

**APPENDIX D:**

***CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT, CLINTON KEITH  
PROPERTY (GROVE PARK PROJECT), WILDOMAR, RIVERSIDE  
COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, BCR CONSULTING, LLC., MARCH 9, 2015.***

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

# **CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT**

**Clinton Keith Property (Grove Park Project)**

**Wildomar, Riverside County, California**



**BCRCONSULTING LLC**

March 9, 2015

# CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT

Clinton Keith Property (Grove Park Project)

Wildomar, Riverside County, California

Prepared for:

Mr. Eric Flodine  
V.P. Community Planning  
Strata Equity Group, Inc.  
4370 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 960  
San Diego, California 92122

Prepared by:

David Brunzell, M.A., RPA  
BCR Consulting LLC  
1420 Guadalajara Place  
Claremont, California 91711  
Project No. STR1202

**National Archaeological Data Base (NADB) Information:**

*Type of Study:* Reconnaissance Survey

*Resources Recorded:* None

*Keywords:* Wildomar

*USGS Quadrangle:* 7.5-minute Murrieta (1979), California



**BCRCONSULTING LLC**

March 9, 2015

## MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

BCR Consulting LLC (BCR Consulting) is under contract to Strata Equity Group, Inc. to complete a Cultural Resources Assessment of the Clinton Keith Property (also known as the Grove Park Project) consisting of Assessor's Parcel Number (APNs) 380-250-003 (the subject property) located in Wildomar, Riverside County, California. A cultural resources records search, reconnaissance pedestrian field survey, Sacred Lands File search, and Paleontological Overview were conducted for the subject property in partial fulfillment of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The records search revealed that 68 cultural resources studies have taken place resulting in the recording of 18 cultural resources within one-mile of the subject property. Of the 68 previous studies, none have assessed the subject property. Of the 18 cultural resources in the records search radius, 12 are prehistoric archaeological sites, one is a historic archaeological site, and five are historic-period buildings. No cultural resources have been previously recorded within the subject property boundaries. Sacred Lands File search results did reveal the presence of Native American cultural resource sites within ½ mile of the subject property (see Appendix A).

During the field survey, BCR Consulting archaeologists did not discover any cultural resources within the subject property boundaries. However, due to the presence of 18 prehistoric and historic resources previously recorded in the immediate vicinity, the subject property is sensitive for buried cultural resources. Therefore, BCR Consulting recommends that an archaeological monitor be present during any earthmoving activities proposed within the subject property. The monitor shall work under the direct supervision of a cultural resources professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction work in the vicinity of any find until the project archaeologist can evaluate it. In the event of a new find, salvage excavation and reporting will be required. Additionally, although a Sacred Lands File search and list of tribes and individuals were requested from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), those entities have not been contacted regarding the subject property. BCR Consulting has learned that the subject property will be part of a project that proposes a General Plan amendment. Creation or amendments of General Plans or Specific Plans require that the lead agency complete Senate Bill 18 Native American Consultation. SB18 Consultation requires that the lead agency provide California Native American tribes an opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early planning stage for the purpose of protecting, or mitigating impacts to, cultural places. SB18 procedures are outlined at [www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09\\_14\\_05\\_Updated\\_Guidelines\\_922.pdf](http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf).

According to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G (Environmental Checklist Form) under the heading "Cultural Resources", projects subject to CEQA must determine whether the project would "directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource". The appended Paleontological Overview has recommended that:

any substantial excavations in the proposed project area may well encounter significant vertebrate fossils from the Pauba Formation deposits, and thus should be monitored closely to quickly and professionally recover any fossil remains while not impeding development. It should be noted, however, that in the Pauba Formation many of the vertebrate fossils are relatively small and would be missed during typical paleontological monitoring. Sediment samples from any excavations

in the Pauba Formation should be collected and processed to assess their small vertebrate fossil potential. Any fossils recovered during mitigation should be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations (McLeod 2013, complete report in Appendix C).

