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I. INTRODUCTION

In response to a requirement by the City of Fontana for the environmental assessment of a proposed industrial development, Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. conducted an archaeological survey of the 8.9-acre Cherry Distribution Facility Project. The property, which includes Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) 236-122-11 and -12, is located northeast of the intersection of Cherry Avenue and Santa Ana Avenue in the city of Fontana, San Bernardino County, California (Figure 1, Attachment B). The project is located in Section 26, Township 1 South, Range 6 West of the 7.5-minute USGS Fontana, California topographic quadrangle map (Figure 2, Attachment B). The project proposes the development of a 183,433-square-foot warehouse, a 10,000-square-foot office, a parking lot with 64 automobile parking spots and 46 trailer parking spots, and associated landscaping (Figure 3, Attachment B). The archaeological survey, which was conducted on October 4, 2019, was completed in order to determine if cultural resources exist within the property. The survey did not identify any cultural resources within the project.

As part of this study, a copy of the report will be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton (CSU Fullerton). All investigations conducted by BFSA related to this project conformed to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and City of Fontana environmental guidelines.

II. SETTING

Natural Environment

The Cherry Distribution Facility Project is generally located in southwestern San Bernardino County within the city of Fontana. The subject site is part of the Chino Basin in the foothills of the eastern end of the San Gabriel Mountains, located to the west of the San Bernardino Mountains. The San Gabriel Mountains extend from Newall Pass in Los Angeles County to the east to the Cajon Pass in San Bernardino County. These mountains are part of the Transverse Ranges with peaks exceeding 9,000 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). The property is generally flat, with elevations ranging between 976 and 987 feet AMSL. Currently, the property consists of disturbed, vacant land that appears to have been previously disked and rough graded. While the property was mostly vacant, the sparse vegetation noted at the time of survey included non-native grasses and weeds, eucalyptus trees, one oak tree, and Russian thistle. Soils in the project area consist of Tujunga loamy sand, zero to five percent slopes, which include very deep, somewhat excessively drained soils that formed in alluvium from granitic sources (NRCS 2019).

Cultural Environment

Paleo Indian, Archaic Period Milling Stone Horizon, and the Late Prehistoric Shoshonean groups are the three general cultural periods represented in San Bernardino County. The following discussion of the cultural history of San Bernardino County references the San Dieguito Complex,
the Encinitas Tradition, the Milling Stone Horizon, the La Jolla Complex, the Pauma Complex, and the San Luis Rey Complex, since these culture sequences have been used to describe archaeological manifestations in the region. The Late Prehistoric component in the southwestern area of San Bernardino County was represented by the Gabrielino and the Serrano Indians. According to Kroeber (1976), the Serrano probably owned a stretch of the Sierra Madre from Cucamonga east to above Mentone and halfway up to San Timoteo Canyon, including the San Bernardino Valley and just missing Riverside County. However, Kroeber (1976) also states that this area has been assigned to the Gabrielino, “which would be a more natural division of topography, since it would leave the Serrano pure mountaineers.”

Absolute chronological information, where possible, will be incorporated into this discussion to examine the effectiveness of continuing to use these terms interchangeably. Reference will be made to the geological framework that divides the culture chronology of the area into four segments: late Pleistocene (20,000 to 10,000 years before the present [YBP]), early Holocene (10,000 to 6,650 YBP), middle Holocene (6,650 to 3,350 YBP), and late Holocene (3,350 to 200 YBP).

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

The Paleo Indian Period is associated with the terminus of the late Pleistocene (12,000 to 10,000 YBP). The environment during the late Pleistocene was cool and moist, which allowed for glaciation in the mountains and the formation of deep, pluvial lakes in the deserts and basin lands (Moratto 1984). However, by the terminus of the late Pleistocene, the climate became warmer, which caused glaciers to melt, sea levels to rise, greater coastal erosion, large lakes to recede and evaporate, extinction of Pleistocene megafauna, and major vegetation changes (Moratto 1984; Martin 1967, 1973; Fagan 1991). The coastal shoreline at 10,000 YBP, depending upon the particular area of the coast, was near the 30-meter isobath, or two to six kilometers further west than its present location (Masters 1983).

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

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

The Archaic Period of prehistory began with the onset of the Holocene around 9,000 YBP. The transition from the Pleistocene to the Holocene was a period of major environmental change throughout North America (Antevs 1953; Van Devender and Spaulding 1979). The general warming trend caused sea levels to rise, lakes to evaporate, and drainage patterns to change. In southern California, the general climate at the beginning of the early Holocene was marked by cool/moist periods and an increase in warm/dry periods and sea levels. The coastal shoreline at
8,000 YBP, depending upon the particular area of the coast, was near the 20-meter isobath, or one to four kilometers further west than its present location (Masters 1983).

The rising sea level during the early Holocene created rocky shorelines and bays along the coast by flooding valley floors and eroding the coastline (Curray 1965; Inman 1983). Shorelines were primarily rocky with small littoral cells, as sediments were deposited at bay edges but rarely discharged into the ocean (Reddy 2000). These bays eventually evolved into lagoons and estuaries, which provided a rich habitat for mollusks and fish. The warming trend and rising sea levels generally continued until the late Holocene (4,000 to 3,500 YBP).

