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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

In November and December 2013, Applied EarthWorks, Inc. (Æ) performed a cultural resources survey of a 989.4-acre (ac) area of private land constituting the original Phase 1 area of the proposed Tapestry Project (Project), a mixed-use community development located within the City of Hesperia in San Bernardino County, California. The survey was requested by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) on behalf of Hesperia Venture I. The proposed Project will require a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and as such, it is considered an undertaking per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.16 and is subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended). The proposed Project is also subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended.

The proposed Project is also subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended.

The survey of the original Phase 1 Area of Potential Effect (APE), which was defined as the entire 989.4-ac Phase 1 area, resulted in the identification and documentation of 95 cultural resources including 13 previously recorded archaeological resources (12 archaeological sites and 1 isolated artifact), 79 newly identified archaeological sites, and three newly identified localities of isolated artifacts (Clark and McDougall 2014). The majority of the identified archaeological sites consist of prehistoric archaeological resources (81), with a small number of historical (9) and multicomponent (1) resources also present. All of the isolated artifacts that were identified are prehistoric in age. No built-environment cultural resources (e.g., buildings or structures) were identified in the original Phase 1 APE.

Subsequent design modifications to the Project resulted in the expansion of the Phase 1 APE by a total of 152.5 ac in Sections 9, 10, 11, 15, and 16, Township 3 North, Range 4 West of the Silverwood Lake USGS 7.5' topographic quadrangle. These changes included a slight extension of the southern and western boundary of the Phase 1 area, along with the addition of two recycled water storage ponds, relocation of the water tank, and an associated access road. All of the additional land is privately owned and is located within the larger Project area. Given that the newly added portions of the Phase 1 area had not been inventoried during the initial cultural resources survey, HELIX requested that Æ complete a supplemental survey to identify and record cultural resources within the expanded portion of the APE. This report summarizes the methods and results of the supplemental cultural resources investigation of the additional acreage, which is now included as part of the Project’s revised Area of Potential Effects (APE), totaling 1,141.9 ac.

The intensive cultural resources pedestrian survey that comprises the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE was conducted by Æ between 15 and 18 April 2014. These studies resulted in the identification and documentation of six previously recorded archaeological sites and four newly recorded archaeological sites; seven previously recorded sites could not be re-identified during the current survey efforts. The 10 archaeological resources located within the expanded portion of the Phase 1 area include five prehistoric sites, four historical site, and one multicomponent site that contains both prehistoric and historical remains. Although a small portion of the expanded Phase 1 APE is located within the boundary of the proposed Guapiabit-Serrano Homeland Archaeological District, no cultural resources associated with the proposed district were identified during the supplemental survey. The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) eligibility of the 10 cultural resources
documented within the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE cannot be determined based on the data currently available.

The Project developer intends to redesign elements of the Project to avoid impacts to archaeological resources where possible. Where avoidance of potentially significant archaeological resources is not a feasible management option, a site evaluation (Phase II) program would be required to determine the significance of the resource, followed by mitigation to reduce the level of Project-related impacts to resolve adverse effects to historic properties under NHPA and historical resources under CEQA.

For a detailed Project background and description, details regarding the regulatory context pertaining to the Project, the environmental and cultural setting of the Project area, a review of previous studies conducted within the Project area, the results of the archaeological literature and records search conducted of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center (SBAIC), and the results of the Sacred Lands File search of the Project area from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento, California, the reader is referred to Clark and McDougall (2014). For the results of a predictive sensitivity model for archaeological resources within the expanded Phase 1 area, the reader is referred to Mirro (2014).

Field notes documenting the current investigation are on file at AE’s Hemet office. A copy of this report will be filed with the USACE Los Angeles District office and the SBAIC of the CHRIS at the San Bernardino County Museum (SBCM), Redlands.
This addendum to the cultural resources technical report was prepared to characterize the cultural resources that may be affected by design modifications to the Phase 1 portion of the proposed Tapestry Project (Project). Specifically, the addition of two recycled water storage ponds, relocation of a water tank, and an associated access road resulted in the addition of 152.5 acres (ac) to the Phase 1 Area of Potential Effect (APE). Given that the newly added portions of the Phase 1 APE were not inventoried during the initial cultural resources survey by Applied EarthWorks, Inc. (Æ), HELIX requested that a supplemental survey be completed to identify and record cultural resources within the 152.5 ac area. Results of the survey will provide the Project developer with baseline information on cultural resources that will enable more effective development and remediation planning through early consideration of cultural resources. Vanessa Mirro served as Principal Investigator for the cultural resources study with Tiffany Clark acting as Senior Project Archaeologist. Æ archaeologist Dennis McDougall served as field supervisor during the survey effort.

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

In November and December 2013, Æ performed a cultural resources survey of a 989.4-acre (ac) area of private land constituting the original Phase 1 area of the proposed Tapestry Project (Project), a mixed-use community development located within the City of Hesperia in San Bernardino County, California (Figure 1). The survey was requested by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) on behalf of Hesperia Venture I. The proposed Project will require a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and as such, it is considered an undertaking per 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.16[y] and is subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended). The proposed Project is also subject to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended.

The survey of the original APE, which was defined as the entire 989.4-ac Phase 1 area, was undertaken by Æ in November and December 2013 (Clark and McDougall 2014). This work resulted in the identification and documentation of 95 cultural resources including 13 previously recorded archaeological resources (12 archaeological sites and 1 isolated artifact), 79 newly identified archaeological sites, and three newly identified localities of isolated artifacts. The majority of the identified archaeological sites consist of prehistoric archaeological resources (81), with a small number of historical (9) and multicomponent (1) resources also present. All of the isolated artifacts that were identified are prehistoric in age. No built-environment cultural resources (e.g., buildings or structures) were identified in the original Phase 1 area.

Subsequent design modifications to the Phase 1 portion of the Project resulted in the expansion of the Phase 1 area by a total of 152.5 ac in Sections 9, 10, 11, 15, and 16, Township 3 North, Range 4 West of the Silverwood Lake USGS 7.5’ topographic quadrangle (Figure 2). These changes included a slight extension of the southern and western boundary of the Phase 1 area, along with the addition of two recycled water storage ponds, the relocation of a water tank, and an associated access road. All of the additional land is privately owned and is located within the larger Project area.
Figure 1  Project location map.
Figure 2  Map showing expanded Phase 1 survey area.
1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report documents the results of the supplemental cultural resource investigations of the additional 152.5 ac of land within the Project area that was not surveyed during the previous investigation conducted by AE. This additional acreage is now included as part of the revised Phase 1 APE, which totals 1,141.9 ac. Chapter 1 briefly introduced the supplemental investigations reported herein. The archaeological study methods employed during these investigations are outlined in Chapter 2; findings are discussed in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 provides a summary of the investigations conducted to date within the Phase 1 area and provides management recommendations for the cultural resources identified in the expanded Phase 1 APE. Bibliographic references are provided in Chapter 5. Appendix A contains copies of the site records for the cultural resources documented during the supplemental survey.

For a detailed Project background and description, details regarding the regulatory context pertaining to the Project, the environmental and cultural setting of the Project area, a review of previous studies conducted within the Project area, the results of the archaeological literature and records search conducted of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center (SBAIC), and the results of the Sacred Lands File search of the Project area from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento, California, the reader is referred to Clark and McDougall (2014). For the results of a predictive sensitivity model for archaeological resources within the expanded Phase 1 area, the reader is referred to Mirro (2014).
The intensive cultural resources pedestrian survey of the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE was conducted by Æ between 15 and 18 April 2014. Æ’s staff archaeologist Dennis McDougall served as Field Supervisor, accompanied by Field Technicians Chuck Bouscaren and Robert Lichtenstein. All fieldwork occurred under the direct supervision of Vanessa Mirro, Æ’s Principal Investigator for the Project, and Tiffany Clark, the Senior Project Archaeologist. All key Project personnel meet the Professional Qualifications Standards outlined in the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

During the supplemental survey, the crew walked parallel transects spaced at 10 to 15 m (33 to 50 ft) intervals. All areas likely to contain or exhibit archaeologically or historically sensitive cultural resources were inspected carefully to ensure that visible, potentially significant cultural resources were discovered and documented. Additionally, surveyors investigated any unusual landforms, contours, soil changes, features (e.g., road cuts, drainages), and other potential cultural site markers. A Daily Work Record was completed each day by the Field Supervisor that documented survey personnel, hours worked, weather, ground surface visibility, vegetation, soils, exposure/slope, topography, natural depositional environments, and identified cultural resources.

During the field inventory, systematic efforts were made to characterize and define the areal extent of each cultural resource. For purposes of this survey, one or more cultural features or three or more artifacts greater than 45 years of age within a 30 m (98 ft) radius was deemed to constitute a cultural resource (or site). Cultural features or clusters of artifacts more than 30 m away from the nearest known cultural resource were generally considered a separate site area. Less than three prehistoric or historical artifacts within a 30 m radius, but outside of a known site, were considered to be an isolated find, and were recorded appropriately as such.

When encountered, any newly identified cultural resources were recorded on State of California Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Records and Archaeological Site Forms (DPR 523 [1995]). Systematic efforts were made to characterize and define the boundaries of each archaeological site, as well as discrete activity loci and cultural features. Site locations were plotted on the appropriate 1:24,000 scale USGS 7.5' quadrangle using a Trimble GeoXH handheld global positioning system (GPS) unit using real-time satellite based augmentation system (SBAS) corrections achieving sub-meter accuracy. The GPS unit was also used to determine and document the precise locations and Universal Transfer Mercator (UTM) coordinates of all activity loci, cultural features, and temporally or functionally diagnostic artifacts identified within site areas. Site maps of each archaeological resource were drawn to scale, indicating the location of activity loci, features, and temporally or functionally diagnostic artifacts. Digital site overview photographs were also taken; in addition, digital overview photographs were taken of each activity locus, cultural feature, and temporally or functionally diagnostic artifacts. All cultural features were documented fully, inventoried, and mapped by UTM coordinates. No artifacts were collected during survey.

Æ personnel also attempted to re-identify the 13 cultural resources that had previously been recorded within the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE. If the current site record was deemed
inadequate or incorrect, the site record for these resources was updated appropriately using the methods described above.
3
FINDINGS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarizes the results of the intensive cultural resources survey conducted within the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE. Following the summary of these investigations, this chapter also provides individual descriptions of each previously and newly identified archaeological site identified within the APE. Site records for the cultural resources identified in the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE are included in Appendix A.

3.2 SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

The intensive pedestrian survey of the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE resulted in the identification and documentation of 10 cultural resources. These resources include six previously recorded archaeological sites and four newly identified archaeological sites. The newly identified sites have been designated with the permanent trinomial (primary) numbers of CA-SBR-17136 (P-36-027168) through CA-SBR-17139 (P-36-027171). Seven previously recorded sites could not be re-identified during the survey effort.

Five of the identified cultural resources within the newly added portion of the Phase 1 area are prehistoric sites, four are historical sites, and one is a multicomponent site that contains prehistoric and historical remains. No built-environment resources or isolated artifacts were recorded in the expanded portion of the APE. Maps showing the locations of these resources within the revised Phase 1 APE are provided in Figure 3.

Ground visibility was good to excellent throughout the supplemental survey area. Much of the survey area appears to have burned sometime in the last decade. As a result of these fires, large swaths of the survey area were denuded of vegetation. As shown in Figure 4, that area is characterized by scattered small juniper bushes with occasional yucca, grasses, and small scrubs.

The five prehistoric sites (CA-SBR-2397, CA-SBR-17080, CA-SBR-17136, CA-SBR-17137, and CA-SBR-17139), and the prehistoric remains at the multicomponent site (CA-SBR-17138/H) all consist of low-density lithic scatters. Ranging in size from 594 to 3,772 square meters (m²), these scatters contain small numbers of tested cobbles, cores, and lithic reduction debris. The artifacts that compose the lithic scatters are indicative of the testing or assaying of locally available cobbles for toolstone quality, as well as early-stage core reduction.

The historical archaeological sites (CA-SBR-5292H, CA-SBR-12649H, CA-SBR-12654H, and CA-SBR-12655H) and the historic component of CA-SBR-17138/H consist of small scatters of domestic refuse. Examination of the artifacts suggests that the refuse scatter remains date to the 1940s and 1950s. No other historical resources, including buildings or structures, were found in the vicinity of the refuse deposits. Given the proximity of these sites to roads, however, it is likely that these remains represent secondary dumping episodes (Guerrero and Bupp 1996).
3.3 PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

3.3.1 CA-SBR-2397/P-36-002397
CA-SBR-2397 was originally identified in 1987 during the URS survey of the Rancho Las Flores Planned Unit Development (Peter et al. 1989). The site is located on a south and southeast-facing slope just below the crest of a broad, southwest to northeast trending ridgeline. The site was originally recorded as a lithic scatter measuring 125 x 100 meters (m) with two flaked stone reduction loci (Loci A and B). Locus A was described as a sparse quarry along the southern edge of the ridgetop with Locus B containing a dense flake scatter.

During the survey of the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE, CA-SBR-2397 was re-identified and found to be slightly smaller in size than originally recorded (82 x 46 m) with no discernible concentrations (or loci) of artifacts. The site appears to represent the remains of a lithic quarry/assay/reduction locale and consists of two cores, 14 tested/assayed quartzite cobbles, and 11 pieces of lithicdebitage. All artifacts are derived from lithic materials readily available on site within dense, alluvial gravel lag deposits exposed by erosion. There appears to be no potential for subsurface cultural deposits.

3.3.2 CA-SBR-17080/P-36-027065
CA-SBR-17136 was initially recorded in December 2013 by ∈ during the survey of original Phase 1 area of the Tapestry Project (Clark and McDougall 2014). The site measured 36 x 32 m in area and consisted of a sparse lithic quarry/assay/reduction location situated along the slope of a finger ridge that extends to the northwest from a large alluvial ridge. CA-SBR-17080 contained three quartzite unidirectional cores, five tested/assayed quartzite cobbles, and 13 quartzite flakes.
(3 cortical and 10 interior). These lithic materials are readily available on site within alluvial gravel lag deposits exposed by erosion. There appeared to be little potential for subsurface cultural deposits exceeding 5 cm in depth.

During the supplemental survey, the southern portion of CA-SBR-17080 was found to extend into the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE. Resurvey of the area found that the site description and boundary recorded during the original survey was accurate and that no update was needed.

3.3.3 CA-SBR-17136/P-36-027168
CA-SBR-17136 is located on the southeast-facing slope, just below the crest of a relatively broad, southwest to northeast trending ridgeline. Measuring 27 x 22 m, the site consists of a sparse lithic quarry/assay/reduction station containing two unidirectional cores (one quartzite and one metavolcanic material), two tested quartzite cobbles, and four cortical quartzite flakes. These artifacts are derived from fairly dense alluvial gravel lag deposits exposed within the site area by erosion. The site appears to represent the opportunistic procurement, testing, and reduction of lithic materials readily available on site within dense alluvial gravel lag deposits exposed by erosion. There appears to be no potential for subsurface cultural deposits.

3.3.4 CA-SBR-17137/P-36-027169
Measuring 35 x 17 m, CA-SBR-17137 is located on the southeast-facing slope immediately below the crest of a relatively broad, southwest to northeast trending ridgeline. The site is a small sparse lithic quarry and assay station that contains seven tested/assayed quartzite cobbles and two cortical quartzite flakes. The artifacts are derived from cobbles readily available on site within alluvial gravel lag deposits exposed by erosion. The site appears to represent the opportunistic procurement and testing of lithic materials. There is little to no potential for subsurface cultural deposits.

3.3.5 CA-SBR-17139/P-36-027171
CA-SBR-17139 is situated on the upper southeast-facing slopes just below the crest of a prominent ridgeline that trends from southwest to northeast. Measuring 54 x 19 m, CA-SBR-17139 is a sparse lithic quarry/assay/reduction location containing at least one unidirectional core, four tested/assayed cobbles, and 20 debitage items. Most artifacts are derived from quartzite with a few flakes made from metavolcanic material. These lithic materials are readily available on site within dense alluvial gravel lag deposits exposed by erosion. The site appears to represent the opportunistic procurement, testing, and initial core reduction of lithic materials. There is little to no potential for subsurface cultural deposits.