If human remains are encountered during any proposed project activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY.....	ii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
NATURAL SETTING.....	1
BIOLOGY .....	1
GEOLOGY .....	1
CULTURAL SETTING .....	3
PREHISTORIC CONTEXT .....	3
ETHNOGRAPHY .....	3
HISTORY .....	4
PERSONNEL.....	5
METHODS.....	5
RESEARCH .....	5
FIELD SURVEY .....	5
RESULTS .....	5
RESEARCH .....	5
FIELD SURVEY .....	6
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
REFERENCES .....	8
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
A:    NAHC SACRED LANDS FILE SEARCH	
B:    PHOTOGRAPHS	
C:    PALEONTOLOGICAL OVERVIEW	
<b>FIGURES</b>	
1: Subject Property Location Map.....	2

## INTRODUCTION

BCR Consulting LLC (BCR Consulting) is under contract to Strata Equity Group, Inc. to complete a Cultural Resources Assessment of the Clinton Keith Property (also known as the Grove Park Project) consisting of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 380-250-003 (the subject property) located in Wildomar, Riverside County, California. A cultural resources records search, reconnaissance-level pedestrian field survey, and Sacred Lands File search have been conducted for the subject property in partial fulfillment of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The subject property is located within Section 6 of Township 7 South, Range 3 West, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian. It is depicted on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) *Murrieta* (1979), *California* 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (Figure 1).

## NATURAL SETTING


The elevation of the subject property ranges from approximately 1328 to 1374 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and exhibits variable gentle slopes. Artificial disturbances consist of recent mechanical discing, trenches excavated for geotechnical studies, and some modern trash dumping. No buildings or foundations were observed within the subject property.

### Biology



Although recent discing has severely impacted the native vegetation within the subject property, remnants of coastal sage scrub and mature oak woodland have been intermittently observed. These vegetation communities both contain plants utilized by local prehistoric groups (see Lightfoot and Parrish 2009:269, 357). Rabbits, turkey vultures, raptors, and various other bird species, along with back dirt from rodent burrows, were observed in the vicinity. For additional details on local prehistoric (particularly Luiseño) use of plant and animal species, see Bean and Shipek (1978:552) and Oxendine (1983:19-29). Sparkman (1908) and Bean and Saubel (1972) can be referenced for overviews of prehistoric harvesting and processing methods, and to review seasons and conditions in which edible plants grow locally.

### Geology

The subject property is located in the Peninsular Range geologic province of California that encompasses western Riverside County. It occupies the eastern margin of the Perris Block (Kenney 1999), which is bounded on the east by the San Jacinto Fault (Reynolds 1988, Morton 1972, 1977). Crystalline rocks present in the region include late Jurassic and cretaceous granitics of the southern California batholith. These resistant rocks weather to form gray or tan colored, boulder-covered conical buttes and hills. Locally, a thin veneer of Holocene soils typically obscures late Pleistocene sediments that often erode away to reveal the base of local boulder outcrops (Rogers 1965). During prehistory in Western Riverside County the boulders that form such outcrops were widely utilized as milling slicks for seed processing. Decomposing granite in the form of reddish brown sandy silts intermixed with granitic and quartz cobbles dominates sediments observed within the subject property.



Subject Property



Subject Property  
Clinton Keith Property

Figure 1

Strata Equity Group, Inc.  
4370 La Jolla Village Dr. Suite 960  
San Diego, California 92122

**BCRCONSULTING LLC**  
Careemont Naga Tehachapi  
www.bcrconsulting.net  
909-525-7078

Reference: Topol 2010 National Geographic; USGS Quad: Murrieta (1979), CA

## **CULTURAL SETTING**

### **Prehistoric Context**

The local prehistoric cultural setting has been organized into many chronological frameworks (see Warren and Crabtree 1986; Bettinger and Taylor 1974; Lanning 1963; Hunt 1960; Wallace 1958, 1962, 1977; Wallace and Taylor 1978; Campbell and Campbell 1935), although there is no definitive sequence for the region. The difficulties in establishing cultural chronologies for Riverside County are a function of its enormous size and the small amount of archaeological excavations conducted there. Moreover, throughout prehistory many groups have occupied the area and their territories often overlap spatially and chronologically resulting in mixed artifact deposits. Due to dry climate and capricious geological processes, these artifacts rarely become integrated in-situ. Lacking a milieu hospitable to the preservation of cultural midden, local chronologies have relied upon temporally diagnostic artifacts, such as projectile points, or upon the presence/absence of other temporal indicators, such as groundstone. Such methods are instructive, but can be limited by prehistoric occupants' concurrent use of different artifact styles, or by artifact re-use or re-sharpening, as well as researchers' mistaken diagnosis, and other factors (see Flenniken 1985; Flenniken and Raymond 1986; Flenniken and Wilke 1989). Recognizing the shortcomings of comparative temporal indicators, this study recommends review of Warren and Crabtree (1986), who have drawn upon this method to produce a commonly cited and relatively comprehensive chronology.

### **Ethnography**

The subject property is situated within the traditional boundaries of the Luiseño (Bean and Shipek 1978; Kroeber 1925). Typically, the native culture groups in southern California are named after nearby Spanish missions, and such is the case for this Takic-speaking population. For instance, the term "Luiseño" is applied to the natives inhabiting the region within the "ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Mission San Luis Rey...[and who shared] an ancestral relationship which is evident in their cosmogony, and oral tradition, common language, and reciprocal relationship in ceremonies" (Oxendine 1983:8). The first written accounts of the Luiseño are attributed to the mission fathers. Sparkman (1908), Oxendine (1983) and others produced later documentation. Prior to Spanish occupation of California, the territory of the Luiseño extended along the coast from Agua Hedionda Creek to the south, Aliso Creek to the northwest, and the Elsinore Valley and Palomar Mountain to the east. These territorial boundaries were somewhat fluid and changed through time. They encompassed an extremely diverse environment that included coastal beaches, lagoons and marshes, inland river valleys and foothills, and mountain groves of oaks and evergreens (Bean and Shipek 1978:551).

Like other Native American groups in southern California, the Luiseño caught and collected seasonally available food resources, and led a semi-sedentary lifestyle. Luiseño villages generally were located in valley bottoms, along streams, or along coastal strands near mountain ranges sheltered in canyons, near a water source, and in a location that was easily defended. Individuals from these villages took advantage of the varied resources available. They also established seasonal camps along the coast and near bays and estuaries to gather shellfish and hunt waterfowl (Kroeber 1925, Bean and Shipek 1978). The Luiseño lived in small communities, which were the focus of family life. Luiseño villages

were politically independent, administered by a hereditary chief, and occupied by patrilineally linked extended families (Kroeber 1925; Bean and Shipek 1978). The Luiseño believed in private property, which covered items and land owned by the village, as well as items (houses, gardens, ritual equipment, trade beads, eagle nests, and songs) owned by individuals. Trespass against any property was punished (Bean and Shipek 1978:551). Luiseño subsistence was based primarily on seeds like acorns, grass seed, Manzanita, sunflower, sage, chia, and pine nuts. Seeds were dried and ground to be cooked into a mush. Game animals such as deer, rabbit, jackrabbit, wood rat, mice, antelope, and many types of birds supplemented their vegetal intake (Lightfoot and Parrish 2009:341-362). The Luiseño utilized fire for crop management and communal rabbit drives (ibid.; Bean and Shipek 1978:552).

## History

Historic-era California is generally divided into three periods: the Spanish or Mission Period (1769 to 1821), the Mexican or Rancho Period (1821 to 1848), and the American Period (1848 to present).

**Spanish Period.** The first European to pass through the vicinity is thought to be a Spaniard called Father Francisco Garces. Having become familiar with the area, Garces acted as a guide to Juan Bautista de Anza, who had been commissioned to lead a group across the desert from a Spanish outpost in Arizona to set up quarters at the Mission San Gabriel in 1771 near what today is Pasadena (Beck and Haase 1974). Garces was followed by Alta California Governor Pedro Fages, who briefly explored the region in 1772. Searching for San Diego Presidio deserters, Fages had traveled through Riverside to San Bernardino, crossed over the mountains into the Mojave Desert, and then journeyed westward to the San Joaquin Valley (Beck and Haase 1974).

**Mexican Period.** In 1821, Mexico overthrew Spanish rule and the missions began to decline. By 1833, the Mexican government passed the Secularization Act, and the missions, reorganized as parish churches, lost their vast land holdings, and released their neophytes (Beattie and Beattie 1974).

**American Period.** The American Period, 1848–Present, began with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. In 1850, California was accepted into the Union of the United States primarily due to the population increase created by the Gold Rush of 1849. The cattle industry reached its greatest prosperity during the first years of the American Period. Mexican Period land grants had created large pastoral estates in California, and demand for beef during the Gold Rush led to a cattle boom that lasted from 1849–1855. However, beginning about 1855, the demand for beef began to decline due to imports of sheep from New Mexico and cattle from the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys. When the beef market collapsed, many California ranchers lost their ranchos through foreclosure. A series of disastrous floods in 1861–1862, followed by a significant drought diminished the economic impact of local ranching. This decline combined with ubiquitous agricultural and real estate developments of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, set the stage for diversified economic pursuits that have continued to proliferate to this day (Beattie and Beattie 1974; Cleland 1941).

