gas cylinders, electronic equipment, food products, and medical devices. As the county seat and largest city in the region, Riverside also houses numerous legal, accounting, brokerage, architectural, engineering, and technology firms, as well as banking institutions.

In recent years, Riverside has given much attention to diversifying its economy beyond the citrus industry, creating a sustainable community encompassing an area of nearly 7,200 square miles and boasting a population of 1.3 million people (2010 Census). Riverside is home to UCR and the UCR Botanical Gardens, which contains 40 acres of unusual plants and 4 miles of walking trails. The City prides itself on its historic connection to the navel orange, being home to the one surviving parent navel orange tree from which all American West Coast navel orange trees are descended. Despite changes in the regional economic focus and the general shifts in social movements in California over the last decade, Riverside has consistently been one of the, if not the, fastest growing areas in the country.

2.3 Background Research

2.3.1 Literature Review

As part of the cultural resources study prepared for the proposed project, Dudek conducted a California Historical Resources Information System records search at the EIC on December 16, 2015, for the project site and surrounding 0.25 mile. This search included the EIC’s collection of mapped prehistoric, historic, and built-environment resources, Department of Parks and Recreation Site Records, technical reports, and ethnographic references. Additional consulted sources included historical maps of the project area, the NRHP, the CRHR, the California Historic Property Data File, and the lists of California State Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility. Confidential Appendix A provides the confidential results of the records search and a bibliography of prior cultural resources studies.
2.3.1.1 Previous Technical Studies

The EIC records indicate that 13 cultural resource investigations have been conducted within the 0.25-mile search radius of the proposed project (Table 1). Of these, five studies overlap all or a portion of the project site (RI-2050, RI-3693, RI-4813, RI-5873, and RI-6088). Three of these studies are general overview reports that do not specifically address the project site (RI-2050, RI-4813, and RI-6088). One study (RI-3693) is mapped as overlapping a small portion of the eastern boundary of the project site. However, this study, conducted in 1991 by Foster et al., was an extensive linear investigation spanning multiple cities and did not specifically address the project site. A brief summary of the remaining overlapping study (RI-5873) follows Table 1.

Table 1
Previous Cultural Resource Investigations within 0.25 Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI-2050</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Preliminary Historic Inventory–March Air Force Base, California</td>
<td>Perault, G.</td>
<td>Overlaps–General Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-4799</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>A Phase I Archaeological Study for TELACU Housing-Riverside, Inc., 1807 11th Street, City of Riverside, County of Riverside, California</td>
<td>Wlodarski, R.</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-4813</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>California Citrus Heritage Recording Project: Photographs, Written Historical and Descriptive Data, Reduced Copies of Measured Drawings for: Arlington Height Citrus Landscape, Gage Irrigation Canal, National Orange Company Packing House, Victoria Bridge, and Union Pacific Railroad Bridge</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Overlaps–General Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-5056</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation for the Proposed Corona Feeder Master Plan Project Area, Riverside County, California</td>
<td>McKenna, J.</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-5996</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report, APNs 221-161-002, -003, -005, -024, -025, -026, 1744-1794 12th Street, City of Riverside, Riverside County, CA</td>
<td>Tang, B., M. Hogan, and J. Smallwood</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Love et al. (2002) conducted this cultural resources study of approximately 1,300 acres of UCR campus and associated agricultural experiment fields. The study consisted of a records search and reconnaissance-level field survey. The current project site was included within the records search area; however, the pedestrian survey did not include the project site. The study resulted in the identification of eight historic-era buildings located on the campus, the CRHR-eligible Gage Canal located west of the campus, and a prehistoric milling station located east of the campus within undeveloped hillsides. Although no cultural resources were located within the area of the current proposed project site as a result of the study, the study suggested that the agricultural fields south of Martin Luther King Boulevard (within the vicinity of the project site) have potential indicators to suggest the possibility of historic-era archaeological remains.

### 2.3.1.2 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

According to the EIC records, there are no previously recorded cultural resources located within the project site. There are two previously recorded cultural resources within 0.25 mile of the project site, both of which consist of built environment resources. These are the Gage Canal (CA-RIV-4768) and the Weber House (P-33-9691). The Gage Canal was constructed in 1885 to...
supply water to feed Riverside’s booming citrus industry. A segment of the 20.13-mile canal is approximately 0.22 mile east of the current project site. The Gage Canal is City Cultural Heritage Landmark #24 and is recommended as eligible for listing in the CRHR. Peter J. Weber, an architect who designed numerous public and private buildings in the Riverside area, built his one-story brick and timber residential structure in 1932. The Weber House is approximately 0.1 mile northwest of the project site. The Weber House is listed in the NRHP and is recognized as City Landmark #52.

2.3.2 Archival Map Review

In addition to research conducted through the EIC, Dudek also consulted historic maps and aerial photographs to further understand the development of the project site and surrounding neighborhood. Historic topographic maps of the project site were available for the following years: 1901, 1955, 1969, and 1974 (NETR 2012). Historic aerial photographs of the project site were available for the years 1948, 1959, 1966, 1978, 1994, 2002, and 2012 (NETR 2012). By 1901, Riverside was already a burgeoning City. While the project site remained vacant, the City grid was already established to the west of the project site; the Gage Canal is visible just east of the project site; and a network of rail lines is north of the project site. A structure just north of the project site is also shown on the 1901 topographic map. The aerial image from 1948 shows the project site and surrounding area dominated by agricultural fields. The Weber House is visible to the northwest of the project site, as is a larger property just north of the project site at the southwest corner of University Avenue and Iowa Avenue. The grid continued to expand east by 1955, although the project site and immediate surrounding area remained agricultural land. By 1959, a majority of the surrounding fields had gone fallow, including the fields just north of the project site. These fields gave way to development by 1966. The property just north of the project site was replaced by commercial development, and the infrastructure for the apartments along Everton Place was put in place. The area just north and northwest of the project site continued to develop throughout the 1970s, and by 1994, only areas to the east and south of the project site remained as agricultural land. The project site looked much like it does today by 2002: the west half of the project site is covered in orchard; the central portion of the site is fallow; and the beginnings of the experimental plot of ornamentals is visible in the southeast corner of the project site. Photographs from 2002 through 2012 do not reveal any changes to the project site or the surrounding area.