3.4 HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

3.4.1 CA-SBR-5292H/P-36-005292
CA-SBR-5292H was originally recorded in 1987 during the URS survey of the Rancho Las Flores Planned Unit Development (Peter et al. 1989). URS described the site as a possible historical line camp measuring 84 x 65 m that contained a rock alignment, which may represent a house foundation or possible tent supports (Feature 1), a second “unknown” rock alignment associated with a depression (Feature 2), and large quantities of historical debris.

During the survey of the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE, Æ re-identified CA-SBR-5292H and concluded that Features 1 and 2 are not historical cultural features but rather, result from
modern off-road vehicle disturbances and natural brush fires. Specifically, the two “rock alignments” noted on the original record were determined to be old off-road vehicle tire tracks digging into shallow alluvial gravel lag deposits. In addition, the “depression” associated with Feature 2 appears to be the result of the subsidence of soils resulting from burrowing animals around a burned-out juniper stump. Other modern disturbances found in the vicinity of the site included several rock piles from recent camping activity.

Although Features 1 and 2 at CA-SBR-5292H are not historical in origin, a scatter of artifacts dating to the 1940s and 1950s was found at the site. The scatter of historical debris measured approximately 92 x 42 m in size and contained two discrete concentrations of historical debris (Loci A and B). Most of the artifacts consist of sanitary cans with smaller quantities of porcelaneous stoneware plates, bottle glass (clear, cobalt, straw, and milk), carbon battery cores, and fragments of milled lumber. The remains likely represent a single or small number of secondary dumping episodes of domestic refuse disposal. There appears to be little potential for subsurface cultural deposits. An examination of a historic map of Hesperia (USGS 1942) found no evidence of buildings or structures in the area of CA-SBR-5292H, although the site is located adjacent to a two-track dirt road.

3.4.2 CA-SBR-12649H/P-36-013756
This site was first recorded in 2007 during the reconnaissance survey of the Villages 6 and 7 areas of the Rancho Las Flores Project (de Barros 2007a). CA-SBR-12649H was originally described as a historical trash scatter that measured 82 m x 33 m in size and contained two artifact concentrations (Loci A and B). Locus A measured 16 m in diameter and was composed of 12 vent hole cans; Locus B measured 13 m in diameter and contained 10 metal cans. Some clear and milk glass fragments were also noted on the surface of the site. Disturbances to CA-SBR-12649H included a dirt road that bisected the site between the two artifact concentrations.

A revisit to CA-SBR-12649H during the survey of the expanded Phase 1 area found that the description and mapped boundary of the site provided in the original DPR form is fairly accurate. In addition, the general condition of the area does not appear to have changed significantly since it was originally documented. As such, AE determined that a site update is not required for CA-SBR-12649H.

3.4.3 CA-SBR-12654H/P-36-013765
CA-SBR-12654 was first recorded in 2007 during the reconnaissance survey of the Villages 6 and 7 areas of the Rancho Las Flores Project (de Barros 2007b). CA-SBR-12654H was originally identified as a historical trash scatter located on a gentle to moderate slope. The scatter measured 42 x 37 m in size and contained two artifact concentrations (Features 1 and 2). Feature 1 included 12 food and beverage cans, a coffee can, a “Brasso”-like can, and two clear bottle fragments. Feature 2 consisted of 16 food and beverage cans and a “Brasso-like can. At least ten metal cans were located outside the two artifact concentrations, most of which were food and beverage containers. No disturbance was noted at the site in 2007.

A revisit to CA-SBR-12654H during the survey of the expanded Phase 1 area found that the description and mapped boundary of the site provided in the original DPR form is fairly accurate. In addition, the general condition of the area does not appear to have changed significantly since it was originally documented. As such, AE determined that a site update is not required for CA-SBR-12654H.
3.4.4 CA-SBR-12655H/P-36-013766
This site was first recorded in 2007 during the reconnaissance survey of the Villages 6 and 7 areas of the Rancho Las Flores Project (de Barros 2007c). CA-SBR-12655H was originally described as a historical trash scatter containing approximately 25 metal cans located within a small drainage. The site measured 59 x 20 m in size. No disturbance was noted at the site.

A revisit to CA-SBR-12655H during the survey of the expanded Phase 1 area found that the description and mapped boundary of the site provided in the original DPR form is fairly accurate. In addition, the general condition of the area does not appear to have changed significantly since it was originally documented. As such, Ae determined that a site update is not required for CA-SBR-12655H.

3.5 MULTICOMPONENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

3.5.1 CA-SBR-17138/H/P-36-027170
Measuring 44 x 39 m, CA-SBR-17138/H is a multicomponent site situated on the relatively steep, incised southeast-facing slope of a ridgeline overlooking a major drainage. The prehistoric component of the site is represented by a discrete lithic reduction station (Locus A) located along the southeastern site boundary. The feature measures approximately 3 x 15 m and contains one multidirectional quartzite core and eight pieces ofdebitage (2 cortical flakes, 6 interior flakes), all of which derive from the core. The prehistoric component of CA-SBR-17138/H represents a single, opportunistic episode of core reduction that utilized readily available materials eroding out of the nearby alluvial gravel lag deposits. There appears to be no potential for subsurface prehistoric deposits within the site area.