**PERSONNEL**

David Brunzell, M.A., RPA acted as the Project Manager and Principal Investigator for the current study. Mr. Brunzell also conducted the cultural resources records search and compiled the technical report. The field study was performed by Mr. Brunzell and BCR Consulting staff archaeologist, Jon Spenard, M.A.

**METHODS**

**Research**

Prior to fieldwork, a records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC), the local clearinghouse for cultural resource records. This archival research reviewed the status of all recorded historic and prehistoric cultural resources, and survey and excavation reports completed within one mile of the subject property site. Additional resources reviewed included the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, and documents and inventories published by the California Office of Historic Preservation. These include the lists of California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, Listing of National Register Properties, and the Inventory of Historic Structures.

**Field Survey**

An archaeological field survey of the subject property was conducted on November 6 and 15, 2012. The survey was conducted by walking parallel transects spaced approximately 15 meters apart across 100 percent of the subject property. Soil exposures were carefully inspected for evidence of cultural resources.

**RESULTS**

**Research**

Research completed through the EIC revealed that 68 cultural resource studies have taken place resulting in the recording of 18 cultural resources within one-mile of the subject property. None of the 68 previous studies has assessed the subject property. Of the 18 cultural resources in the study radius, 12 are prehistoric archaeological sites, one is a historic archaeological site, and five are historic-period buildings. No cultural resources have been previously recorded within the subject property. A summary of the records search is included below.

USGS 7.5 Minute Quadrangle	Cultural Resources Within 1 Mile of Subject Property	Reports Within 1 Mile of Subject Property
<i>Murrieta, California</i> (1979)	CA-RIV-3405, 7804, 7812, 8173, 8652, 8653, 8654, 8948, 8949, 10986, 11434, 11435, 11436, 15304, 15305, 16988, 17366, 20991	RI-701, 702, 703, 1327, 2020, 2114, 2121, 2215, 2219, 2221, 2235, 2382, 2508, 2510, 2610, 2684, 3127, 3340, 3341, 4065, 4070, 4297, 4350, 4390, 4470, 4510, 4885, 4877, 4937, 5009, 5150, 5181, 5216, 5366, 5369, 5415, 5536, 5611, 5920, 5921, 5970, 6030, 6033, 6035, 6036, 6442, 6457, 6556, 6827, 6880, 6905, 6909, 7044, 7228, 7408, 7525, 7593, 7597, 7598, 7600, 7677, 7680, 7797, 8056, 8172, 8726, 8770, 16286

## Field Survey

During the field survey, BCR Consulting archaeologists did not discover any cultural resources. The subject property exhibited approximately 90 percent surface visibility. Artificial disturbances consist of recent mechanical discing, trenches excavated for geotechnical studies, and some modern trash dumping. Some rilling and sheetwashing are evident along slopes. Native vegetation observed in the vicinity included buckwheat, cholla, and mature oaks, accompanied by non-native shrubs and seasonal grasses.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

BCR Consulting conducted a cultural resources assessment of the Clinton Keith Property (also known as the Grove Park Project) consisting of APN 380-250-003 located in Wildomar, Riverside County, California. This work has been completed in partial fulfillment of CEQA. During the field survey, BCR Consulting did not discover any cultural resources. However the 18 prehistoric and historic resources previously recorded in the immediate vicinity, indicates that the subject property is sensitive for buried cultural resources. Therefore, BCR Consulting recommends that an archaeological monitor be present during any earthmoving activities proposed within the subject property. The monitor shall work under the direct supervision of a cultural resources professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction work in the vicinity of any find until the project archaeologist can evaluate it. In the event of a new find, salvage excavation and reporting will be required. Additionally, although a Sacred Lands File search and list of tribes and individuals were requested from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), those entities have not been contacted regarding the subject property. BCR Consulting has learned that the subject property will be part of a project that proposes a General Plan amendment. Creation or amendments of General Plans or Specific Plans require that the lead agency complete Senate Bill 18 Native American Consultation. SB18 Consultation requires that the lead agency provide California Native American tribes an opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early planning stage for the purpose of protecting, or mitigating impacts to, cultural places. SB18 procedures are outlined at [www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09\\_14\\_05\\_Updated\\_Guidelines\\_922.pdf](http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf).