2.4 Native American Coordination

2.4.1 NAHC Sacred Lands File Search

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources within or near the project site, Dudek contacted the NAHC on December 22, 2015, to request a review of the SLF. The NAHC emailed
a response on January 28, 2016, which stated that the SLF search was returned with negative results. Because the SLF search does not include an exhaustive list of Native American cultural resources, the NAHC suggested contacting Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have direct knowledge of cultural resources in or near the project site. The NAHC provided the contact list along with the SLF search results. Documents related to the NAHC SLF search are included in Appendix C.

Letters were prepared and sent to each of the 21 persons and entities on the contact list requesting information about cultural sites and resources in or near the project site. These letters, mailed on February 3, 2016, contained a brief description of the proposed project, a summary of the SLF search results, and a reference map. Recipients were asked to reply within 30 days of receipt of the letter should they have any knowledge of cultural resources in the area.

Dudek conducted initial Native American coordination during the constraints analysis phase of the proposed project. As such, at the time of submittal of the initial inquiry letters, the proposed project was not yet a formally adopted project. Dudek forwarded all responses to the initial inquiry letters to the lead agency, the ARB. Native American correspondence documents are included in Appendix C.

Dudek received five responses to the initial inquiry letters. Judy Stapp, director of cultural affairs for the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, stated that the project site is located outside of the tribe’s current reservation boundaries. Ms. Stapp further stated that the tribe has no specific archival information indicating that the project site may be a sacred/religions site or other site of Native American traditional cultural value. Vincent Whipple, manager of the Cultural Resource Department for the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, replied that the project site is within the Luiseño Aboriginal Territory of the Luiseño people but not within Rincon’s historic boundaries. Mr. Whipple suggested that further inquiries defer to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians or the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians. Raymond Huaute, cultural resource specialist for the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, did not have any additional information or immediate concerns pertaining to the proposed project. However, Mr. Huaute requested that the tribe be contacted in the event that cultural artifacts or human remains are discovered during project implementation. Additionally, Mr. Huaute stated that a formal cultural resources investigation should be conducted at the project site. Katie Croft, archaeologist for the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, requested further information on the project site in order to provide informed comments and recommendations. Ms. Croft requested copies of the California Historical Resources Information System records search and a cultural resources inventory of the proposed project site.

Dudek received one response to the initial inquiry letters requesting initiation of consultation with the lead agency. Joseph Ontiveros, cultural resource director of the Soboba Band of Luiseño
Indians, stated that there are multiple areas of concern and potential impacts surrounding the proposed project site. Mr. Ontiveros requested the contact information for the lead agency. Dudek forwarded this request to the ARB.

2.4.2 Assembly Bill 52

The proposed project is subject to compliance with AB 52 (PRC, Section 21074), which requires consideration of impacts to “tribal cultural resources” as part of the CEQA process, and requires the ARB, the CEQA lead agency, to notify any groups (who have requested notification) of the proposed project who are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project. While the ARB has yet to receive any requests from tribes for formal notification of specific projects, they reached out to all groups listed on the NAHC’s Local Government Tribal Consultation List in a good-faith effort to provide notification of the proposed project. Mr. Ontiveros was not included in the NAHC contact list, but because he previously requested government-to-government consultation through Dudek’s initial inquiry letter during the constraints analysis phase of the proposed project, ARB included him in the list of recipients.

ARB received a written response from Mr. Ontiveros dated August 28, 2016. Mr. Ontiveros requested formal government-to-government consultation with ARB regarding the proposed project. On October 6, 2016, ARB’s tribal liaison sent a letter to the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians in response to their request for consultation. On January 6, 2017, ARB emailed and sent via U.S. mail a copy of the cultural resources technical report to the tribe. A consultation meeting between Mr. Ontiveros and ARB occurred on February 22, 2017, to discuss the scope of the project and the proposed mitigation measures that will be included in the CEQA document. Mr. Ontiveros provided minor revisions to the proposed mitigation measure language. ARB agreed to include the language recommended by Mr. Ontiveros with a few revisions, which were emailed and sent via certified mail to Mr. Ontiveros on March 9, 2017. ARB requested that any comments on the revised language be received within one week. If ARB does not receive a response, they will consider the consultation closed. As of the submittal of this report, ARB has not received a response from the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians. The mitigation measures in Section 6.2 and 6.3 reflect a collaborative effort between ARB and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians to protect cultural resources while meeting the requirements of the law.

ARB received a written response from the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians dated August 2, 2016. The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians requested a copy of the project’s cultural resources technical report. ARB emailed and sent via U.S. mail a copy of the report to the tribe. The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians made no further requests regarding the proposed project following the receipt of the cultural resources technical report.
In addition, during preparation of the constraints analysis for the Iowa Avenue site, the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians indicated they were interested in receiving additional information regarding the proposed project. On January 6, 2017, ARB emailed and sent via U.S. mail a copy of the cultural resources technical report to the tribe. On January 27, 2017, the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians requested a copy of the confidential appendices (project records search and the Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 forms), which were sent to them on February 2, 2017. The Agua Caliente Band of the Cahuilla Indians sent a letter to ARB indicating they are concluding their consultation with ARB, deferring to the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians tribe.

Because AB 52 is a government-to-government process, all records of correspondence related to AB 52 notification and any subsequent consultation are kept on file with the ARB.
RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 Integrity

Delineation of the horizontal distribution and vertical depth of the site is necessary for an assessment of research potential. Of particular importance is the integrity of the deposits: whether or not features or surfaces are preserved and whether the potential exists for identifying, through analysis, horizontal and vertical spatial patterning in the evidence for prehistoric behavior.

A variety of post-depositional disturbance processes can greatly alter the original character of archaeological sites (e.g., see Gross and Robbins-Wade 2008; Schiffer 1987; Waters 1992). Formation processes such as alluvial deposition, erosion, bioturbation, and modern disturbance can considerably affect the integrity of archaeological sites. Here, attempts are made to identify and interpret the processes that formed the site, with particular attention given to the character of post-depositional processes and the extent to which they have affected the integrity of the archaeological deposits.