At the beginning of the late Holocene, sea levels stabilized, rocky shores declined, lagoons filled with sediment, and sandy beaches became established (Gallegos 1985; Inman 1983; Masters 1994; Miller 1966; Warren and Pavesic 1963). Many former lagoons became saltwater marshes surrounded by coastal sage scrub by the late Holocene (Gallegos 2002). The sedimentation of the lagoons was significant in that it had profound effects on the types of resources available to prehistoric peoples. Habitat was lost for certain large mollusks, namely *Chione* and *Argopecten*, but habitat was gained for other small mollusks, particularly *Donax* (Gallegos 1985; Reddy 2000). The changing lagoon habitats resulted in the decline of larger shellfish, the loss of drinking water, and the loss of Torrey Pine nuts, causing a major depopulation of the coast as people shifted inland to reliable freshwater sources and intensified their exploitation of terrestrial small game and plants, including acorns (originally proposed by Rogers 1929; Gallegos 2002).

The Archaic Period in southern California is associated with a number of different cultures, complexes, traditions, and horizons, including San Dieguito, La Jolla, Encinitas, Milling Stone, and Pauma, as well as the Intermediate Period.

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

Approximately 1,350 YBP, a Shoshonean-speaking group from the Great Basin region moved into San Bernardino County, marking the transition to the Late Prehistoric Period. This period has been characterized by higher population densities and elaborations in social, political, and technological systems. Economic systems diversified and intensified during this period, with the continued elaboration of trade networks, the use of shell-bead currency, and the appearance of more labor-intensive, yet effective, technological innovations. Technological developments during this period included the introduction of the bow and arrow between A.D. 400 and 600 and the introduction of ceramics. Atlatl darts were replaced by smaller arrow darts, including the Cottonwood series points. Other hallmarks of the Late Prehistoric Period include extensive trade networks as far reaching as the Colorado River Basin and cremation of the dead.

**Protohistoric Period (Late Holocene: 1790 to Present)**

**Gabrielino**

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

The Gabrielino lived in permanent villages and smaller resource gathering camps occupied at various times of the year depending upon the seasonality of the resource. Larger villages were comprised of several families or clans, while smaller seasonal camps typically housed smaller family units. The coastal area between San Pedro and Topanga Canyon was the location of primary subsistence villages, while secondary sites were located near inland sage stands, oak groves, and pine forests. Permanent villages were located along rivers and streams, as well as in sheltered areas along the coast. As previously mentioned, the Channel Islands were also the locations of relatively large settlements (Bean and Smith 1978a; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Gabrielino houses were domed, circular structures made of thatched vegetation. Houses varied in size, and could house from one to several families. Sweathouses (semicircular, earth-covered buildings) were public structures used in male social ceremonies. Other structures included menstrual huts and a ceremonial structure called a yuvar, an open-air structure built near the chief’s house (Bean and Smith 1978a; Kroeber 1976).

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

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

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

Serrano

Aboriginally, the Serrano occupied an area east of present-day Los Angeles. According to Bean and Smith (1978b), definitive boundaries are difficult to place for the Serrano due to their sociopolitical organization and a lack of reliable data:

The Serrano were organized into autonomous localized lineages occupying
definite, favored territories, but rarely claiming any territory far removed from the lineage’s home base. Since the entire dialectical group was neither politically united nor amalgamated into supralineage groups, as many of their neighbors were, one must speak in terms of generalized areas of usage rather than pan-tribal holdings. (Strong [1929] in Bean and Smith 1978b)

However, researchers place the Serrano in the San Bernardino Mountains east of Cajon Pass and at the base of and north of the mountains near Victorville, east to Twentynine Palms, and south to the Yucaipa Valley (Bean and Smith 1978b). Serrano has been used broadly for languages in the Takic family including Serrano, Kitanemuk, Vanyume, and Tataviam.

The Serrano were part of “exogamous clans, which in turn were affiliated with one of two exogamous moieties, tukʷutam (Wildcat) and wahiʔiam (Coyote)” (Bean and Smith 1978b). According to Strong (1929), details such as number, structure, and function of the clans are unknown. Instead, he states that clans were not political, but were rather structured based upon “economic, marital, or ceremonial reciprocity, a pattern common throughout Southern California” (Bean and Smith 1978b). The Serrano formed alliances amongst their own clans and with Cahuilla, Chemehuevi, Gabrielino, and Cupéno clans (Bean and Smith 1978b). Clans were large, autonomous political and landholding units formed patrilineally, with all males descending from a common male ancestor, including all wives and descendants of the males. However, even after marriage, women would still keep their original lineage, and would still participate in those ceremonies (Bean and Smith 1978b).

