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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

In December 2015 and January 2015, at the request of RBF Consulting, CRM TECH performed a cultural resources study on the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed Clean Water Factory Project in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California. As proposed by the San Bernardino Municipal Water Department (SBMWD), the undertaking entails the installation of a recycled water pipeline system to connect the Waterman Basins and the East Twin Creek Spreading Grounds, located at the base of the San Bernardino Mountains, to the San Bernardino Water Reclamation Plant, located just north of the confluence of East Twin Creek and the Santa Ana River.

The APE for the undertaking is delineated to encompass the maximum extent of ground disturbance required by the undertaking, including approximately 120,120 linear feet of pipeline right-of-way along four alternative routes, located within various roads and flood channels, and seven potential pump station and storage reservoir sites that total approximately 5.24 acres. Collectively, the APE extends some 6.5 miles north-south and 1.5 miles east-west through a fully urbanized area in the City of San Bernardino, across portions of the Rancho Muscupiabe and Rancho San Bernardino land grants lying within T1N R4W and T1S R4W, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian.

The study is a part of the environmental review process for the proposed undertaking, as required by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and by the SBMWD in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The purpose of the study is to provide the BOR and the SBMWD with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the proposed undertaking would have an effect on any “historic properties,” as defined by 36 CFR 800.16(l), or “historical resources,” as defined by Title 14 CCR §15064.5(a)(1)-(3), that may exist in or near the APE.

In order to accomplish this objective, CRM TECH conducted a historical/archaeological resources records search, pursued historical and geoarchaeological background research, contacted Native American representatives, and carried out a systematic field survey. The result of these research procedures indicate that nine historical/archaeological sites, all of them linear features dating to the historic period, were previously identified as lying partially in the APE, as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-006544</td>
<td>North Fork Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-006847</td>
<td>Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway’s Kite-Shaped Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-007049/36-012189</td>
<td>State Route 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-010820</td>
<td>San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad/Harlem Motor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-015497</td>
<td>San Bernardino Baseline/Baseline Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1071-19H</td>
<td>West Twin Creek Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-92H</td>
<td>Davis Mill Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-96H</td>
<td>Heap Springs Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSBR-30H</td>
<td>Stout’s Dam Ditch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among these nine sites, 36-010820, the circa 1888 San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad/Harlem Motor Road, is known to have been removed some time prior to the 1950s. Five other sites, 36-006544, P1071-19H, P1074-92H, P1074-96H, and PSBR-30H, represent the courses of mid-19th century irrigation lines that have long since been abandoned and evidently obliterated by
later developments. The courses of these ditches across the APE were established solely on the basis of historical maps and other documentation, and not from tangible features of the landscape. During the present survey, no physical remains were observed of any of the five ditches, nor of the San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad/Harlem Motor Road, within or adjacent to the APE.

Site 36-006847, representing the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe (now the Burlington Northern Santa Fe) Railway’s Kite-Shaped Track, was previously determined not to constitute a “historic property” or a “historical resource” due to the lack of historic integrity. Field observations indicate that one of the two segments of the railroad line across the APE has been removed while the other, still in working condition today, does not retain sufficient historical characteristics to relate to its period of significance, namely the 1880s-1910s. Therefore, this study concurs with the previous determination.

Site 36-007049/36-012189, namely State Route 18, is known to date to the early 20th century. Similarly to the surviving segments of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, the segment of the highway within the APE, which coincides with Waterman Avenue, is essentially modern in appearance due to repeated upgrading and constant maintenance over the years, and exhibits no particular historical character. As such, the portion of Site 36-007049/36-012189 within the APE does not retain sufficient historic integrity to be considered a potential “historic property” or a “historical resource.”

Site 36-015497, the San Bernardino Baseline/Baseline Street, has been designated by the State of California as a Point of Historical Interest (CPHI-SBr-12), and thus meets the definition of a “historical resource” under CEQA and potentially that of a “historic property” under Section 106. However, the historic value of the site is largely symbolic in nature, and is derived from a conceptual line across the landscape instead of any physical features of present-day Baseline Street, a working component of the modern transportation infrastructure. As such, the proposed undertaking will not affect the significance or integrity of Site 36-015497.

In summary of the information and analysis summarized above, this study concludes that six of the nine historic-period sites previously identified as lying across the APE, 36-006544, 36-010820, P1071-19H, P1074-92H, P1074-96H and PSBR-30H, are no longer in existence, while Sites 36-006847 and 36-007049/36-012189 do not appear to meet the statutory definition of “historic properties” or “historical resources,” and the undertaking will not have any effect on Site 36-015497. No other potential “historic properties” or “historical resources” were encountered throughout the course of this study, and the vertical extent of the APE appears to be relatively low in sensitivity for subsurface deposits of potentially significant archaeological remains.

Based on these findings, and pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1) and Calif. PRC §21084.1, CRM TECH recommends to the BOR and the SBMWD a conclusion that no “historic properties” or “historical resources” will be affected by the proposed undertaking. No further cultural resources investigation is recommended for the undertaking unless project 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 undertaking, 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 December 2015 and January 2015, at the request of RBF Consulting, CRM TECH performed a cultural resources study on the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the Clean Water Factory Project in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California (Fig. 1). As proposed by the San Bernardino Municipal Water Department (SBMWD), the undertaking entails the installation of a recycled water pipeline system to connect the Waterman Basins and the East Twin Creek Spreading Grounds, located at the base of the San Bernardino Mountains, to the San Bernardino Water Reclamation Plant, located just north of the confluence of East Twin Creek and the Santa Ana River.

The APE for the undertaking is delineated to encompass the maximum extent of ground disturbance required by the undertaking, including approximately 120,120 linear feet of pipeline right-of-way along four alternative routes, located within various roads and flood channels, and seven potential pump station and storage reservoir sites that total approximately 5.24 acres. Collectively, the APE extends some 6.5 miles north-south and 1.5 miles east-west through a fully urbanized area in the City of San Bernardino, across portions of the Rancho Muscupiabe and Rancho San Bernardino land grants lying within T1N R4W and T1S R4W, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian (Figs. 2a, 2b).

The study is a part of the environmental review process for the proposed undertaking, as required by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and by the SBMWD in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The purpose of the study is to provide the BOR and the SBMWD with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the proposed undertaking would have an effect on

Figure 1. Project vicinity. (Based on USGS San Bernardino, Calif., 1:250,000 quadrangle [USGS 1979])
Figure 2a. Area of Potential Effects (northern portion). (Based on USGS San Bernardino North and San Bernardino South, Calif., 1:24,000 quadrangles [USGS 1980; 1996])
Figure 2b. Area of Potential Effects (southern portion). (Based on USGS San Bernardino North and San Bernardino South, Calif., 1:24,000 quadrangles [USGS 1980; 1996])
any “historic properties,” as defined by 36 CFR 800.16(l), or “historical resources,” as defined by Title 14 CCR §15064.5(a)(1)-(3), that may exist in or near the APE.