The results of testing at various sites have been used to address the following issues:

- Does the horizontal and vertical extent of the archaeological record within the sites represent continuous or discrete occupations?
- Is it possible to discern depositional versus post-depositional processes that have contributed to the present condition of the archaeological record at any of the sites? In other words, what are the factors, both natural and anthropogenic, that have altered the position and condition of artifacts from the prehistoric and historic occupations of the sites?
- What kinds of features are potentially preserved at the sites (e.g., structures, wells, privy)? Are there features that are highly disrupted by postdepositional processes but that are still recognizable? Can these features be associated with particular functions?
- By examining spatial patterns in the horizontal distribution of artifacts, is it possible to discern areas that were associated with specific functions? Do patterns in the vertical distribution of artifacts tell us anything about changes in the function, materials exploited, or human activities at the sites through time?
- At historical archaeological sites, is there evidence of overlapping dump episodes, such as multiple points of concentration or concentration of artifacts of a certain age?

The issue of integrity takes on a different meaning when considering the historical built environment. Built structures and landscape features have an intended structure that is often more durable than prehistoric features, and determining integrity is sometimes more obvious. However,
the factors contributing to declining integrity of, say, a residential building, not only include exposure to the elements through neglect, but also scavenging of building materials. Scavenging was a common practice during the homestead era when building materials were at a premium and any abandoned building or equipment rarely went unnoticed. The results of scavenging can be completely destructive, but it oftentimes focused on taking easily obtained materials such as wood siding or exposed wood framework, metal piping, sheet metal, windows, and doors. This kind of reuse has direct effects on the integrity of historic features. Determining the impact of scavenging on integrity can be as simple as making observations about missing elements from a building. However, scavenging can go undetected if irrigation pipes were taken; the disappearance of such items would leave little to no trace of its prior existence.

3.2 Chronological Placement

Chronological issues are basic to any archaeological research design, as they provide the primary framework of history. Because chronological controls are essential to any archaeological investigation, several basic questions concerning the temporal data potential of evaluated sites include:

- Can the chronological placement of project sites be determined?
- What kinds of chronometric data can project sites provide? Of those obtained during survey, how well do they correlate in terms of the age estimates they provide (e.g., cans vs. bottles)?
- Are there data indicating the presence of multiple occupation episodes at project sites?
- Do diagnostic artifacts appear to fit with temporal patterns recognized in the surrounding region? Are there any unique diagnostic items present?
- Can chronometric data from project sites help to refine dating schemes in the local region?

Potential chronometric evidence includes radiocarbon dates, obsidian hydration measurements, and diagnostic artifact forms. For historic sites, time-sensitive artifacts are usually limited to items with maker’s marks, specific can manufacture styles, or coins. However, it is common for dates of manufacture for a particular artifact to be much broader than those for another artifact class, making a determination for age of consumption for any given class difficult, if not impossible. For this reason, the date of refuse disposal is more pertinent for refuse deposits that are not located at homesites; and this is usually determined by the early manufacture date on the youngest artifact for each dump event. Hale et al. (2010) document a widespread pattern of dumping items of mixed manufacture and consumption age as the result of homesite cleanup and off-site dumping. If refuse deposits are located at a homesite, assessing the age of consumption for historic artifacts is an approximation based on overlapping manufacture dates, taking into account the earliest and latest possible dates. Assemblages that cannot be securely
placed chronologically would be less likely to possess a significant research potential. Of course, archival research can provide direct information on the date of construction and occupancy for historic homesites and lands used for agriculture, ranching, or mining.

### 3.3 Settlement and Site Function

Interpretation of the study sites depends upon an assessment of their places within the larger settlement-subsistence system of their occupants. Sites belonging to functional types that are relatively ubiquitous within the region would be less likely to be considered significant than unusual site types. Sites with evidence of multiple functions may possess richer information content than relatively simple sites; on the other hand, single-function sites may have a greater research potential than multiple-function sites if the residues from the various activities at the latter cannot be effectively differentiated.

Evidence for the functional uses represented by the site come from surface observations made during both the survey and testing phases, as well as through the results of subsurface excavations. Interpretations of functions rest upon both the range and the relative and absolute frequencies of various classes of features, artifacts, and ecofacts.

Considering historical archaeological sites and homesites, the kinds of artifacts present, the activities they represent, and their overall proportions can give some indication of where refuse originated, and why it was abandoned at its place of discard. The main question for historical archaeological sites is:

- What is the nature of refuse at historic sites? Are proportions of consumptive, household, industrial, and other artifacts substantial enough to derive context of origin(s)?
- Are any maker’s marks on historic artifacts indicative of specific places of manufacture? Do they provide any information about where particular goods might have been purchased or otherwise obtained?

These kinds of questions are relevant for understanding the nature of historical occupation, including at homesites or agricultural facilities (i.e., field worker residential areas). Archival research helps bolster field data by documenting past historical landowners, lease holders, or residents, and by documenting historical changes in the local landscape. While it is virtually impossible to tie historic refuse deposits to residential or agricultural sites, it is possible to identify potential sources of refuse and make informed assumptions about its origin.
3.4 Subsistence

The issues related to subsistence orientation are interwoven with the previously discussed settlement organization, and this section complements the issues discussed previously.

Among the questions addressed are the following:

- Are artifacts present at historical archaeological sites that provide information on the kinds of foods consumed (e.g., food cans, glass bottles)?
- Are artifacts or features present?

To address these issues, a number of data sets and analytical procedures are needed. For historical sites, information is limited to the kinds of food containers and food processing items found at historical archaeological sites.
4 METHODS

4.1 Phase I Pedestrian Survey

Dudek Archaeologist Adriane Dorrler conducted the intensive-level archaeological survey of proposed project site on September 2, 2016, using a methodology consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (48 FR 44716). The intensive-level survey methods consisted of a pedestrian survey conducted in parallel transects spaced no more than 15 meters apart over the entire project site. Within each transect, the ground surface was examined for prehistoric artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools, ceramics, fire-affected rock), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a cultural midden, soil depressions, features indicative of the current, or former presence of structures or buildings (e.g., standing exterior walls, post holes, foundations), and historic artifacts (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics, building materials). Ground disturbances such as burrows, cut banks, and drainages were also visually inspected for exposed subsurface materials.

One newly identified archaeological site (temporarily designated as ARB-AD-01) was identified within the project site. ARB-AD-01 consists of a sparse and widely dispersed historic refuse scatter. The scatter runs generally east–west within the fallow fields in the northern half of the proposed project site.

Documentation of ARB-AD-01 complied with the OHP and Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (48 FR 44720–44726) and the California OHP Planning Bulletin Number 4(a). Newly identified ARB-AD-01 was recorded on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Form 523 (Series 1/95), using the Instructions for Recording Historical Resources (OHP 1995). The DPR form will be submitted to the EIC and is included in confidential Appendix B.

