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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

In March and April 2019, CRM TECH performed a cultural resources study on approximately 0.75 acre of undeveloped land in the San Bernardino Mountains and to the southeast of the unincorporated community of Big Bear City, San Bernardino County, California. The subject property of the study, a portion of Assessor’s Parcel Number 0315-421-02, is located on the northeast side of Greenspot Boulevard (State Route 38) and the southeast side of Erwin Ranch Road, in the northeast quarter of Section 19, T2N R2E, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian.

The study is part of the environmental review process for the proposed McDonald Learning Center East Project, which entails the construction of an approximately 2,930-square-foot child care facility with associated parking spaces and utilities. The County of San Bernardino, as the lead agency for the project, required the study in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The purpose of the study is to provide the County with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the proposed project would cause substantial adverse changes to any “historical resources,” as defined by CEQA, that may exist in or around the project area.

In order to identify such resources, CRM TECH conducted a historical/archaeological resources records search, pursued historical background research, contacted Native American representatives, and carried out an intensive-level field survey. Throughout the course of the study, no “historical resources” were encountered within or adjacent to the project area. The results of the background research suggest that the project area is relatively low in sensitivity for cultural resources from the historic period but, as a part of the Big Bear Valley-Baldwin Lake sphere, is high in cultural sensitivity to the Serrano people, especially the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. During the field survey, much of the ground surface was obscured by the dense deposit of forest detritus. As a result, the presence or absence of surface or subsurface cultural remains could not be established conclusively without further archaeological investigations.

Based on these findings, CRM TECH presents the following recommendations to the County of San Bernardino:

- A resurvey of the project area be implemented after the ground surface is cleared of vegetation and forest detritus or, alternatively, the clearing operations be monitoring by a qualified archaeologist.
- Depending on the findings during the resurvey or monitoring, and in consultation with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, subsurface excavations through shovel test pits or mechanical trenches, known as an Extended Phase I investigation, may be necessary to determine the presence or absence of buried cultural deposits in the project area.

Further recommendations as to the potential impact of this project on any “historical resources” will be formulated and presented based on the results of these additional research procedures.
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INTRODUCTION

In March and April 2019, CRM TECH performed a cultural resources study on approximately 0.75 acre of undeveloped land in the San Bernardino Mountains and to the southeast of the unincorporated community of Big Bear City, San Bernardino County, California (Figure 1). The subject property of the study, a portion of Assessor’s Parcel Number 0315-421-02, is located on the northeast side of Greenspot Boulevard (State Route 38) and the southeast side of Erwin Ranch Road, in the northeast quarter of Section 19, T2N R2E, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian (Figures 2, 3).

The study is part of the environmental review process for the proposed McDonald Learning Center East Project, which entails the construction of an approximately 2,930-square-foot child care facility with associated parking spaces and utilities. The County of San Bernardino, as the lead agency for the project, required the study in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; PRC §21000, et seq.). The purpose of the study is to provide the County with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the proposed project would cause substantial adverse changes to any “historical resources,” as defined by CEQA, that may exist in or around the project.

In order to identify such resources, CRM TECH conducted a historical/archaeological resources records search, pursued historical background research, contacted Native American representatives, and carried out an intensive-level field survey. The following report is a complete account of the methods, results, and final conclusion of the study. Personnel who participated in the study are named in the appropriate sections below, and their qualifications are provided in Appendix 1.

Figure 1. Project vicinity. (Based on USGS San Bernardino, Calif., 30’x60’ quadrangle [USGS 1969])
Figure 2. Project area. (Based on USGS Big Bear City and Moonridge, Calif., 7.5’ quadrangles [USGS 1996a; 1996b])
Figure 3. Aerial view of the project area.
SETTING

NATURAL SETTING

The project area is situated in the southeastern portion of Big Bear Valley, deep in the San Bernardino Mountains. Because of its mountainous setting at high elevations, the area enjoys an alpine climate and woodsy environment, in sharp contrast to the Mediterranean climate and desert environment in most of southern California. Temperatures in Big Bear Valley vary from an average low of nine degrees Fahrenheit in January to an average high of 89 degrees in July, much closer to the national average than to that of the San Bernardino-Riverside region (NOAA 2018). The average annual precipitation reaches more than 18 inches of rainfall and 35 inches of snowfall (ibid.).

Situated in a mountain meadow between the communities of Sugarloaf to the west and Woodlands to the east, the project area features a relatively level, forested terrain at elevations ranging approximately between 6,820 feet to 6,830 feet above mean sea level. It is surrounded mostly by undeveloped forest land except on the northwest and the south, where the project boundary adjoins Erwin Ranch Road, a paved single-lane public road, and the grounds of the Journey Church of Big Bear, respectively (Figure 3). The ground surface in the project area is largely undisturbed, but some of the trees have been cut recently. Vegetation observed on the property consists primarily of pine trees, small bushes, and grasses (Figure 4), and the surface soil is composed of a brown, medium- to coarse-grained sand mixed with small to large rocks.

Figure 4. Overview of the current natural setting of the project area. (Photograph taken on April 4, 2019; view to the north)
CULTURAL SETTING

Prehistoric Context

The earliest evidence of human occupation in Inland southern California was discovered below the surface of an alluvial fan in the northern portion of the Lakeview Mountains, overlooking the San Jacinto Valley, with radiocarbon dates clustering around 9,500 B.P. (Horne and McDougall 2008). Another site found near the shoreline of Lake Elsinore, close to the confluence of Temescal Wash and the San Jacinto River, yielded radiocarbon dates between 8,000 and 9,000 B.P. (Grenda 1997). Additional sites with isolated Archaic dart points, bifaces, and other associated lithic artifacts from the same age range have been found in the nearby Cajon Pass area of the San Bernardino Mountains, typically atop knolls with good viewsheds (Basgall and True 1985; Goodman and McDonald 2001; Goodman 2002; Milburn et al. 2008).

The cultural history of southern California has been summarized into numerous chronologies, including those developed by Chartkoff and Chartkoff (1984), Warren (1984), and others. Specifically, the prehistory of the Inland Empire has been addressed by O’Connell et al. (1974), McDonald et al. (1987), Keller and McCarthy (1989), Grenda (1993), Goldberg (2001), and Horne and McDougall (2008). Although the beginning and ending dates of the recognized cultural horizons vary among different parts of the region, the general framework of the prehistory of the Inland Empire can be broken into three primary periods:

- Paleindian Period (ca. 18,000-9,000 B.P.): Native peoples of this period created fluted spearhead bases designed to be hafted to wooden shafts. The distinctive method of thinning bifaces and spearhead preforms by removing long, linear flakes leaves diagnostic Paleoindian markers at tool-making sites. Other artifacts associated with the Paleoindian toolkit include choppers, cutting tools, retouched flakes, and perforators. Sites from this period are very sparse across the landscape and most are deeply buried.
- Archaic Period (ca. 9,000-1,500 B.P.): Archaic sites are characterized by abundant lithic scatters of considerable size with many biface thinning flakes, bifacial preforms broken during manufacture, and well-made groundstone bowls and basin metates. As a consequence of making dart points, many biface thinning waste flakes were generated at individual production stations, which is a diagnostic feature of Archaic sites.
- Late Prehistoric Period (ca. 1,500 B.P.-contact): Sites from this period typically contain small lithic scatters from the manufacture of small arrow points, expedient groundstone tools such as tabular metates and unshaped manos, wooden mortars with stone pestles, acorn or mesquite bean granaries, ceramic vessels, shell beads suggestive of extensive trading networks, and steatite implements such as pipes and arrow shaft straighteners.

Ethnohistoric Context

Big Bear Valley lies in the heart of the homeland of the Serrano people, which is centered in the San Bernardino Mountains. Together with that of the Vanyume people, linguistically a subgroup, the traditional territory of the Serrano also includes part of the San Gabriel Mountains, much of the San Bernardino Valley, and the Mojave River valley in the southern portion of the Mojave Desert,
reaching as far east as the Cady, Bullion, Sheep Hole, and Coxcomb Mountains. The name “Serrano” was derived from a Spanish term meaning “mountaineer” or “highlander.” The basic written sources on Serrano culture are Kroeber (1925), Strong (1929), and Bean and Smith (1978). The following ethnographic discussion of the Serrano people is based mainly on these sources.

Prior to European contact, the Serrano were primarily hunter-gatherers and occasionally fishers, and settled mostly on elevated terraces, hills, and finger ridges near where flowing water emerged from the mountains. They were loosely organized into exogamous clans, which were led by hereditary heads, and the clans in turn were affiliated with one of two exogamous moieties. The clans were patrilineal, but their exact structure, function, and number are unknown, except that each clan was the largest autonomous political and landholding unit. There was no pan-tribal political union among the clans, but they shared strong trade, ceremonial, and marital connections that sometimes also extended to other surrounding nations, such as the Kitanemuk, the Tataviam, and the Cahuilla.

In Serrano oral tradition, the Big Bear Valley area is known as Yuhaaviat, or “Pine Place,” and is remembered as the point of origin for the nearby San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (Ramos 2009). It is also well-documented in ethnographic literature that Big Bear Valley figures prominently in the Serrano creation story. As Kroeber (1925:619) notes:

Kukitat [younger brother of Pakrokitat, creator of Man], feeling death approach, gave instructions for his cremation; but the suspected coyote, although sent away on a pretended errand, returned in time to squeeze through badger’s legs in the circle of the mourners and make away with Kukitat’s heart. This happened at Hatauva (compare Luiseño Tova, where Wiyot died) in Bear Valley.

In a newspaper article, James Ramos, former Chairman of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, generally corroborates Kroeber’s account and provides the accurate spelling of the deities’ names in the Serrano language, Kruktat and Pakruktat (Ramos 2009). In addition, he identifies the location of Hatauva as being in the general vicinity of a white quartz dome known to tribal members as Aapahunane’t, or “God’s Eye,” near Baldwin Lake (ibid.).

At least two Serrano clans lived in or near Big Bear Valley during prehistoric and protohistoric times, according to Strong (1929:11). The Yuhavetum (or Yuhaaviatam, as spelled by the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians) clan’s territory stretched from Big Bear Valley to the present-day Highland area in the San Bernardino Valley. The Pervetum clan’s territory extended from the vicinity of Big Bear Valley to the headwaters of the Santa Ana River, across Sugarloaf Mountain. The two clans often intermarried.

Although contact with Europeans may have occurred as early as 1771 or 1772, Spanish influence on Serrano lifeways was negligible until the 1810s, when a mission asistencia was established on the southern edge of Serrano territory. Between then and the end of the mission era in 1834, most of the Serrano in the western portion of their traditional territory were removed to the nearby missions. In the eastern portion, a series of punitive expeditions in 1866-1870 resulted in the death or displacement of almost all remaining Serrano population in the San Bernardino Mountains. Today, most Serrano descendants are affiliated with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, or the Serrano Nation of Indians.
Historic Context

In 1772, a small force of Spanish soldiers under the command of Pedro Fages, military comandante of Alta California, became the first Europeans to set foot in the San Bernardino Mountains, followed shortly afterwards by the famed explorer Francisco Garcés in 1776 (Beck and Haase 1974:15). During the next 70 years, however, the Spanish and Mexican colonization activities in Alta California, concentrated predominantly in the coastal regions, left little physical impact on the San Bernardinos. Aside from occasional explorations and punitive expeditions against livestock raiders, the mountainous hinterland of California remained largely beyond the attention of the missionaries, the rancheros, and the provincial authorities. The name “San Bernardino” was bestowed on the region in the 1810s, when the mission asistencia and an associated rancho were established under that name in present-day Loma Linda (Lerch and Haenszel 1981).

For the Big Bear Valley area, the historic period began in 1845, when Benjamin “Benito” Wilson, a prominent early settler in southern California, and a group of young Californios “discovered” the valley while avenging an Indian raid and named it aptly for the large number of grizzly bears they observed (Drake 1949:12). After the U.S. annexation of Alta California in 1848, the rich resources offered by the San Bernardino Mountains brought about drastic changes, spurred by the influxes of settlers from the eastern United States. Beginning in the early 1850s, the dense forest covering the mountainside became the scene—and victim—of a booming lumber industry, which brought the first wagon roads and industrial establishments into the San Bernardinos. However, the lumber industry was concentrated on the western end of the mountain range, with less impact to the area east of Running Springs and Green Valley (Robinson 1989:23). In Big Bear Valley, lumbering was largely limited to a number of small sawmills in support of local construction (ibid.:44-45).

Mining in Big Bear Valley dates back to at least 1855, when gold was discovered near Baldwin Lake (Robinson 1989:47). Then in 1860, William F. Holcomb hit “pay dirt” on a hillside above Big Bear Valley, and later again in the valley now bearing his name, triggering a gold rush that brought 1,000 prospectors to the San Bernardino Mountains by that fall (Holcomb 1900:273-276; Robinson 1989:48-50). Mining boom towns replete with saloons, dance halls, gambling dens, and bagnios as well as stores, hotels, restaurants, and even a brewery soon sprang up in the mountain valleys (Robinson 1989:48-51). By the late 19th century, mining was big business, with Elias J. “Lucky” Baldwin’s Gold Mountain Mining Company usurping individual prospectors as the dominant force in the industry (Drake 1949:19; Robinson 1989:57-71). Still, the much-anticipated “mother lode” was never found, and by the late 1940s mining was no longer the leading industry in the valley (Core 1980:11-12; Robinson 1989:57, 61-62, 70-71).

Around the same time as the Bear-Holcomb Valley gold rush, the San Bernardino Mountains’ reputation as a premium summer grazing ground for sheep and cattle also grew, with Big Bear Valley at the epicenter (Robinson 1989:85). Some of the most prominent figures in early local history, including Augustus “Gus” Knight, Sr., James W. Smart, John R. Metcalf, and the Talmadge brothers, were also among those at the forefront of the cattle industry (ibid.:85-86). Beef sales from the valley peaked in 1921 but went into decline afterwards as increasing resort and residential development drove up real estate value and shrunk the availability of pasture land (Drake 1949:25; Robinson 1989:88, 93-94).
Along with its colorful history in lumber, gold, and cattle, Big Bear Valley owes much of its growth over the past century to the creation of Big Bear Lake, a reservoir built for the purpose of irrigating the vast citrus groves in the eastern San Bernardino Valley. Frank E. Brown and Edward G. Judson, founders of the Redlands colony, organized the Bear Valley Land and Water Company in 1883 and completed construction of the Bear Valley dam in 1884 (Robinson 1989:170). The reservoir was filled during the following winter (Hall 1888:188; Hinckley 1974:41).

The project’s much-celebrated success was cut short over the next five years as the company’s successors attempted to expand the irrigation scheme into Riverside County and became overextended (Robinson 1989:173). A financial panic in 1893 was later compounded in the late 1890s by drought so severe that Big Bear Lake completely dried up in the summers of 1898, 1899, and 1900 (Hinckley 1983:1). As a remedy, in 1903 citrus growers in the Redlands-Highland area incorporated as the Bear Valley Mutual Water Company and took over the Bear Valley system (ibid.:1-2; Robinson 1989:173). Between 1910 and 1912, the new water company constructed the second Big Bear dam that is still in use today (Hinckley 1974:43; 1983:11). The new dam, although only 20 feet higher than the first, substantially increased the size of the reservoir and nearly tripled its capacity (Robinson 1989:174).

By the 1890s, excessive logging and sheep grazing in the San Bernardino Mountains had given rise to a forest conservation movement among residents of the San Bernardino Valley to protect the watershed. In 1893, the movement succeeded in persuading the U.S. government to create the San Bernardino Forest Reserve, later renamed the San Bernardino National Forest, and over the next few decades effectively brought an end to logging and sheep grazing in the San Bernardino Mountains (Robinson 1989:88-9; Robinson and Risher 1990:9).

Meanwhile, Big Bear Lake proved a powerful lure for vacationers and sportsmen, who would commandeer the log cabins left by construction crews (Atchley 1980:21-22). In 1887, the state authorities stocked the lake with thousands of Lake Tahoe trout, signaling the beginning of its development as a recreational property (ibid.:22). Three decades later, in 1916, the Bear Valley Mutual Water Company officially dedicated the lake surface to the free use by the public for hunting, fishing, and boating (Hinckley 1983:43, 79), thereby guaranteeing Big Bear Valley’s future as one of the most popular mountain resorts in southern California.

The first commercial resort established on the lakeshore was Gus Knight, Jr., and John Metcalf’s Big Bear Valley Hotel, which opened for business in 1888 (Atchley 1980:22-23). After the Redlands-based Pine Knot Resort Company purchased the hotel in 1906 and renamed it the Pine Knot Lodge, a small community bearing the same name began to form around the lodge (Robinson 1989:181-182). Knight would later develop the Wild Rose Park and Knight’s Camp near Baldwin Lake (ibid.), and in the meantime became a tireless promoter for the construction of new and better roads between the San Bernardino Valley and his resorts. His efforts helped bring about the roads through City Creek Canyon (1892), Mill Creek Canyon (1888), and Santa Ana Canyon (1899), and culminated with the completion of Rim of the World Drive in 1915 (Atchley 1980:23-26; Robinson 1989:179-183).

The completion of Rim of the World Drive brought about an exponential rise in the number of resorts in Big Bear Valley from two in 1913 to 52 in 1921 (Drake 1949:26; Robinson 1989:183-
Winter snow in the mountains held its own attraction and brought a new set of residents and visitors as the Big Bear Valley area became a year-round getaway. A popular but rudimentary ski jump built in 1932 to the south of Pine Knot spurred the formation of the Big Bear Lake Park District two years later, which in turn brought about the first ski lift in Big Bear Valley in 1949 (Robinson 1989:193-194). Since then, winter sports have become one of Big Bear Valley’s leading attractions.

Adding to the allure, in the early 20th century Hollywood moviemakers found Big Bear Valley to be a suitable scenic backdrop for films such as *Paint Your Wagon, The Parent Trap, Bonanza, Kissin’ Cousins*, and *Dr. Dolittle* (Atchley 1980:24-25). In 1916, the Bear Valley Mutual Water Company started a land boom in Big Bear Valley when it created a subsidiary, the Bear Valley Development Company, to subdivide, sell, and lease the company’s land holdings around the reservoir (Hinckley 1983:42). Other land owners in the valley, such as the Knights and the Talmadges, soon joined in to take advantage of the increasing popularity of Big Bear Lake (Robinson 1989:187).

The boom continued into the 1920s, with summer homes springing up at the rate of 50 to 100 per year (Robinson 1989:189). In 1938, Pine Knot and its surrounding area came to be known as the community of Big Bear Lake, while a smaller cluster of homes and hostries between Big Bear and Baldwin Lakes became Big Bear City (*ibid.*:193). Since the end of World War II, the dramatic urban expansion in southern California has also reached Big Bear Valley, transforming Big Bear Lake into a community of more than 5,000 regular residents with 100,000 visitors on holiday weekends (*ibid.*:195; USCB n.d.). In 1980, Big Bear Lake became the first incorporated city in the San Bernardino Mountains, while the less urbanized Big Bear City remains an unincorporated community today.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

**RECORDS SEARCH**

On April 2, 2019, CRM TECH archaeologist Ben Kerridge conducted the historical/archaeological resources records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University, Fullerton, which is the State of California’s official cultural resource records repository for the County of San Bernardino. During the records search, Kerridge examined maps and records on file at the SCCIC for previously identified cultural resources and existing cultural resources studies within a one-mile radius of the project area. Previously identified cultural resources include properties designated as California Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, or San Bernardino County Historical Landmarks, as well as those listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the California Historical Resources Inventory.

**HISTORICAL RESEARCH**

Historical background research for this study was conducted by CRM TECH historian Bai “Tom” Tang. Sources consulted during the research included published literature in local and regional history, U.S. General Land Office (GLO) land survey plat map dated 1858, United States
Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps dated 1902-1996, and aerial photographs taken in 1938-2018. The historic maps are collected at the Science Library of the University of California, Riverside, and the California Desert District of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, located in Moreno Valley. The aerial photographs are available at the Nationwide Environmental Title Research (NETR) Online website and through the Google Earth software.

NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION

On March 21, 2019, CRM TECH submitted a written request to the State of California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for a records search in the commission’s Sacred Lands File. On April 15, 2019, CRM TECH further contacted four local tribes recommended by the NAHC in writing for additional information on potential Native American cultural resources that may be present in and near the project area. The correspondence between CRM TECH and the Native American representatives is attached to this report in Appendix 2.

FIELD SURVEY

On April 4, 2019, CRM TECH archaeologist Daniel Ballester carried out the intensive-level field survey of the project area. The survey was completed on foot by walking a series of parallel east-west transects spaced 10 meters (approximately 33 feet) apart. In this way, the ground surface in the entire project area was systematically and carefully examined for any evidence of human activities dating to the prehistoric or historic period (i.e., 50 years ago or older). Ground visibility varied from poor (0-10 percent) to fair (70 percent) in different portions of the project area, mainly because of the presence of dense forest detritus (Figure 4).

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

RECORDS SEARCH

The records search at the SCCIC revealed that the project area had been included in two previous archaeological surveys in 2007 and 2008 (Mirro 2007; 2008), but that no cultural resources had been recorded within the project boundaries during those surveys or any other similar studies in the vicinity. As both of the two surveys covering the project area are now more than ten years old, a systematic re-survey of the project area was deemed necessary for this study.

Outside the project area but within the one-mile scope of the records search, SCCIC records show approximately 40 other previous studies on various tracts of land and linear features, which collectively covered more than 80 percent of the land within the records search scope (Figure 5). As a result, 35 historical/archaeological sites and 20 isolates—i.e., localities with fewer than three artifacts—have been identified within the one-mile radius.

Ten of the sites and 18 of the isolates were of prehistoric—i.e., Native American—origin, some of which were located in the Shay Meadow Archaeological District to the north. The sites included remnants of temporary camps, lithic scatters, and milling stations, and the isolates were all chipped-stone or groundstone artifacts, such as projectile points, flakes, cores, and metates. The nearest site
Figure 5. Previous cultural resources studies in the vicinity of the project area. Locations of historical/archaeological sites are not shown as a protective measure.
to the project location was 36-004342, a lithic scatter with quartzite cores and flakes found a half-mile to the southwest, and the nearest isolate was 36-060167, a jasper flake found a quarter-mile to the southeast.

Twenty-three sites and two isolates dated to the historic period and included residential buildings, structural remains, water storage or conveyance features, roads, scattered refuse items, and mining features, some of them comprising parts of the Gold Hill Mine Archaeological District around the hill to the northeast. The nearest among these, Sites 36-013260, 36-013261, and 36-024050, were all recorded a few hundred feet northwest of the project location, representing two refuse scatters and a dirt road known today as Clark Lane.

The final two sites contained both prehistoric and historic-period elements, including a bedrock milling feature, lithic flakes, mining prospects, and scattered refuse, mostly beverage cans. Both of them were located in the vicinity of the Gold Hill Mine, nearly a mile to the northeast of the project location. Since none of the known sites or isolates was found in the immediate vicinity of the project area, none of them requires further consideration during this study.

HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Historical sources consulted for this study suggest that the project area is relatively low in sensitivity for cultural resources from the historic period despite its location near State Route 38, one of the main highways connecting Big Bear Valley to the outside world (Figures 6-8; NETR Online 1938-1969). Sources from the mid- and late 19th century show no man-made features in the immediate vicinity of the project area (Figures 6, 7). By 1938, the predecessors to both State Route 38 and Erwin Ranch Road, then an unpaved road, were in place, along with a few other dirt roads nearby (Figure 8; NETR Online 1938).

As late as 1969, no settlement or land development activities were evident within or adjacent to the project area, although the residential community of Woodlands, laid out some 800 feet to the east at least by 1938, gradually grew into shape during the post-WWII boom (Figure 8; NETR Online 1938-1969). To this day, the Journey Church of Big Bear on the adjacent property to the south, built sometime between 1969 and 1995 and known until recently as the Big Bear Christian Center, remains the only notable development in the immediate vicinity (NETR Online 1969-2012; the Journey Church 2019).
NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION

In response to CRM TECH’s inquiry, the NAHC states in a letter dated April 11, 2019, that the Sacred Lands File identified no Native American cultural resources in the project area but recommends that local Native American groups be contacted for further information. For that purpose, the commission provided a list of potential contacts in the region (see Appendix 2). Upon receiving the NAHC’s reply, CRM TECH sent written requests for comments to all four tribal organizations on the referral list (see Appendix 2). For some of the tribes, CRM TECH contacted the designated spokespersons on cultural resources issues in lieu of the individuals recommended by the NAHC, as recommended previously by the appropriate tribal government staff. The four tribal representatives contacted are listed below:

- Travis Armstrong, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Morongo Band of Mission Indians;
- Donna Yocum, Chairperson, San Fernando Band of Mission Indians;
- Jessica Mauck, Cultural Resources Analyst, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians;
- Mark Cochrane, Chairperson, Serrano Nation of Mission Indians.

As of this time, only the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI), which has a long and close association with Big Bear Valley as the descendent of the Yuhaaviatam clan of the Serrano, has responded to the inquiry. In an e-mail dated April 19, 2019, Jessica Mauck states that while the project area is not known to contain any sites of the Native American cultural value, it remains culturally sensitive to the tribe because of its location near the creation space in Serrano oral tradition and between two known village sites. Therefore, Ms. Mauck concludes: “It is highly likely
that SMBMI will recommend subsurface presence/absence testing be conducted during consultation so that we can properly identify the presence of cultural resources and the impact this project may have on said resources” (see Appendix 2).

FIELD SURVEY

The field survey did not encounter any buildings, structures, objects, sites, features, or artifacts of prehistoric or historic origin. However, as stated above, ground visibility was poor at the time of the survey over much of the project area due to the presence of dense forest detritus (Figure 4). The results of the survey, therefore, are inconclusive at this time.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to identify any cultural resources within or adjacent to the project area, and to assist the County of San Bernardino in determining whether such resources meet the official definition of “historical resources,” as provided in the California Public Resources Code, in particular CEQA. According to PRC §5020.1(j), “‘historical resource’ includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.”

More specifically, CEQA guidelines state that the term “historical resources” applies to any such resources listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, included in a local register of historical resources, or determined to be historically significant by the lead agency (Title 14 CCR §15064.5(a)(1)-(3)). Regarding the proper criteria for the evaluation of historical significance, CEQA guidelines mandate that “generally a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be ‘historically significant’ if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources” (Title 14 CCR §15064.5(a)(3)). A resource may be listed in the California Register if it meets any of the following criteria:

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

As discussed above, no potential “historical resources” were previously recorded within or adjacent to the project boundaries, and none was found during the present survey. The results of the background research suggest that the project area is relatively low in sensitivity for cultural resources from the historic period but, as a part of the Big Bear Valley-Baldwin Lake sphere, is high in cultural sensitivity to the Serrano people, especially the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. During the field survey, much of the ground surface was obscured by the dense deposit of forest
detritus. As a result, although no cultural resources have been identified within or adjacent to the project area, the presence or absence of surface or subsurface cultural remains could not be established conclusively without further archaeological investigations.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CEQA establishes that “a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC §21084.1). “Substantial adverse change,” according to PRC §5020.1(q), “means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of a historical resource would be impaired.”

In summary of the research results presented above, this study has encountered no “historical resources,” as defined by CEQA, within or adjacent to the project area, but the results of the field survey fall short of being conclusive due to the poor ground visibility, especially in light of the well-documented Native American cultural sensitivity of the Big Bear Valley-Baldwin Lake area. Based on these findings, CRM TECH presents the following recommendations to the County of San Bernardino:

- A resurvey of the project area be implemented after the ground surface is cleared of vegetation and forest detritus or, alternatively, the clearing operations be monitoring by a qualified archaeologist.
- Depending on the findings during the resurvey or monitoring, and in consultation with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, subsurface excavations through shovel test pits or mechanical trenches, known as an Extended Phase I investigation, may be necessary to determine the presence or absence of buried cultural deposits in the project area.

Further recommendations as to the potential impact of this project on any “historical resources” will be formulated and presented based on the results of these additional research procedures.
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APPENDIX 2

CORRESPONDENCE WITH
NATIVE AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES*

* Four local Native American representatives were contacted; a sample letter is included in this report.
Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

Native American Heritage Commission
1550 Harbor Boulevard, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95691
(916)373-3710
(916)373-5471 (Fax)
nahc@nahc.ca.gov

Project: Proposed McDonald Learning Center East Project; a Portion of Assessor’s Parcel Number 0315-421-20 (CRM TECH No. 3458)

County: San Bernardino

USGS Quadrangle Name: Moonridge, Calif.

Township 2 North Range 2 East SB BM; Section(s) 19

Company/Firm/Agency: CRM TECH

Contact Person: Nina Gallardo

Street Address: 1016 E. Cooley Drive, Suite A/B

City: Colton, CA Zip: 92324

Phone: (909) 824-6400 Fax: (909) 824-6405

Email: ngallardo@crmtech.us

Project Description: The primary component of the project is to expand the existing McDonald Learning Center on approximately 0.75 acre of land that is located northeast of Greenspot Boulevard and Erwin Ranch Road (a small portion of APN 0315-421-20), near the community of Big Bear City, San Bernardino County, California.

March 21, 2019
April 11, 2019

Nina Gallardo
CRM Tech

VIA Email to: ngallardo@crmtech.us

RE: Proposed McDonald Learning Center East Project, San Bernardino County

Dear Ms. Gallardo:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information you have submitted for the above referenced project. The results were negative. However, the absence of specific site information in the SLF 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.

Attached is a list of Native American tribes who may also have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. 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. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call or email to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify the NAHC. With your assistance, we can assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: steven.quinn@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Steven Quinn
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment
Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Robert Martin, Chairperson
12700 Pumarra Road
Banning, CA, 92220
Phone: (951) 849 - 8807
Fax: (951) 922-8146
dtorres@morongo-nsn.gov

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Denisa Torres, Cultural Resources Manager
12700 Pumarra Road
Banning, CA, 92220
Phone: (951) 849 - 8807
Fax: (951) 922-8146
dtorres@morongo-nsn.gov

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
Donna Yocum, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA, 91322
Phone: (503) 539 - 0933
Fax: (503) 574-3308
ddyocum@comcast.net

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Lee Clauss, Director of Cultural Resources
26569 Community Center Drive
Highland, CA, 92346
Phone: (909) 864 - 8933
Fax: (909) 864-3370
lclauss@sanmanuel-nsn.gov

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

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 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Proposed McDonald Learning Center East Project, San Benito County.
Travis Armstrong, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer  
Morongo Band of Mission Indians  
12700 Pumarra Road  
Banning, CA 92220

RE: Proposed McDonald Learning Center East Project  
Approximately 0.75 Acre near the Community of Big Bear City  
San Bernardino County, California  
CRM TECH Contract #3458

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

I am writing to bring your attention to an ongoing CEQA-compliance study for the proposed project referenced above. The project entails the construction of a building on approximately 0.75 acre of land in a portion of APN 0315-421-02 located along the east side of Erwin Ranch Road, approximately 250 feet north of Highway 38, near the community of Big Bear City, San Bernardino County. The accompanying map, based on USGS Big Bear City and Moonridge, Calif., 7.5’ quadrangles, depicts the location of the project area in Section 19, T2N R2E, SBBM.

In a letter dated April 11, 2019, the Native American Heritage Commission reports that the sacred lands record search identified no Native American cultural resources within the project area, but recommends contacting local Native American groups for further information (see attached). Therefore, as part of the cultural resources study for this project, I am writing to request your input on potential Native American cultural resources in or near the project area.

Please respond at your earliest convenience if you have any specific knowledge of sacred/religious sites or other sites of Native American traditional cultural value in or near the project area, or any other information to consider during the cultural resources investigations. Any information or concerns may be forwarded to CRM TECH by telephone, e-mail, facsimile, or standard mail. Requests for documentation or information we cannot provide will be forwarded to our client and/or the lead agency, namely the County of San Bernardino.

We would also like to clarify that, as the cultural resources consultant for the project, CRM TECH is not involved in the AB 52-compliance process or in government-to-government consultations. The purpose of this letter is to seek any information that you may have to help us determine if there are cultural resources in or near the project area that we should be aware of and to help us assess the sensitivity of the project area. Thank you for your time and effort in addressing this important matter.

Respectfully,

Nina Gallardo  
Project Archaeologist/Native American liaison  
CRM TECH  
Email: ngallardo@crmtech.us

Encl.: NAHC response letter and project location map
Hi Nina,

Thank you for contacting the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI) regarding the above referenced project. SMBMI appreciates the opportunity to review the project documentation, which was received by our Cultural Resources Management Department on 15 April 2019. As stated over the phone today, the proposed project is located ~1/4 of a mile outside of the Sacred Land File that SMBMI has for their creation space. As such, the project area is not within an area SMBMI considers Sacred, and will not impact the non-tangible resources of importance to this community. However, the project is still within an area of great concern to SMBMI given that it is essentially situated in between 2 village sites (SLF village to the north, non-SLF village to the southeast) for which there is a great deal of archaeological data. However, furthering SMBMI’s concerns, this data comes from survey efforts on Federal land, and there is a noticeable lack of survey data for non-Federal land in the area. As such, it is highly likely that SMBMI will recommend subsurface presence/absence testing be conducted during consultation so that we can properly identify the presence of cultural resources and the impact this project may have on said resources.

Thank you,

Jessica Mauck
CULTURAL RESOURCES ANALYST
O: (909) 864-8933 x3249
M: (909) 725-9054
26569 Community Center Drive  Highland California 92346