In order to accomplish this objective, CRM TECH conducted a historical/ archaeological resources records search, pursued historical and geoarchaeological background research, contacted Native American representatives, and carried out a systematic field survey. The following report is a complete account of the methods and results of the various avenues of research, and the final conclusion of the study.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION/AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS**

According to 36 CFR 800.16(d), the Area of Potential Effects is “the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist.” As stated above, for the current undertaking the APE is delineated to encompass the maximum extent of ground disturbances. It lies within a project corridor that measures approximately 6.5 miles long and 1.5 miles wide, with the Waterman Basins and the East Twin Creek Spreading Grounds at the northern end and the San Bernardino Water Reclamation Plant at the southern end (Figs. 2a, 2b).

The APE consists mainly of three north-south pipeline routes that are connected at least partially by east-west pipeline segments at five points. Collectively, these pipelines represent four project alternatives, all of which are located entirely within existing street rights-of-way or the Twin Creek Flood Channel access road. The alternatives include:

- **Alternative Alignment 1:** Two pipelines (recycled water and advanced water) in one trench along the Twin Creek Flood Channel.
- **Alternative Alignment 2:** Two pipelines (recycled water and advanced water) to be installed within 40th Street, Valencia Avenue, Highland Avenue, Crestview Avenue, Baseline Street, Sierra Way, Rialto Avenue, Arrowhead Avenue, and Orange Show Road, and along East Twin Creek.
- **Alternative Alignment 3:** Two pipelines (recycled water and advanced water) to be installed within 40th Street, Waterman Avenue, Baseline Street, Sierra Way, Rialto Avenue, Arrowhead Avenue, and Orange Show Road, and along East Twin Creek.
- **Alternative Alignment 4:** Combination of Alternative Alignment 1 for advanced pipeline and Alternative 2 Alignment for recycled water pipeline.

Trenching along the project routes will reach deep enough to allow for the pipelines and up to 48 inches of cover, or about seven feet in total depth, but may go deeper in specific areas to pass beneath existing facilities.

Also within the APE are seven potential pump station and storage reservoir sites ranging in size from 0.66 to 1.25 acres, including one at the northeastern edge of the Waterman Basins, one near the northwestern edge of the Twin Creek Spreading Grounds, two in Wildwood Park, two in Perris Hill Park, and one near the southeast corner of East 23rd Street and Leroy Street (Figs. 2a, 2b). All together, the APE totals approximately 5.24 acres plus 120,120 linear feet of pipeline right-of-way.
**SETTING**

**CURRENT NATURAL SETTING**

The APE is situated in the San Bernardino Valley, a broad inland valley extending from the southern base of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains on the north to the Santa Ana Mountains and the Jurupa Hills on the south. The current natural environment of the region is characterized by a temperate Mediterranean climate, with the average maximum temperature in July reaching the high 90s (Fahrenheit) and the average minimum temperature in January hovering around 30º. Rainfall is typically less than 20 inches annually.

The pipeline alignments traverse through residential neighborhoods, commercial corridors, and areas of light industry, while the pump station/reservoir sites are located in open areas within existing parks or other vacant, city-owned lots (Figs. 3, 4). As would be expected in an urbanized setting, the ground surface throughout the APE has been completely altered from its natural state, with the vast majority covered by road pavement and landscaping plants.

Elevations in the APE incline gradually from south to north, and range between approximately 990 feet and 1,500 feet above mean sea level. The soils, where exposed and visible, were generally light brown, medium-grained alluvial sands mixed with small rocks.

![Figure 3](image.jpg)

*Figure 3. Typical landscapes along the proposed pipeline alignments. *Clockwise from top left: along East Twin Creek flood channel, view to the north; Valencia Avenue near 21th Street, view to the north; Waterman Avenue near Rialto Avenue, view to the north; and Orange Show Road at Arrowhead Avenue, view to the north. (Photographs taken on December 26, 2014)
Figure 4. Overviews of the potential pump station and storage reservoir sites. *Clockwise from top left:* northeastern edge of the Waterman Basins, view to the west; western edge of the East Twin Creek Spreading Grounds, south of 40th Street, view to the southeast; northern side of 40th Street, view to the east; Perris Hill Park, view to the west; vacant lot near the southeastern corner of 23rd Street and Leroy Street, view to the east; Wildwood Park along Waterman Avenue, view to the north. (Photographs taken on December 26, 2014)

CULTURAL SETTING

Ethnohistoric Context

The City of San Bernardino lies in the homeland of the Serrano Indians, whose traditional territory is centered at the San Bernardino Mountains but also includes the southern rim of the Mojave Desert and most of the San Bernardino Valley. The name “Serrano” was derived from the Spanish word for “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 gatherers and hunters, and occasional fishers, who settled mostly on elevated terraces, hills, and finger ridges near where flowing water emerged from the mountains. They were loosely organized into exogamous clans, which were led by hereditary heads, and the clans in turn were affiliated with one of two exogamous moieties. The 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.

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 San Bernardino Valley, along with the rest of Alta California, was claimed by Spain in the late 18th century, and the first European explorers traveled through the area as early as 1772, three years after the beginning of Spanish colonization. For nearly four decades afterwards, however, the arid inland valley received little attention from the European colonizers, who concentrated their efforts along the Pacific coast. Following the establishment of Mission San Gabriel in 1771, the San Bernardino Valley became a part of the vast land holdings of that mission. The name “San Bernardino” was bestowed on the region at least by 1819, when the asistencia and an associated mission rancho, both bearing that name, were established in the eastern end of the valley.

Mexico gained independence from Spain in 1821 and the new authorities in Alta California began secularization of the mission system in 1834. During the next 12 years, mission lands throughout Alta California were surrendered to the Mexican government and subsequently granted to various prominent citizens of the province. In 1842, the former mission rancho of San Bernardino was granted to the Lugos, a prominent Los Angeles family, who were engaged in cattle-raising on the more than 35,000-acre domain. The Rancho Muscupiabe land grant, some 30,000 acres in size, was awarded in 1843 to Michael C. White, a naturalized Englishman, but was abandoned a few months later. After the American annexation of Alta California in 1848, the Lugos sold the rancho in 1851 to a group of Mormon settlers sent by church leaders in Utah. The group promptly established a fortified settlement and named it Fort San Bernardino.