Ms. Dorrler took detailed notes and photographs of the newly identified cultural resource and the surroundings. All fieldwork was documented using field notes, digital photography, iPad technology with close-scale field maps, and aerial photographs. Location-specific photographs were taken using an Apple 3rd generation iPad equipped with 8 megapixel resolution and georeferenced PDF maps of the project site. Accuracy of this device ranged between 3 meters and 10 meters. The location of the newly identified cultural resource and the individual diagnostic artifacts were mapped with a real-time corrected Trimble GeoXT Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver with sub-meter accuracy.
4.2 Phase II Testing

To evaluate the significance of the newly identified historic refuse scatter and its potential to support a subsurface deposit, the Phase I intensive-level survey was augmented to include a Phase II testing program. Ms. Dorler returned to the project site on September 20, 2016, to conduct the testing program. The testing program involved the excavation of 0.25- by 0.5-meter shovel test pits (STPs) in 20-centimeter arbitrary levels from the surface to depths of 40 centimeters below the surface. Eight STPs spaced approximately 100 feet (30 meters) apart were placed in areas with the highest potential to support subsurface deposits and stable subsurface formations within the boundary of ARB-AD-01. DPR Form 523k in confidential Appendix B shows the location of the STPs in relation to the site. All soils were screened through 1/8-inch wire mesh. Sidewalls of the STPs were visually inspected for cultural material. Excavation pits were terminated after 20 centimeters of culturally sterile levels. Subsurface soil characteristics and natural disturbances were recorded for each STP. No artifacts were collected during the testing program since none of the artifacts identified within the site provided data potential beyond field-level recordation. All diagnostic artifacts identified during the pedestrian survey and testing program were recorded in the artifact catalog included in confidential Appendix B. All field notes, photographs, and records related to the archaeological pedestrian survey and testing program are on file at Dudek’s Riverside, California, office.
5 RESULTS

5.1 Phase I Pedestrian Survey

Visibility at the project site was generally excellent since the majority of the area was either fallow and recently tilled or active orchard. Approximately 10% of the project site had zero visibility. This area consisted of the experimental ornamental grove in the southeast corner of the project. Dense vegetation and a significant layer of duff completely obscured the ground surface in this area. The entire project site is considered disturbed land, having been routinely tilled for agricultural purposes for nearly a century. Additional disturbances within the project site include the network of dirt roads that span the interior perimeter of the site that are routinely maintained by UCR staff and modern refuse dumps from transient activity near the northeastern portion of the project site. Modern refuse was also dispersed throughout the full extent of the project site.

Developed land refers to highly modified lands that support man-made structures. Two relatively small modern concrete slab foundations are in the middle of the project site with one near the eastern side and the other near the western side. Remnants of a modern salinity research station are behind a chain-link fence in the southeastern portion of the project site. Finally, a network of farm irrigation elements runs along the perimeter of each field. While the irrigation system was likely in place for many years, the aboveground elements within the project site are modern improved diversion stands and lateral risers.

No prehistoric or historic-age built environment resources were identified as a result of the pedestrian survey. One newly identified historic-age cultural resource was recorded within the project site: ARB-AD-01. This site consists of a large and widely dispersed historic refuse scatter. The artifact assemblage is dominated by household-type refuse. A full account of the newly identified resource, including locational information, can be found on the DPR Form 523 included in confidential Appendix B.

5.1.1 ARB-AD-01

ARB-AD-01 consists of a widely dispersed and diverse assemblage of historic-age household debris dating roughly from the early to mid-twentieth century. The majority of the refuse consists of chronologically non-diagnostic ceramic and glass body fragments. A few of the diagnostic artifacts suggest that the refuse could be discarded waste from historic-era properties in the vicinity of the project site. The diagnostic artifacts included in the assemblage consist of two sun-colored amethyst glass fragments (1880–1925), one of which is a shard of decorative cut glass; a fragment of blue on white porcelain tableware decorated with the willow pattern and a buffalo china maker’s mark (1915–1940s); a tooled bottle finish (1885–
ca. 1920s); and a machine-made glass swirl marble (1910–present). Modern materials such as plastic, paper, and Styrofoam are mixed together with the historic debris. Both the modern and historic-age material are partially embedded. The scatter does not appear to have a concentration point that would indicate dumping; however, the few diagnostic artifacts are concentrated within the eastern half of the project site.

The refuse scatter measures approximately 440 feet (134 meters) east–west by 150 feet (46 meters) north–south. ARB-AD-01 is located within the fallow and recently tilled fields within the eastern half of the project site. The site is constrained by a dirt road to the east and the experimental ornamental grove to the southeast. A utility road bisects the site east–west.

5.2 Phase II Testing

5.2.1 ARB-AD-01

The testing program conducted for ARB-AD-01 resulted in the excavation of eight STPs spaced generally 100 feet (30 meters) apart to the north and south of the strand of diagnostic artifacts. Half of the excavations resulted in the identification of diagnostic material (STP-02, -05, -06, and -07). The remaining four excavations (STP-01, -03, -04, and -08) unearthed material that was likely historic yet contained no temporally diagnostic features to confirm this assumption. All cultural material was located within the first 20 centimeters below the surface; therefore, all excavations ceased at 40 centimeters below the surface. Modern trash was noted in five of the excavations (STP-01, -02, -05, -07, and -08). Of these, four STPs (STP-01, -02, -05, and -07) contained modern trash in the 20-to-40-centimeter level.

