



Appendix D

Cultural Resources Report

September 4, 2018 (Revised December 13, 2019)

11092

Ms. Jenifer Murillo
Director of Real Estate Development
Costco Wholesale
9 Corporate Park, Suite 230
Irvine, California 92606

Subject: *Cultural Resources Inventory Report for the Costco/Vineyard II Project, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California – Negative Findings*

Dear Ms. Murillo,

Dudek was retained by Costco Wholesale (Costco) to complete a cultural resources inventory for the Costco/Vineyard II Retail Development Project (proposed project), located in the City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California. The purpose of this study is to identify all cultural resources within the project site and determine whether implementation of the proposed project would have the potential to impact known and unknown cultural resources. The City of Murrieta (City) is the lead agency responsible for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). All cultural resource fieldwork and reporting for the proposed project has been conducted by archaeologists meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards.

The present study documents the results of a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC), a Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) search, the results of informal tribal consultation, and an intensive-level pedestrian survey.

The EIC records identified 57 previously recorded cultural resources within 1.0-mile (1,608 meters [m]) of the project site; none of these resources were identified within the project site. However, an NAHC SLF search was positive for the presence of Native American cultural resources. Subsequent Native American outreach letters for the proposed project resulted in six responses. In addition, an intensive-level pedestrian survey conducted of the project site and surrounding area did not identify cultural resources.

Project Location

The proposed project is located in the northern portion of the City of Murrieta in Riverside County. Specifically, the site is located on a vacant lot at the northeast corner of Antelope Road and Clinton Keith Road, east of Interstate (I-) 215 (Appendix A: Figure 1). The proposed project is situated in Sections 34 and 36 of the public land survey system (PLSS) Township 6 South, Range 3 West as shown on the *Murrieta, CA* 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle.

Project Description

The approximately 26-acre, rectangular-shaped project site, is undergoing an ongoing mass grading operation that is removing the low-lying hills on site. The proposed project includes the construction of a new retail development consisting of a Costco warehouse and fuel station, a fitness center, a major retail pad, four smaller retail shops, one restaurant, one drive-through fast-food restaurant, two detention basins, and associated parking (Appendix A: Figure 2).

Regulatory Context

This section includes a discussion of the applicable state laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards governing cultural resources, which must be adhered to before and during construction of the proposed project.

State

The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)

In California, the term “historical resource” includes, but is not limited to, “any object, building, structure, 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” (California Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 5020.1(j)). In 1992, the California legislature established the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) “to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (PRC Section 5024.1(a)). The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), enumerated below. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one 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.

In order to understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than 50 years old may be considered for listing in the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance (see 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 4852(d)(2)).

The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP, and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR, as are the state landmarks and

points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

California Environmental Quality Act

As described further, the following CEQA statutes (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) are of relevance to the analysis of archaeological, historic, and tribal cultural resources:

- PRC Section 21083.2(g) defines “unique archaeological resource.”
- PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) defines “historical resources.” In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) defines the phrase “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource”; it also defines the circumstances when a project would materially impair the significance of a historical resource.
- PRC Section 21074(a) defines “tribal cultural resources.”
- PRC Section 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) set forth standards and steps to be employed following the accidental discovery of human remains in any location other than a dedicated ceremony.
- PRC Sections 21083.2(b) and 21083.2(c) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 provide information regarding the mitigation framework for archaeological and historic resources, including examples of preservation-in-place mitigation measures. Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to significant archaeological sites because it maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context, and may also help avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the archaeological site(s).

More specifically, under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause “a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)). If a site is listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a historical resources survey (meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(q)), it is an “historical resource” and is presumed to be historically or culturally significant for purposes of CEQA (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)). The lead agency is not precluded from determining that a resource is a historical resource even if it does not fall within this presumption (PRC Section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)).

A “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” reflecting a significant effect under CEQA means “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(1); PRC Section 5020.1(q)). In turn, the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project does any of the following:

1. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or
2. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC,

unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

3. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2)).

Pursuant to these sections, the CEQA inquiry begins with evaluating whether a project site contains any “historical resources,” then evaluates whether that project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource such that the resource’s historical significance is materially impaired.

If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts 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 (PRC Sections 21083.2(a)–(c)).

Section 21083.2(g) defines a 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 (PRC Section 21083.2(g)).

Impacts on non-unique archaeological resources are generally not considered a significant environmental impact (PRC Section 21083.2(a); CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(4)). However, if a non-unique archaeological resource qualifies as a TCR (PRC Sections 21074(c) and 21083.2(h)), further consideration of significant impacts is required.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. As described below, these procedures are detailed in PRC Section 5097.98.

California State Assembly Bill 52

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 of 2014 amended PRC Section 5097.94 and added PRC Sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3. AB 52 established that TCRs must be considered under CEQA and also provided for additional Native American consultation requirements for the lead agency. Section 21074 describes a TCR as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object that is considered of cultural value to a California Native American Tribe and that is either:

- On or determined to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register; or
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1.

AB 52 formalizes the lead agency–tribal consultation process, requiring the lead agency to initiate consultation with California Native American groups that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project site, including tribes that may not be federally recognized. Lead agencies are required to begin consultation prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report.

Section 1 (a)(9) of AB 52 establishes that “a substantial adverse change to a tribal cultural resource has a significant effect on the environment.” Effects on TCRs should be considered under CEQA. Section 6 of AB 52 adds Section 21080.3.2 to the PRC, which states that parties may propose mitigation measures “capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource.” Further, if a California Native American tribe requests consultation regarding project alternatives, mitigation measures, or significant effects to tribal cultural resources, the consultation shall include those topics (PRC Section 21080.3.2[a]). The environmental document and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (where applicable) shall include any mitigation measures that are adopted (PRC Section 21082.3[a]).

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5

California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods, regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area reasonably suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the county coroner has examined the remains (Section 7050.5(b)). PRC Section 5097.98 also outlines the process to be followed in the event that remains are discovered. If the coroner determines or has reason to believe the remains are those of a Native American, the coroner must contact NAHC within 24 hours (Section 7050.5(c)). NAHC will notify the “most likely descendant.” With the permission of the landowner, the most likely descendant may inspect the site of discovery. The inspection must be completed within 48 hours of notification of the most likely descendant by NAHC. The most likely descendant may recommend means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native Americans.

Local Regulations

County of Riverside General Plan

The County of Riverside General Plan (2013) specifies preservation of cultural resources under their Land Use Element. The policies laid out in this element that pertain to cultural resources include:

Policy LU 9.1 [Development should] Provide for permanent preservation of open space lands that contain important natural resources, cultural resources, hazards, water features, watercourses including arroyos and canyons, and scenic and recreational values.

Policy LU 9.4 Allow development clustering and/or density transfers in order to preserve open space, natural resources, cultural resources, and biologically-sensitive resources.

County of Riverside Cultural Resource Review Process

If deemed necessary by the County of Riverside Planning Department a Phase I Cultural Resource Review is required to be conducted for proposed private development projects within unincorporated Riverside County. These reports should be submitted directly to the office of the County Archaeologist.