According to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G (Environmental Checklist Form) under the heading "Cultural Resources", projects subject to CEQA must determine whether the project would "directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource". The appended Paleontological Overview has recommended that:

any substantial excavations in the proposed project area may well encounter significant vertebrate fossils from the Pauba Formation deposits, and thus should be monitored closely to quickly and professionally recover any fossil remains while not impeding development. It should be noted, however, that in the Pauba Formation many of the vertebrate fossils are relatively small and would be missed during typical paleontological monitoring. Sediment samples from any excavations in the Pauba Formation should be collected and processed to assess their small vertebrate fossil potential. Any fossils recovered during mitigation should be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations (McLeod 2013, complete report in Appendix C).

If human remains are encountered during any proposed project activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC.

## REFERENCES

- Beattie, George W., and Helen P. Beattie  
1974 *Heritage of the Valley: San Bernardino's First Century*. Biobooks: Oakland.
- Bean, Lowell John, and Florence Shipek  
1978 *California*, edited by R.F. Heizer. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, W.C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Bean, Lowell John and Katherine Siva Saubel  
1972 *Temalpakh*. Malki Museum Press. Banning, California.
- Beck, Warren A., and Ynez D. Haase  
1974 *Historical Atlas of California*. Oklahoma City: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Bettinger, Robert L., and R.E. Taylor  
1974 Suggested Revisions in Archaeological Sequences of the Great Basin and Interior Southern California. *Nevada Archaeological Survey Research Papers* 3:1-26.
- Campbell, E., and W. Campbell  
1935 The Pinto Basin. *Southwest Museum Papers* 9:1-51.
- Cleland, Robert Glass  
1941 *The Cattle on a Thousand Hills—Southern California, 1850-80*. San Marino, California: Huntington Library.
- Flenniken, J.J.  
1985 Stone Tool Reduction Techniques as Cultural Markers. *Stone Tool Analysis: Essays in Honor of Don E. Crabtree*, edited by M.G. Plew, J.C. Woods, and M.G. Pavesic. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Flenniken, J.J. and A.W. Raymond  
1986 Morphological Projectile Point Typology: Replication, Experimentation, and Technological Analysis. *American Antiquity* 51:603-614.
- Flenniken, J.J. and Philip J. Wilke  
1989 Typology, Technology, and Chronology of Great Basin Dart Points. *American Anthropologist* 91:149-158.
- Hunt, Alice P.  
1960 *The Archaeology of the Death Valley Salt Pan, California*. University of Utah Anthropological Papers No. 47.
- Kenney, M.D.  
1999 *Introduction to the Natural History of Southern California*. California Natural History Guides: 13. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Kroeber, Alfred L.

- 1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution. Reprinted in 1976, New York: Dover Publications.

Lanning, Edward P.

- 1963 The Archaeology of the Rose Spring Site (Iny-372). *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 49(3):237-336.

Lightfoot, Kent G., Otis Parrish

- 2009 *California Indians and Their Environment, an Introduction*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Morton, D.M.

- 1972 *Geology of the Lakeview-Perris Quadrangle*, Riverside County, California, CDMG, Map Sheet 19, Scale 1:24,000.

- 1977 Surface Deformation in Part of the San Jacitno Valley, Southern California, in *Journal of Research, USGS*, Vol. 5, No. 1, Jan-Feb. 1977, pp. 117-124.

Oxendine, Joan

- 1983 *The Luiseño Village During the Late Prehistoric Era*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Riverside.

Reynolds, R.E.

- 1988 *Paleontologic Resource Overview and Management Plan for Edwards Air Force Base, California*. San Bernardino County Museum, Redlands, California.

Rogers, M.J.

- 1965 *Early Lithic Industries of the Lower Basin of the Colorado River and Adjacent Desert Areas*. San Diego Museum Papers No. 3.

Sparkman, Philip S.

- 1908 The Culture of the Luiseño Indians. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 8(4). University of California, Berkeley.

United States Geological Survey

- 1979 *Murrieta, California* 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map.

Wallace, William J.

- 1958 Archaeological Investigation in Death Valley National Monument. *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* 42:7-22.

- 1962 Prehistoric Cultural Development in the Southern California Deserts. *American Antiquity* 28(2):172-180.

- 1977 A Half Century of Death Valley Archaeology. *The Journal of California Anthropology* 4(2):249-258.

Wallace, William J., and Edith S. Taylor

1978 *Ancient Peoples and Cultures of Death Valley National Monument*. Acoma Books, Ramona, California.

Warren, Claude N., and R.H. Crabtree

1986 The Prehistory of the Southwestern Great Basin. In *Handbook of the North American Indians, Vol. 11, Great Basin*, edited by W.L. d'Azevedo, pp.183-193. W.C. Sturtevant, General Editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION SACRED LANDS FILE SEARCH**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Governor

**NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION**

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
 (916) 653-8251  
 Fax (916) 657-5380  
 Web Site [www.nahc.ca.gov](http://www.nahc.ca.gov)  
[ds\\_nahc@pacbell.net](mailto:ds_nahc@pacbell.net)



November 30, 2012 (Revised)

Mr. Joseph Brunzell, Staff Archaeologist

**BCR Consulting**

1420 Guadalajara Place  
 Claremont, CA 91711

Sent by FAX to: 909-621-7678

No. of Pages: 5

Re: Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Contacts list for the proposed Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Contacts list for the proposed "Clinton Keith/Priellpp Housing Development Project," located near the Community of Murrieta, Riverside County, California

Dear Mr. Brunzell:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conducted a search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) *Sacred Lands File* was completed for the area of potential project effect (APE) referenced above. Please note that the absence of specific site information in the *Sacred Lands File* does not indicate the absence of Native American traditional cultural places or cultural landscapes in any APE. While in this case, a search of the NAHC *Sacred Lands File* did indicate the presence of any sites within one-half mile of the APE you provided, but outside the HOUSING development Project Area.

Also, a Native American tribe or individual may be the only source for the presence of traditional cultural places. For that reason, enclosed is a list of Native American individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of traditional cultural places in your project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating any areas of potential adverse impact. Also, there are Native American Cultural resources in nearby USGS Sections to the APE.

California Public Resources Code §§5097.94 (a) and 5097.96 authorize the NAHC to establish a Sacred Land Inventory to record Native American sacred sites and burial sites. These records are exempt from the provisions of the California Public Records Act pursuant to California Government Code §6254 (r). The purpose of this code is to protect such sites from vandalism, theft and destruction.

In the 1985 Appellate Court decision (170 Cal App 3rd 604), the court held that the NAHC has jurisdiction and special expertise, as a state agency, over affected Native American resources, impacted by proposed projects including archaeological, places of religious significance to Native Americans and burial sites

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA - CA Public Resources Code §§ 21000-21177, amendments effective 3/18/2010) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes

archaeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as 'a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including ... objects of historic or aesthetic significance.' In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE), and if so, to mitigate that effect. CA Government Code §65040.12(e) defines "environmental justice" provisions and is applicable to the environmental review processes. The NAHC recommends *avoidance* as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15370(a) to pursuing a project that would damage or destroy Native American cultural resources and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 (Archaeological Resources) that requires documentation, data recovery of cultural resources, construction to avoid sites and the possible use of covenant easements to protect sites.

Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries once a project is underway. Local Native Americans may have knowledge of the religious and cultural significance of the historic properties of the proposed project for the area (e.g. APE). Consultation with Native American communities is also a matter of environmental justice as defined by California Government Code §65040.12(e). We urge consultation with those tribes and interested Native Americans on the list that the NAHC has provided in order to see if your proposed project might impact Native American cultural resources. Lead agencies should consider *avoidance* as defined in §15370 of the CEQA Guidelines when significant cultural resources as defined by the CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b)(c)(f) may be affected by a proposed project. If so, Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as "substantial," and Section 21083.2 which requires documentation, data recovery of cultural resources.

The NAHC makes no recommendation or preference of any single individual, or group over another. All of those on the list should be contacted, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe or group. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the NAHC requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

The 1992 *Secretary of the Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11593 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The aforementioned Secretary of the Interior's *Standards* include recommendations for all 'lead agencies' to consider the historic context of proposed projects and to "research" the cultural landscape that might include the 'area of potential effect.'