According to Bean and Smith (1978b), the cosmogony and cosmography of the Serrano are very similar to those of the Cahuilla:

There are twin creator gods, a creation myth told in “epic poem” style, each local group having its own origin story, water babies whose crying foretells death, supernatural beings of various kinds and on various hierarchically arranged power-access levels, an Orpheus-like myth, mythical deer that no one can kill, and tales relating the adventures (and misadventures) of Coyote, a tragicomic trickster-transformer culture hero. (Bean [1962-1972] and Benedict [1924] in Bean and Smith 1978b)

The Serrano had a shaman, a person who acquired their powers through dreams, which were induced through ingestion of the hallucinogen datura. The shaman was mostly a curer/healer, using herbal remedies and “sucking out the disease-causing agents” (Bean and Smith 1978b).

Serrano village locations were typically located near water sources. Individual family dwellings were likely circular, domed structures. Daily household activities would either take place outside of the house out in the open, or under a ramada constructed of a thatched willow pole roof held up by four or more poles inserted into the ground. Families could consist of a husband,
wife/wives, unmarried female children, married male children, the husband’s parents, and/or widowed aunts and uncles. Rarely, an individual would occupy his own house, typically in the mountains. Serrano villages also included a large ceremonial house where the lineage leader would live, which served as the religious center for lineages or lineage-sets, granaries, and sweat houses (Bean and Smith 1978b).

The Serrano were primarily hunters and gatherers. Vegetal staples varied with locality. Acorns and piñon nuts were found in the foothills, and mesquite, yucca roots, cacti fruits, and piñon nuts were found in or near the desert regions. Diets were supplemented with other roots, bulbs, shoots, and seeds (Heizer 1978). Deer, mountain sheep, antelopes, rabbits, and other small rodents were among the principal food packages. Various game birds, especially quail, were also hunted. The bow and arrow was used for large game, while smaller game and birds were killed with curved throwing sticks, traps, and snares. Occasionally, game was hunted communally, often during mourning ceremonies (Benedict 1924; Drucker 1937; Heizer 1978). Earth ovens were used to cook meat, bones were boiled to extract marrow, and blood was either drunk cold or cooked to a thicker consistency and then eaten. Some meat and vegetables were sun-dried and stored. Food acquisition and processing required the manufacture of additional items such as knives, stone or bone scrapers, pottery trays and bowls, bone or horn spoons, and stirrers. Mortars, made of either stone or wood, and metates were also manufactured (Strong 1971; Drucker 1937; Benedict 1924).

The Serrano were very similar technologically to the Cahuilla. In general, manufactured goods included baskets, some pottery, rabbit-skin blankets, awls, arrow straighteners, sinew-backed bows, arrows, fire drills, stone pipes, musical instruments (rattles, rasps, whistles, bull-roarers, and flutes), feathered costumes, mats for floor and wall coverings, bags, storage pouches, cordage (usually comprised of yucca fiber), and nets (Heizer 1978).

**Historic Period**

The historic background of the project began with the Spanish colonization of Alta California. The first Spanish colonizing expedition reached southern California in 1769 with the intention of converting and civilizing the indigenous populations, as well as expanding the knowledge of and access to new resources in the region (Brigandi 1998). In the late eighteenth century, the San Gabriel (Los Angeles County), San Juan Capistrano (Orange County), and San Luis Rey (San Diego County) missions began colonizing southern California, and gradually expanded their use of the interior valley (presently western Riverside County) for raising grain and cattle to support the missions. The San Gabriel Mission claimed lands in what is presently Jurupa, Riverside, San Jacinto, and the San Gorgonio Pass, while the San Luis Rey Mission claimed land in what is presently Lake Elsinore, Temecula, and Murrieta (American Local History Network: Riverside County, California 1998). The indigenous groups who occupied these lands were recruited by missionaries, converted, and put to work in the missions (Pourade 1964). Throughout this period, the Native American populations were decimated by introduced diseases, a drastic shift in diet resulting in poor nutrition, and social conflicts due to the introduction of an entirely
new social order (Cook 1976).

In the mid- to late 1770s, Juan Bautista de Anza passed through much of what is now Riverside County while searching for an overland route from Sonora, Mexico to San Gabriel and Los Angeles, describing fertile valleys, lakes, and sub-desert areas (American Local History Network: Riverside County, California 1998; Riverside County n.d.). Spanish missionaries formed Mission San Gabriel in the San Bernardino Valley in the early nineteenth century. The mission established Rancho San Bernardino in 1819, which included the present-day areas of San Bernardino, Fontana, Rialto, Redlands, and Colton (City of San Bernardino 2015). Since there was no reliable water source in the area, from 1819 to 1820, the missionaries developed a zanja through the use of Native American labor from the Guachama Rancheria (Smallwood 2006). The creation of the zanja was implemented to divert waters from Mill Creek all the way through the city of Redlands, ending near the mission to assist with agricultural enterprises. The new water source allowed nearby ranching districts to develop during the nineteenth century (City of Redlands 2010; Smallwood 2006).