The sediment was uniform throughout the STPs and excavation levels. Stratigraphic soil profiles showed a homogenous plow zone consisting of a dry silt loam that measures as 7.5YR, 5 value, 4 chroma (brown) on the Munsell Color chart. The sediment was loose and friable from surface to 25 centimeters below the surface, then compact through 40 centimeters below the surface. Table 2 summarizes the results of the individual STPs excavated during the testing program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STP</th>
<th>Top Level</th>
<th>Bottom Level</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Material Specific</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Temporally Diagnostic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STP-01</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tableware rim sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-01</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tableware sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-01</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Black plastic threaded bottle cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Green plastic fragment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Summary of Shovel Test Pit Excavations at ARB-AD-01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STP</th>
<th>Top Level</th>
<th>Bottom Level</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Material Specific</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Temporally Diagnostic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STP-01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Paper fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-02</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Yellow, Blue, Colorless swirl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1910–present</td>
<td>Glass marble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-02</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tableware sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-02</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Styrofoam</td>
<td>Styrofoam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Styrofoam fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Possible food wrapper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-03</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Colorless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Colorless glass shard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-03</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Aqua glass shard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-03</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tableware sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-03</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Ostrea sp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Shellfish fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-04</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>White Milk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>White milk glass shard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-05</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1915-1940s</td>
<td>Tableware sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-05</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Colorless</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Colorless glass shards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>White plastic sheet fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-06</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Sun Colored Amethyst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1880-1925</td>
<td>SCA glass shard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-06</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Cobalt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Cobalt glass shard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-06</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tableware sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-07</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1885-ca. 1920s</td>
<td>Aqua bottle finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-07</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Sun Colored Amethyst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1880-1925</td>
<td>SCA cut glass shard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Clear plastic sheet fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-08</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Tableware sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-08</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Unidentifiable ferrous metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-08</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Clear plastic sheet fragment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Significance Evaluation

5.3.1 ARB-AD-01

As a result of the testing program at ARB-AD-01, there is no indication of subsurface cultural deposits within the newly identified site. All cultural material identified in association with the historic refuse scatter was found within the first 20 centimeters below the surface. Modern refuse was found below the cultural material in four of the excavations, suggesting that the surrounding matrix is heavily disturbed from years of tilling. The functional categories of the
artifacts include consumer items (i.e., bottles and bottle caps), household and kitchen items (i.e., glassware, tableware, and discarded shellfish), and a personal gaming item (i.e., glass marble). Based on the artifact assemblage and the location of the scatter, it is possible that ARB-AD-01 is associated with discarded household refuse from the historic-era property once located just north of the project site. The previously extant property was identified during the archival research conducted for this study. The property is visible on the 1901 topographic map and the 1948 historic aerial. The property was razed by 1959, and by 1966, the property was replaced with commercial and retail development.

ARB-AD-01 has no apparent potential to yield important archaeological information due to its lack of a subsurface component. The site appears to be of little scientific or cultural value. ARB-AD-01 is not associated with any significant events locally, regionally, or nationally (Criterion 1); is not associated with, or cannot be connected with, the lives of any important people locally, regionally, or nationally (Criterion 2); does not contain architecture (Criterion 3); and based on the Phase I inventory and Phase II evaluation efforts, ARB-AD-01 does not have the potential to yield information locally, regionally, or nationally (Criterion 4) (PRC, Section 5024.1; 14 CCR 4852). The site is not eligible for listing on the CRHR or the local register, is not a “unique” archaeological resource under CEQA, and is not significant under CEQA. The research potential of the site has been exhausted through recordation and subsurface testing, and no further cultural resource considerations are recommended.

5.4 Impacts

CEQA requires a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on historical resources (PRC, Section 21084.1). If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (Section 21083.2(a)–(c)).

One hundred percent of the proposed project site was surveyed for historical resources. As described in Section 5.1, there is one newly identified archaeological resource within the planned development area, ARB-AD-01. As a result of the Phase I inventory and Phase II evaluation effort, this resource was found ineligible for the CRHR or local listing. Therefore, the project site contains no known historical resources under CEQA, and no known historical resources will be impacted by the proposed project.
6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Although ARB-AD-01 is not a significant resource under CEQA and no intact deposits were encountered during the testing program, there remains the possibility that intact cultural deposits associated with the historic-era property that was identified during background research may be encountered during earth-moving activities. The testing phase showed that there was substantial disturbance to the property likely through tilling of the land, resulting in a plow zone that had a mixing of historic-age and modern material. Excavations planned for the current project will extend through this plow zone, entering soils that may not have been disturbed during tilling activities. The presence of the now razed historic-era property within the vicinity of the project site and the scattered historic-age material within the project site suggests that a historic-age intact deposit may be encountered below this plow zone. Dudek recommends that an archaeological monitor be present for the initial earth-moving activity on the project in addition to the standard measures to address unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources and human remains.

6.1 Archaeological and Native American Monitoring

Archaeological monitoring shall be implemented for initial disturbance of sediments with the potential to uncover historical or prehistoric archaeological materials. These ground disturbing activities would include site preparation, excavation, grading, drilling, and similar activities. Prior to grading activities commencing on site, ARB shall contact the consulting Native American tribe(s) that have requested monitoring, if any, through consultation during the AB 52 process. ARB shall coordinate with the tribe(s) to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s), if necessary.

6.2 Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources

In the event that cultural resources are exposed during construction activities for the proposed project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending upon the significance of the find, the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.

The project archaeologist and ARB shall confer regarding mitigation of the discovered cultural resource(s). If the cultural resource(s) is associated with Native American activities, a representative of the consulting Native American tribe(s) shall also confer regarding mitigation.
and a treatment and disposition plan shall be prepared and implemented to protect the identified cultural resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the cultural resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the cultural resources in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. If the discovered cultural resource(s) is associated with Native American activities, the treatment plan shall require monitoring by the consulting Native American tribes(s) during data recovery. The treatment plan shall require that all recovered cultural resources undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered cultural resources shall be processed and curated according to the current professional repository standards.

6.3 Treatment and Final Disposition of Cultural Resources Associated with Native American Activities

After consultation with the consulting Native American tribe(s), ARB shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources through one or more of the following methods:

a. Human remains, sacred/ceremonial items, and burial goods will be addressed per State Law and sections 6.1 and 6.4 of this Cultural Resources Technical Report.

b. ARB will accommodate the process for avoidance, preservation in place, or potential reburial of the cultural resources with the consulting Native American tribe(s), when feasible. If onsite reburial is feasible, it shall include measures and provisions to protect, in perpetuity, the reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.

c. Where cultural resources are to be curated at a qualified repository, the collections and associated records, including title to, shall be transferred to the Western Science Center, Riverside Metropolitan Museum, or a non-tribally operated third-party local repository that meets the federal standards (36 CFR, Part 79) and be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. The cultural resources shall be made available to all qualified researchers upon application, including the curation agreement with the aforementioned curation repository.

d. For purposes of conflict resolution, if more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural resources within 30 days, the cultural resources shall be curated at the Western
Science Center, Riverside Metropolitan Museum, or a non-tribally operated third-party local repository that meets the federal standards (36 CFR, Part 79).

e. The archaeologist shall prepare a final report containing the significance and treatment findings and submit the report to ARB, the EIC, and the consulting Native American tribe(s).

f. Where the cultural resources and associated records are not claimed by any tribe(s), ARB shall donate the cultural resources to an appropriate curation facility, or deliver them to the appropriate Native American tribe(s) if that is recommended by ARB.