City of Murrieta Historic Preservation Advisory Commission

The City of Murrieta Historic Preservation Advisory Commission (HPAC) acts in an advisory capacity to the City Council with regard to the preservation of cultural and archaeological resources within the City's boundaries. Through the City Planner or Community Development Director, the HPAC makes recommendations to the City Council regarding the designation of cultural resources. Such resources may include individual properties, archaeological districts, or Historic Murrieta Specific Plan within the City. In addition, the HPAC is responsible for maintaining the register of designated cultural resources within the City; reviewing land use, redevelopment, municipal improvement and other planning matters and programs undertaken by the City with regard to cultural resources; providing recommendations to the City Council on the use of available Federal, State, local and private funding sources for protection of the City's cultural resources; and, reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness related to demolition permits and development plan approval, in compliance with the City's *Development Code* for designated cultural resources (City of Murrieta 2011).

The City of Murrieta's Municipal Code Chapter 16 (Development Code) includes subchapter 16.26.050, which defines the City's designation criteria for cultural resources as copied below:

City of Murrieta Development Code

16.26.050. Designation Criteria for Cultural Resources Archaeological Districts and Historic Districts.

For the purposes of the ordinance codified in this section, an improvement or natural feature may be designated a cultural resource by the city council and any area within the city may be designated as an archaeological district or historic preservation district by the city council if it meets any of the following criteria:

A. Individual Resource Designation.

1. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city's cultural , architectural, aesthetic, social, economic, political, artistic and/or engineering heritage;
2. It is identified with persons, a business use or events significant in local, state or national history;
3. It embodies distinctive characteristics of style. type, period or method of construction or is a valuable ex-ample of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
4. It is representative of the notable work of a builder, designer or architect; or
5. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic represents an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community or the city:

B. Local District Designation.

A geographic area may be designated as a local archaeological district or historic preservation district if the city council, after hearing(s) finds that all of the requirements set forth below are met. Concurrent with the

designation of a historic preservation district, design guidelines shall be developed and shall apply to all properties within the historic preservation district.

1. Archaeological District.

- a. The area is a geographically definable area:
- b. The area possesses either:
 - 1. A significant concentration or continuity of archaeological resources ; or
 - 2. The area is associated with the prehistory of Murrieta.
- c. The designation of the geographic area as an archaeological district is reasonable, appropriate, and necessary to protect, promote and further the goals and purposes of the ordinance codified in this chapter and is not inconsistent with other goals and policies of the city.

2. Historic Preservation District.

- a. The area is a geographically definable area:
- b. The area possesses either:
 - 1. A significant concentration or continuity of buildings unified by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development; or
 - 2. The area is associated with an event, person, or period significant or important to Murrieta history.
- c. The designation of the geographic area as a historic preservation district is reasonable, appropriate, and necessary to protect, promote and further the goals and purposes of the ordinance codified in this chapter and is not inconsistent with other goals and policies of the city.
- d. Determining Factors. In determining whether to designate a historic preservation district, the following factors shall be considered:
 - 1. District should have integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, and association.
 - 2. The collective value of the buildings and structures in a district taken together may be greater than the value of each individual building or structure.

3. Contributing Resources.

Contributing resources may be included in a historic preservation district if the city council finds, after a hearing(s) that all of the following requirements are satisfied:

- a. The nominated resource is within a historic preservation district;
- b. The nominated resource either embodies the significant features and characteristics of the district or adds to the historical associations. architectural qualities or archaeological values identified for the district;
- c. The nominated resource was present during the period of historical significance of the district and relates to the documented historical significance of the district;
- d. The nominated resource possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period of historical significance or the district; and

- e. The nominated resource has important historic or architectural worth, and its designation as a contributing resource is reasonable, appropriate and necessary to protect, promote and further the goals and purposes of the ordinance codified in this chapter.

Background Research

EIC Records Search

On June 4, 2018, Dudek completed a CHRIS records search at the EIC, located on the University of California, Riverside campus of the project site and a 1.0 mile (1,608 m) buffer surrounding the project site (study area). This search included CHRIS’s collections of mapped prehistoric, historic, and built environment resources; Department of Parks and Recreation site records; technical reports; and ethnographic references. Additional consulted sources included historical maps of the study area, the NRHP, the CRHR, the California Historic Property Data File, the lists of California State Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility. The records search results are provided in Confidential Appendix B.

Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies

The EIC records indicate that 65 previous cultural resources technical investigations have been conducted within 1.0-mile (1,608 m) of the project site between 1977 and 2017. Of these, two previous studies overlap with the project site and two are adjacent to the project site, while the remaining 61 studies are within the records search buffer. Table 1 summarizes all 65 previous cultural resource studies, followed by a brief summary of each overlapping and adjacent study.

Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Studies within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

EIC Report Number (RI-)	Authors	Year	Title	Proximity to Project Site
00232	Kenneth Daly	1977	Environmental Impact Evaluation: Archaeological Assessment of a Portion of the NW 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 35, T6S, R3W, Murrieta 7.5' Quadrangle, Riverside County, California	Outside
00233	Kenneth Daly	1977	Environmental Impact Evaluation: Archaeological Assessment of the Hachten Property, located in a Portion of the S 1/2 of Section 35, T6S, R3W, Murrieta 7.5' Quadrangle, Riverside County, California	Outside
00294	James Baldwin	1978	Environmental Impact Evaluation: Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Parcel Map 11830, Near Rancho California, Riverside County, California	Outside
00383	Christopher E. Dover	1978	Environmental Impact Evaluation: Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Parcel Map 12030, Near Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
00445	James McManus	1978	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Parcel 13335, South of Keller Road, Riverside County, California	Outside

Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Studies within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

EIC Report Number (RI-)	Authors	Year	Title	Proximity to Project Site
00447	Christopher E. Dover	1995	Cultural Resources Impact and Constraints Analysis the 291 Acre Golden City Project, Murrieta USGS Quadrangle, Riverside County, California	Outside
00531	James P. Barker	1979	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Parcel 14725, Northwest of the Hogbacks, Southwestern Riverside County, California	Outside
00627	Renee Giansanti	1979	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Parcels 15142, 15203, 15096, and Tentative Tract 14851, Paloma Valley Area of Riverside County, California	Adjacent
00638	Renee Giansanti	1979	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of 60 Acres of Land in the Paloma Valley Area of Riverside. The Exact Location Being the SW 1/4 of Section 35, T6S, R3W, SBBM, Murrieta 7.5' Series USGS Quadrangle.	Adjacent
00664	Joan Oxendine	1979	A Report of an Archaeological Survey of 20 Acres in T 7S, R 3W, S 36, Murrieta Quadrangle, Riverside County, California	Outside
01105	Christopher E. Drover	1980	Environmental Impact Evaluation: Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Map 15285	Outside
01208	Alan Davis	1981	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Parcel 17467, Northeast of Murrieta in Riverside County, California	Outside
01243	Roger J. Desautels	1981	An Archaeological Assessment of TPM 17760	Outside
01258	Roger J. Desautels	1981	An Archaeological Assessment of TPM 17629	Outside
01322	Ken Kroesen	1981	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Parcel 18007, North of the Hogbacks in Western Riverside County, California	Outside
01360	Jean A. Salpas	1981	An Archaeological Assessment of Parcel 17419	Outside
02117	Victor DeMunck	1987	Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Parcel 22151 near Murrieta in Riverside County, California	Outside
02118	Bissell, Ronald M.	1992	Cultural Resources Reconnaissance of the Hamilton Property, Approximately 273 Acres in Riverside County, California	Outside
02119	Mary Robbins-Wade and Timothy G. Gross	1999	Archaeological Resources Inventory and Evaluation for the Murrieta Oaks Project, Murrieta, Riverside County, California.	Outside
02217	Drover, C.E.	1988	An Archaeological Assessment of Vesting Tentative Tract 23342, Near Murrieta Hot Springs, Riverside County, California	Outside
02506	Drover, C.E.	1989	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of the Greer Ranch Project Riverside County, California	Outside

Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Studies within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

EIC Report Number (RI-)	Authors	Year	Title	Proximity to Project Site
02780	Christopher E. Drover	1990	A Cultural Resource Assessment: Adobe Springs II Vesting Tentative Tract 25135 near Murrieta Hot Springs, California	Outside
02865	Keller, Jean A.	1990	An Archaeological Assessment Of Tentative Parcel Map 25950 Riverside County, California	Outside
03117	Drover, Christopher E.	1990	Environmental Impact Evaluation: An Archaeological Assessment of Tentative Tract 26262, Murrieta, California	Outside
03118	Jean A. Keller	1995	A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of the Western Half of Tentative Tract Map 26262, +/- 14.5 Acres of Land in Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
03119	Jean A. Keller	1995	Phase IV Archaeological Monitoring Of Demolition of the James Place Structures, Tentative Tract Map 26262, Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
03584	Carolyn E. Kyle, Petei McHenry, and Dennis R. Gallegos	1993	Cultural Resource Survey Report for the California Oaks Reservoir Project Rancho California Water District, County Of Riverside, California.	Outside
04121	Mason, Roger, Philippe Lapin, and Wayne H. Bonner	1998	Cultural Resources Records Search and Survey Report For a Pacific Bell Mobile Services Telecommunications Facility: CM122-01, City of Murrieta, California	Outside
04207	Jean A. Keller	1998	A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of Murrieta Crossing (Plot Plan 98-030) +57.0 Acres of Land in Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
04626	Cotterman, Cary D.	2001	Cultural Resources Records Search and Field Survey Report for a Nextel Communications Facility: Number CA-7239 Located in Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
04638	Jean A. Keller	2000	A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of Lincoln Ranch (TTM 29217), 245.0 Acres of Land in the City Of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
04639	Keller, Jean A.	2002	A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of Valley (CUP 01-0235), 7.0 Acres of Land in the City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
04640	Jean A. Keller	2001	A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of Vesting Tentative Tract Map 30280, 10.0 Acres of Land in the City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
04702	Hogan, Micahel, Bai "Tom" Tang, and Mariam Dahdul	2004	Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Tentative Tract No. 31998, City of Murrieta Riverside County, California	Outside
05113	Horne, Melinda C.	2002	Negative Archaeological Survey Report Route 215, Post Mile 08-RIV-215-KP, Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside

Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Studies within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

EIC Report Number (RI-)	Authors	Year	Title	Proximity to Project Site
05197	Riordan Goodwin and Robert E. Reynolds	2003	Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment: Lincoln Ranch Tract 29217-3, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
05362	Jean A. Keller	2003	A Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment of Development Plan 03-161 (The Orchard at Stone Creek) +/- 54.0 Acres of Land in the City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
05669	Hogan, Michael, Bai Tang, and Mariam Dahduk	2004	Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Tentative Tract No. 31999, City of Murrieta Riverside County, California	Outside
06049	David C. Hanna	2004	Archaeological Testing and Monitoring at Greer Ranch Within the City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
06232	Bai Tang, Michael Hogan, and Josh Smallwood	2004	Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Assessor Parcel Number 359-240-038, 28175 Lee Lane, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
06444	Tang, Bai, Michael Hogan, Matthew Wetherbee, and John J. Eddy	2004	Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Antelope Industrial Park, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
06659	Hogan, Michael, Deirdre Encarnacion, and Josh Smallwood	2006	Archaeological Survey Report: Linnel Lane Overcrossing at I-215 and Meadowlark Lane Improvement, City Of Murrieta, Riverside County, California, 08-RIV-215-PM 13.0-KP 20.9, EA OH820	Outside
06733	Riordan Goodwin and Patricia Tuck	2004	Cultural Resource Monitoring Program: Lincoln Ranch Tract 29271-3, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
06825	Jeanette McKenna	2005	Environmental Phase I Report: Nextel Communications Facility IRENE (CA-8306-B), Project No. N-3007-04	Outside
06876	John Elliot Jones and Michael K. Lerch	2006	Archaeological Survey of the Auld Subsurvey Transmission Lines, Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
07030	Jean A. Keller	2006	A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of NWC Linnel Lane & Mcelwain road 10-Acre Site	Outside
07041	Jordan, Stacey	2007	Archaeological Survey Report for Southern California Edison Company Relocation of the Garboni 12KV and Leon 12KV Circuits Project Riverside County, California	Outside
07045	Anna M. Hoover	2006	An Archaeological Record Search and Survey Report on Murrieta 56, APN 392-290-002, 56.18 Acres in the City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
07049	Robinson, Mark C.	2007	Historical Property Survey Report (08-RIV-215, PM 11.9-13.7, [KP19.30-21.03], EA 32780)	Overlapping
07476	Richardson, Karma O.K. and Robin D. Turner	2007	A Cultural Resource Assessment of the Proposed Commercial Development for 15 +/- Acres at 35070 Antelope Road, Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside

Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Studies within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

EIC Report Number (RI-)	Authors	Year	Title	Proximity to Project Site
08278	Lorna Billat	2009	Letter Report: Proposed Cellular Tower Project(s) in Riverside County, California, Site Number(s)/Name(s): LA-3439B / TCO Cool CA2639 Antelope TCNS# 54935	Outside
08283	Lorna Billat	2009	Letter Report: Proposed Cellular Tower Project(s) in Riverside County, California, Site Number(s)/Name(s): CA-2639 / Antelope TCNS #57797	Outside
08302	Bai Tang	2009	Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report Meadowlark Lane Extension Project (South Segment)	Outside
08645	Jean A. Keller	2009	A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of DPO 2008-2749 +/- 4.45 Acres of Land in the City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
08665		2011	Archaeological Monitoring Program For the Meadowlark Road form Clinton Keith Road to Baxter Road Project	Outside
08673	Jean A. Keller	2010	A Phase IV Cultural Resources Monitoring Report of CK-17, APN 392-290-038, Grading Permit No. 69235, +/- 2.5 Acres of Land Located at 28255 Clinton Keith Road, Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Overlapping
08955	Stacie Wilson, Jill Gibson, and Theodore G. Cooley	2015	Cultural Resources Survey Report For The Proposed Southern California Edison Valley South 115 KV Sub transmission Project, Riverside County, California	Outside
09024	John J. Eddy,	2013	Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Clinton Keith Road Extension Project, Riverside County, California	Outside
09342	Dennis McDougall and Joan George	2015	Cultural Resource Monitoring Report for the Pacific Landing Project: Assessor's Parcel No. 900-040-021, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
09473	Jennifer M. Sanka, Barbara Loren-Webb, and Leslie Nay Irish	2015	Preliminary Identification of Historic Properties for a Portion of Golden City Specific Plan, Tracts 28532-4 and 28532-5, +/-109 Acres in the City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
09477	Bai "Tom" Tang, Jesse Yorck, Ben Kerridge, and Nina Gallardo	2016	Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Assessor's Parcel No. 392-310-018, HealthSouth Rehabilitation Hospital Project, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
09610		2014	Archaeological Survey Report of the United Church of the Valley Project, AT&T Mobility Site NO. RS0276, 35921 Green Road, Murrieta, Riverside County, California 92589	Outside
09716	Joan George	2015	Cultural Resource Constraints Analysis for the Fireman's Circle Project, in the City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside

Table 1. Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Studies within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

EIC Report Number (RI-)	Authors	Year	Title	Proximity to Project Site
09898	Bai "Tom" Tang, Deirdre Encarnacion, Daniel Ballester, and Nina Gallardo	2016	Historical/ Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Murrieta Skilled Nursing Facility Project, Assessor's Parcel No. 392-310-002, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California	Outside
09965	Brian F. Smith, M.A. and Tracey A. Stropes, M.A	2017	A Cultural Resources Monitoring Report for the Golden City Project	Outside

RI-00627

Archaeological Resource Institute was contracted by Cape Aire Company, to conduct an archaeological resource assessment in support of the proposed development of residential subdivisions on 91.47 acres of land in the City of Murrieta. The assessment included a records search, a survey, and the preparation of a technical report. No archaeological or historic cultural remains were identified during the survey and the project was determined to have no potential adverse impacts to cultural resources.