Mexico gained independence in 1822 and desecularized the missions in 1832, signifying the end of the Mission Period (Brigandi 1998; Riverside County n.d.). By this time, the missions owned some of the best and most fertile land in southern California. In order for California to develop, the land would have to be made productive enough to turn a profit (Brigandi 1998). The new government began distributing the vast mission holdings to wealthy and politically connected Mexican citizens. The “grants” were called “ranchos,” of which Jurupa, El Rincon, La Sierra, El Sobrante de San Jacinto, La Laguna (Lake Elsinore), Santa Rosa, Temecula, Pauba, San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero, and San Jacinto Viejo were located in present-day Riverside County. Many of these ranchos have lent their names to modern-day locales (American Local History Network: Riverside County, California 1998).

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

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

Native American culture had been disrupted to the point where they could no longer rely
upon prehistoric subsistence and social patterns. Not only does this illustrate how dependent the Native Americans had become upon the missionaries, but it also indicates a marked contrast in the way the Spanish treated the Native Americans compared to the Mexican and United States ranchers. Spanish colonialism (missions) is based upon utilizing human resources while integrating them into their society. The ranchers, both Mexican and American, did not accept Native Americans into their social order and used them specifically for the extraction of labor, resources, and profit. Rather than being incorporated, they were either subjugated or exterminated (Cook 1976).

In 1846, war erupted between Mexico and the United States. In 1848, with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the region was annexed as a territory of the United States, and in 1850, California became a state. These events generated a steady flow of settlers into the area, including gold miners, entrepreneurs, health-seekers, speculators, politicians, adventurers, seekers of religious freedom, and individuals desiring to create utopian colonies.

In 1851, 500 Mormons moved to the Redlands/San Bernardino area and purchased Rancho San Bernardino from the Lugo family (City of Redlands 2010). The settlement that the Mormons created within the rancho was short-lived, however, as in 1857, Brigham Young recalled all Mormons in San Bernardino back to Utah. Approximately 1,400 Mormons returned to Utah, while the remaining 45 percent stayed in San Bernardino, choosing “to forsake the church rather than leave their homes” (Lyman 1989).

By the late 1880s and early 1890s, there was growing discontent between San Bernardino and Riverside, its neighbor 10 miles to the south, due to differences in opinion concerning religion, morality, the Civil War, politics, and fierce competition to attract settlers. After a series of instances in which charges were claimed about unfair use of tax monies to the benefit of only San Bernardino, several people from Riverside decided to investigate the possibility of a new county. In May 1893, voters living within portions of San Bernardino County (to the north) and San Diego County (to the south) approved the formation of Riverside County. Early business opportunities were linked to the agriculture industry but commerce, construction, manufacturing, transportation, and tourism also provided a healthy local economy (American Local History Network: Riverside County, California 1998; Riverside County n.d.).

**General History of the City of Fontana**

In 1869, Andrew Jackson Pope, co-founder of the Pope & Talbot Company, a lumber dealer based out of San Francisco (1860 Federal Census; 1870 Federal Census; University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections 2018), purchased 3,840 acres of land in San Bernardino County as part of the Land Act of 1820. “During the ensuing years, Andrew Pope and W.C. Talbot acquired other properties in the West, chiefly in California. By 1874, they owned a real estate empire, including almost 80,000 acres of ranch lands” (World Forestry Center 2017).

Pope passed away in 1878, amid water rights conflicts between grant owners (himself) and settlers of the lands surrounding his Fontana-area lands. As a result of the water rights conflict, in
which the United States Supreme Court sided with the grant owners, the Lytle Creek Water Company was formed in 1881. The purpose of the Lytle Creek Water Company was to:

[U]nify the interests of appropriators to the stream, to fight the grant owners. These latter had the law on their side, but the settlers had the water, and were holding and using it. An injunction was issued in favor of the grant owners, restraining the settlers from using the water, but it was never enforced. The conflict was a long and bitter one. In the meantime, the grant owners, and others operating with them, quietly bought up the stock of the Lytle Creek Water Company, until enough to control it was secured, and sold out these rights to the projectors of the Semi-tropic Land and Water Company, with the riparian lands, which movement seems to have quieted the conflict. (Hall 1888)

The Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company was incorporated in 1887. That year, the company platted the settlement of Rosena, but no structures were erected. By 1888, the company had acquired “something more than twenty-eight thousand five hundred acres of land, embracing the channel of Lytle creek for ten miles” (Hall 1888).

In 1903, San Bernardino contractor and agriculturist A.B. Miller and “his pioneer Fontana Development Company purchased Rosena, and by 1905 had begun the building of a farming complex that included an assortment of barns, dining rooms, a 200-man bunk house, a kitchen, a company store, as well as the ranch house used by the foreman” (Anicic 1982). By 1906, Miller had also taken over the remainder of the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company assets and created the Fontana Farms Company and the Fontana Land Company. Afterward, Miller oversaw the construction of an irrigation system that utilized the water from Lytle Creek, as well as the planting of “half a million eucalyptus saplings as windbreaks” (Conford 1995).

In 1913, the town of Fontana was platted between Foothill Boulevard and the Santa Fe railroad tracks. Much of the land to the south of the townsitewas utilized as a hog farm, while the remainder of the Fontana Farms Company land was subdivided into small farms. The smaller “starter farms” were approximately 2.5 acres and the new owner was able to choose between grapevines or walnut trees, all supplied by the Fontana Farms nursery. “By 1930 the Fontana Company had subdivided more than three thousand homesteads, half occupied by full-time settlers, some of them immigrants from Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Italy” (Conford 1995).