Partnering with local tribes and interested Native American consulting parties, on the NAHC list, should be conducted in compliance with the requirements of federal NEPA (42 U.S.C 4321-43351) and Section 106 4(f), Section 110 and (k) of the federal NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq*), Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (23 CFR 774); 36 CFR Part 800.3 (f) (2) & .5, the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ, 42 U.S.C 4371 *et seq.* and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013) as appropriate. The 1992 *Secretary of the Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* were revised so that they could be applied to

all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11593 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The NAHC remains concerned about the limitations and methods employed for NHPA Section 106 Consultation.

Also, California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, California Government Code §27491 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction and mandate the processes to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a project location other than a 'dedicated cemetery', another important reason to have Native American Monitors on board with the project.

To be effective, consultation on specific projects must be the result of an ongoing relationship between Native American tribes and lead agencies, project proponents and their contractors, in the opinion of the NAHC. An excellent way to reinforce the relationship between a project and local tribes is to employ Native American Monitors in all phases of proposed projects including the planning phases.

Confidentiality of "historic properties of religious and cultural significance" may also be protected under Section 304 of the NHPA or at the Secretary of the Interior discretion if not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary may also be advised by the federal Indian Religious Freedom Act (cf. 42 U.S.C., 1996) in issuing a decision on whether or not to disclose items of religious and/or cultural significance identified in or near the APE and possibility threatened by proposed project activity.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions about this response to your request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 653-6251.

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton

Attachment: Native American Contact List

**Native American Contacts  
Riverside County  
November 13, 2012**

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians  
Shane Chapparosa, Chairman  
P.O. Box 189                      Cahuilla  
Warner                      , CA 92086  
(760) 782-0711  
(760) 782-2701 - FAX

Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians  
Joseph Hamilton, Chairman  
P.O. Box 391670                      Cahuilla  
Anza                      , CA 92539  
admin@ramonatribe.com  
(951) 763-4105  
(951) 763-4325 Fax

Pala Band of Mission Indians  
Historic Preservation Office/Shasta Gaughen  
35008 Pala Temecula Road,                      Luiseno  
Pala                      , CA 92059                      Cupeno  
PMB 50  
(760) 891-3515  
sgaughen@palatribe.com  
(760) 742-3189 Fax

Rincon Band of Mission Indians  
Vincent Whipple, Tribal Historic Preationv. Officer  
P.O. Box 68                      Luiseno  
Valley Center, CA 92082  
twolfe@rincontribe.org  
(760) 297-2635  
(760) 297-2639 Fax

Pauma & Yuima Reservation  
Randall Majel, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 369                      Luiseno  
Pauma Valley CA 92061  
paumareservation@aol.com  
(760) 742-1289  
(760) 742-3422 Fax

Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians  
John Marcus, Chairman  
P.O. Box 391820                      Cahuilla  
Anza                      , CA 92539  
(951) 659-2700  
(951) 659-2228 Fax

Pechanga Band of Mission Indians  
Paul Macarro, Cultural Resources Manager  
P.O. Box 1477                      Luiseno  
Temecula                      , CA 92593  
(951) 770-8100  
pmacarro@pechanga-nsn.  
gov  
(951) 506-9491 Fax

Morongo Band of Mission Indians  
Michael Contreras, Cultural Heritage Prog.  
12700 Pumarra Road                      Cahuilla  
Banning                      , CA 92220                      Serrano  
(951) 201-1866 - cell  
mcontreras@morongo-nsn.  
gov  
(951) 922-0105 Fax

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

*Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.84 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.*

*This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Clinton Keith Piilapp Hovaling Development Project, located near the Community of Murrieta, Riverside County, California for which a Sacred Lands File search and Native American Contacts list were requested.*

**Native American Contacts  
Riverside County  
November 13, 2012**

Rincon Band of Mission Indians  
Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 68 Luiseno  
Valley Center, CA 92082  
bomazzetti@aol.com  
(760) 749-1051  
(760) 749-8901 Fax

Pechanga Cultural Resources Department  
Anna Hoover, Cultural Analyst  
P.O. Box 2183 Luiseno  
Temecula, CA 92593  
ahoover@pechanga-rsn.gov  
951-770-8104  
(951) 694-0446 - FAX