6.4 Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains

In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the Riverside County Coroner shall be notified within 24 hours of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the coroner has determined, within 2 working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the MLD from the deceased Native American. The MLD shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
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NAHC Sacred Lands File Search and Tribal Correspondence
Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION
1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95501
(916) 373-3710
(916) 373-5471 – Fax
nahc@nahc.ca.gov

Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File Search

Project: ARB Southern California Lab Relocation - UC Riverside Site Project (9002_07)
County: Riverside

USGS Quadrangle
Name: Riverside East
Township: 2S Range: 4W Section(s): Section 30

Company/Firm/Agency: Dudek
Contact Person: Adriane Dorrler
Street Address: 3544 University Avenue
City: Riverside Zip: 92501
Phone: (760) 840-7556 Extension: 
Fax: (760) 632-0164
Email: adorller@dudek.com

Project Description:
The project is a constraints analysis for the potential relocation of the California Air Resources Board's existing El Monte motor vehicle and engine emissions testing and research facilities to a possible location on the University of California Riverside Campus, Riverside County. Specifically, the site is located within citrus groves west of I-215, south of University Avenue, north of Martin Luther King Boulevard, east of Chicago Avenue, and west of Iowa Avenue. Please see attached map for locational details.

✔ Project Location Map is attached
January 28, 2016

Adriane Dorrier
Dudek

Sent by Email: adorrier@dudek.com
Number of Pages: 5

RE: ARB Southern California Lab Relocation-UC Riverside Site Project (9002_07), Riverside East USGS Quadrangle, Riverside County

Dear Ms. Dorrier:

Attached is a consultation list of tribes with traditional lands or cultural places located within the boundaries of the above referenced counties. Please note that the intent above reference codes is to mitigate impacts to tribal cultural resources, as defined, for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) projects.

As of July 1, 2015, Public Resources Code Sections 21080.1, 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 require public agencies to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purpose mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources:

Within 14 days of determining that an application for a project is complete or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency shall provide formal notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, which shall be accomplished by means of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section. (Public Resources Code Section 21080.1(d))

The law does not preclude agencies from initiating consultation with the tribes that are culturally and traditionally affiliated with their jurisdictions. The NAHC believes that in fact that this is the best practice to ensure that tribes are consulted commensurate with the intent of the law.

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.1(d), formal notification must include a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. The NAHC believes that agencies should also include with their notification letters information regarding any cultural resources assessment that has been completed on the APE, such as:

1. The results of any record search that may have been conducted at an Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), including, but not limited to:
   - A listing of any and all known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE;
   - Copies of any and all cultural resource records and study reports that may have been provided by the Information Center as part of the records search response;
   - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   - Whether the records search indicates a low, moderate or high probability that unrecorded cultural resources are located in the potential APE; and
If a survey is recommended by the Information Center to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. The results of any archaeological inventory survey that was conducted, including:
   - Any report that may contain site forms, site significance, and suggested mitigation measures.

   All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure in accordance with Government Code Section 6254.10.

3. The results of any Sacred Lands File (SFL) check conducted through Native American Heritage Commission. A search of the SFL was completed for the USGS quadrangle information provided with negative results.

4. Any ethnographic studies conducted for any area including all or part of the potential APE; and

5. Any geotechnical reports regarding all or part of the potential APE.

Lead agencies should be aware that records maintained by the NAHC and CHRIS is not exhaustive, and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of a cultural place. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of a tribal cultural resource.

This information will aid tribes in determining whether to request formal consultation. In the case that they do, having the information beforehand well help to facilitate the consultation process.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our consultation list contains current information.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: nw_nahc@pacbell.net.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rob Wood
Associate Environmental Planner
Cabazon Band of Mission Indians
Doug Welmas, Chairperson
84-245 Indio Springs Parkway  Cahuilla
Indio , CA 92203
(760) 342-2593

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Lynn Valbuena, Chairwoman
26569 Community Center  Serrano
Highland , CA 92346
(909) 864-8933

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians
Shane Chapparosa, Chairman
P.O. Box 189   Cahuilla
 Warner Springs , CA 92086
Chapparosa@msn.com
(760) 782-0712

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
Rosemary Morillo, Chairperson; Attn: Carrie Garcia
P.O. Box 487   Luiseno
San Jacinto , CA 92581  Cahuilla
carrie@soboba-nsn.gov
(951) 654-2765

Pala Band of Mission Indians
Shasta Gaughen, PhD, THPO
PMB 50, 35008 Pala Temecula Rd.  Luiseno
Pala   Cupeno
Warner Springs, CA 92059
sgaughen@palatribe.com
(760) 891-3515

Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
Mary Resvaloso, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1160   Cahuilla
Thermal , CA 92274
tmchair@torresmartinez.org
(760) 397-0300

Pauma & Yuima Reservation
Temet Aguilar, Chairperson
P.O. Box 369, Ext. 303   Luiseno
Pauma Valley , CA 92061
(760) 742-1289

Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians
John Marcus, Chairman
P.O. Box 391820   Cahuilla
Anza , CA 92539
(951) 659-2700

Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
Joseph Hamilton, Chairman
P.O. Box 391670   Cahuilla
Anza , CA 92539
admin@ramonatribe.com
(951) 763-4105

Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
Mary Ann Green, Chairperson
P.O. Box 846   Cahuilla
Coachella , CA 92236
(760) 398-4722
(760) 369-7161 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.
This list applicable only for consultation with Native American tribes under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 for the proposed ARB Southern California Lab Relocation - UC Riverside Site Project (9902_07), Riverside East USGS Quadrangle, Riverside County.
Rincon Band of Mission Indians
Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson
1 West Tribal Road
Valley Center, CA 92082
bomazzetti@aol.com
(760) 749-1051

La Jolla Band of Luiseno Indians
Thomas Rodrigues, Chairperson
22000 Highway 76
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
lavonne.peck@lajolla-nsn.gov
(760) 742-3771

San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
Tribal Council
1889 Sunset Drive
Vista, CA 92081
cmojado@slrmissionindians.org
(760) 724-8505

Serrano Nation of Mission Indians
Goldie Walker, ChiTriwnan
P.O. Box 343
Patton, CA 92369
(909) 528-9027
(909) 528-9032