The historical component is represented by a concentration of various types of metal cans, glass, and ceramic fragments (Locus B), which are scattered over an approximately 12 x 4.5 m area within the west-central portion of the site. Additionally, a more diffuse scatter of historical refuse is found throughout the general site area. The historical refuse appears to date to the 1940s and 1950s, and likely represents a single, opportunistic episode of secondary refuse disposal. An examination of a historic map of Hesperia (USGS 1942) found no evidence of buildings or structures in the area of CA-SBR-5292H, although the site is located adjacent to a two-track dirt road. No evidence was found to suggest the potential for subsurface historical deposits within the site area.

Although CA-SBR-17138/H falls within the boundary of the previously recorded site of CA-SBR-2398 (see below), several notable discrepancies are found in comparing the site record for CA-SBR-2398 with the remains identified at CA-SBR-17138/H. Specifically, CA-SBR-2398 was recorded as a sparse scatter of quartzite flakes (no cores or tested cobbles observed) that measured only 5 x 5 m in size. In addition, the site record for CA-SBR-2398 provides no mention of historical refuse within the site boundary. Given these discrepancies, it was concluded that CA-SBR-17138/H is likely a different resource than CA-SBR-2398. As such, it was recorded as a newly identified archaeological site and assigned a temporary number.

3.6 PREVIOUSLY RECORDED RESOURCES NOT FOUND

3.6.1 CA-SBR-2398/P-36-002398
CA-SBR-2398 was initially recorded in 1987 by Peter and others (1989) as a small (5 x 5 m), low-density chipping station. Revisit to the area by Ae in April 2014 failed to re-identify the site.
at the UTM coordinates provided in the site record. However, a multicomponent archaeological site (CA-SBR-17138/H), which consists of a prehistoric lithic reduction locus and historical debris scatter, was found within the vicinity of the previously recorded location of CA-SBR-2398. Because the original site record for CA-SBR-2398 made no mention of the presence of historical refuse within the area, the multicomponent site was recorded as a new resource.

3.6.2 CA-SBR-2404/P-36-002404
CA-SBR-2404 was initially recorded in 1987 by URS (Peter et al. 1989) as a small, low-density chipping station consisting of less than 25 quartzite flakes and cores within an area measuring 3 x 3 m. Intensive cultural resources surveys conducted throughout this area by AE in April 2014 failed to identify the site at the location provided in the original site record. It is possible that CA-SBR-2404 has been incorrectly mapped on the original DPR forms. However, given the abundance of naturally spalled quartzite cobbles on the ground surface within the general area, it is more likely that these naturally spalled materials were mistakenly identified by URS as culturally derived flaked stone artifacts.

3.6.3 CA-SBR-2527/P-36-002527
CA-SBR-2527 was initially recorded in 1987 by URS (Peter et al. 1989) as a small, low-density chipping station consisting of quartzite flakes and cores within an area measuring one square meter; one flake was also recorded approximately 4 m south of the main concentration. Intensive cultural resources surveys conducted throughout this area by AE in April 2014 failed to identify this site at the location provided in original site record. It is possible that CA-SBR-2527 has been incorrectly mapped on the original DPR forms. However, given the abundance of naturally spalled quartzite cobbles on the ground surface within the general area, it is more likely that these naturally spalled materials were mistakenly identified by URS as culturally derived flaked stone artifacts.

3.6.4 CA-SBR-4533/P-36-004533
CA-SBR-4533 was recorded in 1987 by URS (Peter et al. 1989) as a small, low-density lithic scatter measuring 25 x 10 m that consisted of a discrete chipping station composed of five quartzite flakes that was surrounded by a sparse scatter of quartzite flakes and cores. Intensive cultural resources surveys conducted throughout this area by AE in April 2014 failed to identify this site at the location provided in the original site record. It is possible that CA-SBR-4533 has been incorrectly mapped on the original DPR forms. However, given the abundance of naturally spalled quartzite cobbles on the ground surface within the general area, it is more likely that these naturally spalled materials were mistakenly identified by URS as culturally derived flaked stone artifacts.

3.6.5 CA-SBR-4704/P-36-004704
CA-SBR-4704 was recorded in 1987 by URS (Peter et al. 1989) as a small, low-density lithic scatter measuring 25 x 40 m with a discrete chipping station on its western edge. Artifacts described include gray quartzite tertiary flakes and one exhausted core within the chipping station, and a variety of lithic debitage composed of quartzite within the general site area. Intensive cultural resources surveys conducted throughout this area by AE in April 2014 failed to identify this site at the location provided in the original site record. It is possible that CA-SBR-4533 has been incorrectly mapped on the original DPR forms. However, given the abundance of naturally spalled quartzite cobbles on the ground surface within the general area, it is more likely that these naturally spalled materials were mistakenly identified by URS as culturally derived flaked stone artifacts.
3.6.6 CA-SBR-5356H/P-36-005356
CA-SBR-5356H was recorded in 1987 by URS (Peter et al. 1989) as a historic refuse scatter measuring 2 x 3 m and consisting of 25 solder-dot tin cans and unidentifiable metal fragments dating from about 1900–1920. In addition, a floor board and chassis from an old Model T was observed 75 m north of the can scatter. Intensive cultural resources surveys conducted throughout this area by Æ in April 2014 failed to identify this site at the location provided in the original site record or within the general vicinity. The remnants of the Model T also could not be re-identified during the survey. It is assumed that CA-SBR-5356H was originally mapped and plotted incorrectly.

