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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Transition Properties, LP (“Applicant”) is proposing the construction of 117,860-square-foot warehouse buildings on 13.36 acres located at the northwest corner of 5th Street and Church Avenue in the City of Highland, California. For the purpose of this report, all project components will collectively be referred to as the “Study Area”, unless otherwise noted. The proposed project would include excavations across the majority of the Study Area.

MIG conducted a phase I cultural resources assessment of the Study Area to determine the potential impacts to cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources) for the purpose of complying with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the local cultural resource regulations. The scope of work for this assessment included a cultural resources records search through the California Historical Resources Information System-South Central Costal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton (CHRIS-SCCIC), a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), follow-up Native American consultation, land use history research, a paleontological resources records search through the Vertebrate Paleontology Section at the National History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLAC), a site survey, eligibility evaluations for resources identified within the Study Area, impact analyses, and the recommendation of additional work and mitigation measures.

Archaeological Resources
The cultural resources records search results from the South Central Coastal Information Center (CHRIS-SCCIC) indicated that there were no archaeological resources located within the Study Area and none were identified during the site survey. The Study Area is mapped in the City of Highland General Plan as having a low sensitivity for archaeological resources (City of Highland General Plan 2006). Therefore, the proposed project would result in no substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5. Despite the heavy disturbances of the Study Area that may have displaced archaeological resources on the surface and the proximity of the Santa River, it is possible that intact archaeological resources exist at depth. As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in Section 9 to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

Historical Resources
The cultural resources records search results from the South Central Coastal Information Center (CHRIS-SCCIC) indicated that there were no historical resources located within the Study Area. However, archival research indicated that there are four (4) existing structures with varying construction/built dates ranging from circa 1966 to 1968 located within the Project Boundaries that will be impacted by the proposed project. The four existing structures include: 2 corrugated metal paneled sheds, a dispatch office with attached wooden-frame maintenance service bay, an office building located at 27400 5th Street, and an building located at 27454 5th Street that are 45 years old or older, thus requiring evaluation as historic sites to determine if these structures are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Place (NRHP) or California Register of Historic Resources (HRCR). The results of historic evaluation for these four structures showed they are not eligible for listing in the National or California Registers under any of the significance criteria. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

Additionally, there are ten (10) previously recorded historic resources (P-36-007350, P-36-013750, P-36-015467, P-36-020650, P-36-020651, P-36-020652, P-36-020653, P-36-020654, P-36-020655, and P-36-020656) located within a one-mile radius of the Study Area. None of these historic resources will be impacted by the proposed project. There were no historic resources identified during the pedestrian survey. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

1 City of Highland. 2006. General Plan: Chapter 5; Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 5-2 Archaeological Resources. Available at City Hall, the City of Highland.
Paleontological Resources
Results of the paleontological resources records search through NHMLAC indicate that no vertebrate fossil localities from the NHMLAC records have been previously recorded within the Study Area or within a one-mile radius. Moreover, no paleontological resources were identified by MIG during the site survey. These findings; however, do not preclude the existence of undiscovered paleontological resources located below the ground surface and lacking surface manifestation, which may be encountered during construction excavations associated with the proposed project. The Study Area has been previously mapped geologically as surface deposits of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived as alluvial fan deposits from the San Bernardino Mountains to the northeast, via City Creek that currently flows immediately to the east and is diverted adjacent to the north, and also from the Santa Ana River that currently flows immediately to the south. These younger Quaternary Alluvium deposits typically do not contain significant fossil vertebrate remains in the uppermost layers but are underlain by older Quaternary deposits at relatively shallow depths below 8-feet that may well contain significant vertebrate fossils (McLeod 2016). As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in Section 9 of this report to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered paleontological resources and/or unique geological features that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

Tribal Cultural Resources
CEQA defines Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) as either a site, feature, place, landscapes that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources or on a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or a resource determined by a lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historic register criteria in Public Resources Code section 5024.1(c), and considering the significance of the resources to a California Native American tribe.2

Results of the records research conducted at the CHRIS-SCCIC, the Scared Lands File Search commissioned through the NAHC, follow-up Native American Scoping, and the Pedestrian Field Survey failed to indicate known TCR within the Study Area as specified in Public Resources Code (PRC): 210741, 5020.1(k), or 5024.1. Despite the heavy disturbances of the Study Area that may have displaced or submerged archaeological resources relating to TCR’s on the surface and due to the close proximity of the Santa River, it is possible that intact tribal cultural resources exist at depth. As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 9 to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources relating to TCR’s that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

Nevertheless, AB 52 (Gatto, 2014) states: it is the responsible of the Public Agency to consult early in the CEQA process to allow tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environment review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process as outline in PRC Section 2108.3.2.3 Government to government consultation may provide “Tribal Knowledge” of the Study Area that can be used in determining tribal cultural resources that cannot be obtained through other investigative means.

---

2 California Public Resources Code § 21074
3 California Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 – Proposed Project and Location

Transition Properties, LP ("Applicant") is proposing the construction of 117,860-square-foot warehouse buildings on 13.36-acres located at the northwest corner of 5th Street at Church Avenue in the City of Highland, California. For the purpose of this report, all project components will collectively be referred to as the "Study Area", unless otherwise noted. The proposed project would include excavations across the majority of the Study Area.

The Study Area is subdivided into three separate sections: northern, central and southern, with each section fenced off from one another in the City of Highland, in San Bernardino County, California (See Figure 1, Regional and Vicinity Map). The Study Area is located approximately one-third-mile west of Interstate Highway 210, at the intersection of Church Avenue and 5th Street. The Study Area is depicted in Section 1 of Township 1 South, Range 3 West of the Redlands CA United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5" topographic (See Figure 2, USGS Topographic Map). The Study Area is surrounded a flood control channel and residential housing tracts on the north and northeast, light industrial complexes/warehouses and commercial enterprises on the east side of Church Avenue and on the south and west sides of 5th Street, and the Santa Ana River, which is located approximately 320-feet southeast from the intersection of 5th Street and Church Avenue.

1.2 – Scope of Study and Personnel

MIG conducted a phase I cultural resources assessment of the Study Area from July 2016 through August, 2016, to identify potential impacts to cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources) and to develop mitigation measures to avoid, reduce, or mitigate potential impacts to resources for the purpose of complying with CEQA and local cultural resource guidelines. The scope of work for this assessment included a cultural resources records search through the CHRIS-SCCIC, a SLF search through the NAHC and follow-up Native American consultation, land use history research, a paleontological resources records search through the NHMLAC, a pedestrian survey, eligibility evaluations for the resources identified within the Study Area, impact analyses, and the recommendations of additional work and mitigation measures.

The assessment was co-managed and this report compiled by Mr. Chris Purtell, M.A., RPA and Mr. Chris Brown. The pedestrian field survey was performed by Mr. Purtell. The record searches were conducted by Mr. Purtell. Qualifications of key personnel are provided in Appendix A (Resumes).
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Cultural resources are indirectly protected under the provisions of the Federal Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 U.S.C §§ 431 et seq.) and subsequent related legislation, regulations, policies, and guidance documents. The following is a summary of the applicable (federal, state, and local) regulatory frameworks related to the protection of cultural resources in California.

Numerous laws and regulations require federal, state, and local agencies to consider the effects of a proposed project on cultural resources. These laws and regulations establish a process for compliance, define the responsibilities of the various agencies proposing the action, and prescribe the relationship among other involved agencies (e.g., State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation). The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, CEQA, and Public Resources Code (PRC) 5024, are the primary federal and state laws governing and affecting preservation of cultural resources of national, state, regional, and local significance. Other relevant regulations and guidelines at the local level include the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. A description of the applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines are provided in the following paragraphs.

2.1– Federal Level

2.1.1 – NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966
In summary, the NHPA establishes the nation’s policy for historic preservation and sets in place a program for the preservation of historic properties by requiring federal agencies to consider effects to significant cultural resources (i.e. historic properties) prior to undertakings.

2.1.2 – SECTION 106 OF THE FEDERAL GUIDELINES
Section 106 of the NHPA states that federal agencies with direct or indirect jurisdiction over federally funded, assisted, or licensed undertakings must take into account the effect of the undertaking on any historic property that is included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP and that the ACHP and SHPO must be afforded an opportunity to comment, through a process outlined in the ACHP regulations at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800, on such undertakings.

2.1.3 – NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
The NRHP was established by the NHPA of 1966 as “an authoritative guide to be used by federal, state, and local governments, private groups, and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.” The NRHP recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels. To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of potential significance must also possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. A property is eligible for the NRHP if it is significant under one or more of the following criteria:

- **Criterion A:** It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- **Criterion B:** It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past.
- **Criterion C:** It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represents the work of a master; possesses high artistic values; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- **Criterion D:** It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historic figures; properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes; structures that have been moved from their original locations; reconstructed historic buildings; and properties that are primarily commemorative in nature are not considered eligible for the NRHP unless they satisfy certain conditions.
In general, a resource must be at least 50 years of age to be considered for the NRHP, unless it satisfies a standard of exceptional importance.

2.1.4 – Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990
The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990 sets provisions for the intentional removal and inadvertent discovery of human remains and other cultural items from federal and tribal lands. It clarifies the ownership of human remains and sets forth a process for repatriation of human remains and associated funerary objects and sacred religious objects to the Native American groups claiming to be lineal descendants or culturally affiliated with the remains or objects. It requires any federally funded institution housing Native American remains or artifacts to compile an inventory of all cultural items within the museum or with its agency and to provide a summary to any Native American tribe claiming affiliation.

2.2 – State Level

2.2.1 – California Environmental Quality Act
Pursuant to CEQA, a historical resource is a resource listed in, or eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). In addition, resources included in a local register of historic resources or identified as significant in a local survey conducted in accordance with state guidelines are also considered historic resources under CEQA, unless a preponderance of the facts demonstrates otherwise. According to CEQA, the fact that a resource is not listed in or determined eligible for listing in the CRHR or is not included in a local register or survey shall not preclude a Lead Agency, as defined by CEQA, from determining that the resource may be a historic resource as defined in California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1.

CEQA applies to archaeological resources when (1) the archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a historical resource or (2) the archaeological resource satisfies the definition of a “unique archaeological resource.” A unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site that has a high probability of meeting any of the following criteria:

1. The archaeological resource contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.

2. The archaeological resource has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.

3. The archaeological resource is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines provides a set of sample questions that guide the evaluation of potential impacts with regard to cultural resources:

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
2.2.2 – California Register of Historical Resources

Created in 1992 and implemented in 1998, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) is “an authoritative guide in California to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate properties that are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” Certain properties, including those listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and California Historical Landmarks (CHLs) numbered 770 and higher, are automatically included in the CRHR. Other properties recognized under the California Points of Historical Interest program, identified as significant in historic resources surveys, or designated by local landmarks programs may be nominated for inclusion in the CRHR. A resource, either an individual property or a contributor to a historic district, may be listed in the CRHR if the State Historical Resources Commission determines that it meets one or more of the following criteria, which are modeled on NRHP criteria:

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

Resources nominated to the CRHR must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historic resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. It is possible that a resource whose integrity does not satisfy NRHP criteria may still be eligible for listing in the CRHR. A resource that has lost its historic character or appearance may still have sufficient integrity for the CRHR if, under Criterion 4, it maintains the potential to yield significant scientific or historical information or specific data. Resources that have achieved significance within the past 50 years also may be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR, provided that enough time has lapsed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource.

