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The proposed project includes the construction and operation of a 380,000 square-foot high-cube warehouse located east of Interstate 215 and south of Harley Knox Boulevard in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California. The proposed Project Site is 21.63 acres in size, 0.27 acres of which will be provided for purposes of street dedication, and the remainder of the site to be developed with 205,000 square feet of landscaping, 225 passenger vehicle parking stalls, 98 trailer parking stalls, and two detention basins. The warehouse building will include 43 docking bays. The project site is comprised of Assessor’s Parcels 294-210-008, -034, -035, -037, -038, -044, -046, and -056. In addition to the proposed on-site and potential off-site improvements, the project includes a Specific Plan Amendment which will change the zoning in the PVCC Specific Plan from Commercial to Light Industrial.

Adjacent to the west boundary of the project site is a 1.5-acre parcel (APN 294-210-042) that has been included in the environmental analysis, including the technical studies, for future, potential development in conjunction with the project site. Potential inclusion of this additional property at an undetermined future date would result in an alternative project site consisting of 23.66 gross acres. The alternative project site is estimated to support a 400,000 square-foot high-cube warehouse with 212,000 square feet of landscaping, 255 passenger vehicle parking stalls, 150 truck trailer parking stalls, and 47 docks.

The purpose of including the additional property and expanding the scope of the CEQA analysis beyond that submitted for entitlement approval is to avoid the need for future environmental review, should the additional property be added to the project site at a later date. All field surveys, technical data, analysis, mitigation measures, and resulting determinations of significance are sufficient in providing environmental clearance for both the proposed project and the potential future project. For the purposes of this report, the 23.66-acre site that includes the 1.5-acre (APN 294-210-042) parcel will be called the "Study Area".

MIG conducted a Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of the Study Area to determine the potential impacts to cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources) for the purpose of complying with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the local cultural resource regulations. The scope of work for this assessment included a cultural resources records search through the California Historical Resources Information System-Eastern Information Center at the California University, Riverside (CHRIS-EIC), a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and follow-up Native American consultation, research, a paleontological resources records search through the San Bernardino County Museum (SBCM), a pedestrian survey, eligibility evaluations for resources identified within the Study Area, impact analyses, and the recommendation of additional work and mitigation measures.

Archaeological Resources

The cultural resources records search results from the Eastern Information Center (CHRIS-EIC) indicated that there were no archaeological resources located within the Study Area or within one-mile radius, and none were identified during the pedestrian survey. The City of Perris General Plan has identified the Study Area to be in a vicinity of low sensitivity for cultural resources consisting of one or less recorded sites per square mile (City of Perris General Plan 2005). Therefore, the proposed project would result in no adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5.

The Study Area is comprised of multiple built environments and vacant land. The Study Area’s built environment consists of light manufacturing, warehouses and residential housing. The vacant land portion of the Study Area measures approximately: 1,025-feet north-south by 1,000-feet east-west and exhibits shallow plowing or disking of soils in a north-south direction. Despite the heavy disturbances of the Study Area that may have displaced archaeological resources on the surface, it is possible that intact archaeological resources exist at depth. As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 9 to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.
Executive Summary

Historical Resources
The cultural resources records search results from the (CHRIS-EIC) indicated that there were no historical resources located within the Study Area or within a one-mile radius, and none were identified during the pedestrian survey. However, there are four (4) residential homes located at 1350, 1352, 1354, and 1340; West Oleander Avenue/Harley Knox Boulevard that are over 45 years old, built in 1944 (Riverside County Assessor 2016). Notes and photographs were taken of each house, so that they could be evaluated to determine whether they were eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), or as a City Historic Landmark.

The results of archival research and a literature review showed that properties located at 1350, 1352, 1354, and 1340; West Oleander Avenue/Harley Knox Boulevard are not listed on the City of Perris General Plan Historical Resources List (City of Perris General Plan 2008). Therefore, the City of Perris Planning Director (Personal Communication June 13, 2016) has determined that these four properties would result in no adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. ¹

Paleontological Resources
Results of the paleontological resources records search through SBCM indicate that no vertebrate fossil localities from the SBCM records have been previously recorded within the Study Area or within a one-mile radius. Moreover, no paleontological resources were identified by MIG during the pedestrian survey. Nevertheless, the results of the literature review and the search at the SBCM indicate that the Study Area is situated upon Pleistocene older fan deposits that, depending upon their lithology or any previous disturbance, have high potential to contain paleontologic resources. Excavations in this older alluvium therefore have high potential to impact paleontologic resources. Further, a review of the City of Perris’s General Plan indicate that the Study Area is located within a vicinity of high paleontological sensitivity, exhibiting surface exposures of older Pleistocene valley deposits that have the potential to contain significant fossil resources. Thus, requiring paleontological construction monitoring of all project requiring subsurface excavations will be required (City of Perris General Plan 2005, Mitigation Measure IV.A.4). As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 9 to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered paleontological resources or unique geological features that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

¹ Clara Miramontes, Planning Director: Personal communication, June 13, 2016)
1.1 – Proposed Project and Location
The proposed project includes the construction and operation of a 380,000 square-foot high-cube warehouse located east of Interstate 215 and south of Harley Knox Boulevard in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California. The proposed Project Site is 21.63 acres in size, 0.27 acres of which will be provided for purposes of street dedication, and the remainder of the site to be developed with 205,000 square feet of landscaping, 225 passenger vehicle parking stalls, 98 trailer parking stalls, and two detention basins. The warehouse building will include 43 docking bays. The project site is comprised of Assessor’s Parcels 294-210-008,-034,-035,-037,-038,-044,-046, and -056. In addition to the proposed on-site and potential off-site improvements, the project includes a Specific Plan Amendment which will change the zoning in the PVCC Specific Plan from Commercial to Light Industrial.

Adjacent to the west boundary of the project site is a 1.5-acre parcel (APN 294-210-042) that has been included in the environmental analysis, including the technical studies, for future, potential development in conjunction with the project site. Potential inclusion of this additional property at an undetermined future date would result in an alternative project site consisting of 23.66 gross acres. The alternative project site is estimated to support a 400,000 square-foot high-cube warehouse with 212,000 square feet of landscaping, 255 passenger vehicle parking stalls, 150 truck trailer parking stalls, and 47 docks.

The purpose of including the additional property and expanding the scope of the CEQA analysis beyond that submitted for entitlement approval is to avoid the need for future environmental review, should the additional property be added to the project site at a later date. All field surveys, technical data, analysis, mitigation measures, and resulting determinations of significance are sufficient in providing environmental clearance for both the proposed project and the potential future project. For the purposes of this report, the 23.66-acre site that includes the 1.5-acre (APN 294-210-042) parcel will be called the "Study Area".

The Study Area is located in the City of Perris, in Riverside County, California (Figure 1, Regional and Vicinity Map). The Study Area is depicted in Section 36 of Township 3 South, Range 4 West of the Perris CA United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5' topographic (Figure 2, USGS Topographic Map). The Study Area is surrounded by vacant land and a light industrial complex to the north adjacent to Harley Knox Boulevard, to the south by warehouses adjacent to West Oleander Avenue, to the east by warehouses adjacent to Harley Knox Boulevard, and to the west by Interstate 215.

1.2 – Scope of Study and Personnel
MIG conducted a phase I cultural resources assessment of the Study Area from September 2015 through November 2015 to identify potential impacts to cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources) and to develop mitigation measures to avoid, reduce, or mitigate potential impacts to resources for the purpose of complying with CEQA and local cultural resource guidelines. The scope of work for this assessment included a cultural resources records search through the CHRIS-EIC, a Scared Lands File (SLF) search through the NAHC and follow-up Native American consultation, research, a paleontological resources records search through the SBCM, a pedestrian survey, eligibility evaluations for the resources identified within the Study Area, impact analyses, and the recommendations of additional work and mitigation measures, if necessary.

The assessment was co-managed and this report compiled by Mr. Chris Purtell, M.A., RPA and Mr. Chris Brown. The pedestrian field survey was performed by Mr. Purtell. The record searches were conducted by Mr. Purtell. Qualifications of key personnel are provided in Appendix A.
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Regulatory Framework

Cultural resources are indirectly protected under the provisions of the Federal Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 U.S.C §§ 431 et seq.) and subsequent related legislation, regulations, policies, and guidance documents. The following is a summary of the applicable (federal, state, and local) regulatory framework related to the protection of cultural resources in California.

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

2.1 Federal Level

2.1.1 – NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966

Enacted in 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (16 U.S.C §§ 470 et seq.) declared a national policy of historic preservation and instituted a multifaceted program, administered by the Secretary of the Interior, to encourage the achievement of preservation goals at the federal, state, and local levels. The NHPA authorized the expansion and maintenance of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), established the position of State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), provided for the designation of State Review Boards, set up a mechanism to certify local governments to carry out the purposes of the NHPA, assist Native American tribes in preserving their cultural heritage, and created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).

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

2.1.2 – SECTION 106 OF THE FEDERAL GUIDELINES

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

2.1.3 – NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

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

- **Criterion A:** It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
 Criterion B: It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past.

 Criterion C: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represents the work of a master; possesses high artistic values; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

 Criterion D: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

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

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

2.2 – State

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

2.2.2 – CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

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

Criterion 1: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.

Criterion 2: It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

Criterion 3: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represents the work of an important creative individual; or possesses high artistic values.

Criterion 4: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

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

2.3 – Other State Statutes and Regulations

2.3.1 – CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL LANDMARKS

California Historical Landmarks (CHLs) are buildings, structures, sites, or places that have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other value and that have been determined to have statewide historical significance by meeting at least one of the criteria listed below. The

3 California Public Resources Code § 5024.1(b).
resource must also be approved for designation by the County Board of Supervisors or the City or Town Council in whose jurisdiction it is located, be recommended by the State Historical Resources Commission, or be officially designated by the Director of California State Parks. The specific standards in use now were first applied in the designation of CHL No. 770. CHLs No. 770 and above are automatically listed in the CRHR.

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

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

2.3.2 – CALIFORNIA POINTS OF HISTORICAL INTEREST

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

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

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

2.3.3 – NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION, PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTIONS 5097.9–5097.991

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

2.3.4 – CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION ACT OF 2001

Codified in the California Health and Safety Code Sections 8010–8030, the California Native American Graves Protection Act (NAGPRA) is consistent with the federal NAGPRA. Intended to “provide a seamless and consistent state policy to ensure that all California Indian human remains and cultural items be treated with dignity and respect,” the California NAGPRA also encourages and provides a mechanism for the return of remains and cultural items to lineal descendants. Section 8025 established a Repatriation Oversight Commission to oversee this process. The act also provides a process for non–federally recognized tribes to file claims with agencies and museums for repatriation of human remains and cultural items.
2.3.5 – **Senate Bill 18**
Senate Bill (SB) 18 (California Government Code, Section 65352.3) incorporates the protection of California traditional tribal cultural places into land use planning for cities, counties, and agencies by establishing responsibilities for local governments to contact, refer plans to, and consult with California Native American tribes as part of the adoption or amendment of any general or specific plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005. SB18 requires public notice to be sent to tribes listed on the Native American Heritage Commission’s SB18 Tribal Consultation list within the geographical areas affected by the proposed changes. Tribes must respond to a local government notice within 90 days (unless a shorter time frame has been agreed upon by the tribe), indicating whether or not they want to consult with the local government. Consultations are for the purpose of preserving or mitigating impacts to places, features, and objects described in Sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 of the Public Resources Code that may be affected by the proposed adoption or amendment to a general or specific plan.

2.3.6 – **Assembly Bill 52**
Assembly Bill (AB) 52 specifies that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. AB 52 requires a lead agency to begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project, if the tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects in that geographic area and the tribe requests consultation, prior to determining whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project. AB 52 specifies examples of mitigation measures that may be considered to avoid or minimize impacts on tribal cultural resources. The bill makes the above provisions applicable to projects that have a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration filed or mitigated negative declaration on or after July 1, 2015. AB 52 amends Sections 5097.94 and adds Sections 21073, 21074, 2108.3.1., 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3 to the California Public Resources Code (PRC), relating to Native Americans.

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

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

2.5 – Local Level

2.5.1 – **City of Perris General Plan-Conservation Element**
The City of Perris has put forth numerous policies with the Goals and Objectives section of the General Plan. These policies were created to identify and preserve the City’s unique historical and archaeological resources for generations (City of Perris 2008).

| Measure IV.A.2 | For all projects subject to CEQA, applicants will be required to submit results of an archaeological records request through the Eastern Information Center at the University of Riverside. |
| Measure IV.A.3 | Require Phase I Surveys for all projects located in areas that have not been previously surveyed for archaeological or historic resources, or which lie near areas where archaeological or historic sites have been recorded. |
| Measure IV.A.4 | In Area I and Area 2 shown on the Paleontological Sensitivity Map, paleontological monitoring of all projects requiring subsurface excavations will be required once any excavation begins. In Areas 4 and 5, paleontological monitoring will be required once subsurface excavations five feet in depth, with monitoring levels reduced if appropriate, at the discretion of a certified Project Paleontologist. |
The Study Area is located on approximately 23.66 acres of land located in the North Perris area of western Riverside County. The Project Site is bordered by Interstate 215 to the west, Harley Knox Boulevard to the north and east, and West Oleander Avenue to the south of the Study Area. The elevation within the Study Area ranges from approximately 1,500 feet above mean sea level (MSL) in the north-northeast to 1,540 feet above MSL in the south-southwest. With the exception of the southwestern portion the Study Area is currently undeveloped; however, evidence of past disking/plowing activities is evident on Google Earth. This portion of the Study Area appears to have been used for cultivation in the past although it is currently fallow. The developed southern portion of the Study Area shows asphalt paved streets, residential homes and a vacant lot. The topography of the Study Area is relatively flat, with a slight slope along a northwest to southeast direction. Reviews of aerial photographs indicate that the Study Area has been highly disturbed by regular disking/plowing for weed abatement or agricultural usage.

Geologically, the Study Area is located in the north portion of the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province. The Peninsular Ranges province is distinguished by northwest trending mountain ranges and valleys following faults branching from the San Andreas Fault. The Peninsular Ranges are bound to the east by the Colorado Desert and extend north to the San Bernardino – Riverside county line (Norris and Webb 1976), west into the submarine continental shelf, and south to the California state line.

The Perris Valley, in which the Study Area lies, is a northwest-southwest trending inland valley between the Lakeview Mountains and the Santa Ana-Elsinore Mountains. The Study Area is located in the western portion of this valley, more than a mile east of the Gavilan Hills, a high portion of the Perris Structural Block that marks its western edge. The Perris Valley is one of several tectonically controlled valleys within the valley and ridge system of the Perris Structural Block. These are structurally depressed troughs filled with sediments of upper Pliocene through recent ages, and the ridges are composed of plutonic igneous rocks, metasedimentary rocks, and late-stage intrusive dikes (City of Perris 2011).
4.1 – Prehistoric Context
Prehistory is most easily discussed chronologically, in terms of environmental change and recognized cultural developments. Several chronologies have been proposed for inland Southern California, the most widely accepted of which is Wallace’s four-part Horizon format (1955), which was later updated and revised by Claude Warren (1968). The advantages and weaknesses of Southern California chronological sequences are reviewed by Warren (in Moratto 1984), Chartkoff and Chartkoff (1984), and Heizer (1978). The following discussion is based on Warren’s (1968) sequence, but the time frames have been adjusted to reflect more recent archaeological findings, interpretations, and advances in radiocarbon dating.

4.1.1 – Paleo-Indian Period (ca. 13,000-11,000 years before present [YBP])
Little is known of Paleo-Indian peoples in inland southern California, and the cultural history of this period follows that of North America in general. Recent discoveries in the Americas have challenged the theory that the first Americans migrated from Siberia, following a route from the Bering Strait into Canada and the Northwest Coast sometime after the Wisconsin Ice Sheet receded (ca. 14,000 YBP), and before the Bering Land Bridge was submerged (ca. 12,000 YBP). Based on new research from the Pacific Rim, it has been proposed that modern humans settled islands of the eastern Pacific between 40,000 and 15,000 years ago. Evidence of coastal migration has also come from sites on islands off Alta and Baja California. As a result, these sites are contemporary with Clovis and Folsom points found in North America’s interior regions. All of these new findings have made the coastal migration theory gain credibility in recent times (Erlandson et al. 2007).

The timing, manner, and location of the Bering Strait crossing are a matter of debate among archaeologists, but the initial migration probably occurred as the Laurentide Ice Sheet melted along the Alaskan Coast and interior Yukon. The earliest radiocarbon dates from the Paleo-Indian Period in North America come from the Arlington Springs Woman site on Santa Rosa Island, which is located approximately 36 miles off the coast of California and is approximately 150 miles west-northwest of the Study Area. These human remains date to approximately 13,000 YBP (Johnson, et al. 2002). Other early Paleo-Indian sites include the Monte Verde Creek site in Chile (Meltzer, et al. 1997) and the controversial Meadowcroft Rockshelter in Pennsylvania. Both sites have early levels dated roughly at 12,000 YBP. Lifeways during the Paleo-Indian Period were characterized by highly mobile hunting and gathering. Prey included megafauna such as mammoth and technology included a distinctive flaked stone toolkit that has been identified across much of North America and into Central America. They likely used some plant foods, but the Paleo-Indian toolkit recovered archaeologically does not include many tools that can be identified as designed specifically for plant processing.

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

4.1.2 – Archaic Period (ca. 11,000-3,500 YBP)
The earliest Archaic Period life in inland southern California has been given the name San Dieguito tradition, after the San Diego area where it was first identified and studied (Warren 1968). Characteristic artifacts include stemmed projectile points, crescents and leaf-shaped knives, which suggest a continued, focus on large game, although not megafauna of the earlier Paleo-Indian period. Milling equipment appears in the archaeological record at approximately 7,500 years ago (Moratto 1984:158). Artifact assemblages with this equipment include basin milling stones and unshaped manos, projectile points, flexed burials under cairns, and coggd stones, and have been given the name La Jolla Complex (7,500-3,000 YBP). The transition from San Dieguito life to La Jolla life appears to have been an
adaptation to drying of the climate after 8,000 YBP, which may have stimulated movements of desert peoples to the coastal regions, bringing milling stone technology with them. Groups in the coastal regions focused on mollusks, while inland groups relied on wild-seed gathering and acorn collecting.

4.1.3—LATE PREHISTORIC PERIOD (CA. 3,500 YBP–A.D. 1769)
Cultural responses to environmental changes around 4,000–3,000 YBP included a shift to more land-based gathering practices. This period was characterized by the increasing importance of acorn processing, which supplemented the resources from hunting and gathering. Meighan (1954) identified the period after A.D. 1400 as the San Luis Rey complex. San Luis Rey I (A.D. 1400–1750) is associated with bedrock mortars and milling stones, cremations, small triangular projectile points with concave bases and Olivella beads. The San Luis Rey II (A.D. 1750–1850) period is marked by the addition of pottery, red and black pictographs, cremation urns, steatite arrow straighteners, and non-aboriginal materials (Meighan 1954:223, Keller and McCarthy 1989:6). Work at Cole Canyon and other sites in southern California suggest that this complex, and the ethnographically described life of the native people of the region, were well established by at least 1,000 YBP (Keller and McCarthy 1989:80).

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

4.1.5—SERRANO
The Serrano people speak the Takic language, which is a similar to dialect spoken by the Luiseno, Cahuilla, and Garbrielino’s (Bean and Smith 1978). The name Serrano comes from the Spanish word: “mountaineer or highlander” and refers to the indigenous people inhabiting the San Bernardino Mountains east of the Cajon Pass and may have settled along the Santa Ana River as early as 8,000 B.C. Their territory has been difficult to define, but it can be reliable characterized as from the San Bernardino Mountains extending northeast to the Mojave River region and southeast to the Tejon Creek area. The Serrano people were hunters-gathers and their diet consisted of small game such as rabbits, ground squirrels, and birds that was supplement by pinion nuts, acorns, agave, tuber-vegetables, and prickly pears. Villages were based on exogamous moieties (marriage outside of one’s clan) and their size ranged between 25 to hundred people (Bean and Shipek 1978). The Yuhaviatam clan is known as the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Maarenga’ yam clan is known as the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, with a further, clan division for the Sobba Band of Luiseno Indians. The villagers lived in large communal dwellings made from tree branches that were covered with woven mats. Each family group had its own individual fire place inside the dwelling, where they crafted mother-of-pearl inlay baskets and vessels that they trade with the Chumash and Tongvas. In 1771, the Serrano’s’ were subjugated and absorbed into the San Gabriel Mission system that resulted in the loss of their freedom, cultural and customs. In 1891, the United States created the “San Manuel” Indian Reservation after Chief Santos Manuel. From this date forward the Serrano Indians have been known as the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (Boyd and Brown 1922 and San Manuel Band of Mission Indians 2010).

4.1.6—LUISEÑO
The Luiseño are a Takic speaking people that are usually associated with coastal and inland areas of present day Orange and southern Riverside counties, with cultural and social behavioral characteristics similar to those of the Cahuilla, a tribal group generally linked with areas northeast of the San Jacinto Mountains. In fact, exchanges between the Luiseno and Cahuilla have been well documented. In context, the Study Area is considered a Luiseño area, though evidence of a Cahuilla presence may be identified (Robinson and Risher 1996:102-103). The term Luiseño derives from the mission named San Luis Rey and has been used in the region to refer to those Takic-speaking people associated with Mission San Luis Rey (Bean and Shipek 1978:550). The Luiseño shared boundaries with the Cahuilla, Cupeno, Gabrielino, and Kumeyaay groups on the east, north, and south, respectively. These different bands shared cultural and language traditions with the Luiseño. The Luiseño territory comprised from the coast to Agua Hedionda Creek on the south to near Aliso Creek on the northwest. The boundary extended inland to Santiago Peak, then across to the eastern side of Elsinore Fault Valley, then southward to the east of Palomar Mountain, then around the southern slope above the
valley of San Jose (ibid.:550). Their habitat covered every ecological zone from the ocean, sandy beaches, shallow inlets, coastal chaparral, grassy valleys oak groves, among various other niches. The primary food source consisted of game animals such as deer, rabbit, jackrabbit, woodrat, mice, ground squirrels, antelope, and various species of birds. Next to game animals, acorns were the most single important staple, and six different species were utilized (ibid.:552).

The Luiseño social structure is unclear; however, each village was a clan-triblet-a group of people patrilineally related who owned an area in common and who were politically and economically autonomous from neighboring groups. The Luiseño were not organized into exogamous moieties such as were their neighbors, Cahuilla, Cupeno, and Serrano (Strong 1929:291). The hereditary village chief held an administrative position that combined and controlled religious, economic, and warfare powers (Boscana 1846:43). Marriage was arranged by the parents of children and important lineages were allied through marriage. Reciprocally useful alliances were arranged between groups in different ecological niches, and became springboards of territorial expansion, especially following warfare and truces (White 1963:130). The Luiseño material culture included an array of tools that were made from stone, wood, bone, and shell, and which served to procure and process the region's resources. Needs for shelter and clothing were minimal in the region's forgiving climate, but considerable attention was devoted to personal decoration in ornaments, painting, and tattooing. The local pottery was well made, although it was not elaborately decorated (Laylander and Pham 2012).

The Luiseño material culture included an array of tools that were made from stone, wood, bone, and shell, and which served to procure and process the region's resources. Needs for shelter and clothing were minimal in the region's forgiving climate, but considerable attention was devoted to personal decoration in ornaments, painting, and tattooing. The local pottery was well made, although it was not elaborately decorated (Laylander and Pham 2012).

4.1.7 — CAHUILLA

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

4.1.8 — EUROPEAN CONTACT

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

4.2– Historic Context
Riverside County was settled by non-Indians in 1818-1819, by Leandro Jose Serrano who established a cattle ranch in the Temescal Valley under a permit authorized by the Mission San Luis Rey (Jennings et.al. 1993:91). During the same period the Mission San Luis Rey constructed a granary, a chapel and living quarters for the majordomo near the Luiseno village of Temecula. Concurrently, the Perris and San Jacinto Valleys became loosely affiliated with the Rancho San Jacinto, a vast cattle ranch controlled by the Mission San Luis Rey. Rancho San Jacinto first appeared in mission records in 1821 (City of Perris Draft Environmental Impact Report 2011).

During the secularization of the mission systems starting in 1834, mission ranchos throughout, Alta California were surrendered to the Mexican Government, and were consequently divided into large land grants and given to prominent citizens in the various provinces. The Rancho San Jacinto, Mexican officials created three large land grants commencing in the 1840’s, including San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero, which is located east of the project site and was granted to Miguel de Pendorena, a propionate merchant from San Diego in 1846, just prior to American occupation of California. Cattle and agriculture was the economic engine that drove the ranchos way of life, which continued until the second half of the 19th century with the arrival of American and European settlers into California (City of Perris Draft Environmental Impact Report 2011).

4.2.1 – CITY OF PERRIS
Prior to American control of California, a wealthy Mexican landowner, Don Jose Antonio Estudillo, held most of the area in the eastern portion of Perris and further east to Hemet. In 1842, Estudillo was granted the Rancho San Jacinto Viejo Potrero, a 35,000-acre parcel, by Mexican Governor Juan B. Alvarado. The tract, which included an area encompassing the present areas of Hemet, San Jacinto, Valle Vista (Florida) and Winchester (Pleasant Valley), was used to graze cattle. After a son of Don Estudillo inherited the rancho, the division and sale of the rancho to immigrant American pioneers began (City of Perris General Plan 2005).

The western half of Perris was located within the Rancho El Sobrante de San Jacinto, which was granted to Maria del Rosario and Estudillo de Aguirre by Governor Pio Pico on May 9, 1846. This rancho amounted to 48,847 acres and was the last large rancho created by the secularization of the old Spanish ranchlands by the Mexican government. The area included western Perris Valley, the Canyon Lake area and the Lake Mathews region (City of Perris General Plan 2005).

In 1881, when the Southern California Railroad decided to build a railroad through the valley, Fredrick Perris was charged with surveying and constructing the route. The new route was a spur of the transcontinental railroad that led north from San Diego. Once completed, the railroad alignment served to provide access for lands opened for homesteading (City of Perris General Plan 2005).

In 1885, a railroad stop was constructed and the core area of Perris grew up around the depot and few existing buildings, such as the Perris Hotel. Later, the tracks were extended to Los Angeles. In the early 1890s, the tracks in the Temecula gorge portion of the Santa Margarita River were washed out by repeated rainstorms and could not be rebuilt. This meant that the inhabitants of Perris were forced to rely upon farming alone for economic growth until another route could be constructed. Dryland farming became the predominant source of income well into the late 20th century (City of Perris General Plan 2005).

Economic growth hinged upon water, and the early farmers dug wells and grew dryland crops. Plans for citrus groves could not be realized until a reliable source of water could be built and maintained. The Eastern Municipal Water District brought the first water via pipeline to the Perris valley area in the 1950s. Additional sources were brought to the area in the 1970s and 1980s fueling the expansion in development seen today (City of Perris General Plan 2005).
5.1 – Cultural Resources Records Search
On September 17, 2015, Mr. Purtell conducted a records search of the Study Area and within a one-mile radius of the project boundaries at the CHRIS-EIC. The records search included a review of all recorded archaeological and historical resources within a one-mile radius of the Study Area as well as a review of cultural resource reports and historic topographic maps on file. In addition, MIG reviewed the California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), the California Historical Landmarks (CHL), the California Register, the National Register, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) listings. The purpose of the records search is to determine whether or not there are previously recorded archaeological or historical resources within the Study Area that required evaluation and treatment. The results also provide a basis for assessing the sensitivity of the Study Area for additional and buried cultural resources.

5.2 – Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Consultation
On September 11, 2015, Mr. Purtell commissioned a Sacred Lands File (SLF) records search of the Study Area through the NAHC and conducted follow-up consultation with the sixteen (16) Native American groups or individuals (inclusive of Luiseño and Cahuilla groups) identified by the NAHC as having affiliation with the Study Area vicinity. Each Native American group or individual listed was sent a project notification letter and map and was asked to convey any knowledge regarding prehistoric or Native American resources (archaeological sites, sacred lands, or artifacts) located within the Study Area or surrounding vicinity. The letter included information such as Study Area location and a brief description of the proposed project. Results of the search and follow-up consultation provided information as to the nature and location of additional prehistoric or Native American resources to be incorporated in the assessment whose records may not be available at the CHRIS-EIC.

5.3 – Paleontological Resources Records Search
On September 11, 2015, Mr. Purtell commissioned a paleontological resources records search through the Division of Geological Sciences at the SBCM in Redlands, California. This institution maintains files of regional paleontological site records as well as supporting maps and documents. This record search entailed an examination of current geologic maps and known fossil localities inside and within a one-mile radius of the Study Area. The objective of the records search was to determine the geological formations underlying the Study Area, whether any paleontological localities have previously been identified within the Study Area or in the same or similar formations near the Study Area, and the potential for excavations associated with the Study Area to encounter paleontological resources. The results also provide a basis for assessing the sensitivity of the Study Area for additional and buried paleontological resources.

5.4 – Pedestrian Survey
On September 18, 2015, MIG (Mr. Purtell) conducted a field survey of the Study Area to identify the presence of archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources. Mr. Purtell surveyed the Study Area and detailed notes and digital photographs were also taken of the Study Area and surrounding vicinity.
6.1 – Cultural Resources Records

Results of the records research conducted at the CHRIS-EIC indicate that there are no cultural resources (prehistoric or historic) recorded within the Project Site. However, there are nine (9) previously recorded prehistoric archaeological sites (Bedrock Milling Features) located within a one-mile radius of the project boundaries (see Table 1 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within the Study Area). None of these previously documented archaeological resources are located within the Project Area and none of these resources will be impacted by the proposed project. A brief summary of each of these cultural resources is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource No.</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHR Eligibility</th>
<th>CRHR Eligibility</th>
<th>Distance from the Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-005386 P-33-005386</td>
<td>Prehistoric Site</td>
<td>Bedrock Milling Feature</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>5/8 miles to the northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-005389 P-33-005389</td>
<td>Prehistoric Site</td>
<td>Bedrock Milling Feature</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>5/8 miles to the northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-005390 P-33-005390</td>
<td>Prehistoric Site</td>
<td>Bedrock Milling Feature</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>5/8 miles to the northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-005391 P-33-005391</td>
<td>Prehistoric Site</td>
<td>Bedrock Milling Feature</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>¾ miles to the northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-007467 P-33-013448</td>
<td>Prehistoric Site</td>
<td>Bedrock Milling Feature</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>¾ miles to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-007468 P-33-013449</td>
<td>Prehistoric Site</td>
<td>Bedrock Milling Feature</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>5/8 miles to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-007469 P-33-013450</td>
<td>Prehistoric Site</td>
<td>Bedrock Milling Feature</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>5/8 miles to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-013788 CA-RIV-007549</td>
<td>Prehistoric Site</td>
<td>Bedrock Milling Feature</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td>5/8 miles to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-008401 P-33-016250</td>
<td>Prehistoric Site</td>
<td>Bedrock Milling Feature</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td>5/8 miles to the west</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

CA-RIV-005386. This prehistoric bedrock milling feature was first recorded by Keller in 1994 and was re-recorded by Smallwood in 2004. The site contains 12 bedrock milling features that measures approximately 70-meters in diameter. A Phase II Testing and Evaluation was conducted by Hogan in 2004, in which a total of eight shovel test pits and two test units were excavated. No cultural resources were discovered either on the surface or subsurface. The results of these investigations confirmed to Hogan that the site does not qualify as a “historical resources” according to CEQA guidelines.4

CA-RIV-005389. This prehistoric bedrock milling feature was first recorded by Keller in 1994 and was re-recorded by Smallwood in 2004. The site contains a single bedrock boulder with one milling slick that measures approximately 7-meters north-south by 6.5-meters east-west. A Phase II Testing and Evaluation was conducted by Hogan in 2004, in which a total of three shovel test pits and one test unit was excavated. No cultural resources were discovered either on

4 California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2004. Update to Primary Record for CA-RIV-005386. Site form on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.
the surface or subsurface. The results of these investigations confirmed to Hogan that the site does not qualify as a "historical resources" according to CEQA guidelines.\(^5\)

**CA-RIV-005390.** This prehistoric bedrock milling feature was first recorded by Keller in 1994 and was re-recorded by Smallwood in 2004. The site contains a six bedrock boulder and two milling slicks that measures approximately 35-meters north-south by 135-meters east-west. A Phase II Testing and Evaluation was conducted by Hogan in 2004, in which a total of eight shovel test pits and two test units were excavated. No cultural resources were discovered either on the surface or subsurface. The results of these investigations confirmed to Hogan that the site does not qualify as a "historical resources" according to CEQA guidelines.\(^6\)

**CA-RIV-005391.** This prehistoric bedrock milling feature was first recorded by Keller in 1994 and was re-recorded by Smallwood in 2004. The site contains a single bedrock boulder with one milling slick that measures approximately 3-meters in diameter. A Phase II Testing and Evaluation was conducted by Hogan in 2004, in which a total of three shovel test pits and one test unit was excavated. No cultural resources were discovered either on the surface or subsurface. The results of these investigations confirmed to Hogan that the site does not qualify as a "historical resources" according to CEQA guidelines.\(^7\)

**CA-RIV-007467.** This prehistoric bedrock milling feature was first recorded by Keller in 1994 and was re-recorded by Smallwood in 2004. The site contains a single bedrock boulder with a single milling slick that measures approximately 35-meters north-south by 130-meters east-west. A Phase II Testing and Evaluation was conducted by Hogan in 2004, in which a total of seven shovel test pits and three test units were excavated. A chalcedony interior reduction flake was recovered from Test Unit no. 2 and no cultural resources were discovered on the surface. The results of these investigations confirmed to Hogan that the site does not qualify as a "historical resources" according to CEQA guidelines.\(^8\)

**CA-RIV-007468.** This prehistoric bedrock milling feature was first recorded by Smallwood in 2004. The site contains a single bedrock outcrop with a single milling slick that measures approximately 6-meters north-south by 6-meters east-west. A Phase II Testing and Evaluation was conducted by Hogan in 2004, in which a total of three shovel test pits and one test unit was excavated. No cultural resources were discovered either on the surface or subsurface. The results of these investigations confirmed to Hogan that the site does not qualify as a "historical resources" according to CEQA guidelines.\(^9\)

**CA-RIV-007469.** This prehistoric bedrock milling feature was first recorded by Smallwood in 2004. The site contains a single bedrock outcrop with a single milling slick that measures approximately 16-meters northwest-southeast by 7-meters northeast-southwest. A Phase II Testing and Evaluation was conducted by Hogan in 2004, in which a total of four shovel test pits and one test unit was excavated. No cultural resources were discovered either on the surface or subsurface. The results of these investigations confirmed to Hogan that the site does not qualify as a "historical resources" according to CEQA guidelines.\(^10\)

\(^5\) California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2004. Update to Primary Record for CA-RIV-00589. Site form on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

\(^6\) California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2004. Update to Primary Record for CA-RIV-005390. Site form on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

\(^7\) California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2004. Update to Primary Record for CA-RIV-005391. Site form on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

\(^8\) California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2004. Primary Record for CA-RIV-13448. Site form on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

\(^9\) California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2004. Primary Record for CA-RIV-13449. Site form on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

\(^10\) California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2004. Primary Record for CA-RIV-13450. Site form on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.
CA-RIV-007549. This prehistoric bedrock milling feature was first recorded by Everson in 2004. At that time, the site was described as a single milling feature containing one slick and measuring 21 x 15 meters. At the onset of monitoring for the Knox Logistics Center Project in September 2012, three additional features were discovered (Features: A, B, and C). Feature B and Feature C were destroyed during Project construction and a 1 x 1-meter boulder containing Feature A was successfully removed and relocated approximately 173 m @ 25° from its original location. The original slick recorded in 2004 remains intact. 11

CA-RIV-008401. This prehistoric bedrock milling feature was first recorded by Keller in 2007. The site contains a single bedrock outcrop with three milling slicks that measures approximately 9.5-meters north-south by 5.5-meters east-west. The outcrop was recorded as being in poor condition, and was highly fractured and exfoliated. No cultural resources were discovered either on the surface or subsurface. The site was not evaluated for listing to the California Register of Historic Resources. 12

Additionally, a search of The City of Perris’s General Plan indicate that the Study Area lies in a vicinity of low sensitivity for cultural resources, consisting of one or less recorded cultural sites (prehistoric or historic) per quarter square mile (City of Perris General Plan 2005).

The results of the record search indicate that there has been one (1) cultural resource study/report previously conducted within proposed Study Area and five (5) cultural studies/reports that have been previously conducted within a one-mile radius of the Study Area (see Table 2 Previously Conducted Cultural Reports within the Study Area). These studies were performed for one (1) mixed use parcel assessments, one (1) construction site assessment, one (1) cell tower assessment, one (1) overhead power line tower, and one (1) road survey (Route 215). These studies were conducted between 1987 and 2010. A brief description of the one (1) previously recorded cultural study/report conducted within the Study Area is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI-2084</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Negative Archaeological Survey Report</td>
<td>Road Survey</td>
<td>State of California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-2084</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Assessor's Parcel 314-100-001 Located Near Yal Verde in Western Riverside County, California</td>
<td>Mixed Use Parcel Assessments</td>
<td>Archaeological Research Unit, University of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-6780</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of The Associated Ready Mix Project Area (2.5 ac.) In The City of Perris, Riverside County, California</td>
<td>Construction Site</td>
<td>McKenna, et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-8433</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment of Southern Half of Hammock 33kV Overhead DSP Project, March Air Reserve Base, Riverside County, California</td>
<td>Overhead Power Lines</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2012. Update to Primary Record for CA-RIV-13788. Site form on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

12 California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2007. Primary Record for CA-RIV-1625. Site form on file at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.
RI-07538. This study was conducted in 2007 and documents the results of the Cultural Resources Technical Report in support of the North Perris Industrial Specific Plan for the City of Perris. A cultural resources assessment was conducted and included cultural resources records searches, Native American consultation, and a pedestrian survey of the approximately six square-mile project area (3,860 acres) in the City of Perris. A cultural resource assessment concluded that the proposed Industrial Specific Plan Project Area exhibited a low sensitivity for both historic-period built-environmental features and archaeological remains. The report concluded that any proposed project located within the Industrial Specific Plan Area should require a Cultural Resource Assessment prior to the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.13

6.2 – Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Consultation
The NAHC SLF records search results (received September 28, 2015) revealed that there are no known “Native American cultural resources” in the SLF database within the Study Area. As per NAHC suggested procedure, follow-up letters were sent via certified mail on September 30, 2015 to the sixteen (16) Native American individuals and organizations identified by the NAHC as being affiliated with the vicinity of the Study Area. The letters requested any additional information they may have about Native American cultural resources that may be affected by the proposed project. As of November 3, 2015, MIG has received responses from the following five (5) tribes: The Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, the Pala Band of Mission Indians, the Puma & Yuima Reservation, the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. All five tribes stated the Study Area was outside of the ancestral territory and had no comments or concerns regarding the proposed project. However, all five tribes requested that Native American Monitors be present during all ground disturbing activities within the project area. As of January 29, 2016, MIG has received no other responses from the Native American community concerning the proposed project. MIG will keep the Applicant apprised with the progress of this on-going Native American consultation.

The NAHC SLF records search results, the Native American contact list, and the Native American Consultation Matrix is provided in Appendix B of this report.

6.3 – Paleontological Resources Records Search
Results of the paleontological resources records search through the SBCM indicate that no known vertebrate fossil localities that have been previously identified within the Study Area or within a one-mile radius. Nevertheless, the results of the literature review indicate that the Study Area is situated upon Pleistocene older fan deposits that, depending upon their lithology and/or any previous disturbance, have high potential to contain paleontologic resources. Excavation in this older alluvium therefore has high potential to impact paleontologic resources. Additionally, the City of Perris’s General Plan indicates that the Study Area is located in a vicinity of high paleontological sensitivity, exhibiting surface exposures of older Pleistocene valley deposits that have the potential to contain significant fossil resources; thus, requiring paleontological monitoring for all projects requiring subsurface construction related excavations (City of Perris General Plan 2005, Mitigation Measure IV.A.4).