3.6.7 CA-SBR-6190/P-36-006190
CA-SBR-6190 was recorded in 1987 by URS (Peter et al. 1989) as a prehistoric temporary camp that measures 105 x 55 m. The original site form describes the site as a low- to medium-density lithic scatter with some ground stone artifacts and several possible hearth areas; recorded artifacts include more than 100 debitage items (primarily quartzite), 20 tested quartzite cobbles and cores, two mano fragments, one unidentifiable ground stone fragment, one possibly modified piece of quartzite, and fire-altered rock associated with several areas of darkened soil “that may represent deflated hearths.” The 1987 site record adds that the site had a high potential for yielding subsurface deposits.

In 1988, CA-SBR-6190 was reexamined by the Archaeological Research Unit (ARU) from UC Riverside in order to make a National Register eligibility determination. This work involved a more intensive study of the surface artifacts and features at the site, along with limited subsurface testing. In a supplemental site record for CA-SBR-6190 dated August 15, 1988, ARU concluded that the fire-altered rock and possible hearth areas were the result of natural brush fires, the majority of cores and debitage were naturally spalled materials, and the reported ground stone proved to be naturally water-rounded cobbles. Further, no subsurface deposits were identified during testing (Schneider and Parr 1988).

According to the original site location map, the northern portion of CA-SBR-6190 extended into the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE. Water-rounded cobbles and naturally spalled quartzite cobbles were common on the ground surface within the area. However, no cultural deposits were identified at the recorded location of CA-SBR-6190 during the intensive cultural resources surveys conducted throughout this area by Æ in April 2014.

3.7 PROPOSED GUAPIABIT-SERRANO HOMELAND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISTRICT

The small portion of the expanded Phase 1 APE lies within the proposed Guapiabit-Serrano Homeland Archaeological District (see Figure 3). The proposed district consists of a complex of 47 archaeological and/or ethnohistorical sites that the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (San Manual Band) considers to be ancestral to the Serrano people. These sites include several residential areas, at least one ceremonial structure, earthen pit ovens, an unknown number of burial and cremation features, quarry locations, food-resource gathering and processing locations, and a section of the Mojave Trail (Schneider 2010:7). Two historic-period structures associated with the Las Flores Ranch are also considered to be contributing resources to the proposed district. An NRHP-nomination form for the proposed district is currently being revised for submittal to the SHPO by the San Manuel Band (Schneider, personal communication, 2014).
The supplemental survey of the Phase 1 area identified no prehistoric cultural resources within the boundary of proposed archaeological district. As shown in Figure 3, a small historical refuse scatter (CA-SBR-5292H) was located within the proposed district. However, Schnieder (2010) did not consider this cultural resource to be a contributing element to the district.
SUMMARY AND MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The intensive pedestrian survey of the expanded Phase 1 APE of the Project area resulted in the identification and documentation of 10 cultural resources. These resources comprise four newly identified archaeological sites and six archaeological sites that had been previously recorded. In addition, seven sites that were previously recorded in the expanded Phase 1 APE could not be re-identified during the current survey effort. At least a portion of these “sites” appear to consist of naturally spalled cobbles that were mistakenly identified by the original recorders as culturally derived lithic artifacts. It is also possible that some of the cultural resources that have been mapped within the expanded Phase 1 APE were misplotted by previous recorders.

Of the 10 cultural resources identified in the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE, five are prehistoric archaeological sites, four is a historical archaeological site, and one is a multicomponent site containing both prehistoric and historic-period remains. No isolated artifacts or built-environment cultural resources were located during the supplemental survey.

Because the proposed Project will require a federal permit, it is considered an “undertaking” per 36 CFR § 800.2(o) and is subject to compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966 as amended. Under these guidelines, federal agencies are required to identify cultural resources that may be affected by project actions, assess the significance of these resources and their eligibility for inclusion on the NRHP as per 16 USC 470w (5), and consult with the SHPO regarding project effects on significant resources. Eligibility for NRHP inclusion is based on criteria (36 CFR 60.4 [a–d]) defined by the Department of the Interior.

The proposed Project is also subject to compliance with the CEQA as amended. Therefore, cultural resources management work conducted as part of the proposed Project shall comply with the CEQA Statutes and Guidelines (Title 14 CCR, § 15064.5), which directs lead agencies to first determine whether cultural resources are historically significant resources. Generally, a cultural resource shall be considered historically significant if the resource is 45 years old or older, possesses integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and meets the requirements for listing on the CRHR under any one of the criteria defined in Title 14 CCR § 15064.5 (see Clark and McDougall 2014: Section 1.4.2). An archaeological resource eligible for NRHP inclusion often will also be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR.

In the following sections, significance evaluations (per 36 CFR 60.4 [a–d]) are discussed for the cultural resources documented within the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE. Management recommendations are then provided that could potentially reduce the level of impacts associated with the Project to a less than significant level.

4.2 CULTURAL RESOURCES SIGNIFICANCE EVALUATION

As previously discussed, in order for a property to be listed in the NRHP or CRHR, it must meet eligibility requirements for at least one of four significance criteria. It is unlikely that any of the five prehistoric archaeological sites or the prehistoric component of the multicomponent site...
identified within the expanded Phase 1 APE would qualify as a significant resource eligible for NRHP inclusion under Criteria A–C of 36 CFR 60.4 or CRHR inclusion under Criteria 1–3 (see discussion below). Thus, the potential significance and eligibility of these resources for CRHR and/or NRHP inclusion hinges primarily on the applicability of Criterion D or Criterion 4, respectively—the ability of a property to yield information important in prehistory or history.

One of the most critical determinants as to whether a prehistoric archaeological site will be considered a historic property under Criterion D or a historical resource under Criterion 4 is the presence of data that allows assemblages and components to be placed in chronological sequence. Chronological data are essential for reconstructing local and regional prehistoric chronologies, and lacking these data, most realms of research pertaining to technology, subsistence, land-use and settlement patterning, and exchange and external relations, and how these technologies and strategies changed through time as humans adapted to changing environmental, economic, and social conditions become moot.

No temporally diagnostic artifacts or other chronological indicators were identified in association with the prehistoric remains recorded in the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE. Moreover, it appears that these resources have little potential to contain intact cultural deposits in subsurface contexts that could provide data addressable to chronological issues or other research domains. Although these preliminary data indicate that the five prehistoric sites and the prehistoric component of CA-SBR-17138/H likely do not meet the criteria for listing on the NRHP or CRHR, a formal Phase II evaluation program is needed to more thoroughly assess the eligibility of these sites as historic properties/historical resources.

The potential significance and eligibility for NRHP or CRHR inclusion of four historical archaeological sites and the historical component of CA-SBR-17138/H identified within the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE also cannot be determined with the data currently available. It is unlikely that that any of these resources embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction and therefore, these historical archaeological resources are not eligible for NRHP or CRHR inclusion under Criterion C of 36 CFR 60.4 or Criterion 3. Without further historical and archival research, however, it is not possible to determine whether these historical archaeological sites would be eligible for NRHP inclusion under Criterion A (that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history), Criterion B (that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past), and/or Criterion D (that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history) of 36 CFR 60.4.

4.3 MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

In this final section, AE recommends several measures that could potentially reduce the level of Project–related impacts to historic properties/historical resources to a less than significant level. These measures include avoidance, Phase II site evaluations, assessment of effects, and data recovery investigations, and archaeological monitoring. Table 1 summarizes the management recommendations for each of the previously and newly identified cultural resources within the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE.
Table 1
Summary of Cultural Resources Recorded in the Supplemental Survey APE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Management Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-2397</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic quarry/assay/reduction loci</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-2398</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic quarry/assay/reduction loci</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-2404</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric low-density lithic scatter</td>
<td>Site could not be re-identified during survey; no further management is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-2527</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric low-density chipping station</td>
<td>Site is composed of naturally spalled cobbles; no further management is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-4533</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric low-density lithic scatter</td>
<td>Site is composed of naturally spalled cobbles; no further management is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-4707</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric low-density lithic scatter</td>
<td>Site is composed of naturally spalled cobbles; no further management is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-5292H</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Historical refuse deposit</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-5356H</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Historical refuse deposit</td>
<td>Site could not be re-identified during survey; no further management is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-6190</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric temporary camp</td>
<td>Portion of site within APE is composed of naturally spalled cobbles; no further management is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-12649H</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Historical refuse deposit</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-12654H</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Historical refuse deposit</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-12655H</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Historical refuse deposit</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-17080</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric low-density lithic scatter</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-17136</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic quarry/assay/reduction loci</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-17137</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic quarry/assay/reduction loci</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-17138/H</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic reduction station and historical refuse scatter</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SBR-17139</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric lithic quarry/assay/reduction loci</td>
<td>Site requires evaluation against NRHP and CRHR criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guapiabit-Serrano Homeland Archaeological District</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Complex of 47 archaeological and/or ethnohistorical sites and 2 historic-period structures.</td>
<td>No cultural resources associated with the district are located within the supplemental survey APE; no further management is required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1 Avoidance
The Project developer intends to avoid impacts to cultural resources to the extent feasible. Several measures could be employed to avoid adverse effects and impacts to unevaluated cultural resources and preserve these resources in place. These measures include: adjusting the
Phase 1 footprint during design to avoid cultural resources; incorporating the cultural resources into a greenspace or other open space; deeding cultural resources into permanent conservation easements; or possibly covering archaeological sites with a layer of protective sediment ("capping").

If cultural resources avoidance is feasible, no further management of these archaeological resources would be required as they would fall outside of the Project APE. Where avoidance of unevaluated cultural resources is not a feasible management option, Phase II site evaluations would be required to determine the significance of the resource, followed by treatment to resolve (or mitigate) adverse effects to those resources that are determined to be historic properties under NHPA and historical resources under CEQA.

4.3.2 Phase II Site Evaluations

If avoidance of archaeological sites is not feasible, a Phase II site evaluation program is recommended for all cultural resources that have the potential to be impacted by ground-disturbing activities associated with the expanded area of the Phase 1 portion of the Project. The Phase II Testing and Evaluation Program for prehistoric sites should be designed to further define site boundaries and assess the structure, content, nature, and depth of subsurface cultural deposits and features. Emphasis should also be placed on assessing site integrity and the site’s potential to address regional archaeological research questions. Given the relatively high level of similarity that is seen among the prehistoric remains in the Phase 1 area, a sampling strategy may be employed to determine the potential for lithic quarry/assay/reduction station sites to address certain research questions. This may be accomplished by excavation of a certain number or percentage of the sites and focusing on the more substantial sites with the highest potential to contain buried deposits or temporally diagnostic artifacts that could address function and age. The data collected from the site(s) should then be used to address the NRHP/CRHR eligibility requirements for similar archaeological resources and make recommendations as to the suitability of the resource for inclusion on either the NRHP or CRHR.

For the historical archaeological site and the historical component of the multicomponent site, Phase II evaluations would likely include historical and archival research to determine the origin, association, and data potential of the deposits.

The results of this Phase II Testing Program should be presented in a technical report that follows the State of California Office of Historic Preservation Archaeological Resource Management Report Recommended Contents and Format Guidelines (California Office of Historic Preservation [OHP] 1990). The Phase II Report would be submitted to the USACE, the City, and SHPO for review and comment. If resources are determined to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP and/or CRHR upon completion of the Phase II Testing Program, no further cultural resources management of these resources would be required.

4.3.3 Assessment of Effects

Sites that are eligible for the NRHP are considered historic properties, or historical resources if eligible for the CRHR. If historic properties are identified within the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE, potential adverse effects resulting from the undertaking must be addressed by applying the criteria set forth in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1). This regulation states that an undertaking has an adverse effect when it alters the characteristics of the property that make it significant. Likewise, if historical resources are identified within the expanded portion of the Phase 1 APE, potential substantial adverse changes resulting from the Project must also be addressed by
applying the criteria set forth in CCR, § 15064.5(b)(1-5).

4.3.4 Data Recovery Investigations
Phase III Data Recovery excavations are typically employed to mitigate adverse effects to archaeological historic properties/historical resources that cannot be protected in place. If avoidance and/or preservation in place of known prehistoric archaeological resources is not a feasible management option, the USACE would ensure that significant archaeological resource(s) and site(s) are investigated pursuant to the standards, guidelines, and principals of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s Treatment of Archaeological Properties: A Handbook (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 1980).

A Data Recovery Treatment Plan detailing the objectives of the Phase III Program would be developed and contain specific testable hypotheses pertinent to a Data Recovery Research Design and relevant to the site(s) under study. The Phase III Data Recovery Treatment Plan would be submitted to the USACE and SHPO for review and comment prior to implementation of the Data Recovery Program.

After approval of the Treatment Plan and negotiation of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) among the USACE, interested Native American groups, and the SHPO, the Phase III Data Recovery Program for affected, eligible site(s) would be completed. Typically, a Phase III Data Recovery Program involves detailed research, ethnographic research, and the excavation of a statistically representative sample of the site(s) to preserve those resource values that qualify the site(s) as being eligible for listing on the NRHP. Again, participant-observer(s) from interested Native American groups should be present during archaeological data-recovery excavations involving sites of Native American concern. At the conclusion of the Phase III Program, a Phase III Data Recovery Report would be prepared, following the State of California Office of Historic Preservation Archaeological Resource Management Report Recommended Contents and Format Guidelines (California OHP 1990). The Phase III Data Recovery Report would be submitted to the USACE and the SHPO for review and comment.

All archaeological materials recovered during implementation of the Project’s Phase III Data Recovery program should be processed, including cleaning and cataloging, detailed description, and analysis, as appropriate. Following completion of laboratory and analytical procedures, all Project-related collections should be suitably packaged and transferred to a curation facility that meets the standards of 36 CFR 79 for long-term storage and preservation. Materials to be curated include archaeological specimens and samples, field notes, feature and burial records, maps, plans, profile drawings, photo logs, photographic negatives, consultants’ reports of special studies, and copies of the final technical reports.

4.3.5 Archaeological Monitoring and Potential for Buried Archaeological Deposits
Previous archaeological work in the Project area indicates that there is the potential for encountering buried archaeological contexts (Sutton and Schneider 1989; Sutton et al. 1993). A sensitivity model for buried resources should therefore be prepared to identify areas of the Phase I expanded APE, prior to development, that are likely to contain buried deposits. Based on the model, a monitoring program should be developed for areas that are classified as highly sensitive for buried resources. To ensure proper identification and treatment of cultural resources discovered during the development and construction of the Project, qualified archaeologists and culturally affiliated Native American groups should monitor all ground-disturbing activities in
the Phase 1 and water tank/access road APE that extend into natural sediments in areas determined to have high archaeological sensitivity for prehistoric resources.

The CRMP and MOA shall include provisions for the identification and evaluation of archaeological resources inadvertently discovered during construction. If buried archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work should be halted in the vicinity of the archaeological discovery until a qualified archaeologist can visit the site of discovery and evaluate the significance of the archaeological resource. If the archaeological resource is determined to be a potentially significant cultural resource, the CRMP and MOA shall include provisions for the preparation and implementation of a Phase III Data Recovery Program, as well as disposition of recovered artifacts.

In the event of an inadvertent discovery of human remains within the expanded Phase 1 APE, the steps and procedures specified in Health and Safety Code §7050.5, State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(d), and Public Resources Code (PRC) §5097.98 must be implemented. In accordance with PRC §5097.98, the San Bernardino County Coroner must be notified within 24 hours of the discovery of potentially human remains. The Coroner must then determine within two working days of being notified if the remains are subject to his or her authority. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she must contact the NAHC by phone within 24 hours, in accordance with PRC §5097.98. The NAHC then designates a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) with respect to the human remains within 48 hours of notification. The MLD will then have the opportunity to recommend to the Project proponent means for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated grave goods within 24 hours of notification.

On behalf of the USACE and the Project developer, the final technical reports detailing the results of all field investigations should be submitted to the SBAIC of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). In addition, we recommend that finalized versions of the technical reports be widely distributed to relevant Cultural Resources Management professionals and members of academia. Finally, materials based on the data recovery studies should be produced that are appropriate for public distribution; these materials should be made available at local libraries or other appropriate facilities to enhance public appreciation and awareness of the cultural resources.
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APPENDIX A

CONFIDENTIAL SITE RECORDS

(REMOVED)