Kaiser Steel was founded in Fontana in the 1940s and became one of the main producers of steel west of the Mississippi River. To provide for his workers’ health needs, Henry J. Kaiser constructed the Fontana Kaiser Permanente medical facility, which is now the largest managed care organization in the United States. The city of Fontana was incorporated on June 25, 1952. The steel operation was closed in the 1980s; however, the city has since become a transportation hub for trucking due to the number of highways that intersect in the area (Anicic 2005; City of Fontana 2018).
III. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project consists of 8.9 acres located at the northeast corner of Cherry Avenue and Santa Ana Avenue within the city of Fontana, California (APNs 236-122-11 and -12). For the purposes of this study, the entire 8.9-acre property is considered the Area of Potential Effect (APE). The property studied as part of the cultural resources assessment can be characterized as generally flat, mostly disturbed, and previously developed. The property has been disturbed by clearing, disking, and limited agricultural use. The proposed project will include the construction of a 183,433-square-foot warehouse, a 10,000-square-foot office, a parking lot with 64 automobile parking spots and 46 trailer parking spots, and associated landscaping.

IV. **SCOPE OF WORK**

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

1) An archaeological records search was conducted by BFSA at the SCCIC at CSU Fullerton to gather any information regarding recorded cultural resources within or adjacent to the project.
2) The initial archaeological survey of the property was accomplished by conducting a structured intensive reconnaissance that followed survey transects, which were parallel to the existing street directions. All areas of disturbed ground and any rodent burrows were analyzed for evidence of buried archaeological deposits.
3) This archaeological technical report was prepared to present the results of the field survey, impact analysis, and presentation of any mitigation measures required for project approval.

**Research Goals**

The primary goal of the research design is to attempt to understand the way in which humans have used the land and resources within the project area over time, as well as to aid in the determination of resource significance. For the current project, the study area under investigation is the southwestern portion of San Bernardino County. The scope of work for the archaeological program conducted for the Cherry Distribution Facility Project included a survey of the 8.9-acre project site. Given the area involved and the narrow focus of the cultural resources study, the research design for this project was necessarily limited and general in nature. Since the main objective of the investigation was to identify the presence of and potential impacts to cultural resources, the goal here is not necessarily to answer wide-reaching theories regarding the development of early southern California, but to investigate the role and importance of the identified resources. Although survey-level investigations are limited in terms of the amount of
information available, several specific research questions were developed that could be used to
guide the initial investigations of any observed cultural resources. The following research
questions take into account the size and location of the project.

**Research Questions:**

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

**Data Needs**

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

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

**Applicable Regulations**

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

According to CEQA (§15064.5a), the term “historical resource” includes the following:

1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR. Section 4850 et seq.).

2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript, which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Title 14, Section 4852) including the following:

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

4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.
According to CEQA (§15064.5b), a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA defines a substantial adverse change as:

1) Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.

2) The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:
   a) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
   b) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or,
   c) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

Section 15064.5(c) of CEQA applies to effects on archaeological sites and contains the following additional provisions regarding archaeological sites:

1) When a project will impact an archaeological site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is an historical resource, as defined in subsection (a).
2) If a lead agency determines that the archaeological site is an historical resource, it shall refer to the provisions of Section 21084.1 of the Public Resources Code, Section 15126.4 of the guidelines, and the limits contained in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code do not apply.
3) If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria defined in subsection (a), but does meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource in Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code, the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of Section 21083.2. The time and cost limitations described in Public Resources Code Section
21083.2 (c-f) do not apply to surveys and site evaluation activities intended to determine whether the project location contains unique archaeological resources.

4) If an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. It shall be sufficient that both the resource and the effect on it are noted in the Initial Study or EIR, if one is prepared to address impacts on other resources, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.

Section 15064.5 (d) and (e) contain additional provisions regarding human remains. Regarding Native American human remains, paragraph (d) provides:

(d) When an initial study identifies the existence of, or the probable likelihood, of Native American human remains within the project, a lead agency shall work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as provided in Public Resources Code SS5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC. Action implementing such an agreement is exempt from:

1) The general prohibition on disinterring, disturbing, or removing human remains from any location other than a dedicated cemetery (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5).

2) The requirement of CEQA and the Coastal Act.