The Study Area has been previously mapped geologically and is situated entirely upon surface exposures of well-dissected, well-indurated, reddish-brown sands of early Pleistocene age (= unit Qvof). These Pleistocene fan deposits have high potential to contain significant nonrenewable paleontologic resources, depending upon their lithology, and so are assigned high paleontologic sensitivity. Pleistocene alluvial sediments elsewhere throughout San Bernardino and Riverside Counties and the Inland Empire have been reported to yield significant fossils of extinct animals from the Ice Age (Jefferson, 1991; Reynolds and Reynolds, 1991; Anderson and others, 2002; Scott and Cox, 2008; Springer and

The paleontological resources records search results letter from the SBCM and the City of Perris’s Paleontological Sensitivity Map are provided in Appendix C of this report.

6.4 – Pedestrian Survey
On September 18, 2015, MIG | Hogle-Ireland’s Senior Archaeologist Christopher Purtell, M.A., RPA conducted a cultural resources field survey of the proposed project site. The results of the field survey indicated that there were no artifacts or cultural resources (prehistoric or historic) discovered or recorded during the course of the field survey (see Figures 3a-e). However, there are four (4) residential homes located at 1350, 1352, 1354, and 1340 (West Oleander Avenue/Harley Knox Boulevard) located within the Study Area that are over 45 years old, built in 1944 (Riverside County Assessor 2016) (see Figures 3a-e). Three of the houses were small (less than 1,000 square feet), while the fourth house was larger with a second story addition (approximately 2,000-square feet). All of the homes were situated behind a wooden or chain link fencing and showed evidence of remodeling or additions to their original structures (see Figure 3, Photographs 5-7). Notes and photographs were taken of each house, so that they could be evaluated to determine whether they were eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), or as a City Historic Landmark.

Further, there is a vacant lot located along West Oleander Avenue that was fenced off, but was visible from the street and showed a partially covered asphalt parking lot, two (2) modern portable trailers, and an open space in the western and northwestern portions of the lot. The vacant lot contained moderate levels of modern-man-trash and spare weeds and native grasses at various height levels (see Figure 3, Photograph 8).

6.4.1 – Other Study Area Conditions
The undeveloped portion of the Study Area exhibited shallow plowing or the disking of soils in a north-south direction. Approximately 90 percent of the ground cover consisted of low-lying ruderal plant species that were approximately 6 to 12–inches in height (Figure 4 through Figure 6, Study Area Photographs). Ground surface visibility was fair to good exhibiting a light tan to medium brown color sediment with a silty-sandy texture, showing little to no bioturbation. Moderate levels of modern-man-made trash consisting of, but not limited, to car and truck tires, paper and plastic wrappers, glass bottles and aluminum cans were concentrated along Harley Knox Boulevard (north and east) and the Interstate 215 (west) (see Figure 3, Photograph 10). Sparse trash scatters were observed in the center and southern portions of the undeveloped Study Area.
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Photograph 5: House located at 1352 West Oleander Avenue, view towards the north

Photograph 6: House located at 1354 West Oleander Avenue, view towards the north
Photograph 7: House located at 1340 West Oleander Avenue, view towards the north

Photograph 8: Vacant lot located on West Oleander Avenue, view towards the north
Photograph 9: House located at 1350 West Cleander Avenue, view towards the south

Photograph 10: Study Area trash along Harley Knox Boulevard, view towards the south
Evaluation of cultural resources is determined by conducting an “evaluation” of a resource’s eligibility for listing in the California Register; determining whether it qualifies as a “unique archaeological resource” and determining whether the resource retains integrity. This is achieved by applying the California Register criteria (including criteria for a “unique archaeological resource”) as defined in Chapter 2 of this report. If a resource is determined eligible for listing in the California Register or qualifies as a “unique archaeological resource” and retains integrity, then the resource is considered an archaeological resource or a historical resource pursuant to CEQA §15064.5 and any substantial adverse change to the resource is considered a significant impact on the environment. The CEQA guidelines do not provide criteria to evaluate paleontological resources.

7.1 – Archaeological Resources
As discussed previously in Chapter 6, no known archaeological resources from the EIC records were recorded within the Study Area, or within a one-mile radius, and no resources were identified during the pedestrian survey. A search of the City of Perris’s General Plan indicate that the Study Area lies in a vicinity of low sensitivity for cultural resources, consisting of one recorded cultural site (prehistoric or historic) per square mile (City of Perris General Plan 2005). However, despite the heavy disturbances of the Study Area that may have displaced archaeological resources on the surface, it is possible that intact archaeological resources exist at depth. As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 9 to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

7.2 – Historical Resources
As discussed previously in Chapter 6, no known historical resources from the EIC records were recorded within the Study Area or within a one-mile radius. However, there are four (4) residential homes located at 1350, 1352, 1354, and 1340 West Oleander Avenue/Harley Knox Boulevard that are over 45 years old, built in 1944 (Riverside County Assessor 2016). Notes and photographs were taken of each house, so that they could be evaluated to determine whether they were eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), or as a City Historic Landmark.

The results of archival research and a literature review showed that properties located at 1350, 1352, 1354, and 1340; West Oleander Avenue/Harley Knox Boulevard are not listed on the City of Perris General Plan Historical Resources List (City of Perris General Plan 2008). Therefore, the City of Perris Planning Director (Personal Communication June 13, 2016) has determined that these four properties would result in no adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. Therefore, no further evaluation of historical resources is necessary.

7.3 – Paleontological Resources
As discussed previously in Chapter 6, no known historical resources from the SBCM records were recorded within the Study Area, or within a one-mile radius, and no resources were identified during the pedestrian survey. However, the SBCM records did indicate that the Study Area is situated upon Pleistocene older fan deposits that, depending upon their lithology and/or any previous disturbance, have high potential to contain paleontologic resources. Excavations in this older alluvium therefore have high potential to impact paleontologic resources (Scott and Springer, 2003). Additionally, the City of Perris’s General Plan indicates that the Study Area resides in a vicinity of high sensitivity for paleontological resources requiring subsurface construction monitoring during all construction related excavations (City of Perris General Plan 2005; Measure IV.4.A.4). As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in Chapter 9 to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered paleontological resources or unique geological features that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.
The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the potential impacts to archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources, and human remains associated with implementing the proposed project.

8.1 – CEQA Significance Thresholds

8.1.1 – Archaeological Resources

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

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

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

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

8.1.2 – Historical Resources

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

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

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

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

**8.2 – Potential Impacts**

**8.2.1 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
As discussed earlier, the proposed project includes the construction and operation of a 380,000 square-foot high-cube warehouse located east of Interstate 215 and south of Harley Knox Boulevard in the city of Perris, Riverside County, California. The project, for purposes of approval of entitlements, will be constructed on 21.63 acres, 0.27 acres of which will be provided for purposes of street dedication, and the remainder of the site to be developed with 205,000 square feet of landscaping, 225 passenger vehicle parking stalls, 98 trailer parking stalls, and two detention basins. The warehouse building will include 43 docking bays. The project site is comprised of Assessor's Parcels 294-210-008, -034, -035, -037, -038, -039, -044, -046, and -056. In addition to the proposed on-site and potential off-site improvements, the project includes a Specific Plan Amendment which will change the zoning in the PVCC Specific Plan from Commercial to Light Industrial.

Adjacent to the west boundary of the project site is a 1.5-acre parcel (APN 294-210-042) that has been included in the environmental analysis, including the technical studies, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for future, potential development in conjunction with the project site. Potential inclusion of this additional property at an undetermined future date would result in an alternative project site consisting of 23.66 gross acres. The alternative project site is estimated to support a 400,000 square-foot high-cube warehouse with 212,000 square feet of landscaping, 255 passenger vehicle parking stalls, 150 truck trailer parking stalls, and 47 docks. Excavations associated with implementation of the proposed project would occur across the majority of the Study Area.

**8.2.2 – ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**
Results from the CHRS-EIC indicated that there were no previously recorded archaeological resources within the Study Area, or within a one-mile radius, and no archaeological resources were identified during the pedestrian survey, and The City of Perris's General Plan indicate that the Study Area lies in a vicinity of low sensitivity for cultural resources, consisting of one or less recorded cultural sites (prehistoric or historic) per square mile (City of Perris General Plan 2005). However, despite the heavy disturbances of the Study Area that may have displaced archaeological resources on the surface, it is possible that intact archaeological resources exist at depth. As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in the following chapter to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered archaeological resources that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

**8.2.3 – HISTORICAL RESOURCES**
Results from the CHRS-EIC indicated that there were no previously recorded historical resources within the Study Area or within a one-mile radius. However, there are four (4) residential homes located at 1350, 1352, 1354, and 1340; West Oleander Avenue/Harley Knox Boulevard that are over 45 years old, built in 1944 (Riverside County Assessor 2016).
Notes and photographs were taken of each house, so that they could be evaluated to determine whether they were eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), or as a City Historic Landmark.

The results of archival research and a literature review showed that properties located at 1350, 1352, 1354, and 1340; West Oleander Avenue/Harley Knox Boulevard are not listed on the City of Perris General Plan Historical Resources List (City of Perris General Plan 2008). Therefore, the City of Perris Planning Director (Personal Communication June 13, 2016) has determined that these four properties would result in no adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. Therefore, no further evaluation of historical resources is necessary.

**8.2.4 – PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Results of the paleontological resources records search through the SBCM indicate that no known vertebrate fossil localities have been previously identified within the Study Area or within a one-mile radius. Nevertheless, the results of the literature review indicate that the proposed property is situated upon Pleistocene older fan deposits that, depending upon their lithology or any previous disturbance, have a high potential to contain paleontologic resources. Excavation in this older alluvium therefore has high potential to impact paleontologic resources. Additionally, the City of Perris’s General Plan indicates that the Study Area is located in a vicinity of high paleontological sensitivity, exhibiting surface exposures of older Pleistocene valley deposits that have the potential to contain significant fossil resources, thus requiring paleontological monitoring for all projects requiring subsurface construction related excavations (City of Perris General Plan 2005, Mitigation Measure IV.A.4).

The Study Area has been previously mapped geologically and is situated entirely upon surface exposures of well-dissected, well-indurated, reddish-brown sands of early Pleistocene age (= unit Qvof). These Pleistocene fan deposits have high potential to contain significant nonrenewable paleontologic resources, depending upon their lithology, and are assigned high paleontologic sensitivity. Pleistocene alluvial sediments elsewhere throughout San Bernardino and Riverside Counties and the Inland Empire have been reported to yield significant fossils of extinct animals from the Ice Age (Jefferson, 1991; Reynolds and Reynolds, 1991; Anderson and others, 2002; Scott and Cox, 2008; Springer and others, 2009, 2010; Scott, 2010). The paleontological resources records search results letter from the SBCM and the City of Perris’s Paleontological Sensitivity Map are provided in Appendix C of this report. As a result, recommended mitigation measures are provided in the following chapter to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered paleontological resources or unique geological features that may be accidentally encountered during project implementation to a less than significant level.

**8.2.5 – HUMAN REMAINS**

No known human remains have been identified from the database within a one-mile radius of the Study Area. No human remains were identified during the pedestrian survey of the Study Area. However, these findings do not preclude the existence of previously unknown human remains located below the ground surface, which may be encountered during construction excavations associated with the proposed project. Similar to the discussion regarding archaeological resources above, it is also possible to encounter buried human remains during construction given the proven prehistoric occupation of the region, the identification of multiple surface archaeological resources within two-miles of the Study Area, and the favorable natural conditions that would have attracted prehistoric inhabitants to the area. As a result, mitigation measures are recommended in the following chapter that would reduce potentially significant impacts to previously unknown human remains that may be unexpectedly discovered during project implementation to a less than significant level.
9.1 – Archeological Resources

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

Mitigation Measure CULT-1: The project developer shall retain a professional archaeologist-prior to the issuance of grading permits. The task of the archaeologist shall be to monitor the initial ground-altering activities at the subject site and off-site project improvement areas for the unearthing of previously unknown archaeological and/or cultural resources. Selection of the archaeologist shall be subject to the approval of the City of Perris Director of Development Services and no grading activities shall occur at the site or within the off-site project improvement areas until the archaeologist has been approved by the City.

The archaeological monitor shall be responsible for maintaining daily field notes and a photographic record, and for reporting all finds to the developer and the City of Perris in a timely manner. The archaeologist shall be equipped to record and salvage cultural resources that may be unearthed during grading activities. The archaeologist shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow recording and removal of the unearthed resources.

In the event that archaeological resources are discovered at the project site or within the off-site project improvement areas, the handling of the discovered resources will differ. However, it is understood that all artifacts with the exception of human remains and related grave goods or sacred/ceremonial objects belong to the property owner. All artifacts discovered at the development site shall be inventoried and analyzed by the professional archaeologist. If any artifacts of Native American origin are discovered, all activities in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 100-foot radius) shall stop and the project proponent and project archaeologist shall notify the City of Perris Planning Division, the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians. A designated Native American observer from either the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians or the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians shall be retained to help analyze the Native American artifacts for identification as everyday life and/or religious or sacred items, cultural affiliation, temporal placement, and function, as deemed possible. The significance of Native American resources shall be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and shall consider the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Luiseño tribes. All items found in association with Native American human remains shall be considered grave goods or sacred in origin and subject to special handling.

Native American artifacts that are relocated/reburied at the project site would be subject to a fully executed relocation/reburial agreement with the assisting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the reburial area from any future impacts. Relocation/reburial shall not occur until all cataloging and basic recordation have been completed. Native American artifacts that cannot be avoided or relocated at the project site shall be prepared in a manner for curation at an accredited curation facility in Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and makes the artifacts available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study such as University of California, Riverside.
Archaeological Research Unit (UCR-ARU) or the Western Center for Archaeology and Paleontology. If more than one Native American group is involved with the project and they cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of Native American artifacts, they shall be curated at the Western Center by default. The archaeological consultant shall deliver the Native American artifacts, including title, to the accredited curation facility within a reasonable amount of time along with the fees necessary for permanent curation.

Non-Native American artifacts shall be inventoried, assessed, and analyzed for cultural affiliation, personal affiliation (prior ownership), function, and temporal placement. Subsequent to analysis and reporting, these artifacts will be subjected to curation or returned to the property owner, as deemed appropriate.

Once grading activities have ceased or the archaeologist, in consultation with the designated Native American observer, determines that monitoring is no longer necessary, monitoring activities can be discontinued following notification to the City of Perris Planning Division.

A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of recovered artifacts, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. The report shall include a discussion of the significance of all recovered artifacts. The report shall provide evidence that any Native American and Non-Native American archaeological resources recovered during project development have been avoided, reburied, or curated at an accredited curation facility. A copy of the report shall also be filed with the Eastern Information Center (EIC) and submitted to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians (City of Perris 2016).

9.2 – Historical Resources
The proposed project would not impact historical resources therefore no mitigation measures are recommended.

9.3 – Paleontological Resources
The following mitigation measures have been recommended to reduce potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources as recommended by the SBCM and required under in the City of Perris General Plan 2005, Mitigation Measure IV.A.4 during implementation of the proposed project to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure CULT-2: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall submit to and receive approval from the City, a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Monitoring Program (PRIMMP). The PRIMMP shall include the provision of a qualified professional paleontologist (or his or her trained paleontological monitor representative) during on-site and off-site subsurface excavation that exceeds three (3) feet in depth. Selection of the paleontologist shall be subject to approval of the City of Perris Director of Development Services and no grading activities shall occur at the site until the paleontologist has been approved by the City.

Monitoring shall be restricted to undisturbed subsurface areas of older alluvium, which might be present below the surface. The approved paleontologist shall be prepared to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays. The paleontologist shall also remove samples of sediments which are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. The paleontologist shall have the power to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for removal of abundant or large specimens.
Collected samples of sediments shall be washed to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils. Recovered specimens shall be prepared so that they can be identified and permanently preserved. Specimens shall be identified and curated and placed into an accredited repository (such as the Western Science Center or the Riverside Metropolitan Museum) with permanent curation and retrievable storage.

A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of recovered specimens, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. The report shall include a discussion of the significance of all recovered specimens. The report and inventory, when submitted to the City of Perris Planning Division, would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources (City of Perris 2016).

9.4 – Human Remains

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

Mitigation Measure CULT-3: In the event that human remains (or remains that may be human) are discovered at the project site during grading or earthmoving, the construction contractors, project archaeologist, and/or designated Native American observer shall immediately stop all activities within 100 feet of the find. The project proponent shall then inform the Riverside County Coroner and the City of Perris Planning Division immediately, and the coroner shall be permitted to examine the remains as required by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b).

If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the coroner would notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will identify the “Most Likely Descendent” (MLD). Despite the affiliation with any Native American representatives at the site, the NAHC’s identification of the MLD will stand. The MLD shall be granted access to inspect the site of the discovery of Native American human remains and may recommend to the project proponent means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete his or her inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The disposition of the remains will be determined in consultation between the project proponent and the MLD. In the event that the project proponent and the MLD are in disagreement regarding the disposition of the remains, State law will apply and the median and decision process will occur with the NAHC (see Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(e) and 5097.94(k)).

The specific locations of Native American burials and reburials will be proprietary and not disclosed to the general public. The locations will be documented by the consulting archaeologist in conjunction with the various stakeholders and a report of findings will be filed with the Eastern Information Center (EIC) (City of Perris 2016).
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September 28, 2015

Christopher W. Purcell
MIGI Hogle-Ireland
1500 Iowa Ave., Suite 110
Riverside, CA 92507

Email to: cpurcell@migcom.com
Number of Pages: 3

Re: Harley Knox Specific Plan Project, City of Perris, Riverside County

Dear Mr. Purcell,

A record search of the sacred land file has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. The Commission makes no recommendation or preference of a single individual, or group over another. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe or group. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 373-3711.

Sincerely,

Rob Wood
Associate Government Program Analyst
Native American Heritage Commission
Tribal Consultation List
Los Angeles County
September 28, 2015

Cabazon Band of Mission Indians
Doug Welmas, Chairperson
84-245 Indio Springs Parkway Cahuilla
Indio, CA 92203
(760) 342-2593

Soboba Band of Mission Indians
Rosemary Morillo, Chairperson; Attn: Carrie Garcia
P.O. Box 487 Luiseno
San Jacinto, CA 92581 Cahuilla
carrieg@soboba-nsn.gov
(951) 654-2765

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians
Ray Chapparosa, Chairman
P.O. Box 189 Cahuilla
Warner Springs, CA 92086
Los_coyotes@ymail.com

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

Pala Band of Mission Indians
Shasta Gaughen, PhD, THPO
PMB 50, 35008 Pala-Temecula Rd. Luiseño
Pala, CA 92059 Cupeno
sgaughen@palatribe.com
(760) 891-3515

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

Pauma & Yuima Reservation
Temet Aguilar, Chairperson
P.O. Box 369 Luiseno
Pauma Valley, CA 92061
(760) 742-1289

Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
Mary Ann Green, Chairperson
P.O. Box 846 Cahuilla
Coachella, CA 92236
(760) 398-4722
(760) 369-7161 Fax

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

Rincon Band of Mission Indians
Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson
1 West Tribal Road Luiseno
Valley Center, CA 92082
bomazzetti@aol.com
(760) 749-1051

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5993.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list applicable only for consultation with Native American tribes under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 and Government Code Sections 65352.3 and 65362.4 et seq. for the Harley Knox Specific Plan project, City of Perris, Riverside County.
Native American Heritage Commission
Tribal Consultation List
Los Angeles County
September 28, 2015

San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians
Tribal Council
1889 Sunset Drive          Luiseno
Vista        , CA 92081
cjmojado@srmmissionindians.org
(760) 724-8505

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
THPO Patricia Garcia, Tribal Historic Perservation Officer
5401 Dinah Shore Drive          Cahuilla
Palm Springs        , CA 92264
ACBCI-THPO@aguacliente.net
(760) 699-6907

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
Jeff Grubbe, Chairperson
5401 Dinah Shore Drive          Cahuilla
Palm Springs        , CA 92262
lavilesaguacliente.net
(760) 699-6800

Cahuilla Band of Indians
Luther Salgado, Chairperson
P.O. Box 391760          Cahuilla
Anza        , CA 92539
Chairman@cahuilla.net
(760) 763-5549
(760) 763-2631 Tribal EPA

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Robert Martin, Chairperson
12700 Purnarra Road          Cahuilla
Banning       , CA 92220
(951) 849-8807
(951) 755-5200

Pala Band of Mission Indians
Robert H. Smith, Chairperson
PMB 50, 35008 Pala-Temecula Rd.          Luiseño
Pala        , CA 92059
dhuss@palatribe.com
(760) 891-3500

Pechanga Band of Mission Indians
Mark Macarro, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1477          Luiseño
Temecula       , CA 92593
mgoodhart@pechanga-nsn.
(951) 770-6100

La Jolla Band of Mission Indians
Lavonne Peck, Chairwoman
22000 Highway 76          Luiseño
Pauma Valley    , CA 92061
Rob.roy@laajolla-nsn.gov
(760) 742-3771

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5997.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5997.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list applicable only for consultation with Native American tribes under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 and Government Code Sections 65352.3 and 65362.4 et seq. for the Harley Knox Specific Plan project, City of Perris, Riverside County.
October 6, 2015

Christopher W. Purcell, M.A., RPA
MIG
1500 Iowa Ave, Suite 110
Riverside, CA 92507

Re: Harley Knox Project

Dear Mr. Purcell:

The Pala Band of Mission Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Office has received your notification of the project referenced above. This letter constitutes our response on behalf of Robert Smith, Tribal Chairman.