The early growth of the Mormon colony was promising. It became county seat of the newly created San Bernardino County in 1853, and incorporated as a city the next year. In 1857, however, half of the population was recalled to Utah by Mormon leaders, and the budding town was disincorporated. In the 1880s, spurred by the selection of San Bernardino as the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway’s regional headquarters, the rise of the profitable citrus industry, and a general land boom that swept through much of southern California, San Bernardino gradually recovered and reincorporated in 1886, embarking on a period of steady growth that lasted well into the 20th century.
During World War II, the growth of San Bernardino was further boosted when a U.S. Army Air Corps pilot training base was established in the southeastern portion of the city in 1941. Renamed Norton Air Force Base in 1950, over the next 45 years this major military installation proved to be an important driving force in the local economy. In 1994, however, the base was officially closed, and its 2,400-acre site was transferred to local civilian authorities for redevelopment in 1999, ultimately becoming today’s San Bernardino International Airport.

The original townsite of San Bernardino, as recorded in 1854, was bounded by present-day Tenth Street, Sierra Way, Rialto Avenue, and I Street. By 1907, the urbanized area of the city had expanded to 16th Street on the north, Waterman Avenue on the east, Mill Street on the south, and beyond Mount Vernon Avenue on the west. The APE extends across a large area both in the original townsite and on outlying lands to its north, east, and south, and thus reflects the results of urban growth in San Bernardino throughout the post-1850 period, leading up to the present time.

RESEARCH METHODS

RECORDS SEARCH

On December 15, 2014, CRM TECH archaeologist Nina Gallardo (see App. 1 for qualifications) conducted the historical/archaeological resources records search at the Archaeological Information Center (AIC), San Bernardino County Museum, Redlands. During the records search, Gallardo examined maps and records on file at the AIC for previously identified cultural resources in or near the project area, and existing cultural resources reports pertaining to the vicinity. Previously identified historical/archaeological resources include properties designated as California Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, or San Bernardino County Historical Landmarks, as well as those listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the California Historical Resources Inventory.

For the current study, the scope of the records search included a systematic review of all existing cultural resources documentation pertaining to properties within a quarter-mile radius of the APE as well as an expanded, regional records search to identify prehistoric—i.e., Native American—archaeological sites that have been recorded nearby in geomorphologic contexts similar to the APE. The purpose of the expanded records search is to assess the sensitivity of the APE for similar archaeological remains and help determine the potential of encountering significant subsurface cultural deposits during earth-moving activities associated with the undertaking.

GEOARCHAEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

As part of the research procedures, CRM TECH principal investigator Michael Hogan (see App. 1 for qualifications) pursued geomorphologic analysis to assess the APE’s potential for the deposition and preservation of subsurface cultural deposits from the prehistoric period, which cannot be detected through standard surface archaeological survey. Sources consulted for this purpose included topographic and geologic maps published by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and soils reports in the vicinity of the APE. Findings from these sources were used to develop a geomorphologic history of the APE and address geoarchaeological sensitivity of the vertical APE.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND RESEARCH

Historical background research for this study was conducted by CRM TECH historian Terri Jacquemain (see App. 1 for qualifications) on the basis of published literature in local history and historic maps of the San Bernardino area. Among the maps consulted for this study were U.S. General Land Office (GLO) land survey plat maps dated 1876-1878 and USGS topographic maps dated 1901-1954. 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.

NATIVE AMERICAN SCOPING

On December 6, 2014, 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. Following commission’s recommendations, a total of 12 tribal representatives in the region were contacted in writing on December 23, 2014, and by phone on January 5-8, 2015, to solicit local Native American input regarding potential cultural resources concerns associated with the proposed undertaking. The correspondence between CRM TECH and the Native American representatives are attached to this report in Appendix 2.

FIELD SURVEY

The field survey of the APE was carried out on December 26, 2014, by CRM TECH archaeologist Daniel Ballester (see App. 1 for qualifications). In light of the extensively disturbed state and, consequently, reduced archaeological sensitivity of the pipeline routes, the linear portion of the APE was surveyed at a reconnaissance level by driving along the alignments and visually inspecting the surrounding ground surface for any indications of potential cultural resources.

The potential pump station and storage reservoir sites were surveyed at an intensive level by walking parallel transects spaced 10 meters (approx. 33 feet) apart. Using these methods, the entire APE was systematically examined for any evidence of human activities dating to the prehistoric or historic period (i.e., 50 years or older). Visibility of the native ground surface was poor (0-10%) in most of the APE due to the presence of sod, thick vegetation, and pavement, but was occasionally good (70-80%) in the absence of such ground covers.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

PREVIOUS CULTURAL RESOURCES STUDIES IN THE VICINITY

According to AIC records, various portions of the APE were included in at least a dozen previous cultural resources studies (Figs. 5a, 5b), and nine historical/archaeological sites, including four “pending” sites, were identified as lying partially within the APE. Among these sites were the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe (now Burlington Northern Santa Fe) Railway’s once famed Kite-Shaped Track (36-006847), the former alignment of the circa 1888 San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad/Harlem Motor Road (36-010820), State Route 18 (36-007049/36-012189), which dates to around 1917, and the San Bernardino Baseline (36-015497), embodied today by
Figure 5a. Previous cultural resources studies in the vicinity of the APE (northern portion), listed by AIC file number. Locations of known historical/archaeological sites are not shown as a protective measure.
Figure 5b. Previous cultural resources studies in the vicinity of the APE (southern portion).
Baseline Street. The other five sites represented the former courses of mid- to late-1800s irrigation canals, namely the North Fork Ditch (36-006544), West Twin Creek Ditch (P1071-19H), Davis Mill Ditch (P1074-92H); Heap Springs (P1074-96H), Stout’s Dam Ditch (PSBR-30H).

Outside the APE but within a quarter-mile radius, AIC records show some 65 other previous studies covering about a third of the area within the scope of the records search (Figs. 5a, 5b). These and other similar studies resulted in the identification of 34 additional sites and two isolates—i.e., localities with fewer than three artifacts—within the quarter-mile radius, as listed in Table 1. Of these, only the two isolates, a mortar (36-060211) and a metate (36-060212), and one site, 36-002794, were prehistoric—i.e., Native American—in origin, with 36-002794 marking the location of a collection of mortars and metates recovered during construction activities approximately 0.2 miles southeast of the East Twin Creek portion of the APE.

Seven of the historic-era sites were found on properties near the proposed pipeline routes, including the circa 1920s Les Carlson’s Service Building (36-013922), a circa 1954 Federal-style commercial building (36-023371), the circa 1943 Waterman Gardens apartment complex (36-023399), the Mormon Flour Mill site on the former course of East Twin Creek (36-017723), the 150-acre National Orange Show and Events Center (36-017818), and two cemeteries, Home of Eternity Cemetery of Congregation Emmanuel (36-004130) and Pioneer Memorial Cemetery (36-017664). None of these seven sites, however, was located immediately adjacent to the APE.

Since the proposed undertaking entails only subsurface trenching and pipeline installation in the existing public rights-of-way near these locations, there is little potential for the appearance and integrity of any of these buildings or features to be affected, either directly or indirectly. Other than the nine linear features identified above, none of the previously identified historical/archaeological sites listed in Table 1 was found within or immediately adjacent to the APE, and thus none of them require further consideration during this study.

The expanded records review indicates that very few prehistoric sites have been found near the APE or across the level valley floor, while in contrast numerous prehistoric sites have been recorded in the foothills and on elevated terraces further to the north, close to but outside the seasonal drainages emanating from the San Bernardino Mountains. This finding supports existing prehistoric hunter-gatherer settlement-subsistence models for inland southern California, which suggest longer-term residential settlement was more likely to occur on elevated terraces, hills, and finger ridges near permanent or reliable sources of water, while the valley floor was generally utilized for resource procurement, travel, and opportunistic camping.

**GEOARCHAEOLOGICAL PROFILE**

The surface geology in the vicinity of the APE has been mapped by Dibble (2004) as mostly \( Qa \), or alluvium of Holocene age, with some areas of \( Qg \), which is identified as alluvium of presently active stream and river channels. Morton and Miller (2003) mapped the surface geology in and near the APE as mainly alluvium of Holocene age, with a minor amount possibly late-Pleistocene alluvium. Most of the APE lies within paved roadways, where the subsurface soils typically consist of highly disturbed fill dirt to the depth of five to six feet, and the rest of the APE has also been impacted by past urban development. The proposed undertaking, thus, appears to have a low potential to encounter any intact, potentially significant subsurface archaeological deposits of prehistoric origin.
Table 1. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources in the Vicinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Recorded by/Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-002794</td>
<td>Smith 1961</td>
<td>Mortars and metates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-004130</td>
<td>Various 1975</td>
<td>Home of Eternity Cemetery of Congregation Emmanuel, ca. 1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-004186</td>
<td>Teal 1980</td>
<td>Atwood Adobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-006544*</td>
<td>Various and McKenna 2010</td>
<td>North Fork Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-006796</td>
<td>Various 1905-1991</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-006847*</td>
<td>Horne 1998</td>
<td>Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway’s Kite-Shaped Track, built in 1887-1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-007049/36-012189*</td>
<td>Various 1991-2011</td>
<td>State Route 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-010399</td>
<td>Various 1978-2000</td>
<td>Site of San Bernardino Chinatown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-010400</td>
<td>Costello and Goldberg 2000</td>
<td>Residence, ca. 1894-1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-010820*</td>
<td>Various 1967-2002</td>
<td>San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad/ Harlem Motor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-012986</td>
<td>Tang 1998</td>
<td>Craftsman-style residence, ca. 1921-1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-013922</td>
<td>Brock 1989</td>
<td>Les Carlson’s Service Building, ca. 1920s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-015497*</td>
<td>Various 1973-1979</td>
<td>San Bernardino Baseline/Baseline Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-01664</td>
<td>Various 1973-1989</td>
<td>Pioneer Memorial Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-017668</td>
<td>Donaldson 1994</td>
<td>Single-family residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-017723</td>
<td>Various 1975-2007</td>
<td>1850s Mormon Flour Mill site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-017732</td>
<td>Various 1981-2005</td>
<td>West Twin Creek Water Company flume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-017733</td>
<td>Various 1979-2007</td>
<td>Old courthouse site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-017760</td>
<td>Starzak 1990</td>
<td>Craftsman-style residence, ca. 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-017797</td>
<td>Various 1985-1987</td>
<td>Cox-Bradley Adobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-017798</td>
<td>Various 1996-2009</td>
<td>Single-family residence, ca. 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-017818</td>
<td>Various 1972-2008</td>
<td>National Orange Show and Events Center, 1923-1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-020302</td>
<td>Barna 2004</td>
<td>Single-family residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-020411</td>
<td>Various 1991-2005</td>
<td>Adobe structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-020673</td>
<td>McKenna 2009</td>
<td>Refuse scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-020803</td>
<td>McKenna 2009</td>
<td>Single-family residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-020825</td>
<td>Chasteen 2009</td>
<td>Waterman Used Cars and Trucks (commercial building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-023371</td>
<td>Johnson 2010</td>
<td>Federal-style commercial building, ca. 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-023399</td>
<td>Daly 2011</td>
<td>Waterman Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-026928</td>
<td>Goodwin 2011</td>
<td>Structural foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-026988</td>
<td>McKenna 2014</td>
<td>Keller-Graham Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-027694</td>
<td>Crawford 2014</td>
<td>Modern-style government office building, ca. 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-060211</td>
<td>Smith 1963</td>
<td>Isolate: mortar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-060212</td>
<td>Smith 1963</td>
<td>Isolate: metate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1071-19H**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>West Twin Creek Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-09H*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jefferson Hunt House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-89H*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rice Thorn Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-90H*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Johnson Swamp Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-92H**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Davis Mill Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-93H*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Daley Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-94H*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Logsdon, Ferrel, and Brooks Ditch, ca. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-95H*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Waterman Ditch, ca. 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-96H**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Heap Springs Ditch, ca. 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSBR-30H***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Stout’s Dam Ditch, ca. 1857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Located partially within the APE; ** "pending" sites.
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Historic maps show that in the 1850s the Mormon stockade known as Fort San Bernardino, located in the vicinity of the present-day San Bernardino courthouse, was the only notable man-made feature in the vicinity of the APE (GLO 1876; 1878). After the national railroad systems reached the region to usher in the land boom of the 1880s, most of the area around the APE began to exhibit a cultural landscape typical of rural southern California at the time, characterized by a regular grid of roads lined by scattered buildings, while concentrated blocks of buildings were clustered in the downtown area of San Bernardino (USGS 1901). Much of the area was presumably devoted to agriculture, including citrus cultivation, particularly in the less populated eastern outskirts of the city, where a tangle of irrigation canals and ditches were dug.

A catastrophic flood across southern California in 1938 changed the course of the Santa Ana River and the geography of the APE, particularly around the southern portion, much of which was under cultivation as agricultural fields at the time (NETR Online 1938-1959; USGS 1941; 1943; Cataldo 2002). In the wake of the flood, the East Twin Creek Wash was channelized from the spreading grounds to the Santa Ana River, merging into the latter near the water reclamation plant location. A smaller version of the plant was reportedly first constructed at this location around 1959, then expanded in 1969 (USGS 1954; NETR Online 1959; Phelps 2012).

Following the end of WWII, the area around the APE, like the rest of San Bernardino and southern California in general, entered a period of rapid urbanization (USGS 1954; NETR Online 1959). The drastic changes in land use has greatly altered the formerly agrarian landscape of the area, and in all likelihood obliterated most of the cultural remains from the prehistoric or early historic periods, such as the 19th century irrigation canals.

NATIVE AMERICAN INPUT

In response to CRM TECH’s inquiry, the Native American Heritage Commission reports in a letter dated December 11, 2014 that the sacred lands record search identified no Native American cultural resources within the APE, 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 NAHC’s response, CRM TECH requested consultation with all 11 individuals on the referral list and the organizations they represent. In addition, as referred by tribal government staff, Anna Hoover, Cultural Analyst for the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, was also contacted. As previously noted, the written requests for consultation were sent to the tribal representatives on December 23, 2014, and follow-up telephone solicitations were carried out on January 5-8, 2015. As of this time, three written responses and one verbal response have been received (see App. 2).

In e-mails dated December 23 and 31, 2014, respectively, Ms. Hoover and Denisa Torres, Cultural Resources Manager for the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, indicate that the APE is outside their tribes’ traditional territory and thus they wish to defer to other tribes in closer proximity to this location. When reached by telephone on January 5, 2015, Goldie Walker, Chairperson of the Serrano Nation of Mission Indians, requested to be notified if any cultural resources were found during the undertaking.
In an e-mail dated January 8, 2015, Daniel McCarthy, Director of Cultural Resources Management for the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, states that the tribe is aware of cultural resources in the vicinity of the APE. Given the known sensitivity of the location, Mr. McCarthy stresses that the APE should be carefully examined for cultural resources. If any cultural resources are identified during the fieldwork, the tribe wishes to be notified to provide further input about their cultural sensitivity.

**CULTURAL RESOURCES IDENTIFIED**

During the field survey, no evidence of any cultural resources of prehistoric origin was found within or adjacent to the APE. As stated previously, the APE and the surrounding area have been greatly disturbed by construction and maintenance activities in the past, making it unlikely for any cultural remains from the prehistoric or early historic period to survive intact within the APE. Historic maps referenced above suggest that several of the roadways containing the proposed pipeline routes are now close to a century or more in age. As working public roadways in full service today, however, they are modern in appearance and exhibit no particular historical character due to repeated upgrading and constant maintenance over the years.

A number of buildings and other built-environment features that appeared to date to the historic period were observed along the pipeline routes, including the seven buildings and features identified in AIC records (see Table 1). None of these is located within or immediately adjacent to the APE, and thus none of them may potentially be affected, either directly or indirectly, by the proposed undertaking at these locations. There only potential “historic properties” and “historical resources” that require consideration in this report, therefore, are the nine historical/archaeological sites previously identified as lying partially within the APE, all of them linear features from the historic period. These nine sites are discussed in further detail below.

**Site 36-006544 (North Fork Ditch)**

The North Fork Ditch was one of two diversions from the Santa Ana River dug in 1856 to serve the City Creek Settlement, a non-Mormon community along Sixth Street between Waterman and Sterling Avenues (Scott 1977). After a major flood in 1862, the ditch’s owners decided to extend it using a new heading located further to the north. In doing so, they incorporated a segment of the Cram and Van Lueven Ditch, and enlarged it to increase the flow for both ditches (ibid.:13, 16). That portion of the Cram and Van Lueven Ditch eventually also became known as the North Fork Ditch (ibid.:16).

In the 1880s, the water rights assigned to the North Fork Ditch were transferred to E.G. Judson and Frank E. Brown, developers of the Redlands Colony, who diverted the water to their new venture on the “bench,” or higher ground to the north. A new ditch, known as the North Fork Canal, was built for that purpose. It ran approximately 0.75 mile north of the original North Fork Ditch but did not reach the APE (Scott 1977:15, 17). After that, the North Fork Ditch was evidently abandoned, and during the field survey no physical remains of this early irrigation work were found where it once crossed the APE along Baseline Street.
Site 36-006847 (Santa Fe Railway/Kite-Shaped Track)

Site 36-006847, the former Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway’s famed Kite-Shaped Track, was a popular railroad excursion route between Los Angeles and the Inland Empire in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, so named because of its resemblance to a racetrack with only one turn and its stretches converging to a point, or essentially a figure “8” (AT&SF n.d.; Moore 1973a). The smaller loop at the eastern end, commonly known as the Redlands Loop, crossed the proposed pipeline routes in both the northern portion and the southern portion of the APE.

The Kite-Shaped Track was born of the Santa Fe Railway’s aggressive expansion into California in the 1880s. In 1885, the construction of its first subsidiary in California, the California Southern Railroad, successfully broke the Southern Pacific Railway’s modern transportation monopoly in the state. By 1892, the Santa Fe, through a number of other subsidiaries, had completed the Kite-Shaped Track to provide its own connection to the population and freight centers in the Los Angeles Basin and the Inland Empire. The southern portion of the Redlands Loop, from San Bernardino to Mentone via Redlands, was built in 1887-1888 by the San Bernardino Valley Railway Company (Gustafson and Serpico 1992:65). The northern portion, from Highland Junction to Mentone by way of Highland, was completed by the San Bernardino and Eastern Railway Company in 1892 (ibid.).

Realizing its value as a tourist vehicle to promote its passenger services and the sale of its land holdings, the Santa Fe inaugurated the Kite-Shaped Track excursion—or “kite-lining” for short—with the catchy slogan “No Scene Twice Seen” on January 17, 1892 (Moore 1973b; Gustafson and Serpico 1992:65; Garret 1996:107). It gained instant popularity, and for the next 20 years ranked among the leading tourist attractions in southern California, for local residents as well as travelers from the eastern United States. The success gave the route nationwide fame and propped such cities along the route as Pasadena, Redlands, and Riverside into favored winter resorts for the rich and famous.

During its heyday, the Kite-Shaped Track was not only a catalyst in the economic growth of southern California but also an important part in the region’s the social and cultural life. With the dawn of the automobile age, however, the popularity of the Kite-Shaped Track began to dwindle in the mid-1910s, and the excursion was no longer offered as an organized trip after WWI (Duke 1991:12). In 1938, all passenger trains were discontinued on the Redlands Loop (Duke 1991:12; Hinckley 1985:3). The Santa Fe eventually abandoned the northern portion of the Redlands Loop in 1956 to make way for a highway construction project (Sun 1956).

After further trackage reductions in 1967, 1980, and 1986 (Sun 1980; 1986; Lawrence 1989:27), the final remnant of the Redlands Loop, between San Bernardino and Redlands, remains functional today, but is used only on rare occasions for freight transportation. Where it crosses the southern portion of the APE, the rail line demonstrates no particularly historical characteristics due to past upgrading and maintenance (Fig. 6). In the northern portion of the APE, all traces of the rail line where it once crossed the pipeline routes have been obliterated by Freeway 30/210.