V. RESULTS OF STUDY

Background Research and Results of Records Searches

The records search data (see Confidential Appendix) indicates that there have been 38 cultural resource studies conducted within a one-mile radius of the APE, none of which include any portion of the project. In addition, the records search results indicate that 35 resources have been recorded within one mile of the Cherry Distribution Facility Project. None of the cultural resources intersect with the APE. No prehistoric sites or isolates were identified within one mile of the project; rather, all of the previously recorded resources are historic and include the Kaiser Steel Mill; the Declez Ranch/Felice Pagluiso Winery/Chapel site; two alignments of the Southern Pacific Railroad, one with an associated trash scatter; two transmission lines; two ranch complexes; the Circle Inn Motel; one gasoline station lamp post remnant; and 25 single family residences. A brief description of the resources identified during the records search is provided in Table 1.
Table 1
Archaeological Sites Located Within
One Mile of the Cherry Distribution Facility Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBR-4131H</td>
<td>Historic Kaiser Steel Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR-4584H</td>
<td>Historic Declez Ranch/Felice Pagliuso Winery/Chapel site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR-7426H</td>
<td>Historic Southern Pacific Railroad alignment and trash scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR-10,330H</td>
<td>Historic Southern Pacific Railroad alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR-17,228H and SBR-17,229H</td>
<td>Historic transmission line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-020009</td>
<td>Historic Circle Inn Motel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR-9862H</td>
<td>Historic gasoline station lamp post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR-7795H and SBR-28,639H</td>
<td>Historic farm/ranch complex and trash scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-012227, P-36-020010, P-36-020011, P-36-020012, P-36-020013, P-36-020014, P-36-020015, P-36-020016, P-36-020017, P-36-020018, P-36-020019, P-36-020020, P-36-020021, P-36-020022, P-36-020023, P-36-020024, P-36-020025, P-36-020026, P-36-020027, P-36-020028, P-36-020029, P-36-020030, P-36-020031, P-36-029643, and P-36-033027</td>
<td>Historic single family residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following historic sources were also reviewed:

- The National Register of Historic Place Index
- The Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility
- The 1896, 1898, 1901, and 1954 15-minute USGS San Bernardino topographic maps
- The 1943 1:31,680-scale USGS Fontana topographic map
- The 1967 and 1980 7-minute USGS Fontana topographic map

No additional resources were identified as a result of any of the above sources.

Additional online research including Bureau of Land Management (BLM) General Land Office (GLO) records and historic aerial photographs was also conducted. BLM GLO records indicate that Section 26, Township 1 South, Range 6 West was granted to A.J. Pope on September 20, 1896 (BLM Serial Number CACAAA 084352). The historic aerial photographs extending from 1938 to the 2018 indicate that the subject property was used for agriculture throughout the twentieth century. The 1938 to 1967 aerial photographs indicate that the property was part of a large tree grove. On the 1994 to 2018 aerial photographs, the property appears to be a vacant
agricultural lot and no buildings are visible. In addition, the topographic maps do not show any structures within the subject property.

BFSA also requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search from the NAHC. The search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources on or near the project. A list of Native American contacts was provided by the NAHC, and in accordance with their recommendations, BFSA contacted all Native American consultants to inform the tribes about the nature of the project and to request any relevant information concerning the property. This request is not part of any Assembly Bill 52 Native American consultation. To date, BFSA has received no responses. All correspondence is provided in the Confidential Appendix.

The records search and literature review suggest that there is a low potential for prehistoric sites to be contained within the boundaries of the property due to the extensive nature of past ground disturbances and the lack of natural resources often associated with prehistoric sites. No prehistoric sites have been recorded within one mile of the project and tend to be situated to the south, closer to the bedrock-laden Jurupa Mountains. The records search and literature review do suggest that sites associated with the agricultural history of the project are the most likely cultural resources to be encountered within the project. However, based upon the previously recorded surrounding resources and the historic aerial photographs, there is a low potential for historic resources to be located within the project.

**Field Reconnaissance**

Principal Investigator Brian F. Smith directed the pedestrian survey of the project by Project Archaeologist Andrew Garrison on October 4, 2019. Aerial photographs, maps, and compass permitted orientation and location of project boundaries. Where possible, narrow transect paths were employed to ensure maximum lot coverage. All exposed ground was inspected for cultural materials. Ground visibility was generally excellent with an almost unobstructed view of the surface. A survey form and photographs documented the survey work undertaken. At the time of the survey, the project was characterized as a flat, previously disked and cleared vacant parcel (Plates 1 and 2). No cultural resources, either historic or prehistoric, were discovered during the survey.
Plate 1: Overview of the project, facing north from the southeast corner.

Plate 2: Overview of the project, facing southwest from the northeast corner.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The cultural resources study for the Cherry Distribution Facility Project did not identify any cultural resources within the property. The SCCIC records indicate 38 studies have been conducted within one mile of the project, none of which include the project. In addition, the search listed 35 cultural resource sites within a one-mile radius of the project. Although property research indicated a potential to discover historic resources, at the time of the survey, the entire property was vacant. Therefore, as a result of the research results and the current archaeological survey, no cultural resources are associated with the project.

Given that no archaeological sites, features, or artifacts have been identified within the project, no potential impacts to cultural resources are associated with the proposed development of the project. The archaeological study was completed in accordance with the City of Fontana environmental policies and CEQA significance evaluation criteria. Based upon the absence of any cultural resources within the project, site-specific mitigation measures will not be required for this project. Further, as a result of previous ground-disturbing activities and the absence of cultural resources within the project boundaries, there is little potential for cultural resources to be present or disturbed by the proposed development. No further archaeological study is recommended as a condition of permit approval based upon the records search and the results of the field survey, and no mitigation monitoring for cultural resources is recommended as a condition of approval.

VII. CERTIFICATION

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

October 18, 2019
Brian F. Smith
Principal Investigator
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Experience

Principal Investigator 1977–Present
Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc.
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Brian F. Smith is the owner and principal historical and archaeological consultant for Brian F. Smith and Associates. Over the past 32 years, he has conducted over 2,500 cultural resource studies in California, Arizona, Nevada, Montana, and Texas. These studies include every possible aspect of archaeology from literature searches and large-scale surveys to intensive data recovery excavations. Reports prepared by Mr. Smith have been submitted to all facets of local, state, and federal review agencies, including the US Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Homeland Security. In addition, Mr. Smith has conducted studies for utility companies (Sempra Energy) and state highway departments (CalTrans).

Professional Accomplishments

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Mid-Bayfront Project for the City of Chula Vista: Involved a large expanse of undeveloped agricultural land situated between the railroad and San Diego Bay in the northwestern portion of the city. The study included the analysis of some potentially historic features and numerous prehistoric sites.
Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Audie Murphy Ranch, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of 1,113.4 acres and 43 sites, both prehistoric and historic—included project coordination; direction of field crews; evaluation of sites for significance based on County of Riverside and CEQA guidelines; assessment of cupule, pictograph, and rock shelter sites, co-authoring of cultural resources project report. February-September 2002.

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

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

Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Menifee West GPA, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of nine sites, both prehistoric and historic—included project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on County of Riverside and CEQA guidelines; historic research; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. January-March 2002.

Mitigation of An Archaic Cultural Resource for the Eastlake III Woods Project for the City of Chula Vista, California: Project archaeologist/director—included direction of field crews; development and completion of data recovery program including collection of material for specialized faunal and botanical analyses; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; management of artifact collections cataloging and curation; data synthesis; co-authoring of cultural resources project report, in prep. September 2001-March 2002.

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

Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Lawson Valley Project, San Diego County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of 28 prehistoric and two historic sites—includes project coordination; direction of field crews; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; cultural resources project report in prep. July-August 2000.


Enhanced Cultural Resource Survey and Evaluation for the Prewitt/Schmucker/Cavadias Project, La Jolla, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of a single-dwelling parcel—includes project coordination; direction of field crews; assessment of parcel for potentially buried cultural deposits; authoring of cultural resources project report. June 2000.
Cultural Resources Survey and Test of Sites Within the Proposed Development of the Menifee Ranch, Riverside County, California: Project manager/director of the investigation of one prehistoric and five historic sites—included project coordination and budgeting; direction of field crews; feature recordation; historic structure assessments; assessment of sites for significance based on CEQA guidelines; historic research; co-authoring of cultural resources project report. February-June 2000.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Archaeological Evaluation of Cultural Resources Within the Proposed Corridor for the San Elijo Water Reclamation System Project, San Elijo, California:** Project manager/director—test excavations; direction of artifact identification and analysis; graphics production; coauthorship of final cultural resources report. December 1994-July 1995.

Reports/Papers

Author, coauthor, or contributor to over 2,500 cultural resources management publications, a selection of which are presented below.

2015  An Archaeological/Historical Study for the Safari Highlands Ranch Project, City of Escondido, County of San Diego.

2015  A Phase I and II Cultural Resources Assessment for the Decker Parcels II Project, Planning Case No. 36962, Riverside County, California.

2015  A Phase I and II Cultural Resources Assessment for the Decker Parcels I Project, Planning Case No. 36950, Riverside County, California.


2015  Phase I Cultural Resource Survey for the Woodward Street Senior Housing Project, City of San Marcos, California (APN 218-120-31).


2015  A Phase I and II Cultural Resource Report for the Lake Ranch Project, TR 36730, Riverside County, California.

2015  A Phase II Cultural Resource Assessment for the Munro Valley Solar Project, Inyo County, California.


2014  National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Compliance for the Proposed Saddleback Estates Project, Riverside County, California.

2014  A Phase II Cultural Resource Evaluation Report for RIV-8137 at the Toscana Project, TR 36593, Riverside County, California.

2014  Cultural Resources Study for the Estates at Del Mar Project, City of Del Mar, San Diego, California (TTM 14-001).

2014  Cultural Resources Study for the Aliso Canyon Major Subdivision Project, Rancho Santa Fe, San Diego County, California.

2014  Cultural Resources Due Diligence Assessment of the Ocean Colony Project, City of Encinitas.

2014  A Phase I and Phase II Cultural Resource Assessment for the Citrus Heights II Project, TTM 36475, Riverside County, California.