We have consulted our maps and determined that the project as described is not within the boundaries of the recognized Pala Indian Reservation. The project is also beyond the boundaries of the territory that the tribe considers its Traditional Use Area (TUA). Therefore, we have no objection to the continuation of project activities as currently planned and we defer to the wishes of Tribes in closer proximity to the project area.

We appreciate involvement with your initiative and look forward to working with you on future efforts. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone at 760-891-3515 or by e-mail at sgaughen@palatribe.com.

Sincerely,

Shasta C. Gaughen, PhD
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Pala Band of Mission Indians

ATTENTION: THE PALA TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL REQUESTS FOR CONSULTATION. PLEASE ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE TO SHASTA C. GAUGHEN AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS. IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO ALSO SEND NOTICES TO PALA TRIBAL CHAIRMAN ROBERT SMITH.
Native American Consultation Record

Project Name: Harley Knox
Project Number: 13481
NAHC Contact Initiated: 9/11/2015
NAHC Letter Received: 9/28/2015

Results: The NAHC did identify a single Native American Cultural Resource in their Sacred Lands File (SLF) Search. The NAHC recommended that we contact four (16) Native American groups/individuals listed below.

Matrix prepared by Chris Purtell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Name</th>
<th>Date Contact was Initiated</th>
<th>Method of Contact</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Grubbe, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-342-2593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Green, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-398-4722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabazon Band of Mission Indian</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td>Received phone call from the Cabazon's Historic Preservation Offer on October 16, 2015 to advise that proposed project is outside of the Cabzon's ancestral territory and had no comments concerning the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Welmas, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-342-2593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cyotes Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Chapparsosa, Chariman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Los_coyotes@ymail.com">Los_coyotes@ymail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Name</td>
<td>Date Contact was Initiated</td>
<td>Method of Contact</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pala Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td>Letter received from the Pala’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer on October 6, 2015 stating the proposed project is outside of the Pala’s ancestral territory and had no objects or concerns regarding the proposed project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert H. Smith 760-891-3500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauma &amp; Yuima Reservation</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temet Aguilar, Chairperson 760-742-1289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Hamilton, Chairman 951-763-4105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soboba Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Garcia 951-654-2765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Resvaloso, Chairperson 760-397-0300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marcus, Chairman 951-659-2700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson 760-398-4722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Name</td>
<td>Date Contact was Initiated</td>
<td>Method of Contact</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-724-8505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Martin, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951-849-8807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pechanga Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Mararro, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951-770-6100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahuilia Band of Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther Saigado, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-763-5549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>9/31/2015</td>
<td>U.S. Mail; Certified Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavoone Peck, Chairwoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760-742-3771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C Paleo Record Search
18 September 2015

MIG | Hogle-Ireland
attn: Christopher W. Purtell, Senior Archaeologist
1500 Iowa Avenue, Suite #110
Riverside, CA 92507

re: PALEONTOLOGY LITERATURE AND RECORDS REVIEW, HARLEY KNOX PROJECT, CITY OF PERRIS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Mr. Purtell,

The Division of Geological Sciences of the San Bernardino County Museum (SBCM) has completed a literature review and records search for the above-referenced development near March Air Reserve Base in Riverside County, California. The study area is located in the southwestern quadrant of section 36, Township 3 South, Range 4 West, San Bernardino Base and Meridian, as seen on the Steele Peak, California 7.5' United States Geological Survey topographic quadrangle map (1953 edition).

Previous mapping of the proposed property (Rogers, 1965; Morton, 2001) indicates that the proposed property is situated entirely upon surface exposures of well-dissected, well-indurated, reddish-brown sands of early Pleistocene age (= unit Qvof). These Pleistocene fan deposits have high potential to contain significant nonrenewable paleontologic resources, depending upon their lithology, and so are assigned high paleontologic sensitivity. Pleistocene alluvial sediments elsewhere throughout San Bernardino and Riverside Counties and the Inland Empire have been reported to yield significant fossils of extinct animals from the Ice Age (Jefferson, 1991; Reynolds and Reynolds, 1991; Anderson and others, 2002; Scott and Cox, 2008; Springer and others, 2009, 2010; Scott, 2010). Fossils recovered from these Pleistocene sediments represent extinct taxa including mammoths, mastodons, ground sloths, dire wolves, sabre-toothed cats, large and small horses, large and small camels, and bison, as well as plant macro- and microfossils (Jefferson, 1991; Reynolds and Reynolds, 1991; Anderson and others, 2002; Scott and Cox, 2008; Springer and others, 2009, 2010; Scott, 2010). If not previously disturbed by development, and depending upon the lithology exhibited, these sediments have high paleontologic sensitivity. It is noted that Morton (2001) recorded duripans and silcretes in these sediments, which suggests either formation in arid to semiarid environments, or else soil weathering in a warm, humid climate.
For this review, I conducted a search of the Regional Paleontologic Locality Inventory (RPLI) at the SBCM. The results of this search indicate that no previously recorded paleontologic resource localities are present within the boundaries of the proposed development property, nor from at least within one mile in any direction.

**Recommendations**

The results of the literature review and the search of the RPLI at the SBCM demonstrate that the proposed property is situated upon Pleistocene older fan deposits that, depending upon their lithology and any/or any previous disturbance, have high potential to contain paleontologic resources. Excavation in this older alluvium therefore has high potential to impact paleontologic resources. A qualified vertebrate paleontologist must develop a program to mitigate impacts to nonrenewable paleontologic resources. This mitigation program must be consistent with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Scott and Springer, 2003), as well as with regulations currently implemented by the County of Riverside. This program should include, but not be limited to:

1. Monitoring of excavation in areas identified as likely to contain paleontologic resources by a qualified paleontologic monitor. Areas requiring monitoring include all previously-undisturbed Pleistocene older fan deposits present within the boundaries of the property. Paleontologic monitors should be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays, and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. Monitors must be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. Monitoring may be reduced if the potentially-fossiliferous units described herein are not present, or if present are determined upon exposure and examination by qualified paleontologic personnel to have low potential to contain fossil resources.

2. Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates. Preparation and stabilization of all recovered fossils are essential in order to fully mitigate adverse impacts to the resources (Scott and others, 2004).

3. Identification and curation of specimens into an established, accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable paleontologic storage. These procedures are also essential steps in effective paleontologic mitigation (Scott and others, 2004) and CEQA compliance (Scott and Springer, 2003). The paleontologist must have a written repository agreement in hand prior to the initiation of mitigation activities. Mitigation of adverse impacts to significant paleontologic resources is not complete until such curation into an established museum repository has been fully completed and documented.

4. Preparation of a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens. The report and inventory, when submitted to the appropriate Lead Agency along with
confirmation of the curation of recovered specimens into an accredited museum repository, would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontologic resources.

References


Please do not hesitate to contact us with any further questions you may have.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Eric Scott, Curator of Paleontology
Division of Geological Sciences
San Bernardino County Museum
State of California — The Resources Agency
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*Resource Name or #: Historic Residence No.1: 1340 West Oleander Avenue.

P1. Other Identifier:

*P2. Location: X Not for Publication ☐ Unrestricted

and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

* a. County:

* b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Steele Peak California Date: 1967 (Photorevised 1973) T 3 South; R 4 West; ¼ of ¼ of Sec 36; S.B. B.M.

c. Address: 1340 West Oleander Avenue City: Perris Zip: 92571-7863
d. UTM: Zone: 11; mE/ mN (G.P.S.)
e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation: APN: 294-210-008

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

The historic residence is located at 1340 West Oleander Avenue in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California. The historic residence was constructed in 1944 and is a single-story family home built in the Craftsman Style. The structure is clad in stucco and has a composite roof. The field survey noted multiple alternations of the residence, including, the replacement of the original sidings, windows, and doors, and various additions. The structure does not appear to be individually eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion A or the California Register under Criterion 1 as archival research failed to indicate association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local, state or national history. The structure does not appear to be individually eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion B or the California Register 2 as archival research was unable to determine association with the lives of persons significant in history. There is no indication that any figure of importance is associated with this structure. The structure does not embody distinctive characteristics of a particular type, period or method of construction. Criterion D/4 is typically related to archeological resources rather than built resources. When Criterion D/4 does relate to built resources, it is for cases when the structure itself is the principal sources of important construction-related information. Based on historic research, this criterion is not applicable to 1340 West Oleander Avenue. The structure severely lacks integrity of design, materials, workmanship, association, feeling and setting. Because the building no longer retains sufficient integrity to convey its period of significance, there is no potential for the subject property to be eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register. Therefore, the structure does not appear to be individually eligible for listing on the National Register under the significance criteria (A-D/1-4).

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) (HP2) Single Family Property (HP4) Ancillary Building: detached garage

*P4. Resources Present: X Building ☐ Structure ☐ Object ☐ Site ☐ District ☐ Element of District ☐ Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photo or Drawing (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) South elevation, view north September 18, 2015

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:

Historic X Prehistoric ☐ Both

*P7. Owner and Address: Nicol Investment Company, LLC. 12555 High Bluff Drive, Ste. 333, San Diego, CA. 92130

*P8. Recorded by: C.W. Purtell MIG, Inc. 1500 Iowa Avenue, Ste. 110, Riverside, CA. 92507

*P9. Date Recorded: September 18, 2015

*P10. Survey Type: Intensive Pedestrian Survey

*P11. Report Citation: Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of the Proposed Harley Knox Project, City of Perris, California

*Attachments: ☐ NONE ☐ Location Map ☐ Sketch Map ☐ Continuation Sheet ☐ Building, Structure, and Object Record ☐ Archaeological Record ☐ District Record ☐ Linear Feature Record ☐ Milling Station Record ☐ Rock Art Record ☐ Artifact Record ☐ Photograph Record ☐ Other (List):
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*Required information
*Resource Name or #: Historic Residence No.1: 1340 West Oleander Avenue

Map Name: Historic Residence No.1  *Scale: Google Aerial *Date of Map: September 18, 2015
Resource Name or #: Historic Residence No.1: 1352/1350 West Oleander Avenue.

*P2a. Location: X Not for Publication □ Unrestricted

- a. County:

- b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Steele Peak California Date: 1967 (Photorevised 1973) T 3 South; R 4 West; ¼ of ¼ of Sec 36; S.B. B.M.

- c. Address: 1350/1352 West Oleander Avenue City: Perris, CA. Zip: 92571-7863

- d. UTM: Zone: 11; mE/ mN (G.P.S.)

- e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation: APN: 294-210-035

*P3a. Description: The historic house is located at 1352 West Oleander Avenue in the City of Perris, and is located with two other structures (Historic Residence No. 2 and No. 3) at 1350 West Oleander Avenue in the City of Perris, which suggests that all three structures may have been part of a family compound (APN: 294-210-035). For simplification the property located at 1352 West Oleander Avenue will be referred to as “Historic Residence No. 1” Historic Residence No. 1 was constructed in 1944 and is a single-story family residence built in the “Minimal Traditional” Style.” The structure exhibits a wood siding and has a composite roof. The field survey noted multiple alterations of the residence, including, the replacement of the windows, doors, and other post-construction modifications. The structure does not appear to be individually eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion A or the California Register under Criterion 1 as archival research failed to indicate association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local, state or national history. The structure does not appear to be individually eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion B or the California Register 2 as archival research was unable to determine association with the lives of persons significant in history. There is no indication that any figure of importance is associated with this structure. The structure does not embody distinctive characteristics of a particular type, period or method of construction. Criterion D/4 is typically related to archeological resources rather than built resources. When Criterion D/4 does relate to built resources, it is for cases when the structure itself is the principal sources of important construction-related information. Based on historic research, this criterion is not applicable to 1352/1350 West Oleander Avenue. The structure severely lacks integrity of design, materials, workmanship, association, feeling and setting. Because the building no longer retains sufficient integrity to convey its period of significance, there is no potential for the subject property to be eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register. Therefore, the structure does not reach individual significance that would make it eligible for listing on the National Register or California Register under the significance criteria (A-D/1-4).

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) (HP2) Single Family Property (HP3) Multiple family property

*P4. Resources Present: X Building □ Structure □ Object □ Site □ District □ Element of District □ Other (Isolates, etc.)

P5a. Photo or Drawing (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) South elevation, view north September 18, 2015

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources: Historic X Prehistoric □ Both

*P7. Owner and Address: Nicol Investment Company, LLC. 12555 High Bluff Drive, Ste. 333, San Diego, CA. 92130

*P8. Recorded by: C.W. Purtell. MIG, Inc. 1500 Iowa Avenue, Ste. 110, Riverside, CA. 92507

*P9. Date Recorded: September 18, 2015

*P10. Survey Type: Intensive Pedestrian Survey

*P11. Report Citation: Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of the Proposed Harley Knox Project, City of Perris, California

*Attachments: □ NONE x Location Map □ Sketch Map □ Continuation Sheet □ Building, Structure, and Object Record □ Archaeological Record □ District Record □ Linear Feature Record □ Milling Station Record □ Rock Art Record □ Artifact Record □ Photograph Record □ Other (List):
Resource Name or #: Historic Residence No.1: 1352/1350 West Oleander Avenue.

Map Name: Historic Residence No.1: Scale: Google Aerial Date of Map: September 18, 2015
Historic Residence No. 2: 1354/1350 W. Oleander Avenue.

The historic house is located at 1354 W Oleander Avenue in the City of Perris, County of Riverside, Ca. and is located with two other structures (Historic Residence No. 1 and No. 3) at 1350 West Oleander Avenue in the City of Perris, which suggests that all three structures may have been part of a family compound (APN: 294-210-035). The County of Riverside Office of the Assessor and the City of Perris, Planning Department indicates that the property is unpermitted and is unable to determine if the property was built or was moved to its current location. For simplification the property located at 1354 West Oleander Avenue will be referred to as “Historic Residence No. 2” and is similar in style and size to Historic Residence No. 1. Historic Residence No. 2 is a single-story family residence built in the “Minimal Traditional” Style.” The structure exhibits a wood siding and has a composite roof. The field survey noted multiple alternations of the residence, including, the replacement of the windows, doors, and other post-construction modifications. The structure does not appear to be individually eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion A or the California Register under Criterion 1 as archival research failed to indicate association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local, state or national history. The structure does not appear to be individually eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion A or the California Register under Criterion 1 as archival research failed to indicate association with the lives of persons significant in history. There is no indication that any figure of importance is associated with this structure. The structure does not embody distinctive characteristics of a particular type, period or method of construction. Criterion D/4 is typically related to archeological resources rather than built resources. When Criterion D/4 does relate to built resources, it is for cases when the structure itself is the principal sources of important construction-related information. Based on historic research, this criterion is not applicable to 1354/1350 West Oleander Avenue. The structure severely lacks integrity of design, materials, workmanship, association, feeling and setting. Because the structure no longer retains sufficient integrity to convey its period of significance, there is no potential for the subject property to be eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register. Therefore, the structure does not reach individual significance that would make it eligible for listing on the National Register or California Register under the significance criteria (A-D/1-4).

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes) (HP2) Single Family Property (HP3) Multiple family property

**P4. Resources Present:** X Building □ Structure □ Site □ District □ Element of District □ Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5a. Photo or Drawing:** (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** (View, date, accession #) South elevation, view north September 18, 2015

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:** Historic □ Prehistoric □ Both

**P7. Owner and Address:** Nicol Investment Company, LLC. 12555 High Bluff Drive, Ste. 333, San Diego, CA. 92130

**P8. Recorded by:** C.W. Purtell

MIG, Inc. 1500 Iowa Avenue, Ste. 110, Riverside, CA. 92507

**P9. Date Recorded:** September 18, 2015

**P10. Survey Type:** Intensive Pedestrian Survey

**P11. Report Citation:** Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of the Proposed Harley Knox Project, City of Perris, Riverside County, California
Resource Name or #: Historic Residence No.2: 1354/1350 West Oleander Avenue

Map Name: Historic Residence No.2  
Scale: Google Aerial  
Date of Map: September 18, 2015
and objects.)

P5a. Photo or Drawing

P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #) South elevation, view north September 18, 2015

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:

Historic X Prehistoric □ Both

P7. Owner and Address: Nicol Investment Company, LLC. 12555 High Bluff Drive, Ste. 333, San Diego, CA. 92130

P8. Recorded by: C.W. Purtell

MIG, Inc. 1500 Iowa Avenue, Ste. 110, Riverside, CA. 92507

P9. Date Recorded: September 18, 2015

P10. Survey Type: Intensive Pedestrian Survey

P11. Report Citation: Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of the Proposed Harley Knox Project, City of Perris, Riverside County, California

*Attachments: □ NONE x Location Map □ Sketch Map □ Continuation Sheet □ Building, Structure, and Object Record □ Archaeological Record □ District Record □ Linear Feature Record □ Milling Station Record □ Rock Art Record □ Artifact Record □ Photograph Record □ Other (List):
*Resource Name or #: Historic Residence No.3: 1350 West. Oleander Avenue.

*Map Name: Historic Residence No.3    *Scale: Google Aerial    *Date of Map: September 18, 2015
Appendix E Amendment Letter
August 29, 2016

Kenneth Phung, Project Planner
City of Perris, Planning Division
135 North D Street
Perris, California 92570

Subject: Addendum to the Cultural Resources Technical Report in Support of the Initial Study/Mitigation Negative Declaration for the 1-215 & Harley Knox Boulevard Warehouse Project.

Mr. Phung:

MIG’s Cultural Resource Group is pleased to submit this Addendum in response to Cadence Environmental Consultants’ comments dated August 22, 2016 regarding the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Nicol-Harley Knox Boulevard Warehouse Project (MIG March 23, 2016).

The lack of historic context and association concerning the four (4) residential homes located at 1350, 1352, 1354, and 1340 West Oleander Avenue/Harley Knox Boulevard is due to the absence of available archival materials both public and private. An Eastern Information Center (EIC) record search, the County of Riverside and the City of Perris’s Accessors Offices, and archival research failed to indicate any historic information regarding the four residential structures located within the project area.

Specifically, public records from both the County of Riverside Office of the Assessor and the City of Perris Planning Division show that two of the three structures located at 1350 West Oleander Avenue (1352 and 1354 West Oleander Avenue) are unpermitted. Additionally, these agencies were unable to determine if these properties (1352 and 1354 West Oleander Avenue) were built or were moved onto their current location. County and City records for the structure located at 1340 West Oleander show only that the residence was built in 1944 and provide no further details on remodeling or additions, even though the field survey noted multiple alternations to the residence, including the replacement of the original sidings, windows, and doors, and various additions. Archival research conducted through the Cesar E. Chavez Library (Riverside of County) and on-line database searches through the Los Angeles Times failed to indicate any historic information regarding these four residential structures or the project area itself.

The four structures were evaluated and it was determined they are not eligible for listing in the either the National Register of Historic Places (NRPH) or in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), and are not on the City’s Historic Landmark List. State of California Department of Park and Recreation Series 523p Forms (DPR) were prepared for each of the four structures.

If you have any questions or if I can be of any service regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me directly by telephone at (951) 787-9222, or by email at cpurtell@migcom.com.

Sincerely,

Christopher W. Purtell, M.A., RPA
Senior Archaeologist