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
Jeff Grubbe, Chairperson
5401 Dinah Shore Drive
Palm Springs, CA 92264
lregoz@aguacaliente-nsn.gov
(760) 699-6800

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians THPO
Patricia Garcia-Plotkin Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
5401 Dinah Shore Drive
Palm Springs, CA 92264
ACBCI-THPO@aguacaliente.net
(760) 699-6907

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Robert Martin, Chairperson
12700 Pumarra Road
Banning, CA 92220
(951) 849-8807
(951) 755-5200
(951) 922-8146 Fax

Cahuilla Band of Indians
Luther Salgado, Chairperson
P.O. Box 391760
Anza, CA 92539
Chairman@cahuilla.net
(760) 763-5549
(760) 763-2631 Tribal EPA

Pechanga Band of Mission Indians
Mark Macarro, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1477
Temecula, CA 92593
mgoodharte@pechanga-nsn.net
(951) 770-6100

Pala Band of Mission Indians
Robert H. Smith, Chairperson
PMB 50, 35008 Pala Temecula Rd.
Pala, CA 92059
rsmitl@palatplibe.com
(760) 891-3500

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code. This list applicable only for consultation with Native American tribes under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 for the proposed ARB Southern California Lab Relocation - UC Riverside Site Project (9092-07), Riverside East USGS Quadrangle, Riverside County.
This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.96 of the Public Resources Code.

This list applicable only for consultation with Native American tribes under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 for the proposed ARB Southern California Lab Relocation - UC Riverside Site Project (5002_07), Riverside East USGS Quadrangle, Riverside County.
Subject: Air Resources Board El Monte Lab Relocation Environmental Constraints Evaluation – Iowa Street Site

Dear «HONORIFIC_TITLE» «LAST_NAME»:

Dudek has been retained by the California Department of General Services (DGS) to prepare a cultural resources constraints analysis for the potential relocation of the California Air Resources Board’s existing El Monte motor vehicle and engine emissions testing and research facilities to a possible location on the University of California Riverside Campus, Riverside County. As part of the process of identifying cultural resources issues for this proposed project, Dudek contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search and a list of Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the proposed project site. The SLF search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. However, the NAHC recommended that we consult with you directly regarding your knowledge of the presence of cultural resources that may be impacted by this project.

Project Description and Location

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) maintains an air pollution testing facility in El Monte, California. Over the years, the testing needs of the ARB have grown and have necessitated expansion of this facility into adjacent and nearby spaces. The ARB has determined that all testing functions should be housed in a single site/campus; therefore, relocation of this facility is necessary. The ARB is considering relocating the air pollution testing facility from its current location in El Monte, Los Angeles County, to the Iowa Avenue site in the City of Riverside, Riverside County, California.

The new ARB laboratory facility building(s) will include office areas as well as large open spaces for testing equipment operations. The building(s) will be affixed with several high bay doors to allow for material/equipment shipping/receiving and ingress/egress of large vehicles and trucks and mechanical equipment. The site will include exterior parking for both employees and
large equipment, vehicles and trucks involved with testing operations. The new facility will be
designed to accommodate approximately 400 employees. It is assumed that any infrastructure
improvements (water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, etc.) would occur entirely within roadways
rather than extend into off-site undeveloped areas.

The Iowa Avenue site (Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 253-080-013) is in the northeastern
portion of the City of Riverside and is part of the University of California (UC), Riverside, West
Campus. The site is located approximately 0.5 mile southwest of the Interstate (I-) 215/State
Route (SR-) 60 freeway (from the University Avenue interchange) and 0.7 mile west of the UC
Riverside main campus. The site is relatively flat and consists of active agricultural land
(primarily orange and avocado groves). The site falls within Township 2 South, Range 4 West,
Section 30 the Riverside East U.S. Geological Service 7.5-minute series topographic Quadrangle
map (Figure 1).

If you have any knowledge of cultural resources that may exist within or near the proposed
project site, please contact me directly at (760) 840-7556, adorrler@dudek.com, or at the above
address within 30-days of receipt of this letter.

Please note that this letter does not constitute Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notification or initiation of
consultation. AB 52 is a process between the lead agency and California Native American Tribes
concerning potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Tribes that wish to be notified of
projects for the purposes of AB 52 must contact the lead agency in writing (pursuant to Public
Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (b)).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

A. Dorrler
Archaeologist

Attachment.: Project Location Map
Subject: Air Resources Board El Monte Lab Relocation Environmental Constraints Evaluation
February 16, 2016

[VIA EMAIL TO: adorler@dudek.com]
Dudek
Ms. Adriane Dorrler
3544 University Avenue
Riverside, CA 92501

Re: El Monte Lab Relocation- Iowa Street Site

Dear Ms. Adriane Dorrler,

The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians (ACBCI) appreciates your efforts to include the Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) in the El Monte Lab Relocation - Iowa Street Site project. After reviewing the project information provided and conducting a records search of ACBCI cultural registry it was determined that more information is needed. In order for the ACBCI to provide informed comments and recommendations we request the following:

  * A copy of the records search with associated survey reports and site records from the information center.
  * A cultural resources inventory of the project area by a qualified archaeologist prior to any development activities in this area.
  * Copies of any cultural resource documentation (report and site records) generated in connection with this project.

Again, the Agua Caliente appreciates your interest in our cultural heritage. If you have questions or require additional information, please call me at (760)699-6829. You may also email me at acbci-thpo@aguacaliente.net.

Cordially,

Katie Croft
Archaeologist
Tribal Historic Preservation Office
AGUA CALIENTE BAND
OF CAHUILLA INDIANS
February 10, 2016

Adriane Dorrler
Archaeologist
Dudek
3544 University Avenue
Riverside, California 92501

Re: Air Resources Board El Monte Lab Relocation Environmental Constraints Evaluation - Iowa Street Site

Dear Ms. Dorrler:

Thank you for contacting the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians concerning cultural resource information relative to the above referenced project.

The project is located outside of the Tribe's current reservation boundaries. The Tribe has no specific archival information on the site indicating that it may be a sacred/religious site or other site of Native American traditional cultural value.

We look forward to continued collaboration in the preservation of cultural resources or areas of traditional cultural importance.