2.3 – Other State Statutes and Regulations

2.3.1 – California Historical Landmarks

California Historical Landmarks (CHLs) are buildings, structures, sites, or places that have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other value and that have been determined to have statewide historical significance by meeting at least one of the criteria listed below. The resource must also be approved for designation by the County Board of Supervisors or the City or Town Council in whose jurisdiction it is located, be recommended by the State Historical Resources Commission, or be officially designated by the Director of California State Parks. The specific standards in use now were first applied in the designation of CHL No. 770. CHLs No. 770 and above are automatically listed in the CRHR.

To be eligible for designation as a Landmark, a resource must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the state or within a large geographic region (Northern, Central, or Southern California).
- Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of California.
- A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in a region of a pioneer architect, designer, or master builder.

---

4 California Public Resources Code § 5024.1(a).
5 California Public Resources Code § 5024.1(b).
2.3.2 – California Points of Historical Interest

California Points of Historical Interest are sites, buildings, features, or events that are of local (city or county) significance and have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other value. Points of Historical Interest (Points) designated after December 1997 and recommended by the State Historical Resources Commission are also listed in the CRHR. No historic resource may be designated as both a Landmark and a Point. If a Point is later granted status as a Landmark, the Point designation will be retired. In practice, the Point designation program is most often used in localities that do not have a locally enacted cultural heritage or preservation ordinance.

To be eligible for designation as a Point, a resource must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- The first, last, only, or most significant of its type within the local geographic region (city or county).
- Associated with an individual or group having a profound influence on the history of the local area.
- A prototype of, or an outstanding example of, a period, style, architectural movement or construction or one of the more notable works or the best surviving work in the local region of a pioneer architect, designer, or master builder.

2.3.3 – Native American Heritage Commission, Public Resources Code Sections 5097.9–5097.991

Section 5097.91 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) established the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), whose duties include the inventory of places of religious or social significance to Native Americans and the identification of known graves and cemeteries of Native Americans on private lands. Under Section 5097.9 of the PRC, a state policy of noninterference with the free expression or exercise of Native American religion was articulated along with a prohibition of severe or irreparable damage to Native American sanctified cemeteries, places of worship, religious or ceremonial sites or sacred shrines located on public property. Section 5097.98 of the PRC specifies a protocol to be followed when the NAHC receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner. Section 5097.5 defines as a misdemeanor the unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, historic, or paleontological resources located on public lands.

2.3.4 – California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 2001

Codified in the California Health and Safety Code Sections 8010–8030, the California Native American Graves Protection Act (NAGPRA) is consistent with the federal NAGPRA. Intended to “provide a seamless and consistent state policy to ensure that all California Indian human remains and cultural items be treated with dignity and respect,” the California NAGPRA also encourages and provides a mechanism for the return of remains and cultural items to lineal descendants. Section 8025 established a Repatriation Oversight Commission to oversee this process. The act also provides a process for non–federally recognized tribes to file claims with agencies and museums for repatriation of human remains and cultural items.

2.3.5 – Senate Bill 18

Senate Bill (SB) 18 (California Government Code, Section 65352.3) incorporates the protection of California traditional tribal cultural places into land use planning for cities, counties, and agencies by establishing responsibilities for local governments to contact, refer plans to, and consult with California Native American tribes as part of the adoption or amendment of any general or specific plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005. SB18 requires public notice to be sent to tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission’s SB18 Tribal Consultation list within the geographical areas affected by the proposed changes. Tribes must respond to a local government notice within 90 days (unless a shorter time frame has been agreed upon by the tribe), indicating whether or not they want to consult with the local government. Consultations are for the purpose of preserving or mitigating impacts to places, features, and objects described in Sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 of the Public Resources Code that may be affected by the proposed adoption or amendment to a general or specific plan.
2.3.6—Assembly Bill 52
Assembly Bill (AB) 52 specifies that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change to a defined Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) may result in a significant effect on the environment. AB 52 requires tribes interested in development projects within a traditionally and culturally affiliated geographic area to notify a lead agency of such interest and to request notification of future projects subject to CEQA prior to determining if a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project. The lead agency is then required to notify the tribe within 14 days of deeming a development application subject to CEQA complete to notify the requesting tribe as an invitation to consult on the project. AB 52 identifies examples of mitigation measures that will avoid or minimize impacts to TCR. The bill makes the above provisions applicable to projects that have a notice of preparation or a notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration circulated on or after July 1, 2015. AB 52 amends Sections 5097.94 and adds Sections 21073, 21074, 2108.3.1., 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3 to the California Public Resources Code (PRC), relating to Native Americans.

2.3.7—Health and Safety Code, Sections 7050 and 7052
Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 declares that, in the event of the discovery of human remains outside a dedicated cemetery, all ground disturbances must cease and the county coroner must be notified. Section 7052 establishes a felony penalty for mutilating, disinterring, or otherwise disturbing human remains, except by relatives.

2.3.8—Penal Code, Section 622.5
Penal Code Section 622.5 provides misdemeanor penalties for injuring or destroying objects of historic or archaeological interest located on public or private lands but specifically excludes the landowner.

2.4—County Level

2.4.1—County San Bernardino County Development Code
The County of San Bernardino adheres to the San Bernardino County Development Code Chapter 82.12 that consists of the Cultural Resources Preservation (CP) Overlay. The Overlay, which is established by Sections 82.01.020 and 82.01.030 of the Development Code, is intended to provide for the identification and preservation of important archaeological resources. This is necessary because many of the resources are unique and non-renewable; and the preservation of cultural resources provides a greater knowledge of County history, thus promoting County identity and conserving historic and scientific amenities for the benefit of future generations. The County (per Development Code, Section 82.12.030) requires a project proposed within the CP Overlay to include a report prepared by a qualified professional archaeologist that determines, through appropriate investigation, the presence or absence of archaeological and/or historical resources on the project site and within the project area. The report must also recommend appropriate data recovery or protection measures. The CP Overlay may be applied to areas (determined by cultural resources research and/or inventory) where archaeological and historic sites that warrant preservation are known or are likely to be present.

2.5—Local Level

2.5.1—City of Highland General Plan
The City of Highland has put forth numerous policies with the Goals and Objectives section of the General Plan. These policies were created to identify and preserve the City’s unique historical and archaeological resources for generations (City of Highland 2006).

Goal 5.8
Protect, document and minimize disruption of sites that have archaeological significance.

Policies
1) Avoid significant impacts in all new developments within areas determined to be Archaeologically sensitive through the following measures:
   • Conduct an archaeological records search with the Archaeological Information Center in order to identify potential on-site sensitivities;
• In cooperation with a qualified archaeologist, develop mitigation measures for projects found to be located in or near sensitive areas or sites; and

• Require that environmental review be conducted for all applications within the area designated as archaeologically sensitive, including but not limited to grading, earth moving and stockpiling, and building and demolition permits.

2) Include the following statement as a condition of approval on all development projects: “If cultural resources are discovered during project construction, all work in the area of the find shall cease, and a qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the project sponsor to investigate the find, and to make recommendations on its disposition. If human remains are encountered during construction, all work shall cease and the San Bernardino County Coroner’s Office shall be contacted pursuant to Health and Safety Code provisions.”

3) Coordinate with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians when proposals for development projects are filed within the Areas of Sensitivity for Archaeological Resources (illustrated in Figure 5.2) through the following actions:

• Notify the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians via notification mailings about proposed projects in archaeologically sensitive areas; and

• Invite comments and suggestions to be forwarded to City staff and appropriate decision makers to aid the preservation and development review processes.

2.5.2 – CITY OF HIGHLAND PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

As set forth in Municipal Code 16.32 Historic and Cultural Preservation (Highland Municipal Code 2016) the city council of the City of Highland has found and determined:

A. That the character and history of the city are reflected in its cultural, historical, and architectural heritage;

B. That these historical and cultural foundations should be preserved as living parts of community life and development to build an understanding of the city’s past, so that future generations may have a genuine opportunity to appreciate, enjoy, and understand the rich heritage of the city;

C. That, in the face of ever increasing pressures of modernization and urbanization, city landmarks, neighborhoods, and other areas of historical and cultural interest are threatened with demolition;

D. That pursuant to the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the city of Highland joins with private concerns, the state of California, and the United States Congress to develop preservation programs and activities to give maximum encouragement to agencies and individuals undertaking preservation of the city’s unique architectural, historical, aesthetic, and cultural heritage.

E. The purpose of this chapter is to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare and:

1. To safeguard the city’s unique cultural heritage as embodied and reflected in the city’s architectural history and patterns of cultural development;

---

2. To encourage and facilitate public knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the city’s historic past and unique sense of place;

3. To preserve diverse architectural styles, patterns of development, and design preferences reflecting phases of the city’s history and to encourage complementary contemporary design and construction and inspire a more livable urban environment;

4. To enhance property values and to increase economic and financial benefits to the city and its inhabitants through the exploration of creative financial incentives for preservation;

5. To protect and enhance the city’s attraction to tourists and visitors thereby stimulating business and industry;

6. To identify as early as possible and resolve conflicts between the preservation of cultural resources and alternative land uses;

7. To integrate the preservation of cultural resources into public and private land use management and development processes;

8. To stabilize neighborhoods through the preservation of cultural resources and establishment of historic districts and conservation zones;

9. To encourage public participation in identifying and preserving historical and architectural resources thereby increasing community pride in the city’s cultural heritage;

10. To acknowledge the historic preservation plan “Old Town” as a tool for preservation of the unique character of the city’s Highland Historic District. (Ord. 270 § 6, 2001; Ord. 171 § 8.10, 1994)
The Study Area is subdivided into three separate sections: northern, central and southern, with each section is fenced off from each other. The northern section consists of a single office building and two corrugated metal paneled storage sheds that measures approximately 236-feet north/south by 726-feet east/west. The central section consists of a wooden-sided dispatch office with attached wooden framed service maintenance bay, an above ground fuel storage tank, a single fuel pump station, and a large concrete foundation (50-feet long by 30-feet wide by 4-inches thick). The central section measured approximately 300-feet north/south by 740-feet east/west. The southern section consists of a single office building parking lots (24700 5th Street) a single unidentified structure (274554 5th Street) that was fenced off and couldn’t be surveyed, and a vacant lot located at coroner of the intersection of 5th street and Church Avenue. The southern section measured approximately 174-feet north/south by 836-feet east/west. The elevation within the Study Area is approximately 1200 feet above mean sea level (MSL). The Study Area is developed and the northern portion is currently being used as a wholesale supplier of security fencing, the central and southern portions are dormant and unused.

The County of San Bernardino Office of the Assessor land use designates the Study Area as “Light Industrial”. The topography of the Study Area is characterized as a flat developed land area that is surrounded by built environments that includes: a flood control channel and residential housing tracts on the north and northeast, light industrial complexes/warehouses and commercial enterprises on the eastside of Church Avenue and on the south and west sides of 5th Street, and the Santa Ana River, which is located approximately 320-feet southeast from the intersection of 5th Street and Church Avenue(see Figure 3-11 Site Photos). Review of aerial photographs indicates that the Study Area has been highly disturbed by commercial/industrial activities since 1959. Prior to 1959, historic aerial photographs and USGS historic topographic maps (1954-1964) indicate that the Study Area was undeveloped land.

Geologically, the Study Area is located in the northeastern portion of the San Gabriel Mountain range. The San Gabriel Mountains are situated along the northern province of Los Angeles County and western San Bernardino County. The mountain range is part of the Transverse Ranges and lies between the Los Angeles Basin and the Mojave Desert, with Interstate 5 to the west and Interstate 15 to the east. This range lies in, and is surrounded by, the Angeles National Forest, with the San Andreas Fault as the northern border of the range (Norris and Webb 1976).

Previous mapping of the proposed property indicates surface deposits of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived as alluvial fan deposits from the San Bernardino Mountains to the northeast, via City Creek that currently flows immediately to the east and is diverted adjacent to the north, and also from the Santa Ana River that currently flows immediately to the south (McLeod 2016).
4.1 – Prehistoric Context

Prehistory is most easily discussed chronologically, in terms of environmental change and recognized cultural developments. Several chronologies have been proposed for inland Southern California, the most widely accepted of which is Wallace’s four-part Horizon format (1955), which was later updated and revised by Claude Warren (1968). The advantages and weaknesses of Southern California chronological sequences are reviewed by Warren (in Moratto 1984), Chartkoff and Chartkoff (1984), and Heizer (1978). The following discussion is based on Warren’s (1968) sequence, but the time frames have been adjusted to reflect more recent archaeological findings, interpretations, and advances in radiocarbon dating.

4.1.1 – Paleo-Indian Period (ca. 13,000-11,000 years before present [YBP])

Little is known of Paleo-Indian peoples in inland southern California, and the cultural history of this period follows that of North America in general. Recent discoveries in the Americas have challenged the theory that the first Americans migrated from Siberia, following a route from the Bering Strait into Canada and the Northwest Coast sometime after the Wisconsin Ice Sheet receded (ca. 14,000 YBP), and before the Bering Land Bridge was submerged (ca. 12,000 YBP). Based on new research from the Pacific Rim, it has been proposed that modern humans settled islands of the eastern Pacific between 40,000 and 15,000 years ago. Evidence of coastal migration has also come from sites on islands off Alta and Baja California. As a result, these sites are contemporary with Clovis and Folsom points found in North America’s interior regions. All of these new findings have made the coastal migration theory gain credibility in recent times (Erlandson et al. 2007).

The megafauna that appear to have been the focus of Paleo-Indian life went extinct during a warming trend that began approximately 10,000 years ago, and both the extinction and climatic change (which included warmer temperatures in desert valleys and reduced precipitation in mountain areas) were factors in widespread cultural change. Subsistence and social practices continued to be organized around hunting and gathering, but the resource base was expanded to include a wider range of plant and game resources. Technological traditions also became more localized and included tools specifically for the processing of plants and other materials. This constellation of characteristics has been given the name “Archaic” and it was the most enduring of cultural adaptations to the North American environment.

4.1.2 – Archaic Period (ca. 11,000-3,500 YBP)

The earliest Archaic Period life in inland southern California has been given the name San Dieguito tradition, after the San Diego area where it was first identified and studied (Warren 1968). Characteristic artifacts include stemmed projectile points, crescents and leaf-shaped knives, which suggest a continued subsistence, focus on large game, although not megafauna of the earlier Paleo-Indian period. Milling equipment appears in the archaeological record at approximately 7,500 years ago (Moratto 1984:158). Artifact assemblages with this equipment include basin milling stones and unshaped manos, projectile points, flexed burials under cairns, and cobbled stones, and have been given the name La Jolla Complex (7,500–3,000 YBP). The transition from San Dieguito life to La Jolla life appears to have been an adaptation to drying of the climate after 8,000 YBP, which may have stimulated movements of desert peoples to the coastal regions, bringing...
milling stone technology with them. Groups in the coastal regions focused on mollusks, while inland groups relied on wild-
seed gathering and acorn collecting.

### 4.1.3 – Late Prehistoric Period (ca. 3,500 YBP-A.D. 1769)

Cultural responses to environmental changes around 4,000–3,000 YBP included a shift to more land-based gathering
practices. This period was characterized by the increasing importance of acorn processing, which supplemented the
resources from hunting and gathering. Meighan (1954) identified the period after A.D. 1400 as the San Luis Rey complex.
San Luis Rey I (A.D. 1400–1750) is associated with bedrock mortars and milling stones, cremations, small triangular
projectile points with concave bases and Olivella beads. The San Luis Rey II (A.D. 1750–1850) period is marked by the
addition of pottery, red and black pictographs, cremation urns, steatite arrow straighteners and non-aboriginal materials
that this complex, and the ethnographically described life of the native people of the region, were well established by at
least 1,000 YBP (Keller and McCarthy 1989:80).

### 4.1.4 – Ethnographic Context

Information presented in the California volume of the Handbook of North American Indians (Heizer 1978:575) shows the
Study Area is located near the traditional territory of the Serrano, Luiseño, and Cahuilla. These ethnographic groups are
described below.

#### 4.1.5 – Serrano

The Serrano people speak the Takic language, which is a similar to the dialect spoken by the Luiseno, Cahuilla, and
Gabrielino’s (Bean and Smith 1978). The name Serrano comes from the Spanish word: “mountaineer or highlander” and
refers to the indigenous people inhabiting the San Bernardino Mountains east of the Cajon Pass and may have settled
along the Santa Ana River as early as 8,000 B.C. Their territory has been difficult to define, but it can be reliable
characterized as from the San Bernardino Mountains extending northeast to the Mojave River region, eastward as far as
Twenty-Nine Palms, and south to the Yucaipa Valley (Bean and Smith:1978). The Serrano people were hunters-gathers
and their diet consisted of small game such as rabbits, ground squirrels, and birds that was supplement by pinion nuts,
acorns, agave, tuber-vegetables, and prickly pears. Villages were based on exogamous moieties (marriage outside of
one’s clan) and their size ranged between 25 to hundred people (Bean and Shipek 1978). The Yuhaviatam clan is known
as the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Maarenga’yam clan is known as the Morongo Band of Mission Indians,
with a further, clan division for the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians. The villagers lived in large communal dwellings made
from tree branches that were covered with woven mats. Each family group had its own dwelling, with a central fire pit,
however, the house served primarily as a sleeping and storage area, with most family and subsistence activities taking
place outdoors (Bean and Smith:1978). In 1771, the Serrano’s were subjugated and absorbed into the San Gabriel Mission
system that resulted in the loss of their freedom, cultural and customs. In 1891, the United States created the “San Manuel
Indian Reservation after Chief Santos Manuel. From this date forward the Serrano Indians have been known as the San

#### 4.1.6 – Luiseño

The Luiseño are a Takic speaking people that are usually associated with coastal and inland areas of present day Orange
and southern Riverside counties, with cultural and social behavioral characteristics similar to those of the Cahuilla, a tribal
group generally linked with areas northeast of the San Jacinto Mountains. In fact, exchanges between the Luiseno and
Cahuilla have been well documented. In context, the Study Area is considered a Luiseño area, though evidence of a
Cahuilla presence may be identified (Robinson and Risher 1996:102-103). The term Luiseño derives from the mission
named San Luis Rey and has been used in the region to refer to those Takic-speaking people associated with Mission
San Luis Rey (Bean and Shipek 1978:550). The Luiseño shared boundaries with the Cahuilla, Cupeño, Gabriélino, and
Kumeyaay groups on the east, north, and south, respectively. These different bands shared cultural and language
traditions with the Luiseño. The Luiseño territory comprised from the coast to Agua Hedionda Creek on the south to near
Aliso Creek on the northwest. The boundary extended inland to Santiago Peak, then across to the eastern side of Elsinore
Fault Valley, then southward to the east of Palomar Mountain, then around the southern slope above the valley of San
Jose (ibid.:550). Their habitat covered every ecological zone from the ocean, sandy beaches, shallow inlets, coastal
chaparral, grassy valleys oak groves, among various other niches. The primary food source consisted of game animals such as deer, rabbit, jackrabbit, woodrat, mice, ground squirrels, antelope, and various species of birds. Next to game animals, acorns were the most single important staple, and six different species were utilized (ibid.:552). The Luiseño social structure is unclear; however, each village was a clan-triblet-a people patrilineally related who owned an area in common and who were politically and economically autonomous from neighboring groups. The Luiseño were not organized into exogamous moieties such as were their neighbors, Cahuilla, Cupeno, and Serrano (Strong 1929:291). The hereditary village chief held an administrative position that combined and controlled religious, economic, and warfare powers (Boscana 1933:43). Marriage was arranged by the parents of children and important lineages were allied through marriage. Reciprocally useful alliances were arranged between groups in different ecological niches, and became springboards of territorial expansion, especially following warfare and truces (White1963:130). The Luiseño material culture included an array of tools that were made from stone, wood, bone, and shell, and which served to procure and process the region’s resources. Needs for shelter and clothing were minimal in the region’s forgiving climate, but considerable attention was devoted to personal decoration in ornaments, painting, and tattooing. The local pottery was well made, although it was not elaborately decorated (Laylander and Pham 2012). The Luiseño material culture included an array of tools that were made from stone, wood, bone, and shell, and which served to procure and process the region’s resources. Needs for shelter and clothing were minimal in the region’s forgiving climate, but considerable attention was devoted to personal decoration in ornaments, painting, and tattooing. The local pottery was well made, although it was not elaborately decorated (Laylander and Pham 2012).

4.1.7– CAHUILLA

The Cahuilla occupied a large area in the geographic center of southern California that was bisected by the Cocopa-Maricopa Trail in addition to Santa Fe and Yuman Trails. They occupied an area from the summit of the San Bernardino Mountains in the north to Borrego Springs and the Chocolate Mountains in the south, portions of the Colorado Desert west of Orocopia Mountain to the east, and the San Jacinto Plain near Riverside and the eastern slopes of Palomar Mountain to the west (Bean 1978). The Cahuilla hunted with throwing sticks, clubs, nets, traps, dead falls with seed triggers, spring-poled snares, arrows (often poison tipped) and self-backed and sinew-backed bows. They sometimes fired bush clumps to drive game out in the open, and flares to attract birds at night. Baskets of various kinds were used for winnowing, leaching, grinding, transporting, parching, storing, and cooking. Pottery vessels were used for carrying water, for storage, cooking, serving food and drink. Cahuilla tools included mortars and pestles, manos and metates, fire drills, awls, arrow-straighteners, flint knives, wood, horn, and bone spoons and stirrers, scrapers, and hammer stones. Woven rabbit skin blankets served to keep people warm in cold weather. Feathered costumes were worn for ceremonial events, and at these events the Cahuilla made music using rattles derived from insect cocoon, turtle and tortoise shell, and deer-hoofs, along with wood rasps, bone whistles, bull-roarers, and flutes, to make music. They wove bags, storage pouches, cords, and nets from the fibers of yucca.

4.1.8– EUROPEAN CONTACT

European contact with the Native American groups that likely inhabited the Study Area and surrounding region began in 1542 when Spanish explorer, Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo, arrived by sea during his navigation of the California coast. Sebastían Vizcaino arrived in 1602 during his expedition to explore and map the western coast that Cabrillo visited 60 years earlier. In 1769, another Spanish explorer, Gaspar de Portola, passed through Luiseño/Kumeyaay territory and interacted with the local indigenous groups. In 1798, Mission San Luis Rey was established by the Spanish and it likely integrated the Native Americans from the surrounding region. Multiple epidemics took a great toll on Native American populations between approximately 1800 and the early 1860s (Porretta 1983), along with the cultural and political upheavals that came with European, Mexican, and American settlement (Goldberg 2001:50-52). In the beginning of the nineteenth century, some Spaniards who had worked at the missions began to set up what would later be known as the “Ranchos.” The Rancho era in California history was a period when the entire state was divided into large parcels of land equaling thousands of acres a piece. These large estates were ruled over in a semi-feudal manner by men who had been deeded the land by first the Spanish crown, and later the Mexican government. In 1821 Mexico won independence from Spain and began to dismantle the mission system in California. As the missions began to secularize, they were transformed into small towns and most Native Americans would later be marginalized into reservations or into American society. It was during this time that “Americans” began to enter California. Many of the American Californians married into the Rancho
families, a development that would transform land ownership in Mexican California. By the time the United States annexed California after the Mexican-American War in 1850, much of the Rancho lands were already in the hands of Americans.

4.2– Historic Context

4.2.1 – City of Highland

The Present City of Highland lies in the north and eastern part of the San Bernardino Valley. The land rises from the lowlands to 1600 feet on the slopes of the San Bernardino mountain range, and extends roughly from the west of Victoria Avenue, east to the mouth of the Santa Ana River, north to the United States National Forest line, and south to the Santa Ana River.

Today’s City has evolved from very different settlements that began in 1856 in the northeast at what is now The Village Lakes subdivision at Fifth and Orange Streets. This section came to be known as Cramville after the first white settlers, John Henry Cram and six of his eight sons.

To the west in 1857, the first white settler, Henry Rabel, first bought forty acres on Base Line (which had been set in 1852) west of the present Victoria Avenue. In 1859 he purchased 80 more acres, and the area became known as Rabel Springs because of the large pond filled with clear water from artesian and thermal wells. Rabel erected bath houses and an eleven-room hotel where guests could stay while they bathed in the medicinal springs. There were changes in Rable over the years, and the area became an even more popular recreation spot with the founding of Harlem Springs in 1887, just to the east of Victoria Avenue. With a swimming pool, bath houses, an entertainment hall, and picnic grounds, Harlem also attracted many guests (Beattie 1994).

In 1873 a settlement called Messina was established at Base Line and Palm Avenue. Located in the mid-section of the evolving area, commercial development began with the erection of business building. The first Post Office was established in 1887 in the grocery store, and mail was carried privately for five years to and from San Bernardino before government distribution began (Beattie 1994).

In 1885 the last of these Serrano Indians were moved by the government to the San Manuel Reservation, an area of 640 acres in the foothills on North Victoria Avenue. At one time, there were many more Indians than white in the valley, but a smallpox epidemic in 1862 wiped out whole rancherias. These reservation Indians did much of the manual labor in the area. The women wove beautiful baskets using pine needles and grasses, almost a lost art today. The reservation is now known for its successful Bingo game operations.

From 1883 to 1888 water was provided to this whole area with the building of the North Fork Water Ditch, The Highland Ditch Co., and Bear Valley Lake for storing of irrigation water. As a result, orange groves were planted everywhere. The Cram-Van Leuven Water Ditch, constructed in Cramville in 1858 for irrigation purposes, was incorporated into the North Fork Water Co (Beattie 1994).

In 1881 also, Base Line was opened from Boulder to the base of the Cramville Bench with landowners and Indian labor. The road proceeded north up a canyon at the Bench to the top. This road was washed out in the 1884 flood and never replaced, but a series of county roads were tried which finally ended up in the building of the road up the side of the bluff where a hair-pin turn negotiated the grade for the eastern extension of Base Line to reach Church and Weaver Streets to the east (Beattie 1994).

In 1881 the Santa Fe Railroad had extended its tracks from Los Angeles as far east as Redlands and Mentone. In 1892 the Loop around the Valley was finished from Mentone through Cramville, Highland, and Del Rosa, forming the famous Kite-shaped track from Los Angeles through the San Gabriel Valley to San Bernardino, Redlands, and back to Los Angeles through Riverside and the Santa Ana Valley- or vice versa. The Santa Fe named its depots, and Cramville became East Highlands, Del Rosa became West Highlands, with the central depot Highland. The Post Office in the West Highlands Depot was named Del Rosa (Beattie 1994).
The railroads brought not only more people into the area but industries. Orange and lemon packing houses sprang up at the sites of the depots. Apricots, peaches, grapes and grains had been grown in the early days, but with water for irrigating, and railroads for transportation of crops, orange groves spread everywhere. The area became known particularly as the home of the finest navel oranges in Southern California.

The timber industry began in the mountains above Highland with the founding of the Highland Lumber Company. City Creek Toll Road was opened, a saw mill was erected in Fredalba and a box factory was established at Molino, west of Boulder Avenue on a Santa Fe siding (Beattie 1994).

Sold in 1895 to the Brookings Lumber Company, production of milled lumber increased. At least twenty teams of four to six horse or mule teams hauled the lumber down the mountain toll road to Molino. The company became the largest logging operation in the mountains. Mountain logging was discontinued in 1911, and the plant moved to the Oregon coast. Molino closed in 1914, and in 1919 the old City Creek toll road was made into a county road, increasing the use of the mountains for recreational purposes.

The Messina Post Office move to the Highland Santa Fe Depot in 1899, and Messina changed its name to Highland in response to a petition that year. The district on Base Line was abandoned, and bricks from the buildings were used to reconstruct those in the new business district on Palm and Pacific Avenue (Beattie 1994).

Organized in 1906, the Highland Chamber of Commerce became an organizing force in the development of the early Highland area. In this unincorporated district, the Chamber of Commerce became the mayor, town clerk, and common council, organizing many important and active committees on roads and road care, beautification of the area, and studies of grove and citrus problems. The organization became a supporting unit of the many activities involving the citizens and area industries. The Chamber has remained active through the years, and was a prime force in the formation of the present City of Highland, incorporated November 24, 1987, a city of 32,300 acres covering 13 square miles. In 1984 Highland celebrated its 100-year beginning from its early days as Messina (Beattie 1994).

From 1856 to 1993 the area has evolved from an outstanding agrarian society to a city surrounded by a large urban area, fast becoming, amidst a blend of the old and the new, the successful City of Highland in the eastern San Bernardino Valley (Beattie 1994).
5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 – Cultural Resources Records Search
On September 21, 2016, Mr. Purtell conducted a records search of the Study Area at the CHRIS-SCCIC. The records searches included a review of all recorded archaeological and historical resources within a one-mile radius of the Study Area and within a one-mile radius of the Off-Site Areas as well as a review of cultural resource reports and historic topographic maps on file. In addition, MIG reviewed the California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), the California Historical Landmarks (CHL), the California Register, the National Register, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) listings. The purpose of the record search is to determine whether or not there are previously recorded archaeological or historical resources within the Study Area that require evaluation and treatment. The results also provide a basis for assessing the sensitivity of the Study Area for additional and buried cultural resources.

5.2 – Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Consultation
On September 20, 2016, Mr. Purtell commissioned a SLF records search of the Study Area through the NAHC and conducted follow-up consultation with the thirteen (13) Native American groups and/or individuals identified by the NAHC as having affiliation with the Study Area vicinity. Each Native American group and/or individual listed was sent a project notification letter and map and was asked to convey any knowledge regarding prehistoric or Native American resources (archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, sacred lands, or artifacts) located within the Study Area or surrounding vicinity. The letter included information such as Study Area location and a brief description of the proposed project. Results of the search and follow-up consultation provided information as to the nature and location of additional prehistoric or Native American resources to be incorporated in the assessment whose records may not be available at the CHRIS-SCCIC.

5.3 – Paleontological Resources Records Search
On September 20, 2016, Mr. Purtell commissioned a paleontological resources records search through the Vertebrate Paleontology Section of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLAC). This institution maintains files of regional paleontological site records as well as supporting maps and documents. This record search entailed an examination of current geologic maps and known fossil localities inside and within the general vicinity of the Study Area. The objective of the record search was to determine the geological formations underlying the Study Area, whether any paleontological localities have previously been identified within the Study Area or in the same or similar formations near the Study Area, and the potential for excavations associated with the Study Area to encounter paleontological resources. The results also provide a basis for assessing the sensitivity of the Study Area for additional and buried paleontological resources.

5.4 – Pedestrian Field Survey
On September 30, 2016, MIG (Mr. Purtell) conducted a pedestrian field survey of the Study Area to identify the presence of archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources. Mr. Purtell surveyed 100-percent of the Study Area and detailed notes and digital photographs were also taken of the Study Area and surrounding vicinity.
6.1 – Cultural Resources Records

Results of the records research conducted at the CHRIS-SCCIC indicate that there are no prehistoric sites or cultural resources (prehistoric or historic) recorded within the Study Area and none were observed during the pedestrian field survey.

and the three structures located at 8008 Church Street, 27400, and 27454: 5th Street are less than 45 years old and as a result, are not a historic resource per California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1. However, there are ten (10) historic resources (P-36-007350, P-36-013750, P-36-015497, P-36-020650, P-33-020651, P-33-020652, P-33-020653, P-33-020654, P-33-020655, and P-33-020656) located within a one-mile radius of the Study Area (see Table 1 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within the Study Area). The ten historic resources can be characterized as eight (8) historic residences, one (1) historic site, and one (1) historic linear feature/road. None of these resources will be impacted by the proposed project. The Study Area is mapped in the City of Highland General Plan as having a low sensitivity for archaeological resources (City of Highland General Plan 2006).

Table 1 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource No.</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Date Recorded</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHR Eligibility</th>
<th>CRHR Eligibility</th>
<th>Distance from Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-36-007350</td>
<td>Historic Site</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The historic site consisted of a single concrete foundation, earthen depression, and a trash scatter that was dated between 1890’s-1950. The site measured 33-meters north/south by 23-meters east/west.</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>¾ miles to the northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-013750</td>
<td>Historic Structure</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The historic structure is a single family residence that represents an Early 20th Craftsman/Vernacular Style that was constructed circa 1930’s-1940. The house exhibits a rectangular-shape and wood framed construction.</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>Not Evaluated</td>
<td>1/8 miles to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-015497</td>
<td>Historic Road</td>
<td>1973 Updated 2014</td>
<td>The historic feature is a portion of Baseline Road that was first surveyed by Col. Henry Washington in 1853 and was built in 1850’s. Currently the road is a modern six-lane highway and lacks any of its original historic integrity.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>¾ miles to the north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-020650</td>
<td>Historic Structure</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The historic structure is a one-story family residence exhibiting an irregular shaped wood-framed vernacular-style that was constructed between1945-1960.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>¾ miles to east/northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-020651</td>
<td>Historic Structure</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The historic structure is a one-story wood-framed family residence exhibiting a Ranch-style: L-shaped in plan that was constructed between1931-1951.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>¾ miles to east/northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-020652</td>
<td>Historic Structure</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The historic structure is a wood-framed one-story, vernacular style family residence, rectangular in plan. The structure was built between1945-1960.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>¾ miles to east/northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-020653</td>
<td>Historic Structure</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The historic structure is a wood-framed one-story, Ranch-style family residence, irregular in plan. The residence was constructed between1945-1960.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>¾ miles to east/northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-020654</td>
<td>Historic Structure</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The historic structure is a wood-framed one-story, Ranch-style family residence, irregular in plan. The residence was constructed between1945-1960.</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>¾ miles to east/northeast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The historic structure is a wood-framed one-story, Ranch-style family residence, regular in plan. The residence was constructed between 1945-1960.

Not Eligible  Not Eligible  ¾ miles to east/northeast

The historic structure is a wood-framed one-story, Ranch-style family residence, irregular in plan. The residence was constructed between 1945-1960.

Not Eligible  Not Eligible  ¾ miles to east/northeast

KEY:

NRHR = National Register of Historic Places
CRHP = California Register of Historic Resources

There has been 1 (one) cultural resource study/report (SB-07309) previously conducted adjacent to the proposed project site and seven (7) cultural studies/reports that have been previously conducted within a one-mile radius of the Study Area (see Table 2 Previously Conducted Cultural Reports within the Study Area). These studies were performed for three (3) road improvement projects, two (2) telecommunication towers and support facilities project, one (1) water tunnel and pipeline construction project, and one (1) building construction project. These studies were conducted between 2000 and 2014. A brief description of the one (1) previously recorded cultural study/report (SB-07309) conducted adjacent to the Study Area is provided below.

Table 2 Previously Conducted Cultural Reports within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB-005803</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>An Historical Resources Identification Investigation Of The Light Industrial Shop Building Project, 27262 Meines Street, City Of Highland, San Bernardino County, California</td>
<td>Proposed construction of a light industrial shop building</td>
<td>Stephen, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-07309 Adjacent to the Project Site</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>State of California Department of Transportation, Historic Property Survey Report for the Proposed Tiger II 5th Street Improvement Project.</td>
<td>Road improvement project to include street widening</td>
<td>Tang, Bai, “Tom”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-074465</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Section 106 FCC Submission: Peacock Candidate B, 7793 Central Avenue, Highland, CA. 932346</td>
<td>Construction of cell tower and supporting facilities</td>
<td>Puckett, Heather, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-07569</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Inland Feeder Pipeline Project Final Synthetic Report of Archaeological Findings, San Bernardino County, California</td>
<td>Construction of 95,000-feet of tunnel and 1,000 cubic-feet of pipeline for the Metropolitan Water District.</td>
<td>McDougall, Dennis, P., Onken, Jill, A., Tang, B. Tom, and Hallaran, Kevin, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-07821</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey: Pancho / Ensite #17470 (280002) 2745 Greenspot Road, Highland, San Bernardino County, California 923416 SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of S4 TIS R3W EBI Project No. 61140424</td>
<td>Construction of cell tower and supporting facilities.</td>
<td>Perez, Don, C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-07823</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Due-Diligence Historical / Archaeological Resources Survey Third Street Between Victoria Avenue and Palm Avenue Between the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California CRM TECH Contract No. 2819</td>
<td>Proposed road Improvement project</td>
<td>Tang, Bai, “Tom”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Results

SB-07309: This report was conducted in 2011 and documents the results of the Historic Property Survey Report in support of the proposed Tiger II 5th Street Improvement Project. The report was conducted by CRM TECH on behalf of the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and extended along 5th Street to the on/off ramps on the east side of State Route 210. The report included a Cultural Resources Record Search, Pedestrian field survey, “Ground Truth” of 57 known historical/archaeological resources. The report found that the project would have no adverse effect to state and non-state owned cultural resources (prehistoric, historic, or built environments). The report concluded that no further study was deemed necessary. 7

6.2 – Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Consultation

The NAHC SLF records search results (received September 20, 2016) revealed that there are no known “Native American cultural resources” in the SLF database within the Study Area. As per NAHC suggested procedure, follow-up letters were sent via certified mail on October 6, 2016 to the thirteen (13) Native American Tribes/individuals and organizations identified by the NAHC as being affiliated with the vicinity of the Study Area to request any additional information they may have about Native American cultural resources that may be affected by the proposed project.

As of October 17 2016, MIG has received three (3) responses concerning the proposed project. The Cabazon Band of Mission Indians and the Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians stated that they had no comment regarding the proposed project and the Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians deferred to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. On February 16, 2017, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians responded directly to the City of Highland concerning the proposed project. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians requested specific changes to the report and to the report’s recommended cultural mitigation measures, which are provided in Appendix D of this report.8 As October 26, 2016, MIG has received no other responses from the Native American community concerning the proposed project. MIG will keep the Applicant apprised with the progress of this on-going Native American consultation. The NAHC SLF records search results, the Native American contact list is provided in Appendix B of this report.

6.3 – Paleontological Resources Records Search

Results of the paleontological resources records search through the NHMLAC indicate that no known vertebrate fossil localities from the NHMLAC database have been previously identified within the Study Area or within a one-mile radius. Moreover, no paleontological resources were identified by MIG during the site survey. The Study Area has been previously mapped geologically as surface deposits of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived as alluvial fan deposits from the San Bernardino Mountains to the northeast, via City Creek that currently flows immediately to the east and is diverted adjacent to the north and also from the Santa Ana River that currently flows immediately to the south. These younger Quaternary Alluvium deposits typically do not contain significant fossil vertebrate remains in the uppermost layers but are underlain by older Quaternary deposits at relatively shallow depths below 8-feet may well contain significant vertebrate fossils (McLeod 2016). The paleontological resources records search results letter from the NHMLAC is provided in Appendix C (Paleontology Search Results) of this report.

6.4 – Pedestrian Field Survey

On September 30, 2016, MIG’s Senior Archaeologist Christopher Purtell, M.A., RPA conducted a 100-percent pedestrian field survey of the proposed project site. The results of the pedestrian survey indicated that were no artifacts and/or cultural resources (prehistoric, historic and/or built environments) discovered or recorded during the course of the field survey.

7 CRM Tech. 2011. Historic Property Survey Report: Tiger II 5th Street Improvement Project. Cities of Highland and San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California. Report prepared by CRM Tech, Colton, California 92324; prepared for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 8, San Bernardino California 92401. Report on file at the South Central Costal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton

8 San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. 28 March 2017. Email from San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (Ms. Joan S. Schneider) to the City of Highland (Mr. Thomas Thomsley) in support of the Transition Properties: Design Review Application 2016-014: Tentative Parcel Map 2016-002, City of Highland, CA.
6.4.1 – Other Study Area Conditions
The open spaces of the Study Area’s northern, central, and southern sections can be collectively characterized as a combination of hard packed gravel sediment, asphalt covered driveways, laydown yards, and parking lots. These sections contained sparse vegetation less than 10-percent of the 13.36-acre Study Area and be classified as low-lying ruderal plant species that are approximately 3 to 7-inches in height. Ground visibility was excellent and there was little to no modern-trash except for small quantities of metal bolts, nuts, and washers, rubber modeled part fragments, bailing wire and sections of 1/8-inch chain. The exception to this characterization is the vacant lot located at the intersection of 5th Street and Church Avenue. The vacant lot exhibited soft to semi-hard pack surface that shows a medium tan colored sediment, with a silty/sandy texture, large quantities of surface rocks and cobbles (round and angular shaped) that measured approximately 20-30 centimeters in diameter were observed throughout the project site especially in the western portion. Ground surface visibility was excellent as there was little visible vegetation that obstructed the natural ground surface and the area contained moderate levels of modern man-made trash that included, but not limited to paper and plastic wrappers, various sizes of clear and colored glass fragments. Additionally, on the south side of the lot adjacent to the sidewalk and north of 5th Street was a Southern California Gas Company sign that warned of an underground gas pipeline, suggesting subsurface disturbances within the area (See Figure 11, Site Photograph 18).

6.5 – Tribal Cultural Resources
The results of the records research compiled from the CHRIS-SCCIC, the Scared Lands File Search (commissioned through the NAHC), follow-up Native American Scoping, and the pedestrian field survey failed to indicate known TCR within the Project Boundaries or within a one-mile radius of the Study Area as specified in Public Resources Code (PRC): 210741, 5020.1(k), or 5024.

Although there was no indication of TCRs at the project site and the research and surveys conducted by MIG qualified archaeologists were negative for known or anticipated TCRs, AB 52 (Gatto, 2014) is clear in stating that it is the responsibility of the Public Agency (e.g. Lead Agency) to consult with Native American tribes early in the CEQA process to allow tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the appropriate level of environment review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to TCRs, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see PRC Section 2108..3.2). Specifically, government-to-government consultation may provide “tribal knowledge” of the Study Area that can be used in identifying TCRs that cannot be obtained through other investigative means.
Figure 3 Photographs
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Photograph 1: Study Area, view towards the north.

Photograph 2: Study Area, view towards the south.
Figure 4 Photographs

Photograph 3: Study Area, view towards the east.

Photograph 4: Study Area, view towards the west.
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Figure 5 Site Photos

Photograph 5: Study Area, northern section.

Photograph 6: Study Area, central section.
Figure 6 Photographs

Photograph 7: Study Area, southern section.

Photograph 8: Metal Shed No. 1, northern section.
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Photograph 9: Metal Shed No. 2, northern section.

Photograph 10: Maintenance Area, central section.
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Figure 8 Photographs

Photograph 11: Yard Office, central section.

Photograph 12: Above Ground Fuel Tank, central section.
Figure 9 Photographs

Church & 5th Warehouses Project
City of Highland, San Bernardino County, California

Photograph 13: Foundation Pad, central section.

Photograph 14: Building located at 2700 5th Street.
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Photograph 15: Building located at 27454 5th Street

Photograph 16: Vacant Lot, southern section, view towards the east.

Figure 10 Photographs
Church & 5th Warehouses Project
City of Highland, San Bernardino County, California
Figure 11 Photographs

Photograph 17: Alley between central and southern sections, view towards the east.

Photograph 18: Gas Pipeline Sign, vacant lot, view towards the east.
Evaluation of cultural resources is determined by conducting an “evaluation” of a resource’s eligibility for listing in the California Register; determining whether it qualifies as a “unique archaeological resource”; and determining whether the resource retains integrity. This is achieved by applying the California Register criteria (including criteria for a “unique archaeological resource”) as defined in Section 2 of this report. If a resource is determined eligible for listing in the California Register or qualifies as a “unique archaeological resource” and retains integrity, then the resource is considered an archaeological resource and/or a historical resource pursuant to CEQA §15064.5, and any substantial adverse change to the resource is considered a significant impact on the environment. The CEQA guidelines do not provide criteria to evaluate paleontological resources.

7.1 – Archaeological Resources
As discussed previously in Chapter 6, no known archaeological resources from the SCCIC records were recorded within the Study Area and no resources were identified during the site survey. Despite the heavy disturbances of the Study Area that may have displaced archaeological resources on the surface, it is possible that intact archaeological resources exist at depth. As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 9 to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

7.2 – Historical Resources
As discussed previously in Chapter 6, no known historical resources from the SCCIC records were recorded within the Study Area. However, archival research indicated that there are four (4) existing structures with varying construction/built dates ranging from circa 1966 to 1968 located within the Project Boundaries that will be impacted by the proposed project. The four existing structures include: 2 corrugated metal paneled sheds, a dispatch office with attached wooden-frame maintenance service bay, an office building located at 27400 5th Street, and an building located at 27454 5th Street that are 45 years old or older, thus requiring evaluation as historic sites to determine if these structures are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Place (NRHP) or California Register of Historic Resources (HRCR). Additionally, there are ten (10) historic resources (P-36-007350, P-36-013750, P-36-015497, P-36-020650, P-33-020651, P-33-020652, P-33-020653, P-33-020654, P-33-020655, and P-33-020656) located within a one-mile radius of the Study Area. None of these historic resources will be impacted by the proposed project; therefore, no evaluation of these historic resources is necessary.

7.2.1 – Evaluation
Criterion A/1 – Event
An evaluation of the four historic built environments (2 corrugated metal paneled sheds, a dispatch office with attached wooden-frame maintenance service bay, an office building located at 27400 5th Street and a building located at 27454 5th Street) do not appear to be individually or collectively eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion A or the California Register under Criterion 1 for association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local, state or national history. Archival research failed to indicate that any of the four structures made a significant contribution to social, political and economic trends that were occurring to urban planning during the era such that it would be individually or collectively eligible for listing on the National Register or California Register.

Criterion B/2 – Person
The four historic built environments do not appear to be individually or collectively eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion B or the California Register 2 for resources that are associated with the lives of persons significant in history. There is no indication that any figure of importance is associated with these buildings or structures.

Criterion C/3 – Design/Construction
The four historic built environments do not appear to be individually listed on the National Register under Criterion C or the California Register under Criterion 3. The design of the four structures follows the post-war trend in corrugated steel construction and ranch style architecture. Widely used and often mass-produced, the 2 metal sheds do not embody distinctive characteristics of a particular type, period or method of construction. Again the two building do not embody
distinctive characteristics of a particular type, period or method of construction. These structures do not reach individual significance that would make it eligible for listing on the National Register or California Register.

**Criterion D/4 – Information Potential**
Criterion D/4 is typically related to archeological resources rather than built resources. When Criterion D/4 does relate to built resources, it is for cases when the building itself is the principal sources of important construction-related information. Based on historic research, this criterion is not applicable to the four existing structures.

### 7.2.2 – Integrity
The 2 corrugated metal paneled sheds and the dispatch office with attached wooden-frame maintenance service bay have retained their integrity. They remain in their original location, design and setting. These structures materials are intact and appear to have undergone little change since its construction in circa 1966 (Historic Aerial Photographs) However, there is little contribution of workmanship, feeling or association for these structures. Though it does maintain integrity, it is not sufficient for eligibility. The buildings located at 27400 5th Street and at 27454 5th Street have had design alternations to their exteriors between 1980-1994 (San Bernardino County Office of the Assessors and Historic Aerial Photographs) and are not eligible for listing.

### 7.2.3 – Conclusion
The four historic built environments do not appear to reach the level of significance to be in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. The City of Highland does maintain a local register. These four structures are not a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

### 7.3 – Paleontological Resources
As discussed previously in Chapter 6, no known paleontological resources from the NHMLAC records were recorded within the Study Area and no paleontological resources were identified during the site survey. More over the Study Area has been previously mapped geologically as surface deposits of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived as alluvial fan deposits from the San Bernardino Mountains to the northeast, via City Creek that currently flows immediately to the east and is diverted adjacent to the north and also from the Santa Ana River that currently flows immediately to the south. These younger Quaternary Alluvium deposits typically do not contain significant fossil vertebrate remains in the uppermost layers but are underlain by older Quaternary deposits at relatively shallow depths below 8-feet may well contain significant vertebrate fossils (McLeod 2016). As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 9 to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered paleontological resources or unique geological features that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

### 7.4 – Tribal Cultural Resources
As discussed in Chapter 6, the results of the records research compiled from the CHRIS-SCCIC, the Scared Lands File Search (commissioned through the NAHC), follow-up Native American Scoping, and the pedestrian field survey failed to indicate known TCR within the Project Boundaries or within a one-mile radius of the Study Area as specified in Public Resources Code (PRC): 210741, 5020.1(k), or 5024. Therefore, no further investigation is necessary; however, despite the heavy disturbances of the Study Area that may have displaced or submerged TCR’s on the surface, it is possible that intact TCR’s exist at depth in subsurface soils. Due to this uncertainty, mitigation measures are included in Chapter 9 to address any previously undiscovered archaeological resources relating to TCR’s encountered during project implementation. Incorporation of mitigation will ensure that potential impacts to buried TCRs are less than significant through requirements for evaluation, salvage, curation, and reporting.

Although there was no indication of TCRs at the project site and the research and surveys conducted by MIG qualified archaeologists were negative for known or anticipated TCRs, AB 52 (Gatto, 2014) is clear in stating that it is the responsibility of the Public Agency (e.g. Lead Agency) to consult with Native American tribes early in the CEQA process to allow tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the appropriate level of environment review,
identify and address potential adverse impacts to TCRs, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see PRC Section 2108.3.2). Specifically, government-to-government consultation may provide “tribal knowledge” of the Study Area that can be used in identifying TCRs that cannot be obtained through other investigative means.
The purpose of this Section is to discuss the potential impacts to archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources, and human remains associated with implementing the proposed project.

8.1 – CEQA Significance Thresholds

8.1.1 – Archaeological Resources

The current CEQA Guidelines state that a project will have a significant impact on the environment if it will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. According to the CEQA Guidelines, an archaeological resource is further defined as a resource that qualifies as a “historical resource” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 or a “unique archaeological resource” pursuant to Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code. These terms are defined earlier in this report. Therefore, a project will have a significant impact on the environment if it will cause a “substantial adverse change” in the significance of a historical resource or “damage” to a unique archaeological resource. A “substantial adverse change” (as defined in the CEQA Guidelines) is caused when one or more of the following occurs:

- 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.

- The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:
  - 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
  - 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 a 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
  - Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

The CEQA Guidelines do not define “damage” when it comes to unique archaeological resources, but it can be reasonably interpreted as having a meaning similar to that of “substantial adverse change” (as defined above).

8.1.2 – Historical Resources

The current CEQA Guidelines state that a project will have a significant impact on the environment if it will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. According to the CEQA Guidelines, a historical resource is further defined as a resource that qualifies for listing in the California Register or another federal or local register. The criteria for listing are defined earlier in this report. Therefore, a project will have a significant impact on the environment if it will cause a “substantial adverse change” in the significance of a historical resource. The definition of “substantial adverse change” is provided in the previous section, 8.1.1.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards) are codified at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 67.7. In most circumstances, the Standards are relevant in assessing whether there is a substantial adverse change under CEQA. Section 15064.5b(3) of the CEQA Guidelines states in part that “... a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating,
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Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource,” and therefore may be considered categorically exempt.

8.1.3 – Paleontological Resources
The current CEQA Guidelines state that a project will have a significant impact on the environment if it will directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. The CEQA Guidelines do not define “directly or indirectly destroy,” but it can be reasonably interpreted as the physical damage, alteration, disturbance, or destruction of a paleontological resource.

8.1.4 – Tribal Cultural Resources
Assembly Bill (AB) 52 specifies that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change to a defined Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) may result in a significant effect on the environment. AB 52 requires tribes interested in development projects within a traditionally and culturally affiliated geographic area to notify a lead agency of such interest and to request notification of future projects subject to CEQAA prior to determining if a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project. The lead agency is then required to notify the tribe within 14 days of deeming a development application subject to CEQA complete to notify the requesting tribe as an invitation to consult on the project. AB 52 identifies examples of mitigation measures that will avoid or minimize impacts to TCR. The bill makes the above provisions applicable to projects that have a notice of preparation or a notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration circulated on or after July 1, 2015. AB 52 amends Sections 5097.94 and adds Sections 21073, 21074, 2108.3.1., 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3 to the California Public Resources Code (PRC), relating to Native Americans.

AB 52 (Gatto, 2014) is clear in stating that it is the responsibility of the Public Agency (e.g. Lead Agency) to consult with Native American tribes early in the CEQA process to allow tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the appropriate level of environment review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to TCRs, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see PRC Section 2108..3.2). Specifically, government-to-government consultation may provide “tribal knowledge” of the Study Area that can be used in identifying TCRs that cannot be obtained through other investigative means.

8.1.5 – Human Remains
The current CEQA Guidelines state that a project will have a significant impact on the environment if it will disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The CEQA Guidelines do not define “disturb” but it can be reasonably interpreted as the physical damage, alteration, disturbance, or destruction of any human remains.

8.2 – Potential Impacts

8.2.1 – Project Description
As discussed earlier, the proposed project would include the new construction of 117,860-square-foot warehouse buildings on 13.36-acres located at the northwest corner of 5th Street at Church Avenue in the City of Highland, California. Excavations associated with implementation of the proposed project would occur across the majority of the Study Area.

8.2.2 – Archaeological Resources
Results from the CHRIS-SCCIC indicated that there were no previously recorded archaeological resources within the Study Area and no archaeological resources were identified during the pedestrian survey. Despite the heavy disturbances of the Study Area that may have displaced archaeological resources on the surface, it is possible that intact archaeological resources exist at depth. As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in the following chapter to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.
8.2.3—Historical Resources
Results from the CHRIS-SCCIC indicated that there were no previously recorded historical resources within the Study Area. However, archival research indicated that there are four (4) existing structures with varying construction/built dates ranging from circa 1966 to 1968 located within the Project Boundaries that will be impacted by the proposed project. The four existing structures include: 2 corrugated metal paneled sheds, a dispatch office with attached wooden-frame maintenance service bay, an office building located at 27400 5th Street, and an building located at 27454 5th Street that are 45 years old or older, thus requiring evaluation as historic sites to determine if these structures are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Place (NRHP) or California Register of Historic Resources (HRCR). The results of the historic site evaluation on the four existing structures determined they are not eligible for listing in the National or California Registers under any of the significance criteria. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

8.2.4—Paleontological Resources
Results of the paleontological resources records search through NHMLAC indicate that no vertebrate fossil localities from the NHMLAC records have been previously recorded within the Study Area or within a one-mile radius. Moreover, no paleontological resources were identified by MIG during the pedestrian survey. Nevertheless, the results of the literature review and the search at the NHMLAC indicate that the Study Area is situated upon surface deposits of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived as alluvial fan deposits from the San Bernardino Mountains to the northeast, via City Creek that currently flows immediately to the east and is diverted adjacent to the north and also from the Santa Ana River that currently flows immediately to the south. These younger Quaternary Alluvium deposits typically do not contain significant fossil vertebrate remains in the uppermost layers but are underlain by older Quaternary deposits at relatively shallow depths below 8-feet may well contain significant vertebrate fossils (McLeod 2016). As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in the following chapter to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered paleontological resources or unique geological features that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

8.2.5—Tribal Cultural Resources
Assembly Bill (AB) 52 specifies that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change to a defined Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) may result in a significant effect on the environment. AB 52 requires tribes interested in development projects within a traditionally and culturally affiliated geographic area to notify a lead agency of such interest and to request notification of future projects subject to CEQA prior to determining if a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project. The lead agency is then required to notify the tribe within 14 days of deeming a development application subject to CEQA complete to notify the requesting tribe as an invitation to consult on the project. AB 52 identifies examples of mitigation measures that will avoid or minimize impacts to TCR. The bill makes the above provisions applicable to projects that have a notice of preparation or a notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration/mitigated negative declaration circulated on or after July 1, 2015. AB 52 amends Sections 5097.94 and adds Sections 21073, 21074, 2108.3.1., 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3 to the California Public Resources Code (PRC), relating to Native Americans.

The results of the records research compiled from the CHRIS-SCCIC, the Scared Lands File Search (commissioned through the NAHC), follow-up Native American Scoping, and the pedestrian field survey failed to indicate known TCR within the Project Boundaries or within a one-mile radius of the Study Area as specified in Public Resources Code (PRC): 210741, 5020.1(k), or 5024. Despite the heavy disturbances of the Study Area that may have displaced or submerged tribal cultural resources on the surface, it is possible that intact tribal cultural resources exist at depth in subsurface soils. Due to this uncertainty, mitigation measures are included in Chapter 9 to address any previously undiscovered archaeological resources relating to TCR’s encountered during project implementation. Incorporation of mitigation will ensure that potential impacts to buried TCRs are less than significant through requirements for evaluation, salvage, curation, and reporting.

Although there was no indication of TCRs at the project site and the research and surveys conducted by MIG qualified archaeologists were negative for known or anticipated TCRs, AB 52 (Gatto, 2014) is clear in stating that it is the responsibility of the Public Agency (e.g. Lead Agency) to consult with Native American tribes early in the CEQA process
to allow tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the appropriate level of environment review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to TCRs, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see PRC Section 2108.3.2). Specifically, government-to-government consultation may provide "tribal knowledge" of the Study Area that can be used in identifying TCRs that cannot be obtained through other investigative means.

8.2.6 – HUMAN REMAINS

No known human remains have been identified from the CHRIS-SCCIC database within a one-mile radius of the Study Area. No human remains were identified during the pedestrian survey of the Study Area. However, these findings do not preclude the existence of previously unknown human remains located below the ground surface, which may be encountered during construction excavations associated with the proposed project. As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in the following Section that would reduce potentially significant impacts to previously unknown human remains that may be unexpectedly discovered during project implementation to a less than significant level.
9 RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

9.1 – Archeological Resources

In the event of the unanticipated discovery of archaeological or cultural resources relating to TCR’s during earthmoving operations the following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources that are accidentally discovered during implementation of the proposed project to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure CULT-1: Conduct Archaeological Sensitivity Training for Construction Personnel. The Applicant shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist who meets U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards, to conduct an Archaeological Sensitivity Training for construction personnel prior to commencement of excavation activities. The training session shall be carried out by a cultural resources professional with expertise in archaeology, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. The training session will include a handout and will focus on how to identify archaeological and tribal cultural resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities and the procedures to be followed in such an event, the duties of archaeological monitors, and the general steps a qualified professional archaeologist would follow in conducting a salvage investigation if one is necessary.

Mitigation Measure CULT-2: Cease Ground-Disturbing Activities and Implement Treatment Plan if Archaeological Resources Are Encountered. In the event that archaeological or tribal cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 50-feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until a qualified archaeologist has examined the newly discovered artifact(s) and has evaluated the area of the find. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. Should the newly discovered artifacts be determined to be prehistoric, Native American Tribes/Individuals should be contacted and consulted and Native American construction monitoring should be initiated. The Applicant and City shall coordinate with the archaeologist to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The plan may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to address treatment of the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis.

Mitigation Measure CULT-3: Monitor Construction Excavations for Archeological Resources in Younger Alluvial Sediments. The Applicant shall retain a qualified archaeological monitor, who will work under the direction and guidance of a qualified professional archaeologist, who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards. The archaeological monitor shall be present during all construction excavations (e.g., grading, trenching, or clearing/grubbing) into non-fill younger Pleistocene alluvial sediments. Multiple earth-moving construction activities may require multiple archaeological monitors. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, proximity to known archaeological resources, the materials being excavated (native versus artificial fill soils), and the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of archaeological resources encountered. Full-
time monitoring can be reduced to part-time inspections if determined adequate by the project archaeologist.

**Mitigation Measure CULT-4:** Prepare Report Upon Completion of Monitoring Services. The archaeological monitor, under the direction of a qualified professional archaeologist who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications and Standards, shall prepare a final report at the conclusion of archaeological monitoring. The report shall be submitted to the Applicant, the South Central Costal Information Center, the City, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the project and required mitigation measures. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register and CEQA, and treatment of the resources.

### 9.2 – Historical Resources

The proposed project would not impact historical resources therefore no mitigation measures are recommended.

### 9.3 – Paleontological Resources

The following mitigation measures have been recommended to reduce potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources as recommended by the NHMLAC during implementation of the proposed project to a less than significant level:

**Mitigation Measure CULT-5:** Conduct Paleontological Sensitivity Training for Construction Personnel. The Applicant shall retain a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, shall conduct a Paleontological Sensitivity Training for construction personnel prior to commencement of excavation activities. The training will include a handout and will focus on how to identify paleontological resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities, and the procedures to be followed in such an event; the duties of paleontological monitors; notification and other procedures to follow upon discovery of resources; and, the general steps a qualified professional paleontologist would follow in conducting a salvage investigation if one is necessary.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-6:** Monitor Construction Excavations for Paleontological Resources is required at depths and strata’s at six (6) feet and below in sediment identified as older Quaternary deposits. The Applicant shall retain a qualified paleontological monitor, who will work under the guidance and direction of a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. The paleontological monitor shall be present during all construction excavations (e.g., grading, trenching, or clearing/grubbing) into non-fill older Pleistocene alluvial deposits. Multiple earth-moving construction activities may require multiple paleontological monitors. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, proximity to known paleontological resources and/or unique geological features, the materials being excavated (native versus artificial fill soils), and the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of paleontological resources and/or unique geological features encountered. Full-time monitoring can be reduced to part-time inspections if determined adequate by the qualified professional paleontologist.

**Mitigation Measure CULT-7:** Cease Ground-Disturbing Activities and Implement Treatment Plan if Paleontological Resources Are Encountered. In the event that paleontological resources and or unique geological features are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can
be evaluated. A buffer area of at least 50 feet shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue until appropriate paleontological treatment plan has been approved by the Applicant and the City. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. The Applicant and City shall coordinate with a professional paleontologist, who meets the qualifications set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. Treatment may include implementation of paleontological salvage excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis or preservation in place. At the paleontologist’s discretion and to reduce construction delay, the grading and excavation contractor shall assist in removing rock samples for initial processing.

Mitigation Measure CULT-8: Prepare Report Upon Completion of Monitoring Services. Upon completion of the above activities, the professional paleontologist shall prepare a report summarizing the results of the monitoring and salvaging efforts, the methodology used in these efforts, as well as a description of the fossils collected and their significance. The report shall be submitted to the Applicant, the City, the Museum, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the project and required mitigation measures.

9.4 – Human Remains
Components of the proposed project that require excavation activities, the following mitigation measure is recommended to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously unknown human remains that are unexpectedly discovered during excavations to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure CULT-9: Cease Ground-Disturbing Activities and Notify County Coroner If Human Remains Are Encountered. If human remains are unearthed during implementation of the Proposed Project, the City of Highland and the Applicant shall comply with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. The City of Highland and the Applicant shall immediately notify the County Coroner and no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). After the MLD has inspected the remains and the site, they have 48 hours to recommend to the landowner the treatment or disposal, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated funerary objects. Upon the reburial of the human remains, the MLD shall file a record of the reburial with the NAHC and the project archaeologist shall file a record of the reburial with the CHRIS-SCCIC. If the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD, or the MLD identified fails to make a recommendation, or the landowner rejects the recommendation of the MLD and the mediation provided for in Subdivision (k) of Section 5097.94, if invoked, fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall inter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.

*The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians recommended cultural resource mitigation measures for proposed Project can found in Appendix D of this Report
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Christopher W. Purtell, M.A., RPA
SENIOR ARCHAEOLOGIST

Christopher Purtell is an archaeologist and archaeological project manager with over ten years of professional experience. He is well-versed in project management, environmental compliance, subcontracting, archaeological survey, excavation, monitoring, data recovery, laboratory analysis, and in the development of mitigation and treatment plans.

Mr. Purtell has successfully coordinated cultural resource projects, mitigation measures, and recommendations pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Mr. Purtell has worked with a variety of lead and regulatory agencies, including Los Angeles County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, Ventura County, Orange County, Kern County, Inyo County, Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, among others. Mr. Purtell is a Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) and his training and background meet the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards as a Principle Investigator and Field Director for prehistoric and historic archaeology.

His project management duties have included profit and loss responsibilities, budget management, scope preparation, project task administration, Native American scoping/consultation, subcontractor evaluation and procurement, coordination with lead agencies, clients, and project result meetings with the public and stakeholders both in public and in private forms. His experience also includes cultural resources staff management, review and oversight of cultural surveys results and site recordation to include GIS management and databases, preparation of technical reports and overseeing the quality control assurance of all deliverables.

AFFILIATIONS
- Register of Professional Archaeologist (ID No. 990027)
- Society for American Archaeology (SAA)
- Society for California Archaeology (SCA)

TRAINING
- OSHA 8-hr Annual HazWaste Operations Refresher Certification, March 2016
- OSHA 40-hr HazWaste Operations Certification (Certification No. 10052), January 2014

EDUCATION
- Master of Arts, Anthropology (Emphasis in Archaeology), California State University Fullerton, Fullerton, CA
- Bachelor of Arts, Anthropology/Archaeology, Minor in Geography, California State University Dominguez Hills, Carson, CA

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE
- Senior Archaeologist and Project Manager, Section 106 Evaluation Assessment for the Lytle Creek Ranch South Residential Commercial Development-City of Rialto, San Bernardino County
- Senior Archaeologist, PSEP SL32-21 Pasadena Hydro-test Project for Southern California Gas Company-City of Pasadena, County of Los Angeles
- Senior Archaeologist, PSEP SL 36-9-09 North Section Pismo Beach Hydro-test Project for Southern California Gas Company-City of Pismo Beach, County of San Luis Obispo
- Senior Archaeologist, Long Span P610466 & P613008 Project for San Diego Gas and Electric-City of Bonsall, County of San Diego
- Senior Cultural Resources Specialist, Grounding Rods and Laterals Installation at San Fernando Substation for Southern California Edison-City of San Fernando, County of Los Angeles
- Senior Archaeologist and Project Manager, Cultural Resources Assessment for the Proposed North San Diego County Recycled Water Project-San Diego County
- Senior Archaeologist and Project Manager, Archaeological Survey Report California Street Off-Ramp Project-City of Ventura, Ventura County
- Project Manager and Senior Cultural Resources Coordinator, Runway Safety Area Improvement to Runway 6L-24R
- Project-Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles County
September 20, 2016

Christopher W. Purtell
MIG

Sent by E-mail: cpurtell@migcom.com

RE: Proposed Church & 5th Street Warehouse Project, City of Highland; Redlands USGS Quadrangle, San Bernardino County, California

Dear Mr. Purtell:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File was completed for the area of potential project effect (APE) referenced above with negative results. Please note that the absence of specific site information in the Sacred Lands File does not indicate the absence of Native American cultural resources in any APE.

Attached is a list of tribes culturally affiliated to the project area. I suggest you contact all of the listed Tribes. If they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. The list should provide a starting place to locate areas of potential adverse impact within the APE. By contacting all those on the list, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the NAHC requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact via email: gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Gayle Totton, M.A., PhD.
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
San Bernardino County
9/20/2016

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Director
5401 Dinah Shore Drive
Palm Springs, CA, 92264
Phone: (760) 699-6907
Fax: (760) 699-6924
ACBCI-THPO@aguacaliente.net

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians
Shane Chapparosa, Chairperson
P.O. Box 189
Warner Springs, CA, 92086-0189
Phone: (760) 782-0711
Fax: (760) 782-0712
Chapparosa@msn.com

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
Jeff Grubbe, Chairperson
5401 Dinah Shore Drive
Palm Springs, CA, 92264
Phone: (760) 699-6800
Fax: (760) 699-6919

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians
John Perada, Environmental Director
P.O. Box 189
Warner Springs, CA, 92086
Phone: (760) 782-0712
Fax: (760) 782-2730

Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
Amanda Vences, Chairperson
P.O. Box 846
Coachella, CA, 92236
Phone: (760) 398-4722
Fax: (760) 369-7161

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Robert Martin, Chairperson
12700 Pumarra Road
Banning, CA, 92220
Phone: (951) 649-8807
Fax: (951) 922-8146

Cabazon Band of Mission Indians
Doug Welmas, Chairperson
84-245 Indio Springs Parkway
Indio, CA, 92203
Phone: (760) 342-2593
Fax: (760) 347-7860

Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
John Gomez, Environmental Coordinator
P.O. Box 391670
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951) 763-4105
Fax: (951) 763-4325
jgomez@ramonatribe.com

Cahuilla Band of Indians
Luther Salgado, Chairperson
52701 U.S. Highway 371
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951) 763-5549
Fax: (951) 763-2808
Chairman@cahuilla.net

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

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7055.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5007.94 of the Public Resources Section 5097.08 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contracting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Church & 1st Street Warehouse, San Bernardino County.
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Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
San Bernardino County
9/20/2016

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA, 91322
Phone: (760) 885-0955
tsen2u@hotmail.com

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Lee Clauss, Director of Cultural Resources
28559 Community Center Drive
Highland, CA, 92346
Phone: (909) 864-8933
Fax: (909) 864-3370
lclauss@sanmanuel-nsn.gov

Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians
Steven Estrada, Chairperson
P.O. Box 961820
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951) 659-2700
Fax: (951) 659-2228

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

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
Carrie Garcia, Cultural Resources Manager
P.O. Box 487
San Jacinto, CA, 92588
Phone: (951) 654-2765
Fax: (951) 654-4198
carrieg@soboba-nsn.gov

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department
P.O. BOX 487
San Jacinto, CA, 92581
Phone: (951) 663-5279
Fax: (951) 654-4198
jonliveros@soboba-nsn.gov

Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
Michael Mirelez, Cultural Resource Coordinator
P.O. Box 1160
Thermal, CA, 92274
Phone: (760) 399-0022, Ext. 1213
Fax: (760) 397-8146
mmirelez@tdmcl.org

Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
Mary Resvaloso, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1160
Thermal, CA, 92274
Phone: (760) 397-0300
Fax: (760) 397-8146
tmchair@torresmartinez.org

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 5007.94 of the Public Resources Code Section 5007.94 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Church & 5th Street Warehouse, San Bernardino County.

PROJ-002265 09/20/2016 10:34 AM 2 of 2
Native American Consultation Record

Project Name: Church and 5th Warehouse Project  
Project Number: 13534  
NAHC Contact Initiated: 9/20/2016  
NAHC Letter Received: 9/20/2016

Results: The NAHC Sacred Lands File (SLF) Search failed to indicate Native American Cultural Resources within the Study Area. The NAHC recommended that we contact thirteen (13) Native American groups/individuals listed below.

Matrix prepared by Chris Purtell  
Follow Up conducted by Katherine Zamora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Name</th>
<th>Date Contact was Initiated</th>
<th>Method of Contact</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 1:52 p.m.: left voice mail message, no response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Harvey, Archaeological Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator 760-699-6907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 1:54 p.m.: left voice mail message, no response. February 16, 2017, the Tribe responded the City of Highland via email, requesting specific changes to the project Phase 1 Cultural Assessment including modifications the report's cultural resources mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Clauss, Director of Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909-864-8933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 1:59 p.m.: left voice mail message, no response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Valenzuela, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-885-0955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 2:02 p.m.: left voice mail message, no response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Martin, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951-849-8807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Name</td>
<td>Date Contact was Initiated</td>
<td>Method of Contact</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 2:04 p.m.: left voice mail message, no response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Director</td>
<td>760-699-6907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabazon Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 3:04 p.m. the Tribe had no comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Williams, Chairperson</td>
<td>760-342-2593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Stapp</td>
<td>760-238-4741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 2:08 p.m.: left voice mail message, no response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther Salgado, Chairperson</td>
<td>951-763-5549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 2:12 p.m.: the Tribe had no comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Chapparosa, Chairperson</td>
<td>760-782-0711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice, Tribal Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 2:15 p.m.: the Tribe requested email notification that was sent on October 17, 2016, no response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gomez, Environmental Coordinator</td>
<td>951-763-4105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 2:19 p.m.: the Tribe requested email notification that was sent on October 17, 2016, no response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Estrada, Chairperson</td>
<td>951-659-2700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrano Nation of Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @2:19 p.m.: left voice mail message, no response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldie Walker, Chairperson</td>
<td>909-528-9027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Name</td>
<td>Date Contact was Initiated</td>
<td>Method of Contact</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soboba Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 2:23 p.m.: left voice mail message, no response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Garcia, Cultural Resources Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951-654-2765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>10/6/2016</td>
<td>U.S. Certified Mail</td>
<td>Follow-up call on October 17, 2016 @ 2:25 p.m.: the Tribe deferred to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Miretz, Cultural Resources Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-399-0022, ext. 1213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MIG / Hogle-Ireland
1500 Iowa Avenue, Suite 110
Riverside, CA 92507

Attn: Christopher W. Purcell, Senior Archaeologist

re: Vertebrate Paleontology Records Check for paleontological resources for the proposed 5th and Church St. Warehouse Project, in the City of Highland, San Bernardino County, project area

Dear Christopher:

I have conducted a thorough search of our paleontology collection records for the locality and specimen data for the proposed 5th and Church St. Warehouse Project, in the City of Highland, San Bernardino County, project area as outlined on the portion of the Redlands USGS topographic quadrangle map that you sent to me via e-mail on 20 September 2016. We have no fossil vertebrate localities that lie directly within the proposed project boundaries, but we do have localities at some distance in sedimentary deposits similar to those that occur at depth in the proposed project area.

In the entire proposed project area the surface deposits consist of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived as alluvial fan deposits from the San Bernardino Mountains to the northeast, via City Creek that currently flows immediately to the east and is diverted adjacent to the north and also from the Santa Ana River that currently flows immediately to the south. These younger Quaternary Alluvium deposits typically do not contain significant fossil vertebrate remains in the uppermost layers but are underlain by older Quaternary deposits at relatively shallow depth that may well contain significant vertebrate fossils. Our closest vertebrate fossil locality from somewhat similar deposits is LACM 4540, south-southeast of the proposed project area on the northeastern side of the San Jacinto Valley just west of Jack Rabbit Trail, that produced a...
specimen of fossil horse, *Equus*. Our next closest fossil vertebrate locality from similar deposits is LACM 7811, west-southwest of the proposed project area near Mira Loma east of Archibald Avenue along Sumner Road north of Cloverdale Road, that produced a fossil specimen of whipsnake, *Masticophis*, at a depth of 9 to 11 feet below the surface.

Shallow excavations in the younger Quaternary Alluvium exposed throughout the proposed project area probably will not encounter any significant vertebrate fossils. Deeper excavations that extend down into older sedimentary deposits, however, may well uncover significant fossil vertebrate remains. Any substantial excavations below the uppermost layers, therefore, should be monitored closely to quickly and professionally recover any fossil remains discovered while not impeding development. Also, sediment samples should be collected and processed to determine the small fossil potential in the proposed project area. Any fossils recovered during mitigation should be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations.

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Samuel A. McLeod, Ph.D.
Vertebrate Paleontology

enclosure: invoice
Mitigation Measures (MM) Cult-1:
Prior to construction, SMBMI respectfully requests that all staff on the ground during construction activities undergo cultural sensitivity training, conducted by SMBMI personnel, in tandem with archaeological sensitivity training conducted by the Applicant’s retained qualified professional archaeologist. This training will inform personnel of the need for tribal representatives during ground disturbing activity due to their increased sensitivity and knowledge pertaining to tribal cultural resources (TCRs). This training will ensure all personnel are aware of the collaborative knowledge that both an archaeologist and tribal monitor are able to provide during construction activity. ¹

Mitigation Measures (MM) Cult-2, Cult-4:
SMBMI respectfully requests that a SMBMI-approved Tribal monitor(s) work side-by-side with the archaeological monitor(s) during any ground-disturbing activity in the implementation of this project. The present MM calls for contacting Tribe only if there is a discovery. From the experience of SMBMI, archaeological monitors and/or heavy machine operators are less sensitive to Tribal Resources than Tribal monitors.

Mitigation Measure (MM) Cult-5:
SMBMI respectfully requests that text be added to this MM saying that copies of all reports resulting from the implementation of this project be sent to Tribe.

Mitigation Measure (MM) Cult-9:
SMBMI respectfully requests that it be stated that an area of 100 feet radius be secured (i.e. all work should stop and the area be marked off) in the event that suspected human remains are discovered. Furthermore, there should be no entry into this area until the County Coroner makes his/her determinations. ²

¹ San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. 20 September 2017. Email from San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (Ms. Jessica Mauck to the City of Highland (Mr. Thomas Thomsley) in support of the Transition Properties: Design Review Application 2016-014: Tentative Parcel Map 2016-002, City of Highland, CA.

² San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. 28 March 2017. Email from San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (Ms. Joan S. Schneider) to the City of Highland (Mr. Thomas Thomsley) in support of the Transition Properties: Design Review Application 2016-014: Tentative Parcel Map 2016-002, City of Highland, CA.