RI-00638

LGS & Associates was contracted by Action Surveys, to conduct an archaeological resource assessment in support of the proposed development of residential subdivisions on 60 acres of land in the City of Murrieta. The assessment included a records search, a survey, and the preparation of a technical report. No cultural resources were identified during the survey. The project was determined to have no potential adverse impacts to cultural resources.

RI-07049

Jones & Stokes was contracted by the California Department of Transportation to prepare an archaeological survey report in support of the proposed Clinton Keith Road/Interstate 215 (I-215) Interchange Improvement Project. An archaeological survey of the area did not identify any archaeological resources, and the potential for undiscovered archaeological resources was determined to be low. The project was determined to have no potential adverse impacts to cultural resources.

RI-08673

Jean A. Keller was contracted by CK-17, LLP, to provide cultural resource services in support of the proposed commercial development on approximately 2.5 acres of land in Murrieta. The proposed development would require grading activities, removal of material and Clinton Keith Road and I-215 interchange work. Services included archaeological monitoring and the preparation of a Phase IV Monitoring Report. No cultural resources were observed within the boundaries of the subject property during construction activities. No further mitigation or research was recommended at the culmination of the project.

Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

The EIC records indicate that 57 instances of cultural resources have been previously recorded within 1.0-mile (1,608 m) of the project site, none of which intersect or overlap the project site. Of the 57 resources within the surrounding records search area, 9 are historical and include 5 historic refuse scatters, 2 historic built resources, 1 historic homestead site, and 1 historical isolate. The remaining 48 resources are prehistoric in age and include 14 prehistoric isolates and 34 prehistoric lithic scatters and/or bedrock milling features. Table 2 summarizes all 57 cultural resources identified.

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

Primary Number (P-33-)	Trinomial (CA-RIV-)	Period	NRHP Eligibility	Record By and Year	Descriptions	Proximity To Project Site
000629	000629	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	1973 (J. Humbert, S. Hammond, C.E.F.U.)	Lithic scatter with associated bedrock mortars	Outside
000637	000637	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	1973 (J. Humbert, S. Hammond, C.E.F.U.)	Lithic scatter with associated bedrock mortars	Outside
000638	000638	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	J. Humbert, S. Hammond (1973)	Processing site; dense lithic scatter and 15 bedrock mortars; possible habitation site	Outside
001364	001364	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	1976 (Hildebrand, Morin and Waldron, ARU); 1981 (Jean A. Salpas, ARU)	Milling station with three milling surfaces	Outside
001375	001375	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	1976 (Morin, Waldron, Pettus, Hildebrand, ARU); 1981 (Jean A. Salpas, ARU)	Milling station with two milling surfaces	Outside
001376	001376	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	1976 (Morin, Waldron, Pettus and Hildebrand, ARU); 1981 (Jean A. Salpas, ARU)	Milling station with two milling surfaces	Outside

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

Primary Number (P-33-)	Trinomial (CA-RIV-)	Period	NRHP Eligibility	Record By and Year	Descriptions	Proximity To Project Site
001377	001377	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	1976 (Morin, Waldron, Hildebrand and Pettus, ARU); 1981 (Jean A. Salpas, ARU); 2007 (Koji Tsunoda, Jones and Stokes)	Milling station; was not relocated in most recent site visit	Outside
002190	002190	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	1981 (T. Banks, Scientific Resource Surveys, Inc., Santa Ana, CA.); 2001 (David C. Hanna, Jr., SWCA Environmental Consultants, Mission Viejo, CA.)	Temporary habitation site consisting of dense lithic scatter and food processing stations	Outside
003056	003056	Prehistoric	Found ineligible through survey process	1987 (Victor C. de Munk, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside, CA.); 1992 (Ron Bissell and Ken Becker, RMW Paleo Associates, Inc., Mission Viejo, CA.); 1999 (Robbins-Wade, Affinis, El Cajon, CA.)	Food processing station with milling surfaces, ground stone, and lithic scatter	Outside
003684	003684	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	1989 (C.E. Drover and Andy Jackson)	Lithic scatter	Outside

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

Primary Number (P-33-)	Trinomial (CA-RIV-)	Period	NRHP Eligibility	Record By and Year	Descriptions	Proximity To Project Site
004104	004104	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	1990 (C.E. Drover and D.M. Smith, Christopher Drover 13522 Malena Dr. Tustin, CA 92680)	Lithic scatter with groundstone	Outside
004905	004905	Historic	Ineligible	1999 (Robbins-Wade, Gross, Van Wormer, Affinis)	Historic refuse scatter dating to the 1920s	Outside
009703	006469	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2000 (Jean A. Keller, Cultural Resources Consultant)	Bedrock milling feature consisting of two mortars and one milling slick on a single granitic bedrock outcrop	Outside
009704	006470	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2000 (Jean A. Keller, Cultural Resources Consultant)	Bedrock milling feature consisting of one milling slick on a granitic bedrock outcrop	Outside
009705	006471	Prehistoric	Not evaluated		Bedrock milling feature consisting of two milling slick on adjacent granitic bedrock outcrops	Outside
011238		Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2001 (CW Bouscaren, MG Espinoza, and KA Hintzman, LSA Assoc., Inc.)	Bedrock milling feature consisting of three milling slicks on a cluster of bedrock outcrops	Outside
011239		Prehistoric	Not evaluated		Sparse lithic scatter	Outside
011240		Historic	Not evaluated	2001 (CW Bouscaren, MG Espinoza, KA Hintzman, LSA, Assoc., Inc)	Fallen wooden structure with a concrete foundation and an associated can scatter	Outside

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

Primary Number (P-33-)	Trinomial (CA-RIV-)	Period	NRHP Eligibility	Record By and Year	Descriptions	Proximity To Project Site
011241		Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2001 (Bouscared, CW, MG Espinoza, and KA Hintzman)	Lithic Scatter	Outside
012772		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	1980 (C.E. Drover)	Isolated quartzite chopper	Outside
013304	007405	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	Sal Boites (2005)	Two bedrock milling features with associated lithic and groundstone	Outside
013332	007424	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2004 (Robert Porter, CRM TECH); 2004 (John J. Eddy)	Bedrock milling slick	Outside
013334	007426	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2004 (Robert Porter, CRM TECH); 2004 (John J. Eddy)	Two bedrock milling features	Outside
013335	007427	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2004 (Michael Lozano, CRM TECH)	One bedrock milling feature consisting of two milling slicks; the site was not relocated during its most recent update	Outside
013363		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	2004 (Robert Porter, CRM TECH)	Two bedrock milling features, each containing one milling slick	Outside
013397		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	2013 (Claire Fritz and Patricia Tuck, LSA Associates)	Isolated quartz mano fragment	Outside
013398		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	2004 (Clarie Frtiz and Patricia Tuck, LSA Associates)	Isolated quartz mano	Outside
013976		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	(Ballester, Daniel, CRM Tech)	Isolated milky quartz biface blade	Outside

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

Primary Number (P-33-)	Trinomial (CA-RIV-)	Period	NRHP Eligibility	Record By and Year	Descriptions	Proximity To Project Site
014358		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	2004 (Eddy, John J., CRM Tech)	Isolated metate fragment	Outside
015146	008055	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2006 (Gillean, William R., Author)	Two bedrock mortars	Outside
015315	008084	Historic	Not evaluated	2006 (Jones, J.E., M. Knypstra, and J. Meliska, Statistical Research, Inc.)	Historic period refuse scatter	Outside
015330		Historic	Determined ineligible through Section 106 process	2006 (Smallwood, Josh, CRM Tech)	Wood-framed residence at 35530 Antelope Road	Outside
015331		Historic	Isolate: Ineligible	2006 (Smallwood, Josh, CRM Tech)	Wood-framed residence at 35500 Antelope Road	Outside
016709	008749	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2007 (Gonzalez, M. / Powell, C., PCR Services Corporation); 2012 (Stacie Wilson and Jill Gibson, AECOM)	Bedrock Milling features and associated lithic scatter	Outside
017366	009024	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2008 (Dice, Michael, Michael Brandman Associates)	Lithic scatter	Outside
019791	010075	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2011 (R. Porter, CRM TECH)	Three granite boulders each with a single milling slick, associated lithic scatter, and three groundstone artifacts	Outside
019849	010098	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2011 (R. Porter, CRM TECH)	Four quartz flakes and one piece of quartz shatter; site has been destroyed since recordation	Outside

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

Primary Number (P-33-)	Trinomial (CA-RIV-)	Period	NRHP Eligibility	Record By and Year	Descriptions	Proximity To Project Site
021025	010890H	Historic	Ineligible for NR	2012 (AECOM, AECOM); 2013 (B Lichtenstein and K Moslak, Applied Earthworks Inc)	Historic refuse scatter	Outside
021027	010892	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	AECOM 2012	Sparse lithic scatter	Outside
021031		Historic	Isolate: Ineligible	2012 (AECOM, AECOM); 2013 (B Lichtenstein and K Moslak, Applied Earthworks Inc)	Rectangular metal gas can	Outside
023904	011739	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2014 (K. Moslak, C, Yearyear, Applied EarthWorks)	Lithic Scatter with one groundstone metate fragment	Outside
023971	011777	Historic	Not evaluated	2014 (Andrew R Pignolo, Laguna Mountain Environmental)	Historic refuse scatter	Outside
023972	011778	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2014 (Andrew R Pignolo, Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc.)	Sparse lithic scatter	Outside
023973		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	2014 (Andrew R Pignolo, Laguna Mountain Environmental, Inc.)	Isolated scraper	Outside
024132	011871	Historic	Not evaluated	2015 (Riordan Goodwin, LSA Associates, Inc.)	Historic refuse scatter	Outside
024619		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	Max Jewett, Atkins (2014)	Isolated quartz chopper	Outside
024620		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	Max Jewett, Atkins (2014)	Isolated milling slick	Outside
024622		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	Max Jewett, Atkins (2014)	Isolated quartz chopper	Outside
024624		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	Max Jewett, Atkins (2014)	Isolated quartz projectile point tip	Outside

Table 2. Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within 1.0-Mile of the Project Site

Primary Number (P-33-)	Trinomial (CA-RIV-)	Period	NRHP Eligibility	Record By and Year	Descriptions	Proximity To Project Site
024632		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	Max Jewett, Atkins (2014)	Isolated quartz flake	Outside
024634		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	Max Jewett, Atkins (2014)	Isolated quartz utilized flake	Outside
024638		Prehistoric	Isolate: Ineligible	Max Jewett, Atkins (2014)	Isolated quartz pressure flake	Outside
024646	012195	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2014 (Max Jewett, Atkins, Plute/BP Murrieta Hills, LLC)	Bedrock milling slicks with associated lithic and groundstone fragments	Outside
024647	012196	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2014 (Max Jewett, Atkins, Plute/BP Murrieta Hills, LLC)	Lithic scatter	Outside
024648	012197	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2014 (Max Jewett, Atkins, Plute/BP Murrieta Hills, LLC)	Lithic scatter	Outside
024649	012198	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2014 (Max Jewett, Atkins, Plute/BP Murrieta Hills, LLC)	Lithic scatter	Outside
026601	012509	Prehistoric	Not evaluated	2015 (N/A, AECOM)	Bedrock milling features	Outside

NAHC and Tribal Correspondence

Dudek contacted the NAHC on June 5, 2018, and requested a review of the SLF. The NAHC replied via email on June 6, 2018 stating that the SLF search was completed with positive results and indicated that sites have been located in the 1.0-mile record search area. The NAHC suggested contacting 37 Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have direct knowledge of cultural resources in or near the project site (Table 3; Appendix C). Dudek contacted all groups and/or individuals identified by the NAHC. To date, six response have been received (see Confidential Appendix D). This outreach was conducted for informational purposes only and does not constitute formal government-to-government consultation, as specified by AB 52.

Table 3. Native American Heritage Commission-Listed Native American Contacts

Native American Tribal Representatives	Method of Notification/Date	Response Received
Temet Aguilar, Chairperson Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians – Pauma and Yuima Reservation	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Matias Belardes, Chairperson Juaneno Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation – Belardes	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Shane Chapparosa, Chairman Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Scott Cozart, Chairperson Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Response received via email on January 8, 2019, from Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department, and Jessica Valez, Cultural Resource Specialist.
Steven Estrada, Chairperson Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
John Flores, Environmental Coordinator San Pasqual Band of Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Director Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Responses received via email on November 21, 2018, from Tribal representative, Lacy Padilla, Archaeological Technician.
Michael Garcia, Vice Chairperson Ewiiapaayp Tribal Office	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Shasta Gaughen, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Pala Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Ralph Goff, Chairperson Campo Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
John Gomez, Environmental Coordinator Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Jeff Grubbe, Chairperson Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Responses received via email on November 21, 2018, from Tribal representative, Lacy Padilla, Archaeological Technician.
Julie Hagen Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Response received via standard mail on November 19, 2018, from Tribal representative, Ray Teran, Resource Management.
Joseph Hamilton, Chairperson Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Lisa Haws, Cultural Resources Manager Sycuan Band of Kumeyaay Nation	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Allen E. Lawson, Chairperson San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date

Table 3. Native American Heritage Commission-Listed Native American Contacts

Native American Tribal Representatives	Method of Notification/Date	Response Received
Mark Macarro, Chairperson Pechanga Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Paul Macarro, Cultural Resources Coordinator Pechanga Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Robert Martin, Chairperson Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Response received via email on November 19, 2018, from Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Travis Armstrong.
Cody Martinez, Chairperson Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson Rincon Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Response received via email on December 19, 2018, from Tribal Representative, Destiny Colocho, Cultural Resource Manager and Tribal Historic Preservation Officer.
Jim McPherson, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Rincon Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Response received via email on December 19, 2018, from Tribal Representative, Destiny Colocho, Cultural Resource Manager and Tribal Historic Preservation Officer.
Javaughn Miller, Tribal Administrator La Posta Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Michael Mirelez, Cultural Resource Coordinator Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Response received via email on January 8, 2019, from Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department, and Jessica Valez, Cultural Resource Specialist.
Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson La Posta Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
John Perada, Environmental Director Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla and Cupeno Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Joyce Perry, Tribal Manager Juaneno Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation – Belardes	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Erica Pinto, Chairperson Jamul Indian Village	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Robert Pinto, Chairperson Ewiaapaayp Tribal Office	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Thomas Rodriguez, Chairperson La Jolla Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date

