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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Hillwood Investment Properties proposes the development of the California Alliance Gateway South Building 4, a distribution warehouse building with associated site and off-site improvements, on a 65.8-acre property located in the city of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California. Applied EarthWorks, Inc. (Æ) was retained to conduct a cultural resource assessment of the California Alliance Gateway South Building 4 Project (Project) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City of San Bernardino (City) is the lead agency for the purposes of CEQA.

This report summarizes the methods and results of the cultural resource investigation of the proposed Project area. This assessment included archaeological and historical background research, communication with Native American tribal representatives, a Phase I pedestrian survey, and an evaluation of the significance of four identified cultural resources within the Project area. The purpose of the investigation was to determine the potential for the proposed Project to impact historical resources under CEQA.

A cultural resource literature review and records search conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System at California State University, Fullerton, indicated that 16 cultural resources are present within a 1-mile radius of the Project area but none are located in the Project area. Æ also requested a search of the Sacred Lands File from the Native American Heritage Commission, which found that no Native American cultural resources are known to exist within the immediate Project area. Native American individuals and organizations were contacted to elicit information regarding Native American resource information related to the proposed Project. Of the 16 groups and/or individuals contacted, six responses have been received to date. The Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and Serrano Nation of Mission Indians did not have any specific information regarding sensitive Native American resources that may be present in the area but requested to be kept informed and included in consultation efforts with the City. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians also could not provide specific information about the Project area but recommended that the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians be contacted. The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians and San Manuel Band of Mission Indians indicated that the Project area is located outside of the Tribe’s ancestral lands and, as such, do not have any information on sensitive Native American resources in the vicinity.

A Phase I archaeological survey of Project area was performed by Æ Associate Archaeologist Roberta Thomas on November 29, 2016 with a supplemental survey conducted by Senior Archaeologist Tiffany Clark on May 25, 2017. Although the cultural resource survey did not identify any potentially significant prehistoric or historical archaeological resources, four historical built-environment resources were identified in the Project area. These resources include the San Bernardino Golf Club, two residential buildings (141 and 145 East Dumas Street), and a segment of South Washington Avenue. Significance evaluations of the four built-
environment resources by Æ architectural historian Justin Castells concluded that none of the resources meet the requirements for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Due to the high energy of the flood plain deposits in the majority of the Project area and the young age of the soil deposits in the northern part of the Project area, there is a low potential for encountering intact buried archaeological deposits within the Project area. As such, no further archaeological resource management is recommended for the Project.

Field notes documenting the current investigation are on file at Æ's Pasadena office. A copy of this report will be placed on file at the SCCIC at California State University, Fullerton.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Applied EarthWorks, Inc. (Ä) performed a cultural resource assessment in support of the proposed Alliance California Gateway South Building 4 Project (Project) in the city of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California. The Project proposes the development of a distribution warehouse building with associated site improvements on a 65.8-acre property located north of the Santa Ana River and west of the San Bernardino Flood Control Channel. The proposed Project is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City of San Bernardino (City) is the lead agency for the purposes of CEQA.

1.1 SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF INVESTIGATION

The purpose of this study is to identify and evaluate cultural resources within the Project area and to determine the potential for the proposed Project to result in substantial adverse changes to historical resources per CEQA Guidelines. The cultural resource assessment primarily relies on data obtained from a literature review and site records search conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at California State University, Fullerton, Native American outreach, and a Phase I cultural resource survey of the Project area. Results of these efforts provide a baseline with which to assess the Project’s impacts on both known and unknown cultural resources and can be used for future Project planning.

Ms. Roberta Thomas, MA, RPA, served as Project Archaeologist with Dr. Tiffany Clark, RPA, serving as Senior Archaeologist and Mr. Justin Castells, MS, acting as Architectural Historian for this Project. Ms. Thomas and Dr. Clark meet the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualification standards (PQS) for archaeology, and Mr. Castells meets the PQS for both history and architectural history.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The Project is located within the city of San Bernardino in the southwestern portion of San Bernardino County, California (Figure 1-1). The 65.8-acre Project area is approximately 0.5 miles north of the Christopher Columbus Transcontinental Highway / Interstate 10 (I-10) and 0.5 miles east of the San Bernardino Freeway / Interstate 215 (I-215). The majority of the Project site is situated on the existing San Bernardino Golf Club at the physical address of 1494 S. Waterman Avenue. The Project area is situated south of Orange Show Road, west of S. Waterman Avenue, north of the Santa Ana River, and east of the San Bernardino Flood Control Channel. The Project area is mapped within an unsectioned area of the San Bernardino Landgrant, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian on