

6.4 Cultural Resources

6.4.1 Introduction

Riverside Public Utilities (RPU) proposes to build and operate a nominal 96-megawatt (MW) simple-cycle power plant on a 12-acre fenced site within the City of Riverside, California. This proposed facility is referred to as the Riverside Energy Resource Center (RERC) Project (Project). RPU will develop, build, own and operate the facility. RERC will supply the internal needs of the City of Riverside during summer peak electrical demands and will serve the City's minimum emergency loads in the event RPU is islanded from the external transmission system. No power from RERC will be exported outside of the City.

This section discusses potential impacts to cultural resources related to the proposed Project. The RERC Project site is located at the northern terminus of Acorn Street in the City of Riverside, Riverside County, California. The Project would also require rebuilding a transmission line approximately 1.75 miles long. This analysis is intended to evaluate the potential for Project impacts during construction and operation. This document presents a summary of relevant laws, ordinances, regulations and standards (LORS), the Project's setting, potential environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures affecting cultural resources. Required permits and permitting agencies are also identified.

6.4.1.1 Project Description

The proposed site is owned by the City of Riverside and is located adjacent to the City of Riverside's Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) in a light industrial/manufacturing area. The RERC will consist of two aero-derivative combustion turbine generators with SCRs, an on-site substation, approximately 1.75 miles of 69kV transmission line, natural gas and water supply interconnection, and on-site administration building and warehouse. The power plant and associated administration building and warehouse will occupy approximately 8 of 12 acres with the additional 4 acres reserved for equipment storage and construction parking. The entire plant perimeter will be fenced with a combination of chain-link fencing and architectural block walls.

The following sections in this document, adhering to the scope of work set forth in Instructions to the California Energy Commission (CEC) staff for the review of and Information Requirements for an Application for Certification (CEC 1992) and Rules of Practice and Procedure & Power Plant Site Certification Regulations (CEC 1997), are as follows:

- ◆ Description of Laws, Regulations and Standards (LORS) applicable to the consideration of cultural resources.
- ◆ Cultural Setting
- ◆ Literature Review and Previous Work in the area
- ◆ Native American Consultation

- ◆ Field Survey Methods
- ◆ Field Survey Findings and Description of Cultural Resources near the Project Area
- ◆ Description of the impacts of construction on cultural resources
- ◆ Mitigation Measures to avoid impacts to cultural resources
- ◆ References Cited

The cultural resources study was directed by Mr. Patrick Maxon and Mr. James Steely, who meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (NPS 1983), for prehistoric archaeology and history respectively. This study was designed to fulfill the requirements of the California Energy Commission. All work was guided by the regulations for cultural resources set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)(Section 15064.5 of the Guidelines and Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 of the Public Resources Code) as well as the procedures per Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) at 36CFR800.

The byproducts of human activities and important natural areas that are valued by people are usually considered cultural resources. Cultural resources considered in this effort, that could be present within or near the Project area, consist of archaeological sites and isolates (historic, protohistoric and historic), historic architectural and engineering buildings, structures, objects, sites and districts and ethnographic sites and/or areas of traditional significance to Native Americans and other groups called Sacred Lands or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP). This document reports on the study to determine whether any of the above mentioned cultural resources are present within or near the current study area and whether they will be adversely affected by the construction of the proposed RERC Project.

6.4.2 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations and Standards

This section consists of a discussion of the applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and standards governing cultural resources some of which must be adhered to prior to and during construction of the proposed Riverside Energy Center. Federal, state and local ordinances are included.

6.4.2.1 Federal

Cultural resources are considered during federal undertakings chiefly under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended) through its implementing regulation, 36CFR800 (Protection of Historic Properties), as well as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to Native Americans are considered under Section 101(d)(6)(A) of NHPA. Other federal laws include the Archaeological Data Preservation Act of 1974, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) of 1978, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1989, among others.

Section 106 of NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470f) requires that federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on any district, site, building, structure or object included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings (36CFR800.1). Under Section 106, the significance of any adversely affected cultural resource is assessed and mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the impacts to an acceptable level. Significant cultural resources are those resources that are listed in, or are eligible for listing on the NRHP per the criteria listed at 36CFR60.4 below:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association and that:

- (a) Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- (b) Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- (c) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of installation, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- (d) Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

6.4.2.2 State

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on historical resources. If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts to be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (Section 21083.2 (a), (b) and (c)). 21083.2 (g) describes an *unique archaeological resource* as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- (1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- (2) Has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- (3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

An historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (Section 21084.1), a resource

included in a local register of historical resources (15064.5(a)(2)), or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant (15064.5 (a)(3)).

Public Resources Code SS5024.1, Section 15064.5 of the Guidelines and Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 of the Statutes of CEQA were used as the basic guidelines for the cultural resources study. Public Resources Code SS5024.1 requires evaluation of historical resources to determine their eligibility for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The purposes of the register are to maintain listings of the state's historical resources and to indicate which properties are to be protected from substantial adverse change. The criteria for listing resources on the California Register were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing on the NRHP, enumerated above.

According to Section 15064.5(a)(3)(A-D) in the revised CEQA guidelines (Governor's Office of Planning and Research 1998), a resource is considered historically significant if it meets at least one of the following criteria:

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

Impacts to significant cultural resources that affect the characteristics of any resource that qualify it for the NRHP or adversely alter the significance of a resource listed on or eligible for listing on the CRHR are considered a significant effect on the environment. Impacts to cultural resources from the proposed RERC Project are thus considered significant if the Project physically destroys or damages all or part of a resource, changes the character of the use of the resource or physical feature within the setting of the resource which contribute to its significance or introduces visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of significant features of the resource.

The disposition of burials falls first under the general prohibition on disturbing or removing human remains under Health and Safety Code 7050.5. More specifically, remains suspected to be Native American are treated under CEQA at Section 15064.5 and site language found at Public Resources Code SS5097.98 that illustrates the process to be followed in the event that remains are discovered. If human remains are discovered during the construction of the RERC Project, no further disturbance to the site shall occur and the Riverside County Coroner must be notified. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. The NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descended (MLD) from the deceased. The MLD may then make recommendations as to the disposition of the remains.

6.4.2.3 Local

The County of Riverside has drafted its own requirements regarding the preparation of cultural resources reports for privately initiated development projects (updated March 1993), entitled, Requirements for the Preparation and Review of Archaeological and Biological Reports. It details the requirements as follows (summary):

- ♦ Qualification of Consultants: Consultants wishing to submit archaeological reports to the County need to be pre-qualified to do so by the Planning Department.
- ♦ Memorandum of Understanding: Following pre-qualification, the consultant and County need to execute a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the quality of the report and the procedures under which they will be prepared and submitted.
- ♦ Planner Notification of Need for Archaeological Reports: If archaeological reports are necessary, as determined by the County's project planner, the planner will notify the project proponent.
- ♦ Selection of Consultant: The project proponent is required to select an archaeological consultant qualified by the County. The selection must be made known to the County.
- ♦ Submittal of Report: The consultant must submit his report to the County before or at the same time that it submits the report to the project proponent.

SWCA Environmental Consultants Inc. is already pre-qualified by the County and is on the qualified consultants list maintained by the County Planning Department.

6.4.3 Setting

6.4.3.1 Prehistory

Humans have certainly been present in the New World since 11,000 B.C. There is growing evidence, however, that humans were present long before that date (Dixon 1993). Linguistic and genetic studies suggest a date of 20,000 to 40,000 years ago as more realistic (LA Times 1998). The evidence of earlier occupation is not yet conclusive, but it is beginning to be accepted by archaeologists. The Meadowcroft Rockshelter in Pennsylvania and Monte Verde in Chile, for instance, are two early sites that have produced reliable dates to as early as 12,500 years B.C. These earliest known remains indicate a very small, mobile population, apparently dependent on hunting of large game animals as the primary subsistence strategy. Other resources were certainly used, but the bulk of the few traces remaining today are related to game hunting (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984, Moratto 1984).

The first useful chronology for southern California in general was developed by William Wallace (1955), who described four distinct periods applicable to the southern California coastal region. Although dated, the chronology's relative accuracy has been vindicated by more recent radiocarbon dates. Wallace's earliest period - Horizon I: Early Man - was dated from an unknown time near the end of the Pleistocene to about 5500 B.C. The surviving material culture of this period consists primarily of large, extremely well made

projectile points as well as large, but crude tools such as scrapers and choppers. Encampments were probably never permanent, and were probably sited near a major kill. Occupation would have persisted only until the resources of that kill were exhausted. Such an economy, using only a small fraction of the available resources, would not have supported a large population; therefore, it is probable that the Paleo-Indians lived in groups no larger than extended families and that contact with other such groups was infrequent.

The Pleistocene ended sometime around 9000 years B.C., and the large game animals gradually became extinct. This major change in resource availability, coupled with population expansion, necessitated a major change in subsistence strategies.

The succeeding period identified by Wallace is labeled Horizon II: Milling Stone Assemblages - so named because of the predominance of lithic milling tools associated with it. These tools - the mano and metate - were used to process the small, hard seeds associated with the Sage Scrub Ecological Community. Settlement size seems to have increased from the Early Man Period. An annual round of seasonal migrations was likely practiced as movements coincided with ripening vegetal resources. Some formal burials are also evident. This successful adaptation to local conditions persisted essentially unchanged until around 3000 years B.C.

The Millingstone was followed, in Wallace's scheme, by Horizon III: Intermediate Cultures. The major change marking the Intermediate was the introduction of the mortar and pestle, allowing for the widespread exploitation of the acorn as a food resource. Flaked stone tools also became more diverse and plentiful. Population growth resulted from exploitation of a wider range of resources.

Wallace's final phase is termed Horizon IV: Late Prehistoric Cultures. In the Late Prehistoric (beginning circa A.D. 1000), groups began to settle along trade routes and there was a greater utilization of food resources with more land and sea mammal hunting to complement collecting. The pattern of life in Horizon IV was more complex than during earlier periods. More classes of artifacts were being produced and they exhibited a more sophisticated degree of workmanship. The observation that the bow and arrow was now utilized largely is based on the recovery of a greater number of small, finely flaked projectile points. Other items include steatite containers, shell fishhooks, perforated stones, bone tools, personal ornaments, asphalt adhesive and elaborate mortuary customs. In addition, the population increased and larger, more permanent villages evolved (Wallace 1955:223). Late sites contain beautiful and complex objects of utility, art and decoration.

During the Late Prehistoric, emigrants from the Great Basin appeared in southern California. Apparently, these peoples were very quick to adopt most of the local traits, because it is difficult to separate the archaeological assemblages of the emigrants from those of the indigenous peoples based on artifact typology alone. Linguistic (Kroeber 1925) studies provide most of the extant evidence of the migration.

6.4.3.2 Ethnography

The current Riverside Energy Center study area lies in the vicinity of several ethnographically known groups of Native Americans. The immediate study area was probably occupied ethnographically by the Serrano (King 2003: Fig. 1). To the west, the ethnographic group known as the Gabrielino or Tongva was located (Bean and Smith 1978). The ethnographically known Cahuilla lived immediately to the east (Bean 1978) and the Luiseño to the southeast (Bean and Shipek 1978).

The language of all four groups was derived from the Takic family, part of the Uto-Aztecan linguistic stock, which can be traced to the Great Basin area (Driver 1969). Linguistic analysis suggests that at one time (probably before 500 B.C.) much of the southern California coastal region was populated by Hokan speakers who were gradually displaced by Takic speaking immigrants from the southern Sierra Nevadas and Great Basin area. The timing and extent of the migrations and their impact on indigenous peoples is not well understood.

Serrano

In the immediate area around Riverside and to the north were the Serrano. Serrano is a Spanish term meaning mountaineer or highlander (Bean and Smith 1978), but tribal members refer to themselves as the Maarrénga'yam (Ramón and Elliot 2000: xxix). The Serrano occupied the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains and their southern foothills, the Mojave Desert near Apple Valley and out to Barstow, and areas as far east as Twentynine Palms and Yucaipa Valley. This territorial reach, recently proposed by King (2003) after modeling marriage networks from mission sacramental register data, expands traditional descriptions (Bean and Smith 1978). Their lands ranged in elevation from 1,500 feet in the desert areas to over 11,000 feet in the mountainous areas. The desert dwelling Serrano, or Vanyume, occupied the Upper Sonoran plant-animal community. Serrano villages were located near permanent water sources, making water a determining factor in the location of their settlements (Bean and Smith 1978). The Serrano village of Jurupa (on the west bank of the Santa Anna River, near Mount Rubidoux) was their major settlement close to the Project area.

The Serrano language is part of the Serran language group, which includes both Serrano groups (Serrano proper and Vanyume), Kitanemuk and possibly Tataviam (Bean and Smith 1978), a branch of the Takic language family, and part of the Uto-Aztecan linguistic stock. This places the Serrano among the larger "Shoshonean" migration into southern California that occurred 2,000 to 3,000 years ago.

The Serrano were organized in autonomous localized lineages that maintained favored, generalized usage areas. These lineages were organized into exogamous clans. Each clan had a hereditary leader, called the kiika', who conducted ceremonies and religious activities (Bean and Smith 1978).

The Serrano maintained a hunter-gatherer subsistence strategy: the men hunting and the women gathering. Larger game was generally hunted with the bow and arrow, while snares, traps and pits were used for capturing smaller game. At certain times of the year, communal hunting and gathering expeditions were held. Faunal resources available to the desert dwelling Serrano included deer, mountain sheep, antelope, rabbit, small rodents

and several species of birds (quail being their favorite). Meat was generally prepared by cooking in earth ovens, boiling or sun-drying. Cooking and food preparation utensils consisted primarily of lithic knives and scrapers, mortars and metates, pottery, and bone or horn utensils. Floral resources available to the desert dwelling Serrano included honey mesquite, piñon nuts, yucca roots, mesquite and cacti fruits. These resources were supplemented by trade with foothill groups for roots, bulbs, shoots and seeds (Bean and Smith 1978:571).

Serrano dwellings were generally circular in plan. Houses were used primarily for storage and sleeping, while the majority of their household activities were conducted outdoors. Villages had a ceremonial house where the *kiika'* resided, as well as a sweathouse (Bean and Smith 1978).

With villages in the San Gabriel foothills such as Asucsabit (near the modern city of Azusa) and Cucamobit (at Cucamonga), the Serrano's first contact with the Spanish occurred in 1771 with the founding of Mission San Gabriel. The mission's *asistencias* of San Bernardino, founded near the village of Guachama, put the missionaries permanently in the Riverside area by 1810. An uprising against the Spanish in 1811 resulted in military expeditions to forcibly bring many Serrano, Cahuilla and interior Luiseño into the missions as part of a plan to pacify the region east of Riverside (L. Bean and W. Mason, personal communication 2001). By 1834, most of the Serrano had died of European-introduced diseases, been moved to the Franciscan missions or had worked on private ranchos.

In 1839, members of the Lugo family, prominent Californio rancheros, were granted tracts of land around Jurupa. By this time extensive raiding from Great Basin tribes and Mexican renegades was taking place throughout the region. Most of the Serrano either were mission neophytes or had died of infectious disease brought about by association with the Euro-Americans. The Lugo family looked to the Cahuilla to form a buffer group against the raiders. A Mountain Cahuilla clan lead by Chief Juan Antonio agreed to settle in the valley, over the ensuing years shifting habitation from the rancho to the San Timoteo Creek that feeds into the Santa Ana River (Christian 2002). Most died in the small pox epidemic of the 1860s, including Chief Juan Antonio. These native people later appear in historic photos around Mount Rubidoux. Some remnant remained in the Riverside area until the 1920s when the remaining few moved to the Soboba Reservation. These Mountain Cahuilla people had not been missionized, and were allowed to live their own lives in a loose affiliation with the Lugo rancho.

As of 1975, most of the few remaining Serrano were living on the Morongo or San Manuel reservations and only 100 people, from a precontact population estimate of 1,500-2,500, claimed Serrano descent (Bean and Smith 1978).

Gabrielino/Tongva

To the west of the Serrano were the Gabrielino/Tongva. They arrived in the Los Angeles Basin around 500 B.C. as part of the so-called Shoshonean (Takic speaking) Wedge from the Great Basin region and gradually displaced the indigenous peoples, probably Hokan speakers. Large, permanent villages were established in the fertile lowlands along rivers and streams and in sheltered areas along the coast. Eventually, Gabrielino territory

encompassed the greater Los Angeles Basin, coastal regions from Topanga Canyon in the north to Aliso Creek in the south, and the islands of San Clemente, San Nicholas and Santa Catalina (Bean and Smith 1978:538-540). Recent studies suggest the population may have numbered as many as 10,000 at their peak in the precontact period.

The subsistence economy of the Gabrielino was one of hunting and gathering. The surrounding environment was rich and varied and the natives were able to exploit mountains, foothills, valleys, deserts and coasts. As with most native Californians, acorns were the staple food (by the Intermediate Horizon), supplemented by the roots, leaves, seeds and fruit of a wide variety of flora (i.e., cactus, yucca, sage, agave, etc.). Fresh and saltwater fish, shellfish, birds, insects, as well as large and small mammals, were exploited.

A wide variety of tools and implements were employed by the Gabrielino to gather, collect and process food resources. The most important hunting tool was the bow and arrow. Traps, nets, blinds, throwing sticks and slings were also employed. Fish were an important resource and nets, traps, spears, harpoons, hooks and poisons were utilized to catch them. Ocean-going plank canoes and tule balsa canoes were used for fishing as well as for travel (Moratto 1990:63) by those groups residing near the ocean.

The processing of food resources was accomplished in a variety of ways: nuts were cracked with hammer stone and anvil; acorns were ground with mortar and pestle, seeds and berries with mano and metate. Yucca, an important resource in many areas, was eaten by the natives, as well as exploited for its fibers.

Strainers, leaching baskets and bowls, knives, bone saws and wooden drying racks were also employed. Food was consumed from a variety of vessels. Catalina Island steatite was used to make ollas and cooking vessels (Kroeber 1925:629).

Gabrielino houses were circular, domed structures of willow poles thatched with tule. They were actually quite large and could hold 50 individuals. Other structures served as sweathouses, menstrual huts and ceremonial enclosures (Bean and Smith 1978).

Kroeber (1925:621) considered the Gabrielino to have been the most advanced group south of Tehachapi, except perhaps the Chumash. They certainly were the wealthiest and most thoughtful of all the Shoshoneans of the state, and dominated these civilizations wherever contacts occurred.

The center of the Gabrielino religion was Chingichnich (or Chinigchinich), the last of a series of heroic mythological figures who created mankind, gave instruction on laws and institutions and then died. He then rose to the stars to sit in judgment of the people, rewarding the faithful and punishing those who disobeyed his laws (Kroeber 1925:637-638). The Chingichnich religion was apparently relatively new when the Spanish arrived, and was spreading to nearby groups. Relatively little is known concerning religious practices, but an enclosure called a wankech, containing a representation of Chingichnich, was found in each of the larger villages. The worship of Chingichnich was closely tied to the toloache cult where rituals included the ingestion of extracts from the datura plant; a hallucinogen (Kroeber 1925:622).

Girls were the subjects of an initiation ceremony around the age of puberty. It is unknown whether boys had a similar ceremony. Marriages were the occasion for elaborate ceremonies, but little is known concerning actual practices.

The Gabrielino traced their descent through the male line (Kroeber 1925:633), with status being determined by both wealth and heredity. Each lineage had a leader (chief), whose authority rested in possession of a "sacred bundle." The chief had several assistants to help him with his many duties, including the collection of taxes (gifts from the people, primarily for consumption by guests), leading war parties, concluding treaties and seeing to community welfare. Subject to approval of the people, the position of chief was hereditary within the male line, though females could serve if no male heir was available. Shamans were also people of power, whose primary responsibilities were the overseeing of the various rituals.

The mainland Gabrielino practiced cremation of the dead. Cremation usually occurred about three days after death. Most possessions of the deceased were burned, though some were kept for burning at the annual mourning ceremony, an eight-day event in the fall of the year.

Cahuilla and Luiseño

The Luiseño and the Cahuilla were located to the south and east of the Project area respectively. The term "Luiseño" originally identified those peoples who were under the control of the Franciscan priests at Mission San Luis Rey, but came to be applied specifically to the Payomkawichum ethnic nation where the mission was founded. The name "Cahuilla" is most likely derived from an indigenous word meaning "master" or "boss" (Bean and Bourgeault 1989).

While the exact territorial boundaries of the Luiseño and the Cahuilla can no longer be defined with any certainty, most ethnographic models place the location of the boundary north of the city of Lake Elsinore. For example, Bean and Shipek's (1978) delineation of Luiseño territory places the current Project area just north of their territory. Cahuilla territory, on the other hand, was delineated immediately east of the current Project area (Bean 1978). One must take into consideration that there was a constant shifting of clans and societies throughout prehistory. With the advent of the Mission Period, populations from several tribes were first centralized onto mission grounds and then redistributed to ranchos and farming settlements without consideration of the individuals' origins. Unlike the European mindset of exact property boundaries, the indigenous populations' concept of territory and boundaries are viewed from the inside out, based on resource rights around settlement locations.

The Cahuilla and Luiseño are broadly similar, but there are significant differences in language, ritual and ceremonial observations, and material culture to justify identification as separate entities. The languages of both groups were derived from the Cupan branch of the Takic family, part of the Uto-Aztecan linguistic stock. This origin is shared with the Juaneño tribal group located in what is now Orange Counties, as well as with the Cupeño, a group to the southeast. The Tongva in Los Angeles County, and the Serrano to the north, are related members of the Takic family, but of a separate branch (Mithun 1999).

It is believed that the Cahuilla migrated to southern California about 2,000 to 3,000 years ago, most likely from northern California with the other Takiic speakers. The Cahuilla settled in a territory that extended from the present day city of Beaumont to the central portion of the Salton Sea, occupying the Coachella Valley, the San Jacinto and Santa Rosa Mountains, and a portion of the San Jacinto Valley. At the time of initial European occupation, they had a population of as many as 6,000 to 10,000 individuals. More than 65 percent of Cahuilla territory was located in the low desert (Bean & Bourgeault 1989).

The Cahuilla had three primary levels of socio-political organization. The highest level was the ethnic nationality, encompassing everyone speaking the common language. Next were the two patrimoieties of the Wildcats and the Coyotes. Every clan of the Cahuilla fell into one or the other of these moieties. The third basic level consisted of the numerous political-ritual-corporate units called sibs, or a patrilineal clan (Bean 1978:580). While anthropologists have designated groups of Cahuilla clans by their geographical location into Pass, Desert and Mountain, suggesting dialect and ceremonial differences between these groupings (Strong 1929), these social and linguistic differences were more a result of proximity than actual social connections. In reality, there is a continuum of minor differences from one clan to the next. Lineages within a clan cooperated in defense, in community subsistence activities, and in religious ceremonies. While most lineages owned their own village site and particular resource plots, much of the territory was open to all Cahuilla people.

Each lineage within a sib has a defined territory that, among the Cahuilla of the Coachella Valley desert, was formed around springs in mountain canyons and the alluvial fans that spread from these canyons out into the desert floor. Villages in these canyons were occupied year around. Elsewhere the villages were located along perennial springs, creeks and rivers. They were situated to take maximum advantage of natural resources such as climate, water, food and materials. Individuals or groups would periodically leave the villages for gathering, hunting, visiting, or trading activities. The sibs and lineages would maintain formal associations among themselves for protection, for religious ceremonies, and help with large projects. The relationship between these groups was maintained through intermarriage and ceremonial reciprocity (Bean 1972).

The founding lineage of a sib often possessed the position of ceremonial leader, and maintained both the ceremonial house and the clan ceremonial bundle that the leader used. The lineages had their own leaders (nét) who, like the clan leader, inherited their positions usually father to son. The nét was responsible for the upkeep of community religious rituals and ritual objects. He was an “economic executive” for his people, directing the timing and location for the gathering of foods and hunting of game, their storage for future use and ultimately distribution. He met with other lineage heads to discuss ceremonial rounds, boundary disputes, marriage arrangements and other inter-clan matters. The nét had his own major assistant, the páxa’, who helped carry out all the directions of the net. They were part of a council made up of smaller family heads, ceremonialists and shamans who helped give advice to the net (Bean 1978:580).

The westernmost traditional Cahuilla villages were located in the San Gorgonio Pass. These were Aykat, Pisataña, Waqsiš and Malki. The clans of these habitations maintained a marriage network among themselves and eastward to the Palm Springs-area canyons.

They were also linked to Serrano clans in the adjacent San Bernardino Mountains. In the early Historic Period, the Serrano Mariña clan inhabited this Cahuilla village location. In the late 19th Century, a portion of these lands formed the Morongo Indian Reservation, occupied by both Cahuilla and Serrano who have intermarried to a substantial degree.

6.4.3.3 History

The Santa Ana River basin hosts and defines practically all natural resources, prehistoric record and historic events in the Project area, about five miles northwest of downtown Riverside, California. The first recorded Euro-American entry into the area described the 1774 expedition of Juan Bautista de Anza, a Spanish military officer from Tubac, Arizona, surveying an overland trail from the Mexican interior to San Francisco. De Anza followed his mapping adventure in 1775-1776 across the Santa Ana Narrows with a group of settlers and livestock to colonize San Francisco Bay. The Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail - approved by Congress in 1990 and mapped by the National Park Service in 1996 - and National Millennial Trail - designated in 1999 - commemorate the trail as a heritage tourism automobile route (California Highways 2004).

In 1838 under Mexican government land-grant procedures, San Diego merchant Juan Bandini obtained title to much of the Santa Ana River drainage in this area and named his operation Rancho Jurupa. In 1870, a group of Anglo-American investors bought much of the rancho and surveyed a square-mile townsite for their new colony named Riverside. They built irrigation canals to divert water from the Santa Ana River and as a result founded the modern California citrus industry (Riverside 2004b). In 1882, an affiliate of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway extended the Chicago railroad's main line through Riverside, connecting Barstow with Los Angeles. In 1892, the Southern Pacific Railroad extended a branch line to the city, and the associated land, produce and population boom led to creation in 1893 of Riverside County with Riverside as county seat (Hansen and Mermilliod 2002).

Further expansion of California and Western commerce in 1904 brought the San Pedro, Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad across the Santa Ana River and through Riverside to connect the thriving capitals of California and Utah. The "Salt Lake Route" (after 1921 the Union Pacific, which it remains today) that year built a massive 984-foot-long concrete viaduct across the Santa Ana's Anza Narrows to gain access from the north bank into Riverside south of the river. The bridge briefly held the title "largest concrete structure in the world" after completion (HAER 1991). The railroad established a depot for "Jurupa" just south of the river (between present Jurupa Avenue and Mountain View Avenue not extant). The Riverside Land and Irrigation Company platted housing tracts around the railroad station in 1908,. A handful of suburban-styled homes appeared by the 1920s in the area, also occupied by a dairy and a poultry operation (Hansen and Mermilliod 2002). The surviving 1910s and 1920s houses along Jurupa Avenue and Florence Street represent this early 20th Century attempt at Riverside suburban settlement; the barn in the 5000 block of Jurupa Avenue perhaps represents the concurrent mix of farming operations before the Second World War.

The City of Riverside built a new wastewater treatment plant in 1942 about 1.5 miles east of the railroad mainline, between Jurupa Avenue and the river at the north extreme of

Acorn Street (Riverside 2001). This modern plant (the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant), likely built with federal Work Projects Administration assistance, reflected a post-Depression boom in Riverside and California in general. Following the end of the Second World War in 1945, the area between the old suburb of Jurupa and the treatment plant at last began to develop beyond the early residential examples near the Jurupa depot, but mostly with commercial establishments served largely by automobiles and trucks. This strip-development of Jurupa Avenue brought distinctive post-war commercial buildings such as the wartime-design Quonset hut at 6091 Jurupa Avenue.

The wastewater treatment plant’s subsequent expansions, doubling in capacity in 1953 and again in 1958, chronicle the intensity of the post-war population boom in Riverside (Riverside 2001). One residence in the Project area along Jurupa Avenue between the railroad at the east and Payton Street on the west, 7297 Jurupa at the intersection of Acorn just west of Payton, dates from c. 1960 and appears to represent the final “build out” of the Project area in historic post-war patterns.

6.4.4 Literature Review

A cultural resources records search was accomplished by Ms. Darcy Wiewall, Information Officer at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside, on December 3, 2003 (see Appendix 6.4-A). The search included a review of the Center’s archaeological site records and reports as well as the National Register of Historic Places; the Office of Historic Preservation: Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility and Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File; and the 1901 and 1942 USGS Riverside topographic maps. The search results indicated that no National Register of Historic Places listed or eligible sites, California Register of Historic Places listed or eligible sites, Properties in the Historic Property Data File, or other cultural resources have been recorded within the boundaries of the RERC Project area. However, eight cultural resources have been recorded within one-half mile. In addition, 13 cultural resources studies have been conducted within a one-half mile radius of the Project area; three of which involved portion of the Project area. Table 6.4-1 depicts the eight cultural resources within one-half mile of the Project area:

Table 6.4-1 Cultural Resources Within ½ Mile

Trinomial	Recorder/Date	Description
CA-RIV-127	Eberhart/1951	Originally recorded as a village site; Partially destroyed by construction of a railroad bridge (CA-RIV-3361H). Series of bedrock slicks and mortars remain.
CA-RIV-325	F. & P. Johnston/1967	Group of unspecified artifacts on river bottom.
CA-RIV-620	S. Hammond/1973	Bedrock slicks and mortars on several boulders.
CA-RIV-679	A. Haenszel/1967	Several red pictographs on large boulder; probably destroyed.
CA-RIV-1711	A. Haenszel/1967	Camp w/bedrock mortars, metates and manos.
CA-RIV-3355	J. Schmidt, et al./1987	Granite outcrop w/several slicks; exfoliation has damaged the site.
CA-RIV-3361H	J. Sorensen/1987	Union Pacific railway bridge, over Santa Ana River; constructed in 1903.
CA-RIV-3375	R. Parr/1988	Three bedrock milling slicks on two small granite outcrops.

As mentioned above, 13 cultural resources studies have been conducted within a one-half mile radius of the Project area; three of the studies involved portions of the current Project area. These are described below.

It is clear that the immediate area in the vicinity of the proposed Riverside Energy Center is sensitive for the presence of cultural resources. At least eight cultural resources are recorded within one-half mile of the proposed development and others were surely present in the past as the Santa Ana River floodplain was extensively used by prehistoric residents of the area. Therefore, although no cultural resources were discovered during the reconnaissance, it is possible that resources still exist in the subsurface.

Dillon 1995 (RI-3893)

Brian Dillon conducted an archaeological survey of the proposed Riverside Cogeneration project along the Santa Ana River. It consisted of an examination of a 125-acre landfill site, a 25-acre borrow area and an approximately four-mile pipeline route between the two areas. The examination failed to result in the discovery of any previously unknown cultural resources. It did, however, reveal that five previously known sites (CA-RIV-325, CA-RIV-620, CA-RIV-679, CA-RIV-3355 and CA-RIV-3375) were located near enough to the proposed pipeline to recommend monitoring; and two additional previously known sites (CA-RIV-127 and CA-RIV-3361H) might be intersected by the proposed cogeneration pipeline and also required monitoring. Dillon recommended that monitoring of initial pipeline trenching should be undertaken to assure avoidance of these sites. Apparently, enough discretion in the design of the project was possible so the sites could be avoided (Dillon 1995:56).

Alexandrowicz 1999 (RI-4451)

John Alexandrowicz of Archaeological Consulting Services (ACS) completed the monitoring recommended by Dillon (1995) in 1999. Alexandrowicz identifies six sites (CA-RIV-127, CA-RIV-325, CA-RIV-620, CA-RIV-3355, CA-RIV-3361H, CA-RIV-3375) as well as the first gas well to be drilled in the landfill, that Dillon thought worthy of examination during construction. Monitoring occurred near only four of these sites (CA-RIV-127, CA-RIV-620, CA-RIV-3361H and at Well #1). No monitoring was accomplished during construction near the remaining three sites. No significant cultural resources were discovered during any of the monitoring for the project (Alexandrowicz 1999: 4).

Jones & Stokes 2000 (RI-4404)

This long range, linear project only impinged on the current Project area where it crossed Jurupa Avenue. No cultural resources were discovered during this effort.

6.4.5 Native American Consultation

On December 2, 2003, SWCA contacted Mr. Rob Wood of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requesting a Sacred Lands File search and Native American contacts list. The NAHC's response on December 9, 2003 indicated that no known Native American cultural resources are present in the immediate Project area, but a

substantial list of potentially knowledgeable Native Americans in the area was provided. Subsequently, SWCA sent letters describing the Project to 10 individuals or groups named by the NAHC. They are:

Augustine Band of Mission/Cahuilla Indians (Maryann Martin/Karen Kupcha)

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians (Richard Milanovich/Joseph Nixon)

Cabazon Band of Mission Indians (John James)

Pechanga Band of Mission Indians (Mark Macarro)

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (Deron Marquez)

Professional Native American Cultural Resources Monitors (Samuel Dunlap)

Ti'At Society (Cindy Alvitre)

San Luis Rey Band of Mission Indians (Henry Contreras)

Gabrielino/Tongva Council/Gabrielino Tongva Nation

Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians of CA (Susan Frank)

As of February 6, 2004, two response letters have been received: Joseph Nixon, Cultural Resources Coordinator of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians and Karen Kupcha, Tribal Administrator of the Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians. Both acknowledged that the project was outside of their reservation lands and they did not know of cultural resources in the area. The Augustine Band recommends that additional tribes be contacted and that monitoring should occur during construction. The Agua Caliente asked for a copy of the final cultural resources report for inclusion in the Agua Caliente Cultural Register. See Appendix 6.4-B to view all consultation letters and documents.

6.4.6 Field Survey

On December 22, 2003, an intensive cultural resources survey was accomplished by the author (accompanied by Biologist Brian Arnold and Historian Jim Steely). Three general areas were examined:

The main power plant location site (12 acres)

The adjacent Wastewater Treatment Facility

The proposed transmission line route beginning at the northern end of Payton Street to Jurupa Avenue; along Jurupa Avenue between Payton and Shepard Streets and a short stretch of Shepard Street to the Mt. View substation

Typically, a cultural resources reconnaissance includes examining the property for resources older than 45 years of age, and, if warranted, to formally record them using California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site recording forms. Resources include prehistoric sites, isolates and features, as well as potentially historic buildings (houses, barns, farmsteads, stables, garages, commercial/industrial facilities, etc.), structures (bridges, power plants, transmission lines, railroad tracks, roads, irrigation lines, canals, ditches, etc.) and deposits (privy pits, trash scatters, wells, cisterns, etc.).

Any information gleaned from the literature review and Native American consultation relative to traditional cultural properties and/or sacred places is also considered.

6.4.6.1 Acre Power Plant Location

First, the 12-acre proposed Project area, located at the northern termination of Peyton Street, north of Jurupa Avenue, was examined for cultural resources. Brian Arnold assisted in walking transects (ca 20 meters wide) across the 12-acre parcel. Several large boulder formations exist on the parcel. These were closely examined.

6.4.6.2 Riverside Water Quality Control Plant

Although well outside the current Project area, SWCA researchers next examined the grounds of the Wastewater Treatment facility immediately west of and adjacent to the 12-acre proposed power plant location for the presence of cultural resources. The buildings and other structures of the facility were examined to determine their approximate age and integrity. A maintenance man with more than 30 years on the job provided extensive information on the history of the facility. He told us of an archaeological site on the facility, consisting of bedrock mortars that he knew had previously been protected by construction of a chain link fence around it. I visited this resource to verify its existence.

6.4.6.3 Jurupa Avenue

This portion of the survey began with a windshield survey of the entire proposed transmission line route. During this first pass, all potential historic resources (older than 45 years) within 100 feet (30.8 meters) of the proposed line and all areas of exposed ground surface were noted for later pedestrian examination. Next, the line was driven again. This time, SWCA researchers stopped at each area identified in the first drive by. Locations containing potentially historic homes were examined closely, photographed and documented.

Only three undeveloped parcels, immediately adjacent to and south of Jurupa Avenue, east of Wilderness Avenue held the potential of containing exposed cultural resources. The two westernmost parcels, immediately east of Wilderness Avenue are narrow stretches of disked soils adjacent Jurupa Avenue. The third area, just west of Shepard Street near the eastern end of the proposed transmission line, is the side yard of a single-family residence.

6.4.7 Field Survey Findings

The cultural resources field survey failed to discover the presence of any significant cultural resources within the Project area, on the proposed power plant location, the Wastewater Treatment facility or the proposed transmission line right of way. However, 10 historic structures were noted and recorded within 100 feet of the property. In addition, one prehistoric site was noted on the wastewater treatment plant site. This resource was not recorded, because it is beyond the scope of this phase of the Project. Details are provided below.

6.4.7.1 12-Acre Power Plant Location

Discussions with staff at the Wastewater treatment facility and subsequent reading of the cultural resources reconnaissance report produced by Dillon (1995) revealed that the entire 12-acre parcel had been used as a borrow area for the Tequesquite landfill some four kilometers east of and adjacent to the Santa Ana River. The present ground surface of the parcel is several meters below the original surface. Surface visibility was generally very good (near 100 percent) except for in the extreme southern end of the parcel. Here, seasonal grasses and mustard obscured some of the surface and made visibility about 50 percent. No significant cultural resources were observed. Transects, approximately 20 meters wide, were walked across the parcel. Several boulder concentrations were more closely examined. Apparently the boulders had originally been below the surface and were left in place during borrow operations. No cultural modifications were apparent on the boulders. The parcel, thus, contained no significant cultural resources.

6.4.7.2 Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (33-13252)

Immediately west of the 12-acre proposed power plant location, the wastewater treatment plant (Riverside Water Quality Control Plant), including office and maintenance buildings, plus associated “primary clarifiers” and “digesters” of one fixed-dome and one floating dome (“trickling filters” removed c. five years ago), was originally constructed in 1942. The buildings (office and maintenance under one roof system; separate building for garage and storage) are of cast-concrete-and-brick (now painted pink) structure and walls with red barrel-tile roofs, and present a residential-scale Modern/Spanish Colonial amalgam of details. Clarifier fields and digester tanks are fabricated of concrete and steel. Landscaping includes grass lawns, mature shrubbery (one poinsettia as tall as the one-story building) and mature fan palms. Alterations occurred (sympathetic bay-extending additions, window infills with brick, new exterior doors, earth infill of chlorine mixing basins, exterior paint) with capacity expansions based on the city’s periodic growth episodes (including conversion of the digester silos to shop and storage areas) and the 1942 facilities are now surrounded by later and much larger facilities; nevertheless, the original plant is remarkably intact and well maintained.

The majority of the facility has been developed and little original ground surface is exposed. The archaeological site mentioned by the long-time employee was examined. It consisted of a mass of granitic bedrock with three bedrock mortars on two adjacent boulders. The bedrock has been fenced to protect the resource. As the resource is well outside the current Project area, it was simply photographed and its location noted. The literature review revealed that it had not been previously recorded. The resource will not be formally recorded as it is beyond the scope of the current effort.

6.4.7.3 Jurupa Avenue

No prehistoric cultural resources were discovered in the three open areas along Jurupa Avenue; however, the survey did reveal the existence of nine possibly historic era resources within 100 feet of the right of way. These resources were photographed and initial documentation accomplished using DPR Site Form 523 Primary Record and

Location Map (see sites records in Appendix 6.4-C). Complete recordation should be completed at a later phase.

Those resources include:

(33-13253) Residence at 7297 Jurupa: This is a one-story Ranch Style home under low-hipped roof with Wrightian gable vents. Exterior materials are red brick wainscot at front (south) elevation and tan stuccoed walls, composition roof. Windows are horizontal sliding sash and one “Chicago” picture window centered at front. A single attached garage bay, is right of the entry door on the front elevation. The house is in good condition and appears to be one of the last remaining from a period when Jurupa Road hosted modest residences on large vegetated lots in this area.

(33-13254) “Kendalls” Commercial Building at 6091 Jurupa Avenue: A large 1.5-story Quonset hut configuration (standard prefabricated curved steel structural members covered with corrugated metal skin, sheet-metal vents along roof center) with buttressed-brick storefront façade (south) facing Jurupa Avenue. It is in good condition with fixed-glass replacement windows, in a post-World War II light industrial area.

(33-13261) Residence at 5876 Jurupa Avenue: A one-story frame side-gabled California Bungalow with full-width front porch supported by corner brick columns and battered-wood caps, symmetrical fenestration of central entry door flanked by “Chicago” windows (center fixed pane of each topped by transom of x-pattern panes, central gabled dormer on composition-shingle roof, knee-brace brackets at all eaves, exterior red-brick chimneys flanking both sides. It is in good condition with few alterations (new front door, concrete porch), considerable landscape clutter on single urban residential lot.

(33-13255) Residence at 5868 Jurupa Avenue: A one-story frame front-gabled California Bungalow with extended gabled bay (now infilled porch) creating asymmetrical façade, decorative gable-end attic vents under composition shingled roof, knee-brace brackets, exterior perhaps covered with new siding of #119 washboard pattern. Altered condition (porch infill, new front door, replacement windows not of original size), on single urban residential lot.

(33-13256) Residence at 6019 Florence Street: A one-story frame pyramidal-roof “One-Story Foursquare” (identified as “California Bungalow” in a City of Riverside survey) with full-width front (east) porch supported by four slender modified Doric columns, central entry door flanked by 1-over-1 sash windows, stucco exterior walls, high-pitched composition-shingle roof and small centered hipped dormer.

(33-13257) Barn at 5000+ block of Jurupa Avenue: A two-story frame barn with central east-west axis and main door facing east under round (half-circle) gable. New siding covers sides and end/gable, but angle-pattern sheet-metal shingles appear to be original as major defining feature. If this is indeed a former agricultural building on its original site, its setting has changed considerably from rural to industrial.

(33-13258) Residence at 5748 Jurupa Avenue: A one-story frame bungalow (small ‘b’) with modest Spanish-Pueblo Revival details (textured stucco exterior, flat roof with red-tile parapet copings), decorative trefoil vent in centered triangular parapet accent. Alterations include new aluminum-frame window units.

(33-03361) Union Pacific Railroad Bridge over the Santa Ana River: The site is a concrete viaduct of ten round-arch spans carrying the single-track Union Pacific Railroad and Metrolink commuter rail (built by San Pedro, Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad) across the Santa Ana River basin near Anza Narrows on the river. The viaduct is 984 feet long, 17 feet wide, 55 feet at highest point, eight arches are 86 feet across and the two approach arches are 36.9 feet across; its concrete formwork created subtle details in arch bordering, balustrade molding and curvilinear brackets on certain piers. It was labeled the largest concrete structure in the world upon completion in 1904; it is in excellent condition and still performs its original purpose 100 years after construction.

(33-13260) Martha McLean – Anza Narrows Park: This “Romantic Movement” park preserves and offers passive recreation opportunities along the rolling grounds of the Santa Ana River basin centered on Anza Narrows, a traditional crossing of the river. Entry gates to the park on Jurupa Avenue reflect Rustic Style design popular in late 19th to mid 20th century public parks, but could be well-executed recent construction. In the park on a bluff looking north over the Santa Ana River basin, a 1939 cast-metal marker, mounted on a low stone cairn, commemorates the de Anza Trail that brought a Spanish mapping expedition in 1774 from Tubac, Arizona, to San Francisco across this ford on the river. The park appears to have been established at least as early as the 1930s, with various improvements such as paved roads and trails, playground equipment and picnic facilities added through the late 20th Century. Its condition is generally good, but its evolution from original designs and facilities to the present appearance should be investigated.

6.4.8 Impacts

The literature review undertaken at the Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside revealed that no known cultural resources have previously been recorded within the current Project area. A walkover survey essentially confirmed the Information Centers findings.

While the reconnaissance survey identified a number of historic-age properties in the Project area (houses, barn, commercial building), each of these particular resources exhibits a minimum of significance beyond their value as small stand-alone buildings. Each of these properties will suffer some loss of integrity of “setting” with Project installation of adjacent power lines, but dramatic commercialization of the Jurupa Avenue strip began that same process long ago. The City of Riverside’s Historic Preservation Program wields the greatest recognition and protection potential for each of these properties.

The final recommendation of significance for three of the properties identified: 33-13252 (Riverside Water Quality Control Plant), 33-13529 (Union Pacific Railroad Bridge) and 33-13260 (Martha McLean - Anza Narrows Park) remains professional speculation until an intensive level survey and additional research is performed. However, the Riverside Water Quality Control Plant is a significant surviving complex from the New Deal era, at the local level; the Anza Narrows Park is a significant urban recreation design, at the local level, probably of the same era; and the Railroad Bridge is an outstanding engineering landmark, probably of state if not national significance. The treatment plant

would suffer some visual intrusion from the Project’s adjacent power plant; however, this industrial crowding trend began with the periodic expansion of the plant itself long ago. The integrity of “setting” for the bridge might suffer some impact from nearby power lines; however, other power lines and intrusions altered the pre-WWII setting long ago. Project related impacts to the treatment plant and the bridge would be less than significant. Only the park, with its well-designed entrance and landscape very close to the Project’s power lines, might suffer significant impact from the proposed project configuration. The proposed mitigation measures discussed below would reduce project related impacts to the park to less than significant levels.

The possibility also exists that previously unknown cultural resources, especially prehistoric - will be exposed by construction that penetrates native soils. In this event, the mitigation measures, also described below, would reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

6.4.8.1 Environmental Checklist

Table 6.4-2 provides the CEQA checklist questions that are used to assess the significance of potential impacts to cultural resources.

Table 6.4-2 CEQA Environmental Checklist – Cultural Resources

Cultural Resources - Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
c) Disturb any human remain, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

6.4.9 Mitigation

Because several historic structures and prehistoric cultural resources are known to exist in the vicinity of the Project area, the possibility exists that construction of the Riverside Energy Resource Center and related transmission lines will expose previously unknown cultural resources. Therefore, it is recommended that a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for archaeologists, monitor construction activities that disturb the ground surface. Actual construction areas to be monitored can be determined at the onset of the Project by the monitoring archaeologist. That way, areas that are obviously not sensitive for cultural resources, do not have to be monitored. In the event that cultural resources are exposed during construction, the monitor must be empowered to temporarily halt construction in the immediate vicinity of the discovery while it is evaluated for significance. Construction activities could continue in other areas. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional work, such as evaluation and data recovery excavation, may be warranted.

The monitoring program would lower any potential Project effect on cultural resources to a less than significant level, and should include:

- ♦ A preconstruction assessment of the Project area to examine the study area
- ♦ A training class to educate supervisors on the importance of and legal basis for protection of resources; and a class to educate operators on the nature of cultural resources that could be found during construction
- ♦ Construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist with the authority to divert construction in the event of a discovery
- ♦ Recording of finds using DPR form 523 as appropriate. Substantial finds may be subject to further evaluation and data recovery investigations, or preferably avoidance
- ♦ Evaluation and data recovery investigations will be preceded by an excavation plan to include a burial discovery plan and consultation with the appropriate agencies and Native American groups
- ♦ Plans to curate in perpetuity at a qualified facility, any recovered collection
- ♦ Report of Findings summarizing the investigation

The only historic property with the potential to suffer adverse effects from the proposed power plant project is the Martha McLean – Anza Narrows Park (33-13260). In order to retain Project effects in the CEQA category of "Less Than Significant with Mitigation," it is recommended that 1) an intensive-level survey and additional research be performed to better understand the nature and origin of the park and associated Anza Trail (by itself a significant resource). It is also recommended that 2) visual effects to the park be minimized by project engineering that explores technical options, such as pole material selection and strategic pole placement, to reverse the cumulative visual effects of additional power lines along the existing transmission corridor. The above elements of the proposed cultural resources mitigation program would reduce Project related impacts to the park to less than significant levels.

6.4.10 Involved Agencies and Agency Contacts

The state agencies involved in the cultural resources management for the contract included:

Native American Heritage Commission	Mr. Rob Wood
	915 Capitol Mall, Rm 364
	Sacramento, Ca 95814
	(916) 653-4040

State Historic Preservation Officer Mr. Knox Mellon
California Department of Parks
Recreation Office of Historic Preservation
1416 9th St. Rm 1442-7
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-6624

California Energy Commission Mr. Dale Edwards
1516 9th Street.
Sacramento, CA 95814

6.4.11 References

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

2000 Protection of Historic Properties; Section 106, Step-by-Step.

<http://www.achp.gov>

Alexandrowicz, John Stephen

1999 Cultural Resources Monitoring for the Tequesquite Landfill Well and Gas line Project, City of Riverside, County of Riverside, California. On file, Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

Bean, Lowell John

1972 *Mukat's People: The Cahuilla Indians of Southern California*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

1978 Cahuilla. *Handbook of North American Indians: California*. Robert F. Heizer, editor, Vol. 8, pp. 575-587. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.

Bean, Lowell John and Lisa Bourgeault

1989 Indians of North America. The Cahuilla. Frank W. Porter III, general editor. Chelsea House Publishers.

Bean, L. J. and Charles R. Smith

1978 Gabrielino. In *Handbook of North American Indians, California*, Vol 8, Robert F. Heizer (editor), pp. 538-549. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D. C.

1978b Serrano. *Handbook of North American Indians: California*. Robert F. Heizer, editor, Vol. 8, pp. 570-574. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.

Bean, L.J and Florence Shipek

1978 Luiseño. *Handbook of North American Indians, California*, Vol 8, Robert F. Heizer (editor), pp. 550-563. Smithsonian Institution, Washington D. C.

California Energy Commission (CEC)

Instructions to the California Energy Commission Staff for the Review of and Information Requirements for an Application for Certification, California Energy Commission, Energy Facilities Siting and Environmental Protection Division, Sacramento

1997 *Rules of Practice and Procedure & Power Plant Site Certification*, California Energy Commission, Sacramento

California Highways

2004 "Trails and Roads: De Anza Trail." *Electronic documents*, www.cahighways.org and http://www.pacificnet.net/~faigin/CA_WYS/deanza.html, accessed 2 February 2004.

Chartkoff, Joseph L. & Kerry K. Chartkoff

1984 *The Archaeology of California*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Christian, Peggy

2002 *Historic San Timoteo Canyon: A Pictorial Tour, Myths and Legends*. Sagebrush Press, Morongo Valley, California.

Dillon, Brian

1995 *Archaeological Assessment of the Riverside Cogeneration Project on the Santa Ana River, Riverside County, California*. On file, Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

Dixon, E. James

1993 *Quest for the Origins of the First Americans*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque

Driver, Harold E.

1969 *The Indians of North America*, Second Edition, Revised. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

1998 *CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines*. Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento, California.

<http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/rev/approval.html>

Hansen, Janet L. and Jennifer A. Mermilliod

2002 *Historic Property Survey Report for the Jurupa Avenue Railroad Underpass/ Mountain View Avenue Grade Crossing Closure Project*. Planning Department, City of Riverside, California.

Heusser, Linda

1978 Pollen in the Santa Barbara Basin, California: A 12,000 Year Record. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, Number 89, pp. 673-678.

Johnston, Bernice Eastman

1962 *California's Gabrielino Indians*. Southwest Museum, Los Angeles.

Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.

2000 Final Cultural Resources Inventory report for the Williams Communications, Inc., Fiber Optic Cable System Installation Project, Riverside to San Diego, California Vol. I-IV. On file, Eastern Information Center, University of California, Riverside.

King, Chester

2003 Japchibit Ethnohistory. National Forest Service (in print).

Kroeber, Alfred J.

1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Dover Publications, Inc. New York.

Los Angeles Times, Orange County Edition

1998 *America's First Immigrants*. Article in LA Times, Orange County Edition, 26 March 1998.

Lyman, Edward Leo

2004 "From The City of Angels to the City of Saints: The Struggle to Build A Railroad from Los Angeles to Salt Lake City." Electronic document, http://www.wemweb.com/arduous-road/build_railroad.html, accessed 2 February 2003.

McCawley, William

1996 *The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles*. Malki Museum Press, Banning California and Ballena Press, Novato, California.

Mithun, Marianne

1999 *Languages of Native North America*. Cambridge University Press.

Moratto, Michael J.

1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, San Diego.

1990 Cultural and Paleontologic Resources in the Santa Susana and Santa Monica Mountains, Los Angeles County, California. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

National Park Service

1991 Historic American Engineering Record. HAER No. CA 123, HAER CAL 33-RIVSI.V.

2004 *Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail / California*. Electronic document, <http://www.nps.gov/juba/>, accessed 2 February 2003.

Ramon, Dorothy and Eric Elliot

2000 Wayta' Yawa': Always Believe. Malki Museum Press, Banning, California.

Riverside, City of

“Treatment Facility History.” Chronology of construction and expansion at the city’s wastewater treatment plant, provided to the surveyors by employees Ernie Meloy and Karen Conner.

2004a Historic Resource Property Information Database. Electronic document, http://olmsted.riversideca.gov/historic_resources/main.aspx, accessed 2 February 2003.

2004b “History of Riverside.” Electronic document, <http://www.riversideca.gov/empire/history.htm>, accessed 30 January 2004.

Strong, W. Duncan

1929 Aboriginal Society in Southern California. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 26, No.1

Wallace, William

A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 11: 214-230.