Best regards,

Judy Stapp
Director of Cultural Affairs
Dear Ms. Dorrler,

Thank you for contacting Morongo on behalf of your client. At this time the tribe does not have any additional information or immediate concerns pertaining to this particular project. However, in the unlikely event that cultural artifacts or human remains are discovered, we would like to request that you contact the Morongo Band of Mission Indians immediately and follow the Standard Development Conditions outlined in the attached letter. If you have any further questions regarding this matter please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Raymond Huaute  
Cultural Resource Specialist  
Morongo Band of Mission Indians  
12700 Pumarra Road  
Banning, CA 92220  
Phone: (951) 755-5025  
Fax: (951) 572-6004  
Email: rhuate@morongo-nsn.gov
Date: March 18, 2016

Re: Air Resources Board El Monte Lab Relocation Environmental Constraints Evaluation- Iowa Street site

Dear, Adriane Dorrler
Archaeologist
DUDEK

Thank you for contacting the Morongo Band of Mission Indians regarding the above referenced project(s). The tribe greatly appreciates the opportunity to comment on the project. After reviewing our records and consulting with our tribal elders and cultural experts, we would like to respectfully offer the following comments and/or recommendations:

___ The project is outside of the Tribe’s current reservation boundaries and is not within an area considered to be a traditional use area or one in which the Tribe has cultural ties (i.e. Cahuilla or Serrano Territory). We recommend contacting the appropriate tribes who have cultural affiliation to the project area. We have no further comments at this time.

___ The project is outside of the Tribe’s current reservation boundaries but within an area considered to be a traditional use area or one in which the Tribe has cultural ties (i.e. Cahuilla or Serrano Territory). At this time, we are not aware of any cultural resources on the property; however, that is not to say there is nothing present. At this time, we ask that you impose specific conditions regarding all cultural and/or archaeological resources and buried cultural materials on any development plans or entitlement applications (see Standard Development Conditions attachment).

X The project is outside of the Tribe’s current reservation boundaries but within an area considered to be a traditional use area or one in which the Tribe has cultural ties (i.e. Cahuilla or Serrano Territory). At this time we ask that you impose specific conditions regarding all cultural and/or archaeological resources and buried cultural materials on any development plans or entitlement applications (see Standard Development Conditions attachment). Furthermore, we would like to formally request the following:

X A thorough records search be conducted by contacting one of the CHRIS (California Historical Resources Information System) Archaeological Information Centers and have a copy of the search results be provided to the tribe.

X A comprehensive archaeological survey be conducted of the proposed project property and any APE’s (Areas of Potential Effect) within the property. We would also like to request that a tribal monitor be present during the initial pedestrian survey and that a copy of the results be provided to the tribe as soon as it can be made available.
Morongo would like to request that our tribal monitors be present during any test pit or trenching activities and any subsequent ground disturbing activities during the construction phase of the project.

The project is located with the current boundaries of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians Reservation. Please contact the Morongo Band of Mission Indians planning department for further details.

Once again, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project. Please be aware that receipt of this letter does not constitute “meaningful” tribal consultation nor does it conclude the consultation process. This letter is merely intended to initiate consultation between the tribe and lead agency, which may be followed up with additional emails, phone calls or face-to-face consultation if deemed necessary. If you should have any further questions with regard to this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

Raymond Huaute
Cultural Resource Specialist
Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Email: rhuaute@morongo-nsn.gov
Phone: (951) 755-5025
Standard Development Conditions

The Morongo Band of Mission Indians asks that you impose specific conditions regarding cultural and/or archaeological resources and buried cultural materials on any development plans or entitlement applications as follows:

1. If human remains are encountered during grading and other construction excavation, work in the immediate vicinity shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5.

2. In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during project development/construction, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the overall project may continue during this assessment period.
   a. If significant Native American cultural resources are discovered, for which a Treatment Plan must be prepared, the developer or his archaeologist shall contact the Morongo Band of Mission Indians.
   b. If requested by the Tribe¹, the developer or the project archaeologist shall, in good faith, consult on the discovery and its disposition (e.g. avoidance, preservation, return of artifacts to tribe, etc.).

¹ The Morongo Band of Mission Indians realizes that there may be additional tribes claiming cultural affiliation to the area; however, Morongo can only speak for itself. The Tribe has no objection if the archaeologist wishes to consult with other tribes and if the city wishes to revise the condition to recognize other tribes.
February 9, 2016

Adriane Dorrler
Dudek
3544 University Avenue
Riverside, CA 92501

Re: Air Resources Board El Monte Lab Relocation – Iowa Street Site

Dear Adriane Dorrler:

This letter is written on behalf of Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians. We have received your notification regarding the Air Resources Board El Monte Lab Relocation – Iowa Street Site Project and we thank you for the continued consultation notification. The location you have identified is within the Territory of the Luiseño people.

Embedded in the Luiseño Territory are Rincon’s history, culture and identity. The project is within the Luiseño Aboriginal Territory of the Luiseño people but, is not within Rincon’s Historic Boundaries. We do not have any additional information regarding this project but, we defer to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians or Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians who are closer to your project area.

Thank you for the opportunity to protect and preserve our cultural assets.

Sincerely,

Vincent Whipple
Manager
Rincon Cultural Resources Department
Adriane Dorrler

From: Jessica Valdez <JValdez@soboba-nsn.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 2:51 PM
To: Adriane Dorrler
Cc: Joseph Ontiveros
Subject: Air Resources Board El Monte Lab Relocation Environmental Constraints Evaluation - Iowa Street Site

Adriane,

The Soboba Band is in receipt of your letter, dated February 2, 2016, regarding the Air Resources Board El Monte Lab Relocation Environmental Constraints Evaluation – Iowa Street Site. There are multiple areas of concern/potential impact surrounding the project area, specifics will be discussed in consultation with the lead agency. With that being said, the Soboba Band wishes to initiate consultation with the lead agency via a formal letter. Our records indicate that an email was sent to you on 11/12/15, requesting lead agency contact information. We have yet to receive a response. We look forward to hearing from you. In addition to this email, a voicemail was left for you at the following number 760-840-7556.

Jessica Valdez
Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians
Cultural Resource Department
Office: (951)-654-5544 Ext: 4139
JValdez@soboba-nsn.gov

Confidentiality: The entirety of the contents of this email shall remain confidential between Soboba and the intended recipient (Dudek). No part of the contents of this email may be shared, copied, or utilized in any way with any other individual, entity, municipality, or tribe, whatsoever, without the expressed written permission of the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians.