Appendix D

Letter Report for the Almond Avenue Cultural Resources Inventory Study

March 4, 2020

Karina Fidler, AICP, CPESC
Kimley-Horn
401 B Street, Suite 600
San Diego, California 92101

Letter Report for the Almond Avenue Cultural Resources Inventory Study, near Fontana, San Bernardino County, California

Dear Ms. Fidler,

This letter report summarizes a cultural resources study conducted by ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM) for the Almond Warehouse Project (proposed Project), near Fontana, San Bernardino County, California (Figure 1). The property within this Project area is proposed for development. Both archaeological and architectural history surveys were conducted in advance of the Project. The Project site is located at 8565 Almond Avenue on Assessor Parcel No. (APN) 0230-131-29-0000 (Figure 2). The parcel contains buildings constructed more than 45 years ago, and as such their potential for historical significance must be considered in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This letter report provides the results of an archaeological survey and an evaluation of the buildings on that parcel for eligibility for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and as historical resources under CEQA. The results of this analysis will assist the County of San Bernardino (County) in determining whether the Project has the potential to cause significant effects in accordance with CEQA.

This letter report is divided into the following sections: Introduction, Methodology, Historic Context, Survey Results, Eligibility Criteria, Evaluation of Eligibility, Assessment of Effects, Recommended Mitigation, and Conclusion. References are included as Attachment A; figures and photographs as Attachment B; correspondence with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Attachment C; and Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 site record forms as Attachment D.

INTRODUCTION

The Almond Warehouse Project (proposed Project) is located at 8565 Almond Avenue within an unincorporated area of San Bernardino County that is surrounded by the City of Fontana to the north, east, and south and situated between two western extensions of the boundaries; it is designated as a Sphere of Influence in the City's General Plan. The proposed Project comprises one 179,866-square-foot (sf) warehouse distribution building with approximately 6,000 sf of office space (totaling 185,866 sf) and associated parking and landscaping on approximately 9.5 acres. Preliminary plans indicate the industrial warehouse building would cover 45 percent of the Project parcel. It would have surface parking totaling 114 auto stalls and 42 trailer stalls. The Project site is located in a predominately industrial area, with a few single-family and multi-family residential properties mixed in. Immediately adjacent to the Project area are warehouses with associated paved parking and industrial storage lots for trucks, shipping containers, and railroad cars. Single-family residential developments are located north and northwest of the Project site across Arrow Route. A few parcels, including the Project area, are vacant or nearly vacant and appear to have been cleared. Railroad tracks and a rail yard run parallel to Whittram Avenue south of the Project area, and a racetrack is located approximately 0.25 mi. southwest of the south edge of the Project parcel.

ASM prepared this report to assess the potential for cultural resources to be impacted by the Project. ASM evaluated the historical and architectural significance of buildings located at 8565 Almond Avenue. The parcel contains a single-family residence and ancillary buildings, all of which are proposed for demolition. None of the buildings have previously been listed on the CRHR or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), nor are they listed as a California Point of Historical Interest or California Historical Landmark. The County of San Bernardino does not have a historic preservation ordinance or program, and no official local eligibility criteria, although there are some locally designated resources. In this letter report, ASM evaluates the residential building and ancillary buildings located within the proposed Project for their eligibility for designation on the local and state level as individual resources and as potential contributors to a historic district.

METHODOLOGY

ASM staff conducted a records search of the Project area at the SCCIC on February 5, 2020. A search of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) held by the NAHC was requested on February 12, 2020; the response from the NAHC was received on February 25, 2020.

ASM conducted both an archaeological and architectural history field survey on February 7, 2020, to determine the presence of any previously undocumented cultural resources. The reconnaissance-level field survey was conducted by ASM Architectural Historian Marilyn Novell, M.S., and ASM Senior Archaeologist Sherri Andrews, M.A., RPA.

For the archaeological survey, accessible portions of the parcel were walked in transects spaced approximately 15 m apart and oriented primarily north/south. Documentation of the house and ancillary buildings included multiple photographs (exterior only) from the public right-of-way and within the site to document the resources and their setting. The buildings' plans, architectural features, condition, and historical integrity were noted. In order to determine whether the buildings might be associated with a potential historic district, a brief windshield survey of the surrounding neighborhood and select comparable areas of San Bernardino County west of Fontana was conducted to identify comparable properties. The DPR 523 site record form prepared to document this field survey is provided in Attachment D.

ASM conducted archival research to develop a general historic context for Fontana and San Bernardino County near the Project area and site-specific information. ASM conducted research through the County of San Bernardino Assessor-Recorder offices at the San Bernardino County Hall of Records and online at the County Property Information Management System and Document Search. Online databases of historical newspapers, photographs, USGS topographical maps, aerial photographs, and Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps were consulted. Detailed County property records for the Project area are available online from 1980 through 2020; documents associated with the property are available online from 1958 to the present. Earlier ownership documentation is available only on microfiche accessible by staff on 30 days notice at the County's Historical Archives. County building permits are not available without authorization from the property owner and were not obtained because of time constraints. The years of the residence's construction was confirmed by the San Bernardino County Assessor's year-built data; full property records were not obtained (San Bernardino County Assessor-Recorder 2020). ASM also consulted historical maps and aerial photos to further understand the development of the area (Historicaerials.com).

In evaluating the currently extant buildings within the Project area, ASM considered a number of factors relevant to making a recommendation of eligibility, including:

- the history of Fontana and southwestern San Bernardino County;
- the history of the building's construction, use, and association with local development near Fontana;
- the history of the surrounding community and the building's relationship to that community;
- the building's association with important people or events;
- whether the residence is the work of a master architect, craftsman, artist, or landscaper;
- whether the building is representative of a particular style or method of construction; and
- whether the residence and ancillary buildings have undergone structural alterations over the years, the extent to which such alterations have compromised their historical integrity, and the current condition of the properties.

ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

SCCIC Records Search

The SCCIC records search was conducted to determine whether the Project area has been previously subject to survey as well as the presence or absence of cultural resources previously documented within the Project area. The search included all records and documents on file with the SCCIC, as well as the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Historic Properties Directory.

A total of 13 previous reports were identified as a result of the records search (Table 1), one of which encompasses the Project area (bolded below).

Table 1. Previous Cultural Resource Projects Conducted within the 1-Mile Records Search Radius

Report No. (SB-)	Year	Author(s)/Affiliation	Title
02502	1992	Swope, Karen K. / Research Associates	Cultural Resources Survey of a Five-Acre Parcel near Fontana, San Bernardino County, California
03063	1995	Sturm, Bradley L., Jani Monk, and Ivan H. Strudwick / LSA	Cultural Resources Survey & National Register Assessment of the Kaiser Steel Mill for the California Speedway Project, Fontana, CA
03591	**1995**	**Owen, Shelley Marie. / EIP Associates**	**Cultural Resource Record Search and Management Plan for the San Sevaine Redevelopment Project Area, San Bernardino County, CA**
04244	2004	McKenna, Jeanette A. / McKenna et al.	CA 8525 (Snowball), Fontana
04249	2002	Bonner, Wayne H. / Alaris Group	Records Search Results for Cingular Wireless Sb 209-01 (Truck Hydraulics), 14262 Whittram Ave, Fontana, San Bernardino County, CA
04264	2004	McKenna, Jeanette A. / McKenna et al.	CA-506X, 508X & 509X (Speedway), 9300 Cherry Ave, Fontana, CA
04538	2004	McKenna, Jeanette A. / McKenna et al.	CA 8525 (Snowball)
04539	2004	McKenna, Jeanette A. / McKenna et al.	CA 8525b (Excise)

Report No. (SB-)	Year	Author(s)/Affiliation	Title
04869	2005	Bonner, Wayne H., and Marnie Aislin-Kay	Cultural Resource Records Search and Site Visit Results for Cingular Telecommunications Facility Candidate LSANCA8114B (First Choice Self Storage), 14750 Foothill Boulevard, Fontana, San Bernardino County, California
05498	2003	Hammond, Christie / Caltrans District 8	Historical Resources Compliance Report for Relinquishment of State Route 66 (Foothill Boulevard), City of Fontana, San Bernardino County, California
05498A	2003	Hammond, Christie / Caltrans District 8	Historical Resources Evaluation Report for the Relinquishment of State Route 66 (Foothill Boulevard) between East Avenue/Ilex Street and Maple Avenue, City of Fontana, San Bernardino, CA
05869	2007	Mason, Roger D., and Cary Cotterman	Cultural Resources Evaluation Report for the Cherry Avenue Road Widening Project, West Fontana, San Bernardino County, California.
05971	2008	Goodwin, Riordan, and Curt Duke / LSA	Cultural Resources Assessment Cherry Avenue Grade Separation, San Bernardino County, California, LSA Project No. TTE0701

Nine resources have been previously documented within the 1-mi. records search radius, but none appear within or associated with the Project area. All of the resources documented within the records search radius are historic, the vast majority of which are historic buildings or structures (Table 2).

Table 2. Resources Previously Recorded within the 1-Mile Records Search Radius

Primary # (P-36-)	Trinomial (CA-SBR-)	Recorded by / Date	Description	Proximity to Project Area
020309	-	Bricker, Keith Companies / 1994	Single-family residence; 14718 Foothill Bl., Fontana	~0.7 mi. N on Foothill Bl.
020310	-	Bricker, Keith Companies / 1994	Redwing Motel, 14888 Foothill Bl., Fontana	~0.7 mi. N on Foothill Bl.
020311	-	Bricker, Keith Companies / 1994	Single-family residence, restaurant building; 14127-14129 Foothill Bl., 8155 Banana Av., Fontana	~0.7 mi. N on Foothill Bl.
020312	-	Bricker, Keith Companies / 1994	Single-family residence; 14293 Foothill Bl., Fontana	~0.7 mi. N on Foothill Bl.
021695	-	Hathaway, Dept. of Public Works / 2007	Single-family residence; 8566 Cherry Av., Fontana	~0.1 mi. E on Cherry Av.
021696	-	Hathaway, Dept. of Public Works / 2007	Single-family residence; 8657 Cherry Av., Fontana	~0.1 mi. E on Cherry Av.
024084	-	Trampier / 2011	Cherry Av. at Foothill Bl./Route 66	~0.25 mi. NE
024622	15663H	Lev-Tov / 2011	Redwood Av. at Foothill Bl./Route 66	~0.7 m. N on Foothill Bl.
029538	-	McKenna / 2016	Flood control channel	~0.25 mi. S along railroad

Historical Image Research

The only available Sanborn Fire Insurance map covering the Project area is dated 1929-1938 (Figure 3; Sanborn 1929-1938). Nearby areas between the Project area and the City of Fontana to the east show a sprinkling of agriculture-related buildings and structures, specifically Swift & Co's Duck Farm and multiple properties associated with Fontana Farms: Wade Hog Ranch and Mexican Quarters east of S. Calabash Avenue, Camp #16 and Camp #17 east of Cherry Avenue, Camp #1 at W. Merrill Avenue and Pepper Avenue, Poultry Plant No. 2 including rows of Laying Houses southeast of S. Cherry Avenue and W. Randall Avenue, Fontana Union Water Co. north of W. Ceres Avenue, and Mexican Bunk House northeast of W. Merrill Avenue and Pepper Avenue.

Historic aerials from 1938, 1948, 1959, 1966, 1994, 2002, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 were analyzed on historicaerials.com, as were historic topographic maps dated 1896, 1898, 1901, 1905, 1909, 1913, 1926, 1929, 1938, 1943, 1946, 1955, 1959, 1963, 1965, 1969, 1975, 1980, 1985, 2012, 2015, and 2018. Additional detailed aerial views dated 1953 and 1959 available from the special research collections at University of California Santa Barbara Library were also analyzed.

Two sets of railroad tracks running east and west are shown in the Project vicinity on the 1896 topographic map. A spur is shown running south from the main tracks at the Declez stop. Several roads running east and west are shown, along with a few roads running approximately north and south. This pattern continues unchanged until the topographic from 1943, which shows a grid of roads on sloped land and a building in the approximate location of the current house. The 1955 topographic map shows development including the Kaiser Steel Plant, consisting of multiple buildings and structures, as well as railroad spurs in the area north of San Bernardino Avenue, south of Whittram Avenue, west of Cherry Avenue, and east of Etiwanda Avenue. A gravel pit is shown near the Kaiser Siding track at the northeast corner of plant, and a hospital and administration building are in the southeast corner. Also shown are Redwood School on Redwood Avenue, scattered buildings, and small housing tracts south of Route 66, one on Cherry Avenue and another on Redwood Road. The project parcel and those in the immediate vicinity are shown planted in orchards. Through 1973, additional buildings are shown along the roads, as the parcels show fewer orchards over time. In 1975, a few trailer parks are labeled as such in the vicinity.

The aerial view from 1938 shows the Project area in use as an orchard. A detailed 1953 aerial view shows a regular pattern of tall trees lining the east-west boundaries of all of the parcels to the north and east of the Kaiser Steel Plant, including the Project area. In 1958, tall windbreak trees (likely junipers or eucalyptus) line the east-west boundaries of both halves of the parcel, as well as in between the two halves. while the 1959 image indicates that the land had been cleared. The 1959 view is similar in the immediate Project area, and the areas east of Cherry Avenue shows some of the previous agricultural lands beginning to fill with commercial development along the Santa Fe tracks and residential development nearer the city. Aerials between 1994 and 2005 show semi-truck trailers or containers parked randomly over both parts of the parcel.

A 2018 Google Earth view of the vicinity of the Project area indicates that a racetrack has replaced part of the Kaiser Steel property. The surrounding parcels are filled with small warehouses and random arrangements of shipping containers and trucks. The area north of Arrow Route is predominantly occupied by housing developments. North of Foothill Boulevard is filled with newer housing developments, with an area of large warehouses occupying the land east of Cherry Avenue and north of Arrow Route.

NAHC Sacred Lands File Search

A request for a search of the Sacred Lands File held by the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was made by ASM on February 13, 2020. This search was undertaken to supplement the SCCIC records search to inquire as to whether resources important to local Native American groups

may exist within the proposed Project area that may not appear within the CHRIS system. The NAHC response of February 25, 2020, indicated negative results. A list of 15 tribal contacts who may have interest in the Project area was provided with the NAHC response; this response and contact list is provided with this memo as Attachment C.

CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Natural Setting

The Project area is located approximately 40 mi. east of the City of Los Angeles, in an area of unincorporated Sa Bernardino County surrounded on the north, east, and south by the City of Fontana, with Rancho Cucamonga to the west. This area is characterized by its positioning atop a gently south-sloping alluvial fan formation lying in a wide valley between the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and the Jurupa Mountains to the south. The elevation is approximately 1,180 ft. above mean sea level. The setting surrounding the Project area is mixed residential and business/industrial. The Project area is flanked on the north by a residence and the south by an equipment yard.

Prehistoric Cultural Setting

The following brief overview of the prehistory of the region is adapted from Moratto (1984), Warren (1984), and Warren and Crabtree (1986).

Lake Mojave Period (Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic; ca. 12,000 - 7000 B.P.)

The Lake Mojave complex represents the earliest human occupation in the Mojave Desert region, beginning at about 12,000 B.P. (Grayson 1993; Wallace 1962). Considered a Paleo-Indian assemblage, it is thought to be ancestral to the Early Archaic cultures of the subsequent Pinto period (Warren and Crabtree 1986:184). Claims for archaeological assemblages dating to periods earlier than Lake Mojave period, such as those made for Tule Springs (Harrington and Simpson 1961), China Lake (Davis 1978), and Manix Lake (Simpson 1958, 1960, 1961), are controversial and, even if eventually proven to be authentic, these manifestations appear to have no relationship to later cultural developments in the region (Warren and Crabtree 1986). This era, at the close of the Pleistocene, was a time of extreme environmental change as the relatively cool and moist conditions of the terminal Wisconsin glacial age were gradually replaced by the warmer and drier conditions of the Holocene (Spaulding 1990). Desertification continued throughout the period with mesquite appearing by ca. 8000 B.P. (DuBarton et al. 1991).

Cultural materials characteristic of the Lake Mojave Complex include Lake Mojave, Parman, Silver Lake, and rare fluted projectile points (Clovis). Other artifacts typically found in these assemblages include lunate and eccentric crescents, small flake engravers, technical scrapers, leaf-shaped knives, drills, and heavy choppers or hammer stones. Milling stones are generally absent in the Lake Mojave Complex (Campbell et al. 1937; Warren and Crabtree 1986).

In the Mojave Desert and southern Great Basin, this assemblage is typically (but not exclusively) found in association with Late Pleistocene/Early Holocene lake stands and outwash drainages, although the role of the lakes in the overall adaptation remains in dispute (e.g., Bedwell 1970, 1973; Davis 1978; Warren 1967; Willig 1988). Some researchers have argued that lacustrine resources were the subsistence focus, while others suggest that grasslands suitable for the grazing of Late Pleistocene megafauna would have surrounded the lakes, and that these were the primary subsistence focus of the Lake Mojave cultures. Warren (1967) postulated that the assemblages are the remains of a widespread, generalized hunting adaptation found throughout the western Great Basin. Bedwell (1970, 1973), Hester (1973), and others interpret the same assemblages as indicating a specialized exploitation of the lacustrine resources of the pluvial lakes and call the complex the “Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition.” Jonathan O. Davis (1978)

proposes a combination of these models positing a generalized hunting and collecting economy, in which lakeside sites represent the seasonal exploitation of marsh resources.

This complex represents Early Man in the Mojave Desert, and exhibits similarities to sites in the western Great Basin and to the San Dieguito complex of the southern California culture area (Warren and Crabtree 1986). Alternate designations for the manifestation of the complex in the interior desert area include: Lake Mojave Culture (Campbell et al. 1937; Wallace 1962), San Dieguito Complex (Warren 1967) and Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition (Bedwell 1970; Moratto 1984). Establishing strong temporal definition of the period is also hampered by the shortage in datable sites throughout the Great Basin and Mojave Desert. Few sites dating to the early portion of the Lake Mojave period have been excavated and little direct evidence of subsistence practices has been reported. When sites do contain datable materials, artifacts are generally found on the surface with no stratigraphic separation. Unlike sites in the Southwest, no early Great Basin projectile point types have been found in undisputed association with the large mega-fauna known to have existed during that time (Warren and Crabtree 1986:184). Characterization of this period of prehistory in California is extremely complex due to the large number of competing models. For detailed discussions of the Lake Mojave period, see Moratto (1984), Warren and Crabtree (1986), and Warren's contributions in Blair et al. (2004).

Pinto Period (Middle Archaic; ca. 7000 - 4000 B.P.)

The transition from pluvial to arid conditions at the end of the early Holocene appears to have been the most extreme environmental change in the southern Great Basin during post-Pleistocene times. Increasingly arid conditions prevailed throughout the region between about 7500 and 5000 B.P. (Hall 1985; Spaulding 1991). Woodland environments reached their approximate modern elevations and the modern desert scrub communities appeared with the migration of plant species such as creosote bush into the area.

Warren (1984) sees the cultural manifestations of this period as indicative of adaptation to increasing aridity. As the Pleistocene lakes and rivers dried up and plant and animal life changed, human populations adapted or withdrew to more desirable areas. Pinto populations appear to have withdrawn to desert margins and scattered oases, undergoing the changes as the Pinto Basin Complex assemblages gradually replace those of the preceding Lake Mojave period (Warren 1984:414). As in the Lake Mojave period, Pinto period sites are usually found in open settings in relatively well-watered locales representing isolated oases of high productivity. Artifacts dating to the Pinto period include Pinto series projectile points, leaf-shaped points and knives, domed and elongated keeled scrapers, and occasional Lake Mojave and Silver Lake points. Simple flat milling stones, occasional shallow-basined milling stones, and hand stones also occur in Pinto period sites (Warren and Crabtree 1986:184-187). Warren (1990) attributes the latter development to the exploitation of hard seeds, which is seen as part of a process of subsistence diversification brought on by increased aridity and reduced ecosystem carrying capacity. Big-game hunting probably continued as an important focus during this time, but the economic return of this activity likely decreased as artiodactyl populations declined in response to increased aridity (Warren and Crabtree 1986).

The appearance of Pinto projectile points in the archaeological record denote this period in the Mojave Desert, although their dating remains controversial (Lyneis 1982:176; Schroth 1994; Warren 1984). Warren and Crabtree (1986) and Warren (1984:414) postulate that the Pinto Complex represents a continuation and evolution from the hunting complexes of the Lake Mojave period. During this period, small, mobile populations continued to be dependent upon hunting and gathering. The use of grinding implements is expanded; however, these were poorly developed as might be expected in a newly acquired technology. This development suggests that the processing of hard seeds was becoming more important in the subsistence system, although it is believed that Pinto period people maintained a mobile subsistence strategy focused primarily on the hunting of highly ranked large game (Elston 1982).

The question of how people adjusted to environmental change is central to varying interpretations of the Pinto period (Warren 1984:410-411). Some (Donnan 1964; Kowta 1969; Wallace 1962) argue the desert

was essentially abandoned between 7000 and 5000 B.P., while others (Susia 1964; Tuohy 1974; Warren 1980) argue that no evidence of an occupational hiatus of such magnitude exists in the archaeological record. The ongoing debate revolves around the definition and dating of Pinto projectile points (Schroth 1994; Warren and Crabtree 1986:184).

Gypsum Period (Late Archaic; ca. 4000 - 1500 B.P.)

Gradual improvement of the climate began by around 5000 B.P. culminating in the Neoglacial at about 3600 B.P. A period of greater effective moisture emerged in the latter part (by 3000-4000 B.P.) of the middle Holocene (for an overview of Neoglacial and Little Ice Age environments in the Mojave Desert, see Enzel et al. 1989, 1992; Spaulding 1995). At this time, the barren pans in the Mojave Sink intermittently held perennial water (Enzel et al. 1992), although it is not known if this was the case for other closed basins in the region.

The Gypsum period is characterized by population increases and broadening economic activities as technological adaptation to the changing environment evolved. Hunting continued to be an important subsistence activity, but the increase in the occurrence and diversity of ground stone artifacts indicate that plant foods were becoming a more important subsistence item. The reduction in the size of projectile points about 1350 B.P. marks the introduction of the bow and arrow (Bettinger and Eerkins 1999), increasing the efficiency of hunting and possibly indicating a shift from larger to smaller game. Perhaps as a result of these new adaptive mechanisms, the increase in aridity during the late Gypsum period (after ca. 2500 B.P.) seems to have had relatively little consequence on the distribution and increase in human populations (Warren 1984:418-420; Warren and Crabtree 1986:189).

The use of rock shelters appears to have increased at this time although the occupation of open sites continues. Base camps with extensive midden development are a prominent site type in well-watered valleys and near concentrated subsistence resources (Warren and Crabtree 1986). Additionally, several types of special purpose sites in upland settings begin to appear during this period. Considerable evidence is present indicating increased contact with the California coast and the Southwest, and the presence of split-twig figurines and zoomorphic petroglyphs, thought to date to this period, suggest a rich ritual life was present (Fowler and Madsen 1986). Evidence of this increased ritual life is clearly seen in the archaeological record at Newberry Cave (Davis and Smith 1981), where split-twig figurines, ritual bows, arrows, pictographs, and what was interpreted as a wand were recovered supporting what was interpreted as ritual hunting magic.

Gypsum period artifact assemblages are characterized by medium- to large-stemmed and notched projectile points (i.e., Elko series, Humboldt Concave Base, and Gypsum types). The assemblages also include rectangular-based knives, flake scrapers, infrequently large scraper planes, choppers, and hammer stones. Milling equipment becomes more common and the mortar and pestle appear for the first time.

Sites dated to the Gypsum period are well represented in the mountains and in adjoining areas toward the coast. The Siphon site in Summit Valley, characterized by Sutton et al. (1993) as a middle to late Millingstone horizon base camp, has been dated to about 1550 B.C. Other sites in the area from this period include those at Yucaipa (Grenda 1998) and at Prado Basin (Grenda 1995). In general, the Gypsum period was a time of intensified settlement and exploitation of the desert valley floor and surrounding mountains.

Saratoga Springs Period (ca. 1500 - 750 B.P.)

During the Saratoga Springs period, marked regional diversification in artifact and site types is evidenced throughout the region (Warren and Crabtree 1986). The primary projectile point types of the southern Mojave Desert—and by extension, the San Bernardino Mountains—are Cottonwood and Desert Side-notched points. The Rose Spring types common to the north are rarer in the San Bernardino Mountains but have found around Baldwin Lake, while Eastgate and Rose Spring points began to dominate assemblages in other parts of the Mojave Desert and southern Great Basin (Lyneis 1982). These regional variations

might have been the result of intensified contact with neighboring groups along the coast, in the mountains, and in the southwest. Evidence from the Oro Grande site on the Mojave River below the northern slopes of the San Bernardino Mountains indicates trade with coastal groups during this period and a more structured settlement hierarchy centered on large village sites (Rector et al. 1983). Cultural developments south of the Mojave River and Providence Mountains diverge from those in the northern area during this period, reflecting influence from Hakataya developments along the lower Colorado.

Ceramics were likely introduced into the region during this period, though evidence is scarce. Lower Colorado Buff Ware and Tizon Brown Ware ceramics are often associated with Cottonwood and Desert Side-notched points and likely date from the very end of the Saratoga Springs period and into protohistoric times. Unlike some communities farther to the north who were using Anasazi-inspired pottery as early as A.D. 500 (Warren 1984:421–422), the southern desert and mountain groups seem to have concentrated on contacts with coastal communities. For example, marine shell beads are much more common at Saratoga Springs period sites, suggesting trade with the southern California coast, probably along the Mojave River valley route later known as the Mojave Trail (Warren 1984).

Evidence for Ancestral Puebloan influence or occupation is limited to the occurrence of pottery, which has been found as far west as the Halloran Spring (Blair 1985; Blair and Winslow 2004; Leonard and Drover 1980; Rogers 1929; Warren 1980) and the Cronise Basin in California (Larson 1981; Rogers 1929). It is unclear whether the pottery was left by small foraging or hunting parties (Berry 1974:83-84; Fowler and Madsen 1986:180; James 1986:114-115; Rafferty 1984:30-35; Shutler 1961:7; Warren and Crabtree 1986:191), the result of Ancestral Puebloan people working the turquoise mines near Halloran Springs (Blair 1985:2-4; Blair and Winslow 2004; Leonard and Drover 1980:251; Rogers 1929:12-13; Warren 1980:81-84), or if it was being traded along the Mohave trading route along with shells, obsidian and salt (Harrington 1927:238-239; Heizer and Treganza 1944; Hughes and Bennyhoff 1986; Morrissey 1968; Pogue 1915:46-51; Ruby 1970; Shutler 1961:58-66). Overall, the nature of the Ancestral Puebloan presence in the Mojave Desert is poorly understood at this time and warrants future research. In contrast, a strong Ancestral Puebloan influence is seen in the northeastern Mojave, where this horticultural people (termed the Lowland Virgin Branch Anasazi) resided in residential communities along the Muddy and lower Virgin rivers in southeastern Nevada and adjacent portions of Utah and Arizona (Fowler and Madsen 1986:175-181; Lyneis 1982, 1995; Lyneis et al. 1978:178-179; Warren and Crabtree 1986:191; Winslow 2003a, 2003b).

In the remainder of the Mojave Desert region, sites of this period seem to exhibit general continuity with the Gypsum pattern. One of the most conspicuous changes from the earlier period is the reduction in size of projectile points. Rose Spring and Cottonwood series points dominate assemblages of this period and are morphologically similar to Gypsum period points with the exception of their smaller size, and milling equipment (i.e., metates, manos, mortars and pestles) continues to be in use (Warren and Crabtree 1986).

Late in prehistory (approximately 1000 B.P.), it is theorized, groups of people speaking Numic languages expanded from somewhere in the Death Valley area across the Great Basin. The Numic Expansion hypothesis gained widespread support in the years following its introduction by Sydney Lamb in 1958 (Lamb 1958). Bettinger and Baumhoff (1982:485) believe that the Numa were able to displace the previous inhabitants because of low-cost adaptive strategies oriented around the exploitation of diverse plant resources. This hypothesis is supported by similarities in artifact types and glottochronological theory advanced by Lamb (1958:99). Young and Bettinger (1992:85), supporting Bettinger and Baumhoff (1982), propose that a competitive interaction existed between the Numic and pre-Numic groups in the Great Basin. In recent years, however, the hypothesis has been challenged and remains controversial.

Protohistoric Period (750 B.P. - Contact)

The Protohistoric era, a transitional period between the prehistoric and the historic/ethnohistoric, dates from ca. 750 B.P. and continues until first contact with Euro-Americans (Warren 1980; Warren and Crabtree

1986). Cultural developments established earlier during the Saratoga Springs period continue with some modifications. Numerous sites dating to this most recent period of prehistory are located along the Mojave River (Altschul et al. 1989; Schneider 1988; Smith 1963), in the San Bernardino Mountains (Simpson et al. 1972; White and Reeder 1970), and in the inland valleys to the south of the mountains (Grenda 1998). Diagnostic artifacts for this period are Desert Side-notched points and various poorly defined types of brown ware pottery. Most archaeologists agree that trade along the Mojave Trail was steady throughout this period, accounting for much of the coastal and Colorado River influences in the San Bernardino Mountains (Warren 1984).

Regional diversity continued during this period (Warren and Crabtree 1986:191). South of the Mojave River, the influence of the Yuman-speaking Hakataya continued. It is clear that by around A.D. 600, Hakatayan groups occupied a wide area in western Arizona, southeastern California, and southern Nevada (Schroeder 1979). The Hakataya were centered primarily on the lower Colorado River, however, and their assemblages, characterized by brown, buff, and red-on-buff pottery, and Desert Side-notched and Cottonwood Triangular points, are found along the length of the Mojave River to the Mojave Sinks (Drover 1979; Rogers 1929; Smith 1963). These ceramics, along with the continued use of coastal artifacts such as shell beads, suggest fairly long-distance trade contacts and possibly more extensive seasonal rounds.

North of the Mojave River, the Saratoga Springs artifact assemblage continued, with the addition of Desert Side-notched and Cottonwood Triangular points and Great Basin Brown Ware pottery. Also present in these assemblages are steatite beads, large triangular knives, unshaped manos and milling stones, mortars and pestles, incised stones, slate pendants, and shell beads (Warren and Crabtree 1986). Bettinger (1975, 1976, 1977) attributes the beginning of regular pinyon exploitation to this period, as shown by the appearance of camps in the pinyon-juniper woodland (Warren 1984:424-427; Warren and Crabtree 1986:191-192). Warren and Crabtree (1986:191-192) note that the initial occurrence of this assemblage is linked with the ancestors of the historic Southern Paiute and is roughly contemporaneous with the terminal date for the Ancestral Puebloan occupation of the region. Virgin Anasazi development and influence had been curtailed in the eastern Mojave Desert by the Protohistoric period (Warren 1984:427). Occupation by the hunter-gatherer groups present earlier, however, appears to have continued relatively unchanged.

Ethnohistoric Background

The major ethnographic group associated with the Project area was the Serrano (Bean and Smith 1978; Benedict 1924; Kroeber 1925:611-619; Strong 1929:5-35). The following summary is closely drawn from a recent ethnography by Lerch and Ciolek-Torrello (2007). Details concerning other aspects of Serrano culture, such as social organization and religion, may be found in a number of sources, including Benedict (1924), Gifford (1918), Kroeber (1907, 1925), Strong (1929), Bean and Smith (1978) and Bean et al. (1981). The Serrano were so called by the Spanish because they lived in and around the San Bernardino Mountains (serrano, from sierra, means “mountain dweller” in Spanish). The Serrano’s own general name for themselves was Takhtam, or “people,” although most individuals were identified by the name of their particular clan or village, and these names are frequently referred to as “tribes.”

The Serrano language is part of the Takic subfamily of the larger Uto-Aztecan language family (Ergle 1999; Moratto 1984:534), which includes a wide variety of language groups extending as far south as the Basin of Mexico. Closer to home, the culture groups neighboring the Serrano to the south of the San Bernardino Mountains—the Gabrielino, Luiseño, and Cahuilla—were also Takic-language speakers. The Serrano appear to have been most closely linguistically aligned with the Cahuilla people, the easternmost of the three. In the Mojave Desert, to the west, north, and east, were the Kawaiisu, Panamint, and Chemehuevi, who spoke Numic languages, another subfamily of the Uto-Aztecan language family. Although these language group names are often understood as some sort of tribal identity reflecting politically unified groups, this was clearly not the case. Designations such as Serrano and Chemehuevi are purely linguistic labels that, when applied to a geographic region, simply refer to the total territory inhabited by a number of independent bands who spoke a common language. Very often, significant cultural interactions crosscut

language groups as a result of topography or other factors. The Serrano, in particular, seem to have maintained close ties with peoples on both sides of the mountains, regardless of linguistic affiliation.

The Serrano, and many neighboring language groups, were organized into independent but interconnected village communities. Each of these villages consisted of one or more patrilineal clans that belonged to one of two exogamous moieties, named coyote or wildcat. The clan-based villages and the larger moiety groups maintained complex ceremonial relationships with one another (Gifford 1918; Strong 1929). Frequently, a number of communities would combine to celebrate important festivals, harvest cycles, and other ceremonial events, occasionally inviting distant, linguistically unrelated groups.

Prior to European contact, the Serrano were hunters and gatherers who exploited a wide variety of resources from the mountains, the desert, and the Mojave River, including both large and small game, as well as numerous plant resources. Large game—such as deer, mountain sheep, and pronghorn—was hunted with bow and arrow, and smaller animals such as rabbits, rodents, and reptiles were taken with throwing sticks, nets, and snares. Acorns, pinyon nuts, and mesquite beans were among the staple foods, which were seasonally supplemented by chia and ricegrass seeds, roots, tubers, and various fresh greens (Bean and Smith 1978; Lerch 2002).

The presence of a perennial water source was the determining factor in the nature, duration, and distribution of Serrano villages (Benedict 1924:368). Most Serrano village-hamlets "were in the foothill Upper Sonoran life-zone while a few were out on the desert floor (near permanent water sources) or in the forest Transition zone" (Bean and Smith 1978:570). Small villages were more common, although there were larger villages in the Summit Valley and the Cajon Pass. Small special purpose sites, such as temporary camps, food processing stations, and lithic procurement areas, were located as needed. The Serrano who inhabited the San Bernardino Mountains would inhabit the milder areas of Apple Valley and Lucerne Valley during the winter and the area in and around Baldwin Lake during the summer.

In the early literature, there are only occasional references to the Project study area and the Native Americans who once lived there (Beattie and Beattie 1951:421; Brown and Boyd 1922:21-25; Pierson 1970:110-111), although contact with Europeans may have occurred as early as 1771. By 1806, the Serrano were recruited into the mission systems and most of them were removed from their homelands to the missions (Beattie and Beattie 1939:366). Missionization led to the loss of their native lifeways; although, northeast of the San Gorgonio Pass, Serrano culture survived.

By 1975, most Serrano lived on two southern California reservations (Morongo and San Manuel), where with other native Californians, they participated in ceremonial and political affairs on a pan-reservation. According to Bean and Smith (1978:543), at the time of the writing, only slightly over 100 people claimed Serrano descent, reduced from a pre-contact figure between 1,500 (Kroeber 1925:617) and 2,500 (Bean 1962-1972), and even fewer speak their native language; however, all recall with pride their history. Ethnic identity is strong and they remain a readily identifiable cultural entity.

BRIEF HISTORY OF FONTANA

In 1769, Spanish explorers established Mission San Gabriel in what is presently eastern Los Angeles County. The area that is now known as Fontana was under Spanish rule as part of the Mission San Gabriel lands until 1822, when Mexico gained its independence from Spain. After independence, Mexican land grants further divided the land into ranchos. Rancho San Bernardino (37,700 acres), granted to the Lugo family, encompassed present-day Fontana (Dice 2006). In 1848, the United States took over the Mexican rancho land in California.

Fontana was one of several cities west of San Bernardino that developed during what was known as the boom of the eighties (i.e., 1880s). The towns grew on lands managed by the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company, which was incorporated in 1887 by Los Angeles bankers George H. Bonebrake and F. C. Howes (Pioneer 1958:58). The same year, the Santa Fe Railroad built a track through the valleys east of Los Angeles, calling the Fontana station Rosena. Within a few years, the Santa Fe joined the Southern Pacific Railroad in serving San Bernardino County. In 1901, A. B. Miller acquired the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company and incorporated the Fontana Development Company to promote the agricultural opportunities in the area (Fontana Development Company 1901). A year later, Almond Avenue was approved as a County road. The company purchased Rosena in 1903 and constructed a vast irrigation system, tapping the flow of Lytle Creek from the Mount Baldy snow melt and planting a half a million eucalyptus saplings as windbreaks (Davis 1992:380). By 1905, the company had begun building a farming and ranching complex that included an assortment of barns, dining rooms, a 200-man bunkhouse, a kitchen, a company store, and a ranch house at Camp #1, which was occupied by the foreman. Chief among the company's activities were the cultivation of 3,000 acres of grain crops such as barley and oats, as well as beef, hog, chicken, and citrus production. Many acres of vineyards and deciduous fruit orchards were also among the land uses. The ranch house at Camp #1 was the first permanent building in Rosena and is listed in the NRHP as significant for its association with the agricultural development of Southern California from 1905 to 1944 (Anicic 1982).

The Fontana Farms Company was organized in 1918 to continue efforts to lure prospective landowners to the San Bernardino Valley. Many well-known irrigation colonies established at the time, such as Pasadena, Ontario, and Redlands, promoted citrus growing as a draw for wealthy sun-seeking Easterners. But the cultivation of oranges and lemons required substantial startup capital, as well as funds to sustain the prospective farmers until the trees matured and crops could be harvested. As an alternative, Miller presented his vision as an unprecedented combination of industrial plantation, as represented by Fontana Farms Company, and small landholdings subdivided by Fontana Land Company. As an example of the early industrialization of Fontana Farms, the company engineered a contract with the Los Angeles between 1921 and 1950 to receive the City's garbage shipments by rail. The massive tonnage of garbage received in the Fontana area was used to fatten the 60,000 hogs that made Fontana Farms the largest hog farm in the world (Davis 1992:380-381).

In 1930, Fontana Farms published an advertising brochure touting the packaged small farms. The ad presented a conversation in which an imaginary couple longs for acres of level fertile land with "a beautiful fringe of tall, graceful eucalypti, through which they glimpsed the lofty crests of the San Bernardinos" (Fontana Historical Society 1930). Eventually, the couple would build a rambling house with room at the back for "2,000 chickens, rabbits, ducks, and turkeys." A walnut orchard, berry bushes, and fruit trees were included in the imagined eden. This dream became a reality for many families, and the five- and 10-acre parcels could still be identified by their fringes of eucalyptus trees as late as the 1960s (UCSB 1953, 1959) (Figure 4). Thus, Fontana's development early on grew to include large-scale ranching mixed in with the chicken farms and orchards typical of the early twentieth century in what is now known as the "Inland Empire." Before World War II, the plains west of Fontana were occupied by ranches devoted to raising hogs, ducks, and other livestock, including Swift & Co's Duck Farm, the Wade Hog Ranch, and a poultry plant. Along with the ranching-related buildings and structures were workers' housing (Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps 1929-1938). Served by two major rail lines, and within easy reach of Los Angeles and its ports, the Fontana area was ideal for transport of agricultural goods (Figures 5 and 6).

With transportation in place and its prime location between Los Angeles's ports and the mines of the Mojave Desert, Fontana was also well positioned for industry on a large scale. In 1942, radical changes took place when Henry Kaiser built the largest steel plant on the West Coast on a one-by-one-and-a-half-mile parcel west of Cherry Avenue and south of the Santa Fe tracks (Figure 7). Most of the 1,100 acres for the plant were farmlands acquired from the Fontana Farms Company and Sierra Madre Vintage Company

(*San Bernardino County Sun* 1942). The plant, funded by a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was established to meet the emergency needs of vastly accelerated shipbuilding on the Pacific (Pioneer 1958:67). The War Department, perhaps responding to post-Pearl Harbor hysteria, insisted that the plant be located at least 50 miles from the Pacific Coast for safety from attack (Davis 1992:388). The rush to ready the plant for production was so intense that construction began without the customary ground-breaking ceremony and without Kaiser officials on hand. "This is war," said T.M. Price, construction superintendent at Kaiser. We are too busy for ceremonies or celebrations, all we have time for is work and more work!" he said (*San Bernardino County Sun* 1942).

Available housing stock quickly became saturated by steel workers, and many Kaiser employees were housed in "Kaiservilles," such as the trailer camp at Merrill and Fontana Avenues (Anicic 2006:17). The original Fontana Farms colonists came under pressure to sell to developers and regulators, while others converted chicken coops to shacks and rented them to single workers, a primitive form of housing that continued into the 1950s (Davis 1992:398). The presence of the polluting exhaust from the steel plant, as well as the constant truck traffic, contributed to the demise of agricultural land use in the Fontana area. The Kaiser mill continued operation and remained a primary source of employment until it closed in 1984, leaving behind a rare large block of industrial-zoned property open for development (*Monrovia News-Post* 1983).

Along with these changes came rapid population growth and a building boom that began with scattered small housing developments that soon blanketed the valley. Like the rest of the Inland Empire, as a result of post-World War II expansion and the population boom in southern California, Fontana became a bedroom community to larger cities in the county and region. However, beyond housing, Fontana also has seen widespread growth in industry. Fueled by openness to industrial development and the ground laid by large corporate ranching and Kaiser's entry into the local economy, Fontana has welcomed the mammoth distribution warehouses that have become ubiquitous in the area (*Los Angeles Times* 2019). In 2020, the city and its sphere of influence encompass an area of approximately 52.4 square miles with a population of about 210,000 (City of Fontana 2020).

SITE-SPECIFIC HISTORY

The house at 8565 Almond Avenue was constructed in 1940 according to the County Assessor's official property records. However, original handwritten forms on file at the Assessor's office indicate the date is approximate, and the earliest entry in the County Parcel Books shows an improvement on Lot 171 (the northern part of the Project site) in 1928 and 1929. In 1930 through 1934, no improvement is listed, suggesting the earliest improvement might not have been the current house. Again in 1935, an improvement is listed, which is likely the current house and shows in a 1938 aerial view (historicaerials.com 1938).

When first subdivided as part of Fontana Arrow Route Tract No. 2102, the Project parcel consisted of two parcels: lots 171 and 172. In 1980, an approximately 4.5-acre parcel (Lot 171; APN 0230-131-20-0000) east of Almond Avenue was split, forming two parcels; a smaller parcel where a residence is currently located was split from the northwest corner of a larger, approximately 4.5-acre parcel, forming APNs 0230-131-28-0000 and 0230-131-29-0000. In 2018, the two parcels were recombined, along with an approximately 5-acre parcel adjacent to the south (Lot 172), to form the current 9.5-acre Project parcel (Figure 8).

Both lots were originally owned by the Fontana Land Company and recorded as 5 acres each. The Parcel Books show the Company as owner of page after page of 5-acre lots. In 1932, the Security First National Bank acquired both lots. In 1934, Lot 172 was sold to S. J. and Lucy Kearns, who owned the property until 1948, when a group of owners was listed, including the children of S. J. and Lucy. Lucy and Simon J. Kearns lived in Los Angeles according to a 1937 Los Angeles City Directory.

In 1935, the Fontana Land Company was again listed as the owner. In 1940, when Lot 171 was owned by the Anglo California National Bank of San Francisco, an improvement consisting of "Trees and Vines" is listed. John L. and Eula L. York owned Lot 171 from 1944 through 1950, although both are listed in California Voter Registrations as living in San Bernardino in those years. No Parcel Books are available for the land after 1950.

Throughout the 1950s, classified ads ran regularly in the local newspaper listing turkeys and ducks for sale "by grower" at the address of the Project site (*San Bernardino County Sun* various dates). In 1964, Angelina Kocalis deeded the property to Levin Mushegain. All that is known about Kocalis is that she was born in 1914 and died 100 years later in 2014 (ancestry.com). Levin Mushegain, of Armenian heritage, was born in 1906 and died in 1996 in Upland (*Los Angeles Times* 1996). The 1940 U.S. Census shows him to be 33 years of age and married to Mary in 1932. He had lived in Downey, California, where his Russia-born father was a dairyman, at least since 1935. He had worked 84 hours in the week before the Census (U.S. Census 1940). His father, also Levin, was the owner of a dairy on Old River School Road in Downey in 1932 (*California Dairyman* 1932). Levin might have followed his father into the dairy business, as a 1952 Downey City Directory listed Levin, wife Mary, as owner of the Silver Dairy on Old River School Road (Downey City Directory 1952).

In 1968, a few years after acquiring the land near Fontana, Levin and Mary (of Cypress, a city in north Orange County about 12 miles south of Downey) sold 18.5 acres in Chino, California, suggesting the Mushegains might have been investors who did not necessarily occupy the Project parcel (*San Bernardino County Sun* 1968). In 1975, Levin won approval from the County Planners to establish an auto wrecking business near the Project area south of Whittram Avenue and east of Cherry Avenue. The application had been protested by nearby residents, who objected to the unsightly use and noise that would bother neighbors and agitate dogs at a kennel adjacent to the proposed yard. The application was approved because the area had already been zoned for general manufacturing use (*San Bernardino County Sun* April 18, 1964). In 1975, Richard sought approval for another land use, consisting of an auto wrecking and dismantling facility and also a salvage yard for scrap metal in a manufacturing zone south of Whittram Avenue at the south end of Redwood Avenue (*San Bernardino County Sun* 1975). Otherwise engaged in commerce in the Inland Empire, in 1979, Levin applied for a permit to "continue" a dairy manure stockpiling and grinding operation on 10 acres in Chino Valley. This proposal was also protested by neighbors, who had been complaining about odor and health problems (*San Bernardino County Sun* 1979).

In 1980, Mary M. Mushegain and Levin Mushegain were listed in Assessor-Recorder records as owners. In 1996, their sons, Thomas L. and Richard D. Mushegain acquired the property. According to Assessor-Recorder records, the Mushegains bought and sold many properties in San Bernardino County over the decades. No documentation was found that they lived in the house, and it is possible the family were developers who ultimately packaged the parcels to prepare for sale to a development company. In 1986, Richard Mushegain, described as a partner in the truck wrecking business on Whittram Avenue, led a group of landowners to lobby for a proposal to re-zone the area for industrial use. Mushegain argued that the area was in transition toward industrial development and needed encouragement in that direction in the form of a general plan amendment (*San Bernardino County Sun* 1986). Another group of landowners had a different idea in mind, with a vision to turn the area into a new city, called Rancho Vista. The area had been earmarked for annexation since about 1968, and plans were for additional residential use to be added to the City. To promote annexation, the City was trying to clean up the industrial area, including the toxic closed Kaiser Steel Mill. The bid failed, and in 1990, the re-zoning of County land for industrial use was approved. Thomas Mushegain, co-owner of the truck wrecking business with his brother Richard, argued, "It is stupid to keep a pocket of junk. If you get industry in here, there won't be any more drug trafficking and crime out here." Among the objections by residents to the re-zoning was the claim that it was sought purely for financial gain, as land values were expected to triple with industrial development (*San Bernardino County Sun* 1990). In 2013, the owner of record was St. Gregory Almond Street LLC, and in 2018, the current owner, Cargo Solution Express Inc., bought the land.

SURVEY RESULTS

Archaeological Survey

The open, flat Project site is entirely surrounded by chain-link fencing. It is largely vacant but has an unoccupied house, garage, and some associated landscaping trees situated at its northwest corner. There is also a large loosely asphalted ramp and platform centrally located along the eastern edge of the parcel with a makeshift driveway leading to it from a gate at Almond Avenue (Figures 9 and 10). It has undergone a large amount of disturbance over time, beginning with its agricultural use and continuing into the present day. Some portions of the parcel evidence loose asphalt and/or introduced gravels on the ground surface with minimal low grassy vegetation in other areas. Recent scraping and vehicle tracks are evident throughout the parcel with gravel and dirt piles with discarded construction materials and modern trash found in various locations (Figures 11 and 12).

The entire Project area was carefully inspected for any sign of the presence of cultural materials. No previously undocumented resources were encountered during the intensive pedestrian archaeological survey.z

Architectural Description

The Project parcel is located on a rectangular grid of two-lane roads, many of which lack curbs and sidewalks. The north-south streets, like Almond Avenue, are named for trees, e.g., Cherry, Live Oak, Hemlock, Beech, Redwood, and Banana. Property types and land uses adjacent to and near the Project parcel are widely varied, ranging from vacant lots to new warehouses to small houses. Looking north from the Project parcel, the neighborhood appears somewhat rural in nature (Figure 13), whereas directly across Almond Avenue is a dirt lock with chainlink fencing that serves as a parking area for large vans (Figure 14). To the southwest are small houses that are more than 50 years old and a much newer two-story corrugated metal warehouse (Figure 15). Immediately adjacent to the north of the Project parcel is a late-twentieth-century Ranch-style house, and across the street from that is a stucco-clad multi-story duplex, which has a lawn, a sidewalk, and curbs along the street in front (Figures 16 and 17). Less than a mile to the west across Whittram Avenue from the former Kaiser Steel Plant is a row of quite small houses of similar age, which likely served as workers' housing for the Kaiser plant (Figure 18). Farther to the west lining the railroad tracks are remnants of early heavy industrial plants as well as new warehouses (Figure 19). The land adjacent to the Project parcel on the east is used as storage for cranes and other heavy industrial equipment (Figure 20).

The only buildings and structures on the parcel are located at its northwest corner, consisting of a house and a detached garage. Two mature pepper trees and one mature pine tree remain between the street at the house. A shed is visible east of the house in aerials as recent as August 2018 (Google Earth), but only a concrete slab foundation remained at the time of survey (Figure 21). A few of the once-ubiquitous eucalyptus trees defining parcel boundaries remain at the northeast corner of the former south parcel (Figure 22).

The single-story wood-frame house is situated at the northwest corner of the property. It has a moderately sloped cross-gabled roof covered with composition shingles. The narrow eaves have open beams and a flat wood fascia. A square red-brick chimney is visible. It sits on a post-and-beam foundation. There is a shed-roofed addition at the east façade. The house is clad in stucco. The primary entrance is located at the west façade at the juncture of the two wings and sits beneath a slightly sloped front-gabled porch supported by stucco-clad piers that are connected to the wall of the house. It is approached by crossing a poured-concrete patio scored in a grid pattern. There is a second patio at the east between the house and the detached garage. The patio is composed of triangular bricks with wide concrete grout (Figures 23-28).

Fenestration is irregular, consisting of a flat hollow-core wood door at the primary entrance and two similar doors at the east façade. Windows are double-hung wood sash, multi-light wood casement, multi-light fixed, two-part aluminum sliders, or two-part vinyl sliders (Figures 29-32).

Although the interior was not completely accessible at the time of survey, it appears that the addition at the east façade contains three small rooms with laminate floors. Visible doors have two recessed panels. The room at the south side of the addition has painted wood paneled walls. The back side of a fireplace that might have originally been on the exterior of the house has a wood mantle with wood shelves above (Figures 33 and 34).

To the southeast is a detached two-car garage with a moderately sloped front-gabled roof and narrow eaves with exposed beams. The roof is covered in composition shingles. The gables are filled with horizontal wood boards, and a sloped shed roof extends over the entranced. Exterior walls are clad in stucco. The garage is accessed via a curved poured-concrete driveway. Window openings at the southeast and northeast facades are filled in with plywood. A decorative door with eight recessed panels is at the northwest façade. The vehicle entrance is half filled with particle board; the other half is open. The interior walls are covered in sheetrock. The ceiling is open and the structural beams are exposed (Figures 35 and 36).

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

California Register of Historical Resources Significance Criteria

The CRHR program encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archaeological, and cultural significance; identifies historical resources for state and local planning purposes; determines eligibility for state historic preservation grant funding; and affords certain protections under CEQA. The criteria established for eligibility for the CRHR are directly comparable to the national criteria established for the NRHP.

In order to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, a building must satisfy at least one of the following four criteria:

1) It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
2) It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
3) It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.
4) It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

Historical resources eligible for listing in the CRHR must also retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. For the purposes of eligibility for the CRHR, integrity is defined as “the authenticity of an historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance” (California Office of Historic Preservation 2001). This general definition is generally strengthened by the more specific definition offered by the NRHP—the criteria and guidelines on which the CRHR criteria and guidelines are based upon.

Integrity

In order to be eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR, a property must retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance. The NRHP publication *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, National Register Bulletin 15, establishes how to evaluate the integrity of a property: “Integrity is the ability

of a property to convey its significance" (National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places 1991). The evaluation of integrity must be grounded in an understanding of a property's physical features and how they relate to the concept of integrity. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a property requires knowing why, where, and when a property is significant. To retain historic integrity, a property must possess several, and usually most, aspects of integrity:

1. **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
2. **Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
3. **Setting** is the physical environment of a historic property and refers to the character of the site and the relationship to surrounding features and open space. Setting often refers to the basic physical conditions under which a property was built and the functions it was intended to serve. These features can be either natural or manmade, including vegetation, paths, fences, and relationships between other features or open space.
4. **Materials** are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period or time, and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
5. **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history or prehistory and can be applied to the property as a whole, or to individual components.
6. **Feeling** is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. It results from the presence of physical features that, when taken together, convey the property's historic character.
7. **Association** is the direct link between the important historic event or person and a historic property.

California Environmental Quality Act Significance Criteria

CEQA Section 15064.5 *Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archeological and Historical Resources* requires that all private and public activities not specifically exempted be evaluated against the potential for environmental damage, including effects to historical resources. Historical resources are recognized as part of the environment under CEQA. It defines historical resources as "any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California."

Lead agencies have a responsibility to evaluate historical resources against the CRHR criteria prior to making a finding as to a proposed project's impacts to historical resources. Mitigation of adverse impacts is required if the proposed project will cause substantial adverse change to a historical resource. Substantial adverse change includes demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of an historical resource would be impaired. While demolition and destruction are fairly obvious significant impacts, it is more difficult to assess when change, alteration, or relocation crosses the threshold of substantial adverse change. The CEQA Guidelines provide that a Project that demolishes or alters those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance (i.e., its character-defining features) can be considered to materially impair the resource's significance. The CRHR is used in the consideration of historical resources relative to significance for purposes of CEQA. The CRHR includes resources listed in, or formally determined eligible for listing in, the NRHP, as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest. Properties of local significance that have been designated under a local preservation ordinance (local landmarks or landmark districts), or that have been identified in

a local historical resources inventory, may be eligible for listing in the CRHR and are presumed to be significant resources for purposes of CEQA unless a preponderance of evidence indicates otherwise. Generally, a resource is considered by the lead agency to be a "historical resource" if it:

1) Is listed in, or determined to be eligible by, the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (PRC Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).
2) Is included in a local register of historical resources or is identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC.
3) Is a building or structure determined to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

EVALUATION OF ELIGIBILITY

The two buildings on the property are older than 45 years: the house and the ancillary garage. Both buildings are recommended not eligible for the CRHR, neither individually nor as a contributor to any historic district under any criteria. In consideration of the buildings' individual eligibility, 8565 Almond Avenue is not associated with significant historic themes or events in San Bernardino County's history, specifically agricultural development and residential development in San Bernardino County from 1905 to 1944. Thus, 8565 Almond Avenue is recommended as not eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 1. As no historically significant individuals were identified that were associated with 8565 Almond Avenue, the buildings are recommended as not eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 2. Architectural elements of the simply-constructed house and ancillary garage are not indicative of any particular style. Furthermore, no evidence was found that the buildings are a work of a master architect or a noted local architect. Therefore, the buildings are recommended not eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 3. The buildings are recommended not eligible under CRHR Criterion 4 because they are common property types that do not have the potential to provide information about history or prehistory that is not available through historic research.

No potential historic district was identified to which 8565 Almond Avenue could be considered a contributor. As the buildings at 8565 Almond Avenue are not recommended eligible for the CRHR either individually nor as contributors to a historic district, they are not historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

IMPACTS ASSESSMENT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1) define a substantial adverse change as one that would materially impair the significance of an historical resource. According to Section 15064.5 (2)(C), "the significance of a historic 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 eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA." As a result of the evaluation of the two buildings more than 45 years old within the Project area, both are recommended not eligible for the CRHR and therefore are not historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. They are not included in a local register of historical resources (as there is no local register or local criteria), nor identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code. As a result of ASM's evaluation, the buildings are not recommended as a building or structure determined to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. The demolition of the house and ancillary garage will not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource. Therefore, according to Title 14, Chapter 3 of the CEQA Guidelines, ASM recommends that this action does not constitute an adverse impact.

RECOMMENDED MITIGATION

There is no significant adverse impact to any CEQA historical resource; therefore, mitigation is not required.

CONCLUSION

After documentation and evaluation of the history of 8565 Almond Avenue, and careful consideration of the ability of the two buildings on the property to reflect the significance historic contexts and themes in San Bernardino County, both of the buildings are recommended not eligible for the CRHR under any criteria. Neither of the buildings is included in a local register (as there is no extant register or local criteria), nor are they recommended as historically significant buildings. As such, the buildings are not considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA compliance. The buildings are not considered contributors to a potential historic district under any criteria. Further, no archaeological resources were identified within the Project area as a result of the current study. Therefore, no CEQA historical resources will be adversely impacted as a result of the Project. Please contact me as needed, if you have questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Sherri Andrews
Senior Archaeologist
ASM Affiliates, Inc.
20 North Raymond Avenue, Suite 220
Pasadena, California 91103
(626) 793-7395
sandrews@asmaffiliates.com

Attachment A: References
Attachment B: Photographs
Attachment C: NAHC Response
Attachment D: DPR Form

ATTACHMENT A: REFERENCES

References

Altschul, Jeffrey H., William C. Johnson, and Matthew A. Sterner
1989 *The Deep Creek Site (CA-SBR-176): A Late Prehistoric Base Camp in the Mojave River Forks Region, San Bernardino County, California*. Technical Series 22. Statistical Research, Tucson.

Ancestry.com
2020 Find a Grave Index. Entry for Angelina Aguirre Kocalis.

Anicic, John Charles Jr.
1982 National Register nomination for Fontana Land Company Ranch House, Camp #1.
2005 *Fontana.* Images of America Series. Arcadia Publishing, Charleston, South Carolina.
2006 *Kaiser Steel Fontana*. Images of America Series. Arcadia Publishing, Charleston, South Carolina.

Bean, Lowell J.
1962-1972 *Serrano Fieldnotes*. Manuscript in Bean's Possession.

Bean, Lowell J., and Charles Smith
1978 Serrano. In *California*, edited by R. F. Heizer, pp. 570-574. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, Lowell J., Sylvia B. Vane, Michael K. Lerch, and Jackson Young
1981 *Native American Places in San Bernardino National Forest, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California*. Report to the U.S. Forest Service, South Zone Contracting Office, Arcadia, California. Prepared by Cultural Systems Research, Inc., Menlo Park.

Beattie, George W., and Helen P. Beattie
1939 *Heritage of the Valley: San Bernardino's First Century*. San Pasqual Press, Pasadena, California.
1951 *Heritage of the Valley: San Bernardino's First Century*. Biobooks, Oakland, California.

Bedwell, S. F.
1970 Prehistory and Environment of the Pluvial Fort Rock Lake Area of South-Central Oregon. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.
1973 *Fort Rock Basin: Prehistory and Environment*. University of Oregon, Eugene.

Benedict, Ruth F.
1924 A Brief Sketch of Serrano Culture. *American Anthropologist* 26(3):366-392.

Berry, M. S.
1974 The Evans Mound: Cultural Adaption in Southwestern Utah. Unpublished Master's thesis. Department of Anthropology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

Bettinger, Robert L.
1975 The Surface Archaeology of the Owens Valley, Eastern California: Prehistoric Man-Land Relationships in the Great Basin. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation in Archaeology, University of California, Riverside.
1976 The Development of Pinyon Exploitation in Central Eastern California. *Journal of California Anthropology* 3(1):81-95.
1977 Aboriginal Human Ecology in Owens Valley: Prehistoric Change in the Great Basin. *American Antiquity* 42(1):3-17.

Bettinger, Robert L., and Martin A. Baumhoff
1982 The Numic Spread: Great Basin Cultures in Competition. *American Antiquity* 46(3):485-503.

Bettinger, Robert L., and Jelmer Eerkens
1999 Point Typologies, Cultural Transmission, and the Spread of Bow-and-Arrow Technologies in the Prehistoric Great Basin. *American Antiquity* 64(2):231-242.

Blair, Lynda M.
1985 Virgin Anasazi Turquoise Extraction and Trade. Paper presented at the 1985 Arizona-Nevada Academy of Sciences, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Blair, Lynda M., Jeffrey. R. Wedding, Suzan F. Rose, Jennifer. E. Riddle, and Annette. J. Smith
2004 *Kern River 2003 Expansion Project, California - Volume II: Cultural Resource Data Recovery Report.* With contributions by C. N. Warren, H. T. Ore, J. T. Watson, and D. C. Smee. Harry Reid Center for Environmental Studies, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Prepared for Kern River Gas Transmission.

Blair, Lynda M., and Diane L. Winslow
2004 *Kern River 2003 Expansion Project, California - Volume I: Prehistoric Turquoise Mining in the Mojave Desert - Data from the Dr. Albert Mohr Collection Kern River 2003 Expansion Project California Volume.* Harry Reid Center for Environmental Studies, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Prepared for Kern River Gas Transmission.

Brown, J., and J. Boyd
1922 *History of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties.* Lewis Publishing Company, Chicago.

California Dairyman
1932

Campbell, Elizabeth W. Crozier, William H. Campbell, Ernst Antevs, Charles Amsden, Joseph A. Barbieri, and Francis D. Bode
1937 *The Archaeology of Pleistocene Lake Mohave: A Symposium*. Southwest Museum Papers No. 11. Los Angeles, California.

City of Rialto
2015 "The Story of Rialto." City of Rialto website. Available at http://www.rialtoca.gov/cityclerk_1165.php, accessed November 18, 2015.

Davis, C. Alan, and Gerald A. Smith
1981 *Newberry Cave*. San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, California.

Davis, Jonathan O.
1978 *Quaternary Tephrochronology of the Lake Lahontan Area, Nevada and California.* Nevada Archaeological Survey Research Paper No. 7. Reno, Nevada.

Davis, Mike
1992 *City of Quartz.* Vintage Books, New York.

Dice, Michael
2006 *Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment and Paleontological Records Review Renaissance Specific Plan Project, Rialto, San Bernardino County, California.* Prepared for City of Rialto by Michael Brandman Associates, November 28, 2006.

Donnan, C. B.
1964 A Suggested Cultural Sequence for the Providence Mountains, Eastern Mojave Desert. *Annual Reports of the University of California Archaeological Survey* 1963-1964:1-23.

Downey, California, City Directory
1952 Entry for Levin Mushegain.

Drover, C. E.
1979 The Late Prehistoric Human Ecology of the Northern Mohave Sink, San Bernardino County, California. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Anthropology, University of California, Riverside.

DuBarton, A. E., W. G. Spaulding, M. S. Kelly, and J. H. Cleland
1991 *City of Las Vegas Land Transfer, Final Report on Archaeological and Paleontological Testing of Three Sites along the Eglington Escarpment*. Prepared for the Bureau of Land Management, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Elston, Robert G.
1982 Good Times, Hard Times: Prehistoric Culture Change in the Western Great Basin. In *Man and Environment in the Great Basin*, edited by David B. Madsen and James F. O'Connell, pp. 186-206. Society for American Archaeology Papers No. 2. Washington, D.C.

Enzel, Yehouda, D. R. Cayan, R. Y. Anderson, and S. G. Wells
1989 Atmospheric Circulation During Holocene Lake Stands in the Mojave Desert: Evidence of Regional Climate Change. *Nature* 341:44-48.

Enzel, Y., W. J. Brown, R. Y. Anderson, L. D. McFadden, and S. G. Wells
1992 Short-Duration Holocene Lakes in the Mojave River Drainage Basin, Southern California. *Quaternary Research* 38:60-73.

Ergle, Dolan H., Jr.
1999 *Native California Guide: Weaving the Past and Present*. Trees Company Press, San Francisco, California.

Fontana Development Company
1901 Articles of Incorporation. County of San Bernardino Historical Archives.

Fontana Farms
1930 Advertising brochure. Fontana Historical Society.

Fowler, Don D., and David B. Madsen
1986 Prehistory of the Southeastern Area. In *Great Basin*, edited by W. L. d'Azevedo, pp. 173-182. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 11, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Gifford, Edward W.
1918 Clans and Moieties in Southern California. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 14(2):155-219.

Grayson, Donald K.
1993 The *Desert's Past: A Natural Prehistory of the Great Basin*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Grenda, Donn R.
1995 *Prehistoric Game Monitoring on the Banks of Mill Creek: Data Recovery at CA-RIV-2804, Prado Basin, Riverside County, California*. Technical Series 52. Statistical Research, Tucson.
1998 *Between the Coast and the Desert: Archaeological Data Recovery at the Yukaipa't Site, CA-SBR-1000, Yucaipa, California*. Technical Series 70. Statistical Research, Tucson.

Hall, S. A.
1985 Quaternary Pollen Analysis and Vegetational History of the Southwest. In *Pollen Records of Late Quaternary North American Sediments*, edited by V. Bryant, Jr., and R. Holloway, pp. 95-124. American Association of Stratigraphic Palynologists Foundation, Dallas, Texas.

Harrington, Mark Raymond
1927 Some Lake Bed Camp Sites in Nevada. *Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, Indian Notes* 4(1):40-47. New York.

Harrington, Mark R., and Ruth D. Simpson
1961 *Tule Springs, Nevada, with Other Evidence of Pleistocene Man in North America*. Southwest Museum Papers No. 4. Los Angeles, California.

Heizer, Robert F., and A. E. Treganza
1944 Mines and Quarries of the Indians of California. *California Journal of Mines and Geology* 40:291-359.

Hester, T. R.
1973 Chronological Ordering of Great Basin Prehistory. *Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility* 17:55-128.

Historicaerials.com
Aerials: 1938, 1948, 1959, 1966, 1994, 2002, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016.
Topos: 1896, 1898, 1901, 1905, 1909, 1913, 1926, 1929, 1938, 1943, 1946, 1955, 1959, 1963, 1965, 1969, 1975, 1980, 1985, 2012, 2015, and 2018.

Hughes, Richard E., and James A. Bennyhoff
1986 Early Trade. In *Great Basin*, edited by W. L. d'Azevedo, pp. 238-255. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 11, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

James, S. R.
1986 What Mean These Sherds? A Functional Approach to Fremont Ceramics in the Western Periphery. In *Pottery of the Great Basin and Adjacent Areas*, edited by S. Griset, pp. 107-118. Anthropological Papers 111. University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

Kowta, Makoto
1969 The Sayles Complex: A Late Milling Stone Assemblage from Cajon Pass and the Ecological Implications of Its Scraper Planes. *University of California Publications in Anthropology No. 6*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Kroeber, Alfred L.
1907 *The Religion of the Indians of California*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 4(6). University Press, Berkeley, California.
1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Dover Publications Inc., New York.

Lamb, Sydney
1958 Linguistic Prehistory in the Great Basin. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 24(2):95-100.

Larson, Daniel
1981 *A Study of the Settlement Patterns of Southern Nevada as Reflected by the Archaeological Records*. Western Anasazi Reports 3(1). Cedar City, Utah.

Leonard, N. Nelson, III, and Christopher Drover
1980 Prehistoric Turquoise Mining in the Halloran Springs District, San Bernardino County, California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 2(2):245-256.

Lerch, Michael K.
2002 *CHUKIAM (All Growing Things): The Ethnobotany of the Serrano Indians*. Draft. Manuscript on file at Statistical Research, Woodland, California.

Lerch, Michael K., and Richard Ciolek-Torrello (editors)
2007 *From the Pan into the Fire: Emergency Archaeological Data Recovery at the Pan Hot Springs Site, San Bernardino National Forest, California*. Technical Report 06-90. Statistical Research, Redlands, California.

Los Angeles Times
1996 Obituary of Levin S. Mushegain. January 12.
2019 "When Your House Is Surrounded by Massive Warehouses." October 27.

Lyneis, Margaret M.
1982 Prehistory in the Southern Great Basin. In *Man and Environment in the Great Basin*, edited by David B. Madsen and James F. O'Connell, pp. 172-185. Society for American Archaeology Papers No. 2. Washington, D. C.
1995 The Virgin Anasazi, Far Western Puebloans. *Journal of World Prehistory* 9(2):199-241.

Lyneis, Margaret M., Jeanne Clark, Richard McCarty, and Tara Shepperson
1978 *Archaeological Element: Historic Preservation Assessment and Planning Process, City of Las Vegas*. Department of Anthropology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Cultural Resource Report 4-1-4.

Monrovia News-Post
1983 "Industrial Park Development Set." January 23.

Moratto, Michael
1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, Inc., New York.

Morrissey, R. R.
1968 *Turquoise Deposits of Nevada*. Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Report No. 17. Mackay School of Mines, University of Nevada, Reno.

Pierson, E.
1970 *The Mojave River and Its Valley*. Arthur H. Clarke Co., Glendale.

Pioneer Title Insurance Company (Pioneer)
1958 *The Story of San Bernardino County*. San Bernardino County: Author.

Pogue, J. E.
1915 *The Turquoise: A Study of Its History, Mineralogy, Geology, Ethnology, Archaeology, Mythology, Folklore, and Technology*. Third Memoir Series 12(2):3-162. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. (Reprinted 1971, Rio Grande Press, Glorieta, New Mexico.)

Pronin, Barbara
1989 *West Covina: Fulfilling the Promise*, Windsor Publications. Chatsworth, California.

Rafferty, Kevin A.
1984 *A Cultural Resources Investigation of a 480-Acre Desert Land Entry Act Application for Robert Lewis Moapa, Clark County, Nevada*. Environmental Research Center Division of Anthropological Studies, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Cultural Resource Report BLM 5-1357(P), DAS 5-76-1.

Rector, Carol H., James D. Swenson, and Philip J. Wilke (editors)
1983 *Archaeological Studies at Oro Grande, Mojave Desert, California*. San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, California.

Rogers, Malcolm J.
1929 *Report of an Archaeological Reconnaissance in the Mohave Sink Region.* San Diego Museum of Man Papers No. 1.

Ruby, J. M.
1970 Culture Contact between Aboriginal Southern California and the Southwest. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Anthropology Department, University of California, Los Angeles.

San Bernardino County Sun
1942 "Work Starts on Kaiser Steel Mill." April 14.
1950s Classified ads, various dates.
1964 "Auto Wrecking Yard Site in Fontana Wins Approval." April 18.
1968 "Sold!" December 7.
1975 Legal Advertisement.
1979 Metro Section. Permits. March 13.
1986 "Kaiser-area Zoning Move Postponed." September 27.
1990 "Industrial Zoning Switch South West of Fontana." August 20.

Schneider, Joan S.
1988 Late Prehistoric Times in the Central Mojave Desert: Some Problems. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 24(1):30–44.

Schroeder, Albert H.
1979 Prehistory: Hakataya. In *Southwest*, edited by Alfonso Ortiz, pp. 100-107. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 9, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Schroth, Adella Beverly
1994 The Pinto Point Controversy in the Western United States. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Riverside.

Shutler, Richard, Jr.
1961 *Lost City Pueblo Grande de Nevada*. Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers No. 5. Carson City, Nevada.

Simpson, Ruth D.
1958 The Manix Lake Archaeological Survey. *The Masterkey* 32(1):4-10. Los Angeles.
1960 Archaeological Survey of the Eastern Calico Mountains. *The Masterkey* 34(1):25-35. Los Angeles.
1961 *Coyote Gulch: Archaeological Excavations of an Early Lithic Locality in the Mohave Desert of San Bernardino County*. Archaeological Survey Association of Southern California Paper No. 5. Los Angeles.

Simpson, R. D., G. A. Smith, R. Reynolds, D. H. Bowers, and A. Haenszel
1972 *Rock Camp Site: Archaeological Excavation of an Indian Campsite near Lake Arrowhead, San Bernardino Mountains.* San Bernardino County Museum Association Quarterly 20(1).

Smith, Gerald A.
1963 *Archaeological Survey of the Mojave River Area and Adjacent Regions.* San Bernardino County Museum Association. Unpublished report on file at the San Bernardino County Museum, Redlands, California.

Spaulding, W. G.
1990 Vegetation and Climatic Development of the Mojave Desert: The Last Glacial Maximum to the Present. In *Packrat Middens: The Last 40,000 Years of Biotic Change*, edited by J. L. Betancourt, P. S. Martin, and T. R. Van Devender. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
1991 A Middle Holocene Vegetation Record from the Mojave Desert and its Paleoclimatic Significance. *Quaternary Research* 35:427-437.
1995 Environmental Change, Ecosystem Responses, and the Late Quaternary Development of the Mojave Desert. In *Quaternary Environments and Deep Time: Papers in Honor of Paul S. Martin*, edited by J. I. Mead and D. S. Steadman, pp. 139-164. Fenske Printing, Inc., Rapid City, South Dakota.

Stoebe, Martha
1965 *A History of Rialto*. Rialto Unified School District, Rialto, California.

Strong, W. D.
1929 *Aboriginal Society in Southern California*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 26(1).

Susia, Margaret L.
1964 *Tule Springs Archaeological Surface Survey*. Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers No. 12. Carson City.

Sutton, Mark Q., Joan S. Schneider, and Robert M. Yohe II
1993 The Siphon Site (CA-SBR-6580): A Millingstone Horizon Site in Summit Valley, California. *San Bernardino County Museum Quarterly* 40(3). San Bernardino County Museum Association, Redlands, California.

Tuohy, Donald R.
1974 A Comparative Study of the Late Paleoindian Manifestations in the Western Great Basin. In *A Collection of Papers on Great Basin Archaeology*, edited by R. Elston and L. Savini, pp. 91-116. Nevada Archaeological Survey Research Paper No. 5.

United States Census
1940 Entry for Levin Mushegain.

University of Santa Barbara Library Special Research Collections
1953, 1959 Available at: http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/ap_indexes/FrameFinder/.

Wallace, William J.
1962 Prehistoric Cultural Developments in the Southern California Deserts. *American Antiquity* 28(2):172-180.

Warren, Claude N.
1967 The San Dieguito Complex: A Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity* 32:168-185.
1980 The Archaeology and Archaeological Resources of the Amargosa-Mohave Basin Planning Units. In *A Cultural Resources Overview for the Amargosa-Mohave Basin Planning Units*, edited by C. N. Warren, M. Knack, and E. Warren, pp. 2-134. Unpublished report submitted to the Bureau of Land Management, Desert Planning Staff, Riverside, California.
1984 The Desert Region. In *California Archaeology*, edited by Michael J. Moratto, pp. 338-430. Academic Press, New York.
1990 *Archaeological Investigations at Nelson Wash, Fort Irwin, California*. Fort Irwin Archeological Project Research Report Number 23, Volumes I and II Interagency Archaeological Services, National Park Service Western Region. San Francisco, California.

Warren, Claude N., and Robert Crabtree
1986 Prehistory of the Southwestern Area. In *Great Basin*, edited by W. L. d'Azevedo, pp. 183-193. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 11, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

White, Tim D., and Wes Reeder
1970 *An Archaeological Survey of the Deep Creek Drainage, San Bernardino Mountains, California*. Manuscript on file, California Historical Resources Information System, San Bernardino Archeological Information Center, San Bernardino County Museum, Redlands.

Willig, A. J.
1988 Paleo-Archaic Adaptations and Lakeside Settlement Patterns in the Northern Alkali Basin, Oregon. In *Early Human Occupation in Far Western North American: The Clovis-Archaic Interface*, edited by J. A. Willig, C. M. Aikens, and J. L. Fagan. Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers No. 21. Carson City.

Winslow, Diane L.
2003a *Mitigation Black Dog Mesa Archaeological Complex (26CK5686/BLM 53-7216) Volume 1 – History and Project Overview*. Harry Reid Center for Environmental Studies, Division of Cultural Resources, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Prepared for Bureau of Land Management and Nevada Power Company. BLM Report No. 5-2430(1), HRC Report No. 5-4-26(1).
2003b *Mitigation Black Dog Mesa Archaeological Complex (26CK5686/BLM 53-7216) Volume II – Black Dog Cave*. Harry Reid Center for Environmental Studies, Division of Cultural Resources, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Prepared for Bureau of Land Management and Nevada Power Company. BLM Report No. 5-2430(2), HRC Report No. 5-4-26(2).

Young, D. A., and R. A. Bettinger
1992 The Numic Spread: A Computer Simulation. *American Antiquity* 57(1):85-98.

ATTACHMENT B: FIGURES AND PHOTOGRAPHS

ATTACHMENT C: NAHC CORRESPONDENCE

ATTACHMENT D: DPR FORMS