Table 3. Native American Heritage Commission-Listed Native American Contacts

Native American Tribal Representatives	Method of Notification/Date	Response Received
Daniel Salgado, Chairperson Cahuilla Band of Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Angela Elliot Santos, Chairperson Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date
Denisa Torres, Cultural Resources Manager Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Response received via email on November 19, 2018, from Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Travis Armstrong.
Amanda Vance, Chairperson Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	Response received via standard mail on November 15, 2018, from Tribal representative, Victoria Martin.
Robert Welch, Chairperson Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	*Response received via standard mail on November 19, 2018, from Tribal representative, Ray Teran, Resource Management.
Doug Welmas, Chairperson Cabazon Band of Mission Indians	Standard Mail; November 5, 2018	None to date

Note: *Represents a response received from a Tribal representative on behalf of a Tribal organization and is listed for each Native American individual from that same Tribe.

Historic Topographic Map and Aerial Photography Review

Dudek consulted historic topographic maps and aerial photographs to understand development of the project site and surrounding properties. Topographic maps are available for the years 1943, 1955, 1962, 1971, 1975, 1979, 1986, 2012, and 2015 (NETR 2018a). Historic aerials are available for the years 1938, 1967, 1978, 1996, 2002, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 (NETR 2018b).

The topographic map from 1943 shows that there was a road where the I-215 now runs, just west of the project site. By 1955, the I-215 had been built; however, no significant development within the area is apparent based on this map. Topographic maps from 1962 to present show an increase in roads throughout the area though general development history is difficult to gauge from these maps.

Aerial images depicting the project site show that in 1938 the only development within the area was a north-south running road, which became the I-215 freeway sometime in the 1950s. Aerial images from 1967 show no development within the project site. There are a few roads to the east of the I-215 at this time and some possible residential development to the north; however, the overall project site and general vicinity is completely undeveloped. The aerials from 1978 show the apparent construction of the Clinton Keith Road on ramp and off ramp. By 1996, there are several small developments to the north and east of the project site, though there are no developments within the project site. Clinton Keith Road, which runs south of the project site, appears to be a dirt road in 1996; though it appears to be paved west of the freeway. Between 2002 and 2005, a large amount of development took place directly to the east of the project site, where a large residential subdivision and a high school were built. There were also several residential subdivisions built to the southwest and northwest of the

project site, and a minor increase in residential development to the east and south of the project site since 2005. Presently, the project site remains undeveloped and the only changes appear to be a significant amount of grading within the site.

Cultural Resource Survey

Field Methodology

A qualified Dudek archaeologist conducted a survey of the project site on June 13, 2018. The survey was conducted to identify and record any unknown cultural resources within the project site. The survey was conducted using standard archaeological procedures and techniques that meet the Secretary of Interior's standards and guidelines for cultural resources inventory. Survey transects were spaced no more than 15 meters wide and oriented south-north across accessible areas of the project site. Where transects were not feasible, a mixed approach (opportunistic survey) was utilized, selectively examining open ground surface where possible. The archaeologist examined the ground surface for the presence of prehistoric artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools), historical artifacts (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics), sediment discolorations that might indicate the presence of a cultural midden, and depressions and other features that might indicate the former presence of structures or buildings.

All fieldwork was documented using field notes and iPad technology with close-scale field maps, and aerial photographs. Location-specific photographs were taken using an Apple 3rd Generation iPad equipped with 8 megapixel resolution and georeferenced PDF maps of the project site. All field notes, photographs, and records related to the current study are on file at Dudek's Pasadena, California office.

Survey Results

The project site is within an area that has been extensively impacted by grading activities. Also observed during the survey are several large granitic boulders present within the site. Soils are a light-yellowish brown sandy soil with many pebble and cobble inclusions. Ground visibility outside of the grading area ranges between good and moderate (50%–80%). Aside from the grading operation, evidence of disturbances throughout the project site include equipment tracks, built berms, and makeshift roads. No cultural resources were identified during the cultural resource survey. Figures 3–6 in Appendix A show overviews of the project site.

Summary and Management Considerations

No archaeological resources were identified within the project site or the immediate vicinity during the intensive-level pedestrian survey or during the EIC records search. Though the NAHC indicated that Native American sites have been identified within the project site, the area has been extensively disturbed over time. Furthermore, until recently, the project site has been subject to massive disturbances due to grading activities in the area. Any archaeological resources that may have been located within the project site have likely been disturbed, displaced, and/or destroyed by the grading activities that have occurred within the project site. Although several prehistoric archaeological sites have been recorded near the project site, neither the EIC records nor the intensive-level pedestrian survey identified any cultural resources within the project site. Considering these factors, the likelihood that there are prehistoric or historical archaeological deposits within the project site is considered to

be low. No additional archaeological efforts are recommended to be required beyond standard considerations for the management of unanticipated resources. Management recommendations to reduce potential impacts to unanticipated archaeological resources and human remains during construction activities are provided below. All activities would be conducted in accordance with regulatory requirements. With the implementation of these measures, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on cultural resources.

Unanticipated Archaeological Resources

All construction crew should be alerted to the potential to encounter archaeological material. In the event that archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for the proposed project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified specialist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether additional study is warranted. Prehistoric archaeological deposits may be indicated by the presence of discolored or dark soil, fire-affected material, concentrations of fragments of shell, burned or complete bone, non-local lithic materials, or the characteristic observed to be atypical of the surrounding area. Common prehistoric artifacts may include modified or battered lithic materials; lithic or bone tools that appeared to have been used for chopping, drilling, or grinding; projectile points; fired clay ceramics or non-functional items; and other items. Historic-age deposits are often indicated by the presence of glass bottles and shards, ceramic material, building or domestic refuse, ferrous metal, or old features such as concrete foundations or privies. Depending upon the significance of the find under CEQA (14 CCR 15064.5(f); PRC Section 21082), the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work, such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.

Unanticipated Human Remains

In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the county coroner shall be immediately notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the county coroner has determined, within 2 working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she shall notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant shall complete his/her inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.


Subject: *Cultural Resources Inventory Report for the Costco/Vineyard II Project, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California – Negative Findings*

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about this report. You can contact me by email at lkry@dudek.com or phone at 626.590.1739, or Micah J. Hale by email at mhale@dudek.com or phone at 760.479.4276.

Respectfully Submitted,



DUDEK
Linda Kry, BA
Archaeologist



DUDEK
Micah J. Hale, Ph.D., RPA
Archaeologist

Att: *Appendix A: Figures*
Appendix B: Confidential EIC Records Search Results
Appendix C: NAHC SLF Results
Appendix D: Confidential Tribal Correspondence
cc: *Adriane Dorrier, Shelah Riggs, and Rachel Struglia*

References

California Office of Historic Preservation. 2018. Electronic document: http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=23317. Accessed February, 2018.

City of Murrieta. 2011. Murrieta General Plan 2035. Available at <https://www.murrietaca.gov/departments/planning/general.asp>.

County of Riverside. 2013. County of Riverside General Plan, Chapter 5: Multipurpose Open

Space Element. Riverside County Planning Department. Pp.OS40-OS43.


NETR (Nationwide Environmental Title Research LLC). 2018a. Historic Topographical Maps of Los Angeles. Accessed June 26, 2018. <https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer>.

NETR. 2018b. Historic Aerial Photographs of Los Angeles. Accessed June 26, 2018. <https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer>.



Appendix A

Figures



SOURCE: NAIP 2016




FIGURE 1

Project Location

Costco/Vineyard Phase III Retail Development Project Initial Study

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



SOURCE: MG2, Inc

PROJECT DATA

APPLICANT: COSTCO WHOLESALE
999 LAKE DRIVE
ISSAQUAH, WA 98027

PROJECT ADDRESS: NEC OF I215
& CLINTON KEITH RD.
MURRIETA, CA

ZONING: REGIONAL COMMERCIAL

SETBACKS: FRONT: 25' BLDG / 15' LANDSC.
REAR: 5' BLDG / 5' LANDSC.
SIDE: 5' BLDG / 5' LANDSC.

SITE DATA: PARCEL 1 & 2 OF TFM 37511

COSTCO SITE AREA: 15.23 ACRES (663,419 SF.)
COSTCO FUEL FACILITY AREA: 1.22 ACRES (52,912 SF.)
TOTAL COSTCO SITE: 16.45 ACRES (716,331 SF.)

VINEYARD PHASE II:

LOT 1A	1.74 ACRES (76,012 SF)
PARCEL 3	0.83 ACRES (37,373 SF)
PARCEL 4	0.71 ACRES (31,058 SF)
PARCEL 5	1.30 ACRES (56,541 SF)
PARCEL 6	3.62 ACRES (157,601 SF)
PARCEL 7	0.85 ACRES (36,852 SF)
PARCEL 8	0.73 ACRES (31,842 SF)
TOTAL GROSS SITE AREA	9.58 ACRES (417,479 SF.)
TOTAL NET SITE AREA	7.94 ACRES (341,467 SF.)

BUILDING DATA:

TOTAL COSTCO SITE: 148,800 SF

BUILDING AREA	1,850 SF
FOOD SERVICE	1,460 SF
MACHINE ROOM	480 SF
FIRE DEPT. ROOM	

TOTAL COSTCO WAREHOUSE: 152,850 SF
FUEL STATION CANOPY: 12,678 SF
FUEL CONTROLLER ENCLOSURE: 125 SF

TOTAL VINEYARD PHASE II SITE:

FITNESS USE (BLDG K)	37,000 SF
RETAIL USE (BLDG J, I, & L)	31,400 SF
FOOD USE (BLDG L & M)	3,000 SF

PARKING DATA:

TOTAL COSTCO PARKING: 807 STALLS

INCLUDES:

- 10' WIDE STALLS: 716 STALLS
- 9' WIDE STALLS: 10 STALLS
- ACCESSIBLE STALLS (1 IN 6 VAN): 17 STALLS
- ◇ 10' WIDE CLEAN AIR/ VAN POOL/ EV STALLS (8% OF PARKING): 64 STALLS

JURISDICTION REQUIRED PARKING INSTALL: 200 S.F. (5/1000): 764 STALLS

TOTAL VINEYARD PHASE II PARKING: 416 STALLS

INCLUDES:

FITNESS USE (BLDG K)	222 STALLS
RETAIL USE (BLDG J, I, & L)	158 STALLS
FOOD USE (BLDG L & M)	36 STALLS

JURISDICTION REQUIRED PARKING: 286 STALLS

CURRENT OWNERS:

1. CANDEE FAMILY LLC
2. CK 17, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
3. SCOTT 215, L.P., A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
4. LAMBDA INVESTMENTS, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

UTILITY COMPANIES:

ELECTRIC: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON (SCE)
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMead, CA 91770
(951) 249-8356

GAS: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
1881 WEST LUGONIA AVENUE
REDLANDS, CA 92374
800-427-2200

SEWERWATER: EASTER MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT (EMWD)
2270 TRUMBLE ROAD
PERRIS, CA 92570
(951) 928-3777

PHONE: VERIZON
24520 VILLAGE WALK PL. STE A
MURRIETA, CA 92562
(951) 872-8466

CABLE: FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS
9 S. 4TH STREET
REDLANDS, CA 92373
(951) 7779667

SCHOOL DISTRICT: MENIFEE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
28775 HAIN ROAD
MENIFEE, CA 92586
(951) 672-1851

FIGURE 2
Site Plan

Costco/Vineyard Phase II Retail Development Project, City of Murrieta, California



INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Figure 3. Overview of project site; View facing north.



Figure 4. Overview of project site; View facing south.



Figure 5. Overview of project site; View facing north.



Figure 6. Overview of project site; View facing west.



Appendix B

CONFIDENTIAL

EIC Records Search Results



Appendix C

NAHC SLF Results

Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95501
(916) 373-3710
(916) 373-5471 – Fax
nahc@nahc.ca.gov

Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File Search

Project: Costco Murrieta Project (Project 11092)

County: Riverside

USGS Quadrangle

Name: Murrieta, CA (see attached map)

Township: 6S Range: 3W Section(s): 34, 35

Company/Firm/Agency:

Dudek

Contact Person: Erica Nicolay

Street Address: 38 North Marengo Avenue

City: Pasadena Zip: 91101

Phone: (760) 936-7952 Extension: N/A


Fax: (760) 632-0164

Email: enicolay@dudek.com

Project Description:


The proposed project includes the construction of a new retail development consisting of a 152,650-square-foot Costco Wholesale warehouse and a fuel station, an LA Fitness Center, a Major Retail Pad, four smaller retail shops, one restaurant, one drive through fast food restaurant, two detention basins, and associated parking on 26 acres.

Project Location Map is attached



-  Study Area
-  1 Mile Buffer

SOURCE: USGS 7.5-Minute Series Murrieta Quadrangle
 Township 6S; Range 3W; Sections 34, 35



Records Search

Costco/Vineyard Phase III Retail Development Project, City of Murrieta, California

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

Cultural and Environmental Department
1550 Harbor Blvd., ROOM 100
West SACRAMENTO, CA 95691
(916) 373-3710



June 6, 2018

Erica Nicolay
Dudek

Sent by E-mail: enicolay@dudek.com

RE: Proposed Costco Murrieta (Project 11092) Project, City of Murrieta; Murrieta USGS Quadrangle, Riverside County, California

Dear Ms. Nicolay:

Attached is a list of tribes that have cultural and traditional affiliation to the areas of potential project effect (APE) referenced above. I suggest you contact all of those listed, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. The list should provide a starting place to locate areas of potential adverse impact within the APE. By contacting all those on the list, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult, as may be required under particular state statutes. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

THIS INFORMATION IS CONFIDENTIAL! PLEASE DO NOT INCLUDE IN PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) *Sacred Lands File* (SLF) was completed for the area of potential project effect (APE) for the above referenced project. Sites have been located within the APE you provided that may be impacted by the project. Please immediately contact the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians at (951) 770-6300 or (951) 770-8100 for more information about these sites.

