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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

In October and November 2015, CRM TECH performed a cultural resources study on approximately 13.81 acres of undeveloped land near the City of Hesperia, San Bernardino County, California. The subject property of the study, Tentative Parcel Map No. 19621, consists of what is currently Assessor’s Parcel No. 3064-231-28, located on the southeast corner of Braceo Street and Nielson Road, in the southeast quarter of Section 19, T4N R5W, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian. The proposed project seeks to subdivide the western portion of the property into four single-family residential lots ranging in size from 2.6 acres to 3.4 acres, with southeast portion of the property to remain undeveloped.

The study is part of the environmental review process for the proposed subdivision. 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.

Through the various avenues of research, this study did not encounter any “historical resources” within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, CRM TECH recommends to the County of San Bernardino a finding of No Impact regarding cultural resources. No further cultural resources investigation is recommended for the project unless development plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study. However, if buried cultural materials are encountered during any earth-moving operations associated with the project, all work in that area should be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds.
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INTRODUCTION

In October and November 2015, CRM TECH performed a cultural resources study on approximately 13.81 acres of undeveloped land near the City of Hesperia, San Bernardino County, California (Fig. 1). The subject property of the study, Tentative Parcel Map No. 19621, consists of what is currently Assessor’s Parcel No. 3064-231-28, located on the southeast corner of Braceo Street and Nielson Road, in the southeast quarter of Section 19, T4N R5W, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian (Fig. 2). The proposed project seeks to subdivide the western portion of the property into four single-family residential lots ranging in size from 2.6 acres to 3.4 acres, with southeast portion of the property to remain undeveloped.

The study is part of the environmental review process for the proposed subdivision. 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 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. The following report is a complete account of the methods, results, and final conclusion of the study.

Figure 1. Project vicinity. (Based on USGS San Bernardino, Calif., 1:250,000 quadrangle [USGS 1979])
Figure 2. Project area. (Based on USGS Baldy Mesa, Calif., 1:24,000 quadrangle [USGS 1996])
SETTING

CURRENT NATURAL SETTING

The project area is situated in the Victor Valley, which lies on the southern rim of the Mojave Desert and immediately to the north of the San Bernardino-San Gabriel mountain ranges. The climate and environment of the area is typical of southern California “high desert” country, so-called because of its higher elevation than the Colorado Desert to the southeast. The climate is marked by extremes in temperature and aridity, with summer highs reaching well over 110ºF and winter lows dipping below freezing. Average annual precipitation is less than five inches.

The entire project area remains undeveloped today, but is located between existing residences to the north and the southeast (Fig. 3). The terrain in the project area is relatively level, with a gradual decline toward the northeast. Elevations range between approximately 3,680 feet and 3,720 feet above mean sea level, the lower ground lying within a wash. Soils consist of light gray-brown coarse sands in the wash area and yellowish-brown coarse sands mixed with decomposing granite on the higher slopes.

The project area is a part of the Joshua Tree Woodland Plant Community, which is characterized by a sparse growth of Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia*), buckwheat (*Eriogonum* species), Apache plume (*Fallugia paradoxa*), desert alyssum (*Lepidium fremontii*), juniper (*Juniperus* spp.), Mormon tea (*Ephedra* spp.), various types of cacti, and assorted other shrubs and plants (Fig. 3). Animals common to the area include small mammals (jackrabbits, desert cottontails, squirrels, rats, and

Figure 3. Overview of the current natural setting of the project area. (Photo taken on November 10, 2015; view to the north)
mice), reptiles (lizards, snakes, and desert tortoise), native birds (doves, vultures, raptors, and quail),
and arthropods (beetles, desert tarantula and scorpions).

The Victor Valley is a part of the Mojave River watershed. During the Late Pleistocene and early
Holocene periods, the region experienced four separate high stands of Lake Mojave and other
pluvial lakes. These episodes afforded greater access to water by aboriginal groups in the region,
while the desiccation of the lakes forced them to move closer to the Mojave River, which provided
not only a dependable water source and subsistence resources but also a major route for interregional
trade. Many of the Native American archaeological sites identified in and around the Victor Valley
consist of ancient habitation debris such as middens, groundstone fragments, chipped-stone pieces,
fire-affected rocks, and faunal remains. Rock shelters, bedrock milling features, and rock art panels
have also been found in the region. As expected, most of these sites occur along the banks of the
Mojave River.

CULTURAL SETTING

Prehistoric Context

In order to understand the progress of Native American cultures prior to European contact,
archaeologists have devised chronological frameworks on the basis of artifacts and site types that
date back some 12,000 years. Currently, the chronology most frequently applied in the Mojave
Desert divides the region’s prehistory into five periods marked by changes in archaeological
remains, reflecting different ways in which Native peoples adapted to their surroundings. According
to Warren (1984) and Warren and Crabtree (1986), the five periods are as follows: the Lake Mojave
Period, 12,000 years to 7,000 years ago; the Pinto Period, 7,000 years to 4,000 years ago; the
Gypsum Period, 4,000 years to 1,500 years ago; the Saratoga Springs Period, 1,500 years to 800
years ago; and the Protohistoric Period, 800 years ago to European contact.

More recently, Hall (2000) presented a slightly different chronology for the region, also with five
periods: Lake Mojave (ca. 8000-5500 B.C.), Pinto (ca. 5500-2500 B.C.), Newberry (ca. 1500 B.C.-
500 A.D.), Saratoga (ca. 500-1200 A.D.), and Tecopa (ca. 1200-1770s A.D.). According to Hall
(ibid.:14), small mobile groups of hunters and gatherers inhabited the Mojave Desert during the Lake
Mojave sequence. Their material culture is represented by the Great Basin Stemmed points and
flaked stone crescents. These small, highly mobile groups continued to inhabit the region during the
Pinto Period, which saw an increased reliance on ground foods, small and large game animals, and
the collection of vegetal resources, suggesting that “subsistence patterns were those of broad-based
foragers” (ibid.:15). Artifact types found in association with this period include the Pinto points and
Olivella sp. spire-opped beads.

Distinct cultural changes occurred during the Newberry Period, in comparison to the earlier periods,
including “geographically expansive land-use pattern…involving small residential groups moving
between select localities,” long-distance trade, and diffusion of trait characteristics (Hall 2000:16).
Typical artifacts from this period are the Elko and Gypsum Contracting Stem points and Split Oval
beads. The two ensuing periods, Saratoga and Tecopa, are characterized by seasonal group
settlements near accessible food resources and the intensification of the exploitation of plant foods,
as evidenced by groundstone artifacts (ibid.:16).
Hall (2000:16) states that “late prehistoric foraging patterns were more restricted in geographic routine and range, a consequence of increasing population density” and other variables. Saratoga Period artifact types include Rose Spring and Eastgate points as well as Anasazi grayware pottery. Artifacts from the Tecopa Period include Desert Side-notched and Cottonwood Triangular points, buffware and brownware pottery, and beads of the Thin Lipped, Tiny Saucer, Cupped, Cylinder, steatite, and glass types (ibid.).

Ethnohistoric Context

The project area is a part of the homeland of the Serrano Indians, whose traditional territory is centered in the San Bernardino Mountains, but also includes portions of the San Bernardino Valley and the southern rim of the Mojave Desert. 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 on these sources.

Prior to European contact, the Serrano were primarily hunter-gatherers and occasionally fishers, and settled mostly 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 exact nature of the clans, their structure, function, and number are not known, except that each clan was the largest autonomous political and landholding unit, the core of which was the patrilineage. There was no pan-tribal political union among the clans.

Families lived in circular, domed structures made from willow and tule thatching and containing a central fire pit. These homes were used mainly for sleep and storage, while most of the daily household activities occurred in the open or under the shade of a ramada. Other important structures in Serrano life were large ceremonial house, granaries and sweat lodges, the last being a circular semi-subterranean hut framed with willow, covered with earth, and having only one entrance. In terms of Serrano technology, shells, wood bone stone, and plant fibers were employed to create household items, tools, and other everyday items, as well as fashion functional decorative items like baskets and blankets.

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 Serranos were removed to the nearby missions. At present, most Serrano descendants are found on the San Manuel and the Morongo Indian Reservations, where they participate in ceremonial and political affairs with other Native American groups on an inter-reservation basis.

Historic Context

The present-day Victor Valley area received its first European visitor, the famed Spanish missionary and explorer Francisco Garcés, in 1776, and the first Euroamerican settlements appeared in the valley as early as 1860 (Peirson 1970:128). Despite these “early starts,” due to its harsh environment, development in the arid high desert country of southern California was slow and
limited for much of the historic period, and the Victor Valley remained only sparsely populated until the second half of the 20th century.

Garcés traveled through the Victor Valley along an ancient Indian trading route known today as the Mojave Trail (Beck and Haase 1974:15). In 1829, most of this trail was incorporated into an important pack-train road known as the Old Spanish Trail, which extended between southern California and Santa Fe, New Mexico (Warren 2004). Some 20 years later, when the historic wagon road known as the Mormon Trail or Salt Lake Trail was established between Utah and southern California, it followed essentially the same route across the Mojave Desert (NPS 2001:5). Since then, the Victor Valley has always served as a crucial link on a succession of major transportation arteries, where the heritage of the ancient Mojave Trail was carried on by the Santa Fe Railway, by the legendary U.S. Route 66, and finally by today’s Interstate Highway 15.

With the completion of the ATSF Railway, settlement activities began in earnest in the Victor Valley in the 1880s. In 1885, the Hesperia area was officially named in conjunction with the establishment of a railroad station. Shortly thereafter, Robert and Joseph Widney formed the Hesperia Land and Water Company, laid out a subdivision referred to as the Old Townsite, and began to establish water rights with the County of San Bernardino (Drylie 2010:13-16). Thanks to the availability of fertile lands and the abundance of ground water, agriculture played a dominant role in the early development of the Victor Valley area in general and in Hesperia specifically (McGinnis 1988). Since the 1980s, however, residential and commercial development spurred by southern California commuters’ search for affordable housing has become the driving force in the growth of the Victor Valley region. In 1988, the City of Hesperia was incorporated largely as a “bedroom community.”

RESEARCH METHODS

RECORDS SEARCH

On October 5, 2015, CRM TECH archaeologist Nina Gallardo (see App. 1 for qualifications) 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, Gallardo examined maps and records on file at the SCCIC for previously identified cultural resources in or near the project area and existing cultural resources reports 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 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 principal investigator/historian Bai “Tom” Tang (see App. 1 for qualifications) on the basis of published literature in local history and historic maps and aerial photographs of the Hesperia area. Among maps consulted for this study were the U.S. General Land Office’s (GLO) land survey plat maps dated 1856 and the
U.S. Geological Survey’s (USGS) topographic maps dated 1902-1956. These 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, taken between 1938 and 2012, are available at the NETR Online website.

NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION

On October 5, 2015, CRM TECH submitted a written request to the State of California’s Native American Heritage Commission for a records search in the commission’s sacred lands file. In the meantime, CRM TECH notified the nearby San Manuel Band of Mission Indians of the upcoming archaeological fieldwork and invited tribal participation. Following the Native American Heritage Commission’s recommendations, on October 28 CRM TECH contacted a total of eight tribal representatives in the region in writing to solicit local Native American input regarding any possible cultural resources concerns over the proposed project. The correspondences between CRM TECH and the Native American representatives are attached to this report in Appendix 2.