Pechanga Band of Mission Indians  
Mark Macarro, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 1477 Luiseno  
Temecula, CA 92593  
(951) 770-6100  
hlalbach@pechanga-rsn.gov  
(951) 695-1778 FAX

SOBOBA BAND OF LUISENO INDIANS  
Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department  
P.O. BOX 487 Luiseno  
San Jacinto, CA 92581  
jontiveros@soboba-rsn.gov  
(951) 663-5279  
(951) 654-5544, ext 4137

William J. Pink  
48310 Pechanga Road Luiseno  
Temecula, CA 92592  
wjpink@hotmail.com  
(909) 936-1216  
Prefers e-mail contact

Cahuilla Band of Indians  
Uther Salgado, Chairperson  
PO Box 391760 Cahuilla  
Anza, CA 92539  
tribalcouncil@cahuilla.net  
915-763-5549

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 6097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 6097.90 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed BC/Clinton Keith/Pielipp Housing Development Project, located near the Community of Murrieta, Riverside County, California for which a Sacred Lands File search and Native American Contacts list were requested.

**APPENDIX B**  
**PHOTOGRAPHS**



1. Subject Property Overview (S View)



2. Subject Property Overview (SW View)

---

**APPENDIX C**  
**PALEONTOLOGICAL OVERVIEW**

Natural History Museum  
of Los Angeles County  
900 Exposition Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

tel 213.763.DINO  
www.nhm.org



Vertebrate Paleontology Section  
Telephone: (213) 763-3325  
Fax: (213) 746-7431  
e-mail: [smcleod@nhm.org](mailto:smcleod@nhm.org)

3 January 2013

BCR Consulting  
1420 Guadalajara Place  
Claremont, CA 91711

Attn: David Brunzell, Principal Investigator / Archaeologist

re: Paleontological resources for the proposed Clinton Keith / Prielipp Property Project, in the City of Wildomar, Riverside County, project area

Dear David:

I have conducted a thorough check of our paleontology collection records for the locality and specimen data for the proposed Clinton Keith / Prielipp Property Project, in the City of Wildomar, Riverside County, project area as outlined on the portion of the Murrieta USGS topographic quadrangle map that you sent to me via e-mail on 20 December 2012. We do not have any vertebrate fossil localities that lie directly within the proposed project boundaries, but we do have localities nearby from the same deposits that occur in the proposed project area.

The entire proposed project area has exposures of the terrestrial Plio-Pleistocene Pauba Formation. Our closest fossil vertebrate localities to the proposed project area from the Pauba Formation are LACM 5447, 5891 and 5892. These localities are all southeast of the proposed project area east of the Temecula Valley Freeway (I-15) around Winchester Road (Route 79). Locality LACM 5447 is situated along Ynez Road north of Winchester Road and Santa Gertrudis Creek. LACM 5891 and 5892 are situated along Margarita Road south of Winchester Road and Santa Gertrudis Creek. All three localities produced specimens of fossil horses, Equidae.

Further southeast of the proposed project area but still in the Pauba Formation we have several vertebrate fossil localities. Southeast of the proposed project area in Temecula east of the Temecula Valley Freeway (I-15), west of Ynez Road, between Long Valley Road and Santiago

Road, locality LACM 5789 produced more specimens of fossil horse, *Equus*. Farther southeast south of Long Canyon, locality LACM 5904 produced specimens of fossil rabbit, Leporidae and fossil pocket gopher, *Thomomys*. More fossil horse, *Equus*, material was recovered from the Pauba Formation locality LACM 5893, in the hills between the confluence of the Temecula and Pauba Valleys east of the Temecula Valley Freeway (I-15).

Any substantial excavations in the proposed project area may well encounter significant vertebrate fossils from the Pauba Formation deposits, and thus should be monitored closely to quickly and professionally recover any fossil remains discovered while not impeding development. It should be noted, however, that in the Pauba Formation many of the vertebrate fossils are relatively small and would be missed during typical paleontological monitoring. Sediment samples from any excavations in the Pauba Formation should be collected and processed to assess their small vertebrate fossil potential. Any fossils recovered during mitigation should be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations.

This records search covers only the vertebrate paleontology records of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. It is not intended to be a thorough paleontological survey of the proposed project area covering other institutional records, a literature survey, or any potential on-site survey.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Samuel A. McLeod".

Samuel A. McLeod, Ph.D.  
Vertebrate Paleontology

enclosure: invoice