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, please contact me at my email address: gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Gayle Totton

Gayle Totton, M.A., PhD.
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
(916) 373-3714

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

**Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
Riverside County
6/6/2018**

**Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla
Indians**

Jeff Grubbe, Chairperson
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Cahuilla
Palm Springs, CA, 92264 Luiseno
Phone: (760) 699 - 6800
Fax: (760) 699-6919

Ewiiaapaayp Tribal Office

Robert Pinto, Chairperson
4054 Willows Road Kumeyaay
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 445 - 6315
Fax: (619) 445-9126
wmicklin@leaningrock.net

**Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla
Indians**

Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Director
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Cahuilla
Palm Springs, CA, 92264 Luiseno
Phone: (760) 699 - 6907
Fax: (760) 699-6924
ACBCI-THPO@aguacaliente.net

Ewiiaapaayp Tribal Office

Michael Garcia, Vice Chairperson
4054 Willows Road Kumeyaay
Alpine, CA, 91901
Phone: (619) 445 - 6315
Fax: (619) 445-9126
michaelg@leaningrock.net

**Augustine Band of Cahuilla
Mission Indians**

Amanda Vance, Chairperson
P.O. Box 846 Cahuilla
Coachella, CA, 92236
Phone: (760) 398 - 4722
Fax: (760) 369-7161
hhaines@augustinetribe.com

Jamul Indian Village

Erica Pinto, Chairperson
P.O. Box 612 Kumeyaay
Jamul, CA, 91935
Phone: (619) 669 - 4785
Fax: (619) 669-4817
mohusky@jiv-nsn.gov

**Cabazon Band of Mission
Indians**

Doug Welmas, Chairperson
84-245 Indio Springs Parkway Cahuilla
Indio, CA, 92203
Phone: (760) 342 - 2593
Fax: (760) 347-7880
jstapp@cabazonindians-nsn.gov

**Juaneno Band of Mission
Indians Acjachemen Nation -
Belardes**

Matias Belardes, Chairperson
32161 Avenida Los Amigos Juaneno
San Juan Capistrano, CA, 92675
Phone: (949) 293 - 8522
kaamalam@gmail.com

Cahuilla Band of Indians

Daniel Salgado, Chairperson
52701 U.S. Highway 371 Cahuilla
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951) 763 - 5549
Fax: (951) 763-2808
Chairman@cahuilla.net

**Juaneno Band of Mission
Indians Acjachemen Nation -
Belardes**

Joyce Perry, Tribal Manager
4955 Paseo Segovia Juaneno
Irvine, CA, 92603
Phone: (949) 293 - 8522
kaamalam@gmail.com

Campo Band of Mission Indians

Ralph Goff, Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1 Kumeyaay
Campo, CA, 91906
Phone: (619) 478 - 9046
Fax: (619) 478-5818
rgoff@campo-nsn.gov

**La Jolla Band of Luiseno
Indians**

Thomas Rodriguez, Chairperson
22000 Highway 76 Luiseno
Pauma Valley, CA, 92061
Phone: (760) 742 - 3771

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Costco Murrieta Project, Riverside County.

**Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
Riverside County
6/6/2018**

**La Posta Band of Mission
Indians**

Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson
8 Crestwood Road Kumeyaay
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 478 - 2113
Fax: (619) 478-2125
LP13boots@aol.com

**Morongo Band of Mission
Indians**

Robert Martin, Chairperson
12700 Pumarra Rroad Cahuilla
Banning, CA, 92220 Serrano
Phone: (951) 849 - 8807
Fax: (951) 922-8146
dtorres@morongo-nsn.gov

**La Posta Band of Mission
Indians**

Javaughn Miller, Tribal
Administrator
8 Crestwood Road Kumeyaay
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 478 - 2113
Fax: (619) 478-2125
jmiller@LPtribe.net

**Morongo Band of Mission
Indians**

Denisa Torres, Cultural Resources
Manager
12700 Pumarra Rroad Cahuilla
Banning, CA, 92220 Serrano
Phone: (951) 849 - 8807
Fax: (951) 922-8146
dtorres@morongo-nsn.gov

**Los Coyotes Band of Mission
Indians**

John Perada, Environmental
Director
P. O. Box 189 Cahuilla
Warner Springs, CA, 92086
Phone: (760) 782 - 0712
Fax: (760) 782-2730

Pala Band of Mission Indians

Shasta Gaughen, Tribal Historic
Preservation Officer
PMB 50, 35008 Pala Temecula Cupeno
Rd. Luiseno
Pala, CA, 92059
Phone: (760) 891 - 3515
Fax: (760) 742-3189
sgaughen@palatribe.com

**Los Coyotes Band of Mission
Indians**

Shane Chapparosa, Chairperson
P.O. Box 189 Cahuilla
Warner Springs, CA, 92086-0189
Phone: (760) 782 - 0711
Fax: (760) 782-0712
Chapparosa@msn.com

**Pauma Band of Luiseno Indians
- Pauma & Yuima Reservation**

Temet Aguilar, Chairperson
P.O. Box 369 Luiseno
Pauma Valley, CA, 92061
Phone: (760) 742 - 1289
Fax: (760) 742-3422
bennaecalac@aol.com

**Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay
Nation**

Angela Elliott Santos, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1302 Kumeyaay
Boulevard, CA, 91905
Phone: (619) 766 - 4930
Fax: (619) 766-4957

**Pechanga Band of Mission
Indians**

Paul Macarro, Cultural Resources
Coordinator
P.O. Box 1477 Luiseno
Temecula, CA, 92593
Phone: (951) 770 - 6306
Fax: (951) 506-9491
pmacarro@pechanga-nsn.gov

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Costco Murrieta Project, Riverside County.

**Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
Riverside County
6/6/2018**

Pechanga Band of Mission Indians

Mark Macarro, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1477 Luiseno
Temecula, CA, 92593
Phone: (951) 770 - 6000
Fax: (951) 695-1778
epreston@pechanga-nsn.gov

San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians

Allen E. Lawson, Chairperson
P.O. Box 365 Kumeyaay
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 3200
Fax: (760) 749-3876
allenl@sanpasqualtribe.org

Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians

Joseph Hamilton, Chairperson
P.O. Box 391670 Cahuilla
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951) 763 - 4105
Fax: (951) 763-4325
admin@ramonatribe.com

San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians

John Flores, Environmental
Coordinator
P. O. Box 365 Kumeyaay
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 3200
Fax: (760) 749-3876
johnf@sanpasqualtribe.org

Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians

John Gomez, Environmental
Coordinator
P. O. Box 391670 Cahuilla
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951) 763 - 4105
Fax: (951) 763-4325
jgomez@ramonatribe.com

Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians

Steven Estrada, Chairperson
P.O. Box 391820 Cahuilla
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951) 659 - 2700
Fax: (951) 659-2228
mflaxbeard@santarosacahuilla-nsn.gov

Rincon Band of Mission Indians

Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson
1 West Tribal Road Luiseno
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 1051
Fax: (760) 749-5144
bomazzetti@aol.com

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians

Scott Cozart, Chairperson
P. O. Box 487 Cahuilla
San Jacinto, CA, 92583 Luiseno
Phone: (951) 654 - 2765
Fax: (951) 654-4198
jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov

Rincon Band of Mission Indians

Jim McPherson, Tribal Historic
Preservation Officer
1 West Tribal Road Luiseno
Valley Center, CA, 92082
Phone: (760) 749 - 1051
Fax: (760) 749-5144
vwhipple@rincontribe.org

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians

Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural
Resource Department
P.O. BOX 487 Cahuilla
San Jacinto, CA, 92581 Luiseno
Phone: (951) 663 - 5279
Fax: (951) 654-4198
jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Costco Murrieta Project, Riverside County.



Appendix D

CONFIDENTIAL

Tribal Correspondence