Site 36-007049/36-012189 (State Route 18)

State Route 18 is an amalgam of mountain roads, city streets, and desert highways that have shared this route designation since around 1917 (Wikipedia n.d.). Although the present-day route
Figure 6. Former Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway near the APE.

designation runs northerly from State Route 210 in San Bernardino to State Route 138 near Adelanto, historically State Route 18 extended from Long Beach to Lancaster. The route was—and is—cosigned with host of other roads, including Rim the World and Crest Highways in the San Bernardino Mountains and Waterman Avenue in the City of San Bernardino, which coincides with one of the major north-south alignments for the proposed pipeline (ibid.; Trampier 2011). Like other elements of the historic transportation infrastructure that remain in use today, Waterman Avenue at this location is essentially modern in character due to repeated upgrading and constant maintenance over the years (Fig. 7).

**Site 36-010820 (SBA&W Railroad/Harlem Motor Road)**

In 1888, the San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad Company received permission from San Bernardino County Supervisors to build a narrow-gauge rail line from San Bernardino to Harlem Hot Springs (Swett 1967:23), which crossed a segment of the proposed pipeline route along Sixth Street. Around the same time, the company also began operating a “horsecar line,” with trolley cars pulled by horses or mules, to move passengers between downtown San Bernardino and its station near the intersection of Seventh Street and A Street (now Sierra Way). Named the Harlem Motor Road, the horse-driven portion of the route coincided with another segment of the APE along Sierra Way (ibid.).

In 1894, services on the Harlem Motor Road were terminated for the lack of profitability, and afterwards the rails there were removed and sold (Swett 1967:23). The San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad tracks extending to the east, later referred to as the “Highland Line,” served as part the Pacific Electric Railway’s extensive interurban rail system through the 1930s (USGS
1943; Swett 1967:28). As the golden age of the steel rails drew to a close, however, that line also fell to disuse, and was removed some time prior to the 1950s (USGS 1954). During the field survey, no identifiable remnants of the San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad or the Harlem Motor Road were found.

### Site 36-015497 (San Bernardino Baseline)

The San Bernardino Baseline has been part of the basis for all land surveys and titles in southern California since it was established by U.S. Deputy Surveyor Henry Washington in 1853. The San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian extended east-west and north-south, respectively, from the summit of Mount San Bernardino, where a monument was erected (Haenszel 1979:31). Because of its far-reaching influence in regional history, Site 36-015497 has been designated by the State of California as a Point of Historical Interest (CPHI-SBr-12; OHP 1973).

The physical embodiment of the San Bernardino Baseline across the APE is Baseline Street, which also dates back to the early 1850s, when the Mormon settlers forged a new road roughly along the San Bernardino Baseline from present-day Highland to Claremont as part of a more direct route between San Bernardino and Los Angeles (Haenszel 1979:31). Today, Baseline Street at this location is a multi-lane modern highway, with no vestige in its character and appearance to relate to the 1850s wagon road (Fig. 8).

### Pending Site P1071-19H (West Twin Creek Ditch)

Also known as Waterman Canyon Creek, the West Twin Creek Ditch flowed from the San Bernardino Mountains at Waterman Canyon (Scott 1977). The probable alignment of the West Twin
Figure 8. Baseline Street at the intersection with Crestview Avenue.

Creek Ditch crossed the proposed pipeline route along East Twin Creek in a northeast-southwest direction (ibid.:112). In 1854, through a legislative act, the water from both West Twin Creek and East Twin Creek was appropriated by the town of San Bernardino and diverted into a ditch that emptied into Town Creek near H Street (ibid.:111). That ditch was later abandoned because of water seepage and winter storm damages.

By 1888 the West Twin Creek Ditch was owned by three individuals for irrigating a total of 60-80 acres, who had altered its course somewhat and had roughly paved it in an effort to decrease seepage (Scott 1977:114-115). It later became a closed conduit water system, with surplus water allowed to recharge the Waterman Spreading Grounds, called the Waterman Basin today (ibid.). No surface evidence of the historical ditch was observed at its documented location during the field survey.

Pending Site P1074-92H (Davis Mill Ditch)

The Davis Mill Ditch, originally known as the St. Bernard Ditch and later as the Kehl Ditch, was an irrigation work built by the Mormon settlers in 1852 to power a grist mill near the present-day intersection of Mill Street and Allen Street (Scott 1977:53). Water from the ditch fed into Timber Creek, and then to Warm Creek. The ditch was later used for irrigation (ibid.). The water rights were acquired by the Riverside Water Company in 1909 (ibid.:54). Available sources regarding the Davis Mill Ditch yielded little additional information, and no physical remains of the ditch were found during the field survey.

Pending Site P1074-96H (Heap Springs Ditch)

The Heap Springs Ditch diverted water between Heap Springs and Warm Creek, to the west of the East Twin Creek Channel (Scott 1977:57). The ditch was used to irrigate about 70 acres of farmland
located near Waterman Avenue, north of Warm Creek. Its water rights were acquired in 1901-1902 by the Riverside Water Company, which had also purchased the rights to drill wells that diverted and diminished the ditch’s flow (ibid.). During the field survey, no evidence could be found of the ditch along its reported course near the intersection of Waterman Avenue and Seventh Street.

Pending Site PSBR-30H (Stout’s Dam Ditch)

PSBR-30H represents the approximate course of Stout’s Dam Ditch, one of the many minor irrigation works that diverted from Warm Creek during the latter half of the 19th century (Scott 1977). Also known as the Shay Ditch, it was originally built in 1857 or 1858, and was apparently enlarged at some later date (ibid.:56). Records indicate that the ditch crossed the APE along East Twin Creek in a generally east-west direction, to the north of Baseline Street. Historical accounts suggest that Stout’s Dam Ditch was in use for irrigation purpose until the 1940s, when its service area was subdivided for residential development (ibid.:57). No information is available regarding the fate of the ditch after that, and no remains were found of it at its former location in or near the APE.

DISCUSSION

DEFINITION OF “HISTORIC PROPERTY”/”HISTORICAL RESOURCE”

The purpose of this study is to identify and evaluate any “historic properties” or “historical resources” that may exist within or adjacent to the Area of Potential Effects of the proposed undertaking. “Historic properties,” as defined by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, include “prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places maintained by the Secretary of the Interior” (36 CFR 800.16(l)). The eligibility for inclusion in the National Register is determined by applying the following criteria, developed by the National Park Service as per provision of the National Historic Preservation Act:

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
(a) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
(b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
(c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, 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) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (36 CFR 60.4)

For CEQA-compliance considerations, the State of California’s Public Resources Code (PRC) establishes the definitions and criteria for “historical resources,” which require similar protection to what NHPA Section 106 mandates for historic properties. “Historical resources,” according to PRC §5020.1(j), “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 of historical significance, CEQA guidelines mandate that “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))

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In summary of the research results presented above, nine historical/archaeological sites, all of them linear features dating to the historic period, were previously identified as lying partially within the APE, as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-006544</td>
<td>North Fork Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-006847</td>
<td>Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway’s Kite-Shaped Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-007049/36-012189</td>
<td>State Route 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-010820</td>
<td>San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad/Harlem Motor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-015497</td>
<td>San Bernardino Baseline/Baseline Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1071-19H</td>
<td>West Twin Creek Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-92H</td>
<td>Davis Mill Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1074-96H</td>
<td>Heap Springs Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSBR-30H</td>
<td>Stout’s Dam Ditch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among these nine sites, 36-010820, the circa 1888 San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad/Harlem Motor Road, is known to have been removed some time prior to the 1950s. Five other sites, 36-006544, P1071-19H, P1074-92H, P1074-96H, and PSBR-30H, represent the courses of mid-19th century irrigation lines that have long since been abandoned and evidently obliterated by later developments. The courses of these ditches across the APE were established solely on the basis of historical maps and other documentation, and not from tangible features of the landscape. During the present survey, no physical remains were observed of any of the five ditches, nor of the San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad/Harlem Motor Road, within or adjacent to the APE.

In sum, the five early irrigation ditches and the San Bernardino, Arrowhead and Waterman Railroad/Harlem Motor Road are no longer in existence in or near the APE. The three remaining
sites, 36-006847 (the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway’s Kite-Shaped Track), 36-007049/36-012189 (State Route 18), and 36-015497 (the San Bernardino Baseline, as embodied by Baseline Street), thus represent the only potential “historic properties” or “historical resources” that may be affected by the implementation of the proposed undertaking.

SITE EVALUATION

Site 36-006847 (Santa Fe Railway/Kite-Shaped Track)

As stated above, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway’s Kite-Shaped Track, previously recorded as Site 36-006847, was once an important part of a major railroad system that helped transform southern California and a nationally renowned tourist attraction showcasing the region’s distinguished “citrus culture.” As such, it played an important role not only in the economic development but also in the social and cultural life of southern California, especially the Inland Empire area, during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Due to the lack of sufficient integrity, however, the site was previously determined not to qualify as a “historic property” or a “historical resource” (Tang et al. 2007:18; 2009:18).

Field observations during this survey indicate that one of the two segments of the railroad line across the APE has been removed while the other, still in working condition today, does not retain sufficient historical characteristics to relate to its period of significance, namely the 1880s-1910s, as a result of more than a century of upgrading and maintenance work. None of the physical components of the site, such as the rails and the signal system in existence along the southern segment, contributes to the potential significance of the site. Therefore, this study concurs with the previous determination, and concludes that neither of the two segments of Site 36-006847 across the APE constitutes a “historic property” or a “historical resource.”

Site 36-007049/36-012189 (State Route 18)

State Route 18 is known to date to the early 20th century. Within the APE, it is represented by Waterman Avenue, a busy local thoroughfare. Similarly to the surviving segments of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, Waterman Avenue at this location is essentially modern in appearance due to repeated upgrading and constant maintenance over the years, and exhibits no particular historical character. As such, it does not retain sufficient historic integrity to relate to its period of origin or the historic period in general. Like the majority of historic-period roadways that remain in use today, it is not considered a potential candidate for the National Register or the California Register due to the lack of integrity, and does not qualify as a “historic property” or a “historical resource.”

Site 36-015497 (San Bernardino Baseline)

Established in 1853 as the basis for all land surveys and titles in southern California, the San Bernardino Baseline, represented by Baseline Street across the APE, has been designated a California Point of Historical Interest because of its far-reaching influence in the early settlement and subsequent development of the region. Therefore, Site 36-015497 appears to meet the definition of a “historical resource” under CEQA and potentially that of a “historic property” under Section 106.
The historic value of the site, however, is largely symbolic in nature and is derived from a conceptual line across the landscape instead of any physical features of present-day Baseline Street, another working component of the modern transportation infrastructure. The current appearance and characteristics of Baseline Street do not contribute to the significance or integrity of the site, and thus the proposed undertaking has no potential to alter the historic aspects of the site’s existence. In short, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.16(i) and Calif. PRC §5020.1(q), the undertaking will not have an effect on the significance or integrity of Site 36-015497.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act mandates that federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects on such properties (36 CFR 800.1(a)). Similarly, 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 an historical resource would be impaired.”

In conclusion, among the nine historic-period linear sites previously identified within the APE, 36-006544, 36-010820, P1071-19H, P1074-92H, P1074-96H, and PSBR-30H are no longer in existence, 36-006847 and 36-007049/36-012189 do not appear to meet the statutory definition of “historic properties” or “historical resources,” and the undertaking will not have any effect on Site 36-015497. No other potential “historic properties” or “historical resources” were encountered throughout the course of this study, and the vertical extent of the APE appears to be relatively low in sensitivity for subsurface deposits of potentially significant archaeological remains.

Based on these findings, and pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1) and Calif. PRC §21084.1, CRM TECH presents to the BOR and the SBMWD the following recommendations regarding the proposed undertaking:

- No historic properties or historical resources, as defined by Section 106 and CEQA, will be affected by the undertaking as currently proposed.
- No further cultural resources investigation is necessary for the proposed undertaking unless project plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study.
- If buried cultural materials are discovered during grading and/or other earth-moving operations associated with the undertaking, 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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APPENDIX 2

CORRESPONDENCE WITH
NATIVE AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES*

* A total of 12 local Native American representatives were contacted; a sample letter is included in this report.
Project: The San Bernardino Clean Water Factory Project (CRM TECH Contract No. 2878A)

County: San Bernardino

USGS Quadrangle Name: San Bernardino North and San Bernardino South, Calif.

Township 1 North Range 4 West SB BM; Section(s) (Within the Rancho Muscupiabe land grant)

Township 1 South Range 4 West SB BM; Section(s) None (within the Rancho Muscupiabe and Rancho San Bernardino land grants)

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 make improvements to the existing recycled water system operated by the San Bernardino Municipal Water Department in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California.
December 11, 2014

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

Sent by Fax: (909) 824-6405  
Number of Pages: 3

Re: The San Bernardino Clean Water Factory Project (CRM TECH Contract No. 2878A ), San Bernardino County.

Dear Ms. Gallardo,

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

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

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 373-3712.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Katy Sanchez  
Associate Government Program Analyst
Native American Contacts
San Bernardino County
December 10, 2014

Pechanga Band of Mission Indians
Paul Macarro, Cultural Resources Manager
P.O. Box 1477
Temecula, CA 92593
pmacarro@pechanga-nsn.gov
(951) 770-8100
(951) 506-9491 Fax

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

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Lynn Valbuena, Chairwoman
26569 Community Center
Highland, CA 92346
(909) 864-8933
(909) 864-3724 Fax
(909) 864-3370 Fax

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
Daniel McCarthy, M.S., Director-CRM Dept.
28569 Community Center Drive
Highland, CA 92346
dmccarthy@sanmanuel-nsn.gov
(909) 864-8933 Ext 3248
(909) 862-5152 Fax

Soboba Band of Mission Indians
Rosemary Morillo, Chairperson; Attn: Carrie Garcia
P.O. Box 487
San Jacinto, CA 92581
carrieg@soboba-nsn.gov
(951) 654-2765
(951) 654-4198 Fax

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

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA 91322
femen@yahoo.com
(661) 753-9833 Office
(760) 885-0955 Cell
(760) 949-1604 Fax

Pechanga Band of Mission Indians
Mark Macarro, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1477
Temecula, CA 92593
mgoodhart@pechanga-nsn.gov
(951) 770-6100
(951) 695-1778 Fax

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 7950.5 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 Locative Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed The San Bernardino Clean Water Factory Project (CRM TECH Contract No. 2878A), San Bernardino County.
Serrano Nation of Mission Indians
Goldie Walker, Chairwoman
P.O. Box 343 Serrano
Patton, CA 92369

(909) 528-9027
(909) 528-9032

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

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department
P.O. BOX 487 Luiseno
San Jacinto, CA 92581
jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov
(951) 663-5279
(951) 654-5544, ext 4137
(951) 654-4198 Fax

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 5997.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5997.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting locative Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed The San Bernardino Clean Water Facility Project (CRM TECH Contract No. 2879A), San Bernadino County
DECEMBER 23, 2014

Anna Hoover, Cultural Analyst
Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians
P.O. Box 2183
Temecula, CA 92592

RE: Clean Water Factory Project
   Approximately 22.3 Linear Miles and 5.8 Acres in the City of San Bernardino
   San Bernardino County, California
   CRM TECH Contract #2878A

Dear Ms. Hoover:

The City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation have initiated environmental studies under Section 106 and CEQA for the Clean Water Factory Project in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California. The Area of Potential Effects (APE) encompasses approximately 5.8 acres of land for new pump stations and 22.3 miles of distribution pipeline right-of-way that will traverse along existing street alignments and flood control channels to the spreading basins (Waterman Basins, East Twin Creeks Spreading Grounds, and San Bernardino Water Reclamation Facility).

The proposed undertaking entails the installation of a tertiary Title 22 microfiltration treatment system, a pilot-demonstration membrane bioreactor and advanced purification system, and a full-scale advanced purification system, which includes recycled water distribution pipelines and pump stations. The accompanying map, based on the USGS San Bernardino North and San Bernardino South, Calif., 7.5’ quadrangles, depict the location of the APE in a portion of the Rancho Muscupiabe and Rancho San Bernardino land grant lying within T1N R4W and T1S R4W, SBBM. CRM TECH has been hired to conduct a cultural resource study, including the Native American scoping, for this project.

In a letter dated December 11, 2014, the Native American Heritage Commission reports that the sacred lands record search identified no Native American cultural resources within the APE, but recommends that local Native American groups be contacted for further information. 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 APE.

According to records on file at the Archaeological Information Center, there are five previously recorded archaeological/historical sites and four pending sites within or partially within the boundaries of the APE. Site 36-006544 is the North Fork Canal, Site 36-006847 is the Kite-Shaped Track of the Santa Fe Railway, Site 36-010820 is San Bernardino, Arrowhead, and Waterman Railroad/Harlem Motor Road, Site 36-012189 is California State Route 18, and Site 36-015497 is Baseline Road. The four pending sites are all historic-period ditches located in different parts of the APE.

Outside the project boundaries but within a quarter-mile radius, AIC records show that 28 additional historic-period sites, one prehistoric site, two prehistoric isolates, and six pending sites were
previously identified. The prehistoric site, 36-002794, is considered a village site, located approximately 0.2 miles southeast of the East Twin Creek alignment of the APE. The prehistoric isolates are described as a mortar and a metate. The historic-period sites include weirs, roads, ditches, canals, refuse scatters and single-family residences.

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 APE that need to be taken into consideration as part of 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 agencies, which are the City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for CEQA- and Section 106-compliance purposes. 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 consultations. Thank you for the time and effort in addressing this important matter.

Respectfully,

Nina Gallardo
CRM TECH
Email: ngallardo@crmtech.us

Encl.: APE map

From: Anna Hoover <ahoover@pechanga-nsn.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 23, 2014 10:04 AM
To: Nina Gallardo
Cc: Ebru Ozdil
Subject: RE: NA Scoping Letter for the Clean Water Factory Project in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County (CRM#2878A)

Hi Nina,

Thank you for sending the Pechanga Band this request. It is outside our Traditional Territory and we will defer to the closer tribe(s) in the area.

Thank you again and Merry Christmas,

Anna M. Hoover
Cultural Analyst
Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians
P.O. Box 2183
Temecula, CA 92593
951-770-8104 (O)
951-694-0446 (F)
951-757-6139 (C)
ahoover@pechanga-nsn.gov
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. However, this project is outside of our Cahuilla ancestral territory. Please follow up with the appropriate tribes who utilized this area.

Denisa

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
## TELEPHONE LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tribe/Affiliation</th>
<th>Telephone Contacts</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Martin, Chairperson</td>
<td>Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Denisa Torres is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denisa Torres, Cultural</td>
<td>Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Ms. Torres responded by e-mail on December 31, 2014 (copy attached).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Siva, Tribal Elder</td>
<td>Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>4:10 pm, January 5, 2015; 11:55 am, January 8, 2015</td>
<td>Left messages; no response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Hoover, Cultural Analyst</td>
<td>Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Ms. Hoover responded by e-mail on December 23, 2014 (copy attached).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Macarro, Chairperson</td>
<td>Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Anna Hoover is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Macarro, Cultural</td>
<td>Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Anna Hoover is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Valenzuela, Chairperson</td>
<td>San Fernando Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>4:13 pm, January 5, 2015; 12:03 pm, January 8, 2015</td>
<td>Left messages; no response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel McCarthy, Director of</td>
<td>San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>4:05 pm, January 5, 2015; 12:00 pm, January 8, 2015</td>
<td>Mr. McCarthy responded by e-mail on January 8, 2015 (copy attached).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources Management Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Valbuena, Chairperson</td>
<td>San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Daniel McCarthy is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldie Walker, Chairperson</td>
<td>Serrano Nation of Mission Indians</td>
<td>4:29 pm, January 5, 2015</td>
<td>Ms. Walker requested notification of any cultural resources found during the undertaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Morillo, Chairperson</td>
<td>Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Joseph Ontiveros is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural</td>
<td>Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
<td>4:02 pm, January 5, 2015; 11:58 am, January 8, 2015</td>
<td>Left messages; no response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>