FIELD SURVEY

On November 10, 2015, CRM TECH field director Daniel Ballester and project archaeologist Jesse Yorck (see App. 1 for qualifications) carried out the intensive-level, on-foot field survey of the project area. The survey was completed by walking a series of parallel north-south and east-west transects spaced 15 meters (approx. 50 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 ranged from fair (60%) to good (80%) depending upon the density of vegetation.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

RECORDS SEARCH

According to SCCIC records, a linear survey for a pipeline project was apparently conducted across the current project area in 1991 (Fig. 4), but no cultural resources were recorded within or adjacent to the project area during any of the previous surveys in the vicinity. Within a one-mile radius of the project area, SCCIC records show more than 20 previous studies covering various tracts of land and linear features (Fig. 4). As a result, seven historical/archaeological sites have been recorded within the scope of the records search, as listed in Table 1. All of these sites dated to the historic period, and all but one represented linear infrastructure feature, mostly roads (Table 1). None of these previously recorded sites is located in the immediate vicinity of the project area, and thus none of them requires further consideration during this study.

HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Historic maps consulted for this study suggest that the project area is relatively low in sensitivity for cultural resources from the historic period. As Figures 5-8 illustrate, no evidence of any settlement or development activities were noted within the project area throughout the 1850s-1950s era. In the
Figure 4. Previous cultural resources studies in the vicinity of the project area, listed by SCCIC file number. Locations of historical/archaeological sites are not shown as a protective measure.
Table 1. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within the Scope of the Records Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Recorded by/Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-004252</td>
<td>Stanton and Norris 2005</td>
<td>Unpaved road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-004267</td>
<td>Various 1980-2007</td>
<td>Unpaved road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-004268</td>
<td>Brock 1995</td>
<td>One-lane dirt road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-004271</td>
<td>Brock 1995</td>
<td>One-lane dirt road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-007152</td>
<td>McKenna and Reeves 1992</td>
<td>Homestead and associated historic-period artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-007694</td>
<td>Various 1986-2013</td>
<td>Transmission lines and access road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-008082</td>
<td>Brock 1995</td>
<td>Phelan Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1850-1890s, the only man-made features known to be present in the project vicinity were various winding roads, including one that traversed a few hundred feet to the southeast of the project location (Figs. 5, 6).

By the mid-20th century, that road had disappeared from the landscape, and the surrounding area remained only sparsely settled with scattered ranches connected by a somewhat regular grid of roads (Figs. 7, 8; NETR Online 1938; 1952). A few crisscrossing dirt roads were observed in the project vicinity by the 1960s, indicating increased human activities, but the most notable man-made features extant near the project area today, the two dirt roads known as Braceo Street and Nielson Road, did not come into being until sometime between 1968 and 1995 (NETR Online 1968; 1995). Based on its depiction in the historic maps and aerial photographs, the project area has evidently remained unsettled and undeveloped to the present time (NETR Online 2002-2012).

![Figure 5](image1.png)  ![Figure 6](image2.png)

Figure 5. The project area and vicinity in 1855-1856. (Source: GLO 1856a; 1856b)  Figure 6. The project area and vicinity in 1898-1899. (Source: USGS 1902)
NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION

In response to CRM TECH’s inquiry, the Native American Heritage Commission states that the sacred lands record search identified no Native American cultural resources within 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 App. 2). Upon receiving the commission’s reply, CRM TECH sent written requests for consultation to all seven individuals on the referral list and the organizations they represent (see App. 2). In addition, as referred by tribal government staff, Raymond Huaute, Cultural Resource Specialist for the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, was also contacted.

As of this time, only one of the local Native American representatives has responded. In an e-mail dated November 10, 2015, Leslie Mouriquand of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians states that the tribe has no specific information on any sites of Native American traditional cultural value in the project area, and requests notification of any cultural resources found in the project area for further consultation (see App. 2).

FIELD SURVEY

The field survey produced negative results for potential cultural resources. The entire project area was closely inspected for any evidence of human activities dating to the prehistoric or historic period, but none was found. A minor amount of modern refuse, of no historical or archaeological interest, was observed scattered throughout the project area, but no buildings, structures, objects, sites, features, or artifacts more than 50 years of age were encountered during the survey.
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. (PRC §5024.1(c))

As discussed above, all research procedures conducted during this study have produced negative results, and no potential “historical resources” were encountered throughout the course of the study. Based on these findings, and in light of the criteria listed above, the present report concludes that no historical resources exist within or adjacent to the project area.

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 outlined above, no “historical resources,” as defined by CEQA, were encountered throughout the course of this study. Therefore, CRM TECH presents the following recommendations to the County of San Bernardino:
• No “historical resources” exist within or adjacent to the project area, and thus the project as currently proposed will not cause a substantial adverse change to any known “historical resources.”

• No further cultural resources investigation is necessary for the proposed project unless development plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study.

• If buried cultural materials are discovered during any earth-moving operations associated with the project, all work in that area should be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds.
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2007 Certificate in Geographic Information Systems (GIS), California State University, San Bernardino.

Professional Experience

2002- Field Director/GIS Specialist, CRM TECH, Riverside/Colton, California.
• Report writing, site record preparation, and supervisory responsibilities over all aspects of fieldwork and field crew.
1999-2002 Project Archaeologist, CRM TECH, Riverside, California.
• Survey, testing, data recovery, monitoring, and mapping.
• Two and a half months of excavations on Topomai village site, Marine Corp Air Station, Camp Pendleton.
• Two weeks of excavations on a site on Red Beach, Camp Pendleton, and two weeks of survey in Camp Pendleton, Otay Mesa, and Encinitas.
1998 Field Crew, Archaeological Research Unit, University of California, Riverside.
• Two weeks of survey in Anza Borrego Desert State Park and Eureka Valley, Death Valley National Park.
PROJECT ARCHAEOLOGIST
Jesse Yorck, M.A., RPA*

Education

2009  M.A., Center for Pacific Islands Studies, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
2002  B.A., Anthropology, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

2005-  Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act Training, National Preservation Institute.

Professional Experience

2012-2014 Archaeologist, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oregon.
2012-2012 Lead Archaeologist, Warm Springs Geo Visions, Warm Springs, Oregon.
2011-2012 Archaeologist/Principal Investigator, ESA, San Francisco, California.
2010-2011 Senior Archaeologist, Pacific Consulting Services, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Memberships

*Register of Professional Archaeologists.
APPENDIX 2

CORRESPONDENCE WITH NATIVE AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES*

* A total of eight local Native American representatives were contacted; a sample letter is included in this report.
Project: Tentative Parcel Map No. 19621; APN 3064-231-28 (CRM TECH Contract No. 2977)

County: San Bernardino

USGS Quadrangle Name: Baldy Mesa, Calif.

Township 4 North Range 5 West 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 develop four single-family residences on 14 acres of land located on the southeast corner of Neilson Road and Braceo Street, near the City of Hesperia, San Bernardino County, California.
Hello,

I’m emailing to inform you that CRM TECH will be conducting cultural study for Tentative Parcel Map No. 19621 (APN 3064-231-28; CRM TECH No. 2977), near the City of Hesperia, San Bernardino County. I’m also emailing to see if the San Manuel Band is interested in joining CRM TECH to conduct the field survey soon. Please let me know if you have questions regarding the project or interested in the field survey.

Thanks for your time and input,

Nina Gallardo  
Project Archaeologist/Native American liaison  
CRM TECH  
1016 E. Cooley Drive Ste. A/B  
Colton, CA 92324  
(909) 824-6400
October 7, 2015

Nina Gallardo  
CRM TECH  
1016 E. Cooley Drive, Suite A/B  
Colton, CA 92324

Sent by E-mail: ngallardo@crmtech.us  
Number of Pages: 2

Re.: Tentative Parcel Map No. 19621; APN 3064-231-28 Project (CRM TECH #2977),  
San Bernardino County

Dear Ms. Gallardo:

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File was  
completed for your project area with negative results, based on the USGS quadrangle information you  
provided. Please note that the absence of specific site information in the Sacred Lands File does not  
indicate the absence of Native American cultural resources in any APE. Other sources of cultural  
resources information should be contacted regarding known and recorded sites.

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

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these  
individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain  
current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my  
email address: rw_nahc@pacbell.net.

Sincerely,

C. Jay  

Rob Wood  
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Native American Contact List
San Bernardino County
October 7, 2015

Ernest H. Siva
Morongo Band of Mission Indians Tribal Elder
9570 Mias Canyon Road Serrano
Banning, CA 92220 Cahuilla
siva@dishmail.net
(951) 849-4676

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Lynn Valbuena, Chairwoman
26569 Community Center Serrano
Highland, CA 92346
(909) 864-8933
(909) 864-3370 Fax

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Denisa Torres, Cultural Resources Manager
12700 Pumarr Road Cahuilla
Banning, CA 92220 Serrano
dtorres@morongo-nsn.gov
(951) 849-8807
(951) 572-6004 Fax
(951) 572-6004 Fax

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Daniel McCarthy, M.S., Director-CRM Dept.
26569 Community Center Drive Serrano
Highland, CA 92346
dmccarthy@sanmanuel-nsn.gov
(909) 864-8933 Ext 3248
(909) 862-5152 Fax

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Robert Martin, Chairperson
12700 Pumarr Road Cahuilla
Banning, CA 92220 Serrano
(951) 849-8807
(951) 755-5200
(951) 922-8146 Fax

Serrano Nation of Mission Indians
Goldie Walker, Chairwoman
P.O. Box 343 Serrano
Patton, CA 92369
(909) 528-9027
(909) 528-9032

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA 91322 Tataviam
Fernandeño
tsen2u@hotmail.com
(661) 753-9833 Office Serrano
(760) 885-0955 Cell Vanyume
(760) 949-1604 Fax Kitanemuk

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Tentative Parcel Map No. 19621; APN 3064-231-28 Project (CRM TECH No 2977), San Bernardino County.
Dear Ms. Torres:

I am writing to inform you of a proposed project that is currently the subject of a CEQA-compliance study. The project, referenced above, entails the subdivision of approximately 13.8 acres of undeveloped land into five new parcels in anticipation of future development. The project area is located on the southeast corner of Braceo Street and Neilson Road, near the City of Hesperia, San Bernardino County. The accompanying map, based on the USGS Baldy Mesa, Calif., 7.5’ quadrangle, depicts the location of the project area in Section 19, T4N R5W, SBBM. CRM TECH has been hired by Cubit Engineering to conduct the cultural resource component of the study, including the Native American scoping, for this project.

According to records on file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), there are no known historical/archaeological sites within the boundaries of the project area. Outside the project boundaries but within a one-mile radius, SCCIC records show that seven historical/archaeological sites have been previously recorded, all of them dating to the historic period, including several roads, a homestead, and a power transmission line.

In a letter dated October 7, 2015, the Native American Heritage Commission reports that the sacred lands record search identified no Native American cultural resources within the project area, but recommends that local Native American groups be contacted 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 within or near the project area that should be considered during the cultural resources investigation. 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 CRM TECH, as the cultural resources consultant for the project, is not the appropriate entity to initiate government-to-government consultation or AB 52-compliance. Thank you for your time and effort in addressing this important matter.
Respectfully,

Nina Gallardo  
Project Archaeologist/Native American liaison  
CRM TECH  
1016 E. Cooley Drive Ste. A/B  
Colton, CA 92324  
(909) 824-6400  
Email: ngallardo@crmtech.us

Encl.: NAHC response letter and project location map

From: Daniel McCarthy <DMcCarthy@sanmanuel-nsn.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2015 12:24 PM
To: Nina Gallardo
Cc: smconsultation@sanmanuel-nsn.gov
Subject: CRM TECH #2977 TPM 19621 Hesperia

Nina,

We received your scoping letter dated October 28, 2015, regarding proposed TPM 19621 near Hesperia, in San Bernardino County. Thank you for the opportunity to review and respond. The proposed project is located within the Tribe’s ancestral territory. We do not have any specific information about tribal cultural resources at the project location. Should tribal cultural resources be identified during your investigation, please contact our office for consultation.

Thank you,
Leslie Mouriquand MA, RPA
for
Daniel McCarthy, MS, RPA
Director
Cultural Resources Management Department
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
26569 Community Center Drive
Highland, CA 92346
Office: 909 864-8933 x 3248
Cell: 909 838-4175
dmccarthy@sanmanuel-nsn.gov