2013  A Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment for the Modular Logistics Center, Moreno Valley, Riverside County, California.
2013 A Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Ivey Ranch Project, Thousand Palms, Riverside County, California.
2013 Cultural Resources Report for the Emerald Acres Project, Riverside County, California.
2013 A Cultural Resources Records Search and Review for the Pala Del Norte Conservation Bank Project, San Diego County, California.
2013 An Updated Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for Tentative Tract Maps 36484 and 36485, Audie Murphy Ranch, City of Menifee, County of Riverside.
2013 El Centro Town Center Industrial Development Project (EDA Grant No. 07-01-06386); Result of Cultural Resource Monitoring.
2013 Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Renda Residence Project, 9521 La Jolla Farms Road, La Jolla, California.
2013 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Ballpark Village Project, San Diego, California.
2012 Archaeological Monitoring and Mitigation Program, San Clemente Senior Housing Project, 2350 South El Camino Real, City of San Clemente, Orange County, California (CUP No. 06-065; APN-060-032-04).
2012 Mitigation Monitoring Report for the Los Peñasquitos Recycled Water Pipeline.
2012 Cultural Resources Report for Menifee Heights (Tract 32277).
2012 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Altman Residence at 9696 La Jolla Farms Road, La Jolla, California 92037.
2012 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Payan Property Project, San Diego, California.
2012 Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Rieger Residence, 13707 Durango Drive, Del Mar, California 92014, APN 300-369-49.
2011 Mitigation Monitoring Report for the 1887 Viking Way Project, La Jolla, California.
2011 Results of Archaeological Monitoring at the 10th Avenue Parking Lot Project, City of San Diego, California (APNs 534-194-02 and 03).
2011 Archaeological Survey of the Pelberg Residence for a Bulletin 560 Permit Application; 8335 Camino Del Oro; La Jolla, California 92037 APN 346-162-01-00.
2011 A Cultural Resources Survey Update and Evaluation for the Robertson Ranch West Project and an Evaluation of National Register Eligibility of Archaeological sites for Sites for Section 106 Review (NHPA).
2011 Mitigation Monitoring Report for the 43rd and Logan Project.
2011 Mitigation Monitoring Report for the Sewer Group 682 M Project, City of San Diego Project #174116.

2011 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Nooren Residence Project, 8001 Calle de la Plata, La Jolla, California, Project No. 226965.

2011 A Phase I Cultural Resource Study for the Keating Residence Project, 9633 La Jolla Farms Road, La Jolla, California 92037.


2010 Pottery Canyon Site Archaeological Evaluation Project, City of San Diego, California, Contract No. H105126.

2010 Archaeological Resource Report Form: Mitigation Monitoring of the Racetrack View Drive Project, San Diego, California; Project No. 163216.

2010 A Historical Evaluation of Structures on the Butterfield Trails Property.

2010 Historic Archaeological Significance Evaluation of 1761 Haydn Drive, Encinitas, California (APN 260-276-07-00).

2010 Results of Archaeological Monitoring of the Heller/Nguyen Project, TPM 06-01, Poway, California.


2010 An Archaeological Study for the 1912 Spindrift Drive Project

2009 Cultural Resource Assessment of the North Ocean Beach Gateway Project City of San Diego #64A-003A; Project #154116.

2009 Archaeological Constraints Study of the Morgan Valley Wind Assessment Project, Lake County, California.

2008 Results of an Archaeological Review of the Helen Park Lane 3.1-acre Property (APN 314-561-31), Poway, California.

2008 Archaeological Letter Report for a Phase I Archaeological Assessment of the Valley Park Condominium Project, Ramona, California; APN 282-262-75-00.


2007 Result of an Archaeological Survey for the Villages at Promenade Project (APNs 115-180-007-3, 115-180-049-1, 115-180-042-4, 115-180-047-9) in the City of Corona, Riverside County.

2007 Monitoring Results for the Capping of Site CA-SDI-6038/SDM-W-5517 within the Katzer Jamul Center Project; P00-017.

2006 Archaeological Assessment for The Johnson Project (APN 322-011-10), Poway, California.
2005 Results of Archaeological Monitoring at the El Camino Del Teatro Accelerated Sewer Replacement Project (Bid No. K041364; WO # 177741; CIP # 46-610.6).

2005 Results of Archaeological Monitoring at the Baltazar Draper Avenue Project (Project No. 15857; APN: 351-040-09).

2004 TM 5325 ER #03-14-043 Cultural Resources.


2003 Evaluation of Archaeological Resources Within the Spring Canyon Biological Mitigation Area, Otay Mesa, San Diego County, California. Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


2002 An Archaeological/Historical Study for the Audie Murphy Ranch Project (et al.). Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>A Cultural Resources Survey and Site Evaluations at the Stewart Subdivision Project, Moreno Valley, County of San Diego.</td>
<td>Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1999  Results of an Archaeological Evaluation for the Anthony's Pizza Acquisition Project in Ocean Beach, City of San Diego (with L. Pierson and B. Smith). Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


1995  Results of a Cultural Resources Study for the 4S Ranch. Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


1994  Results of the Cultural Resources Mitigation Programs at Sites SDI-11,044/H and SDI-12,038 at the Salt Creek Ranch Project. Brian F. Smith and Associates, San Diego, California.


IX. ATTACHMENT B

Project Maps:
General Location Map
USGS Project Location Map
Project Development Map
Figure 1
General Location Map
The Cherry Distribution Facility Project
DeLorme (1:250,000)
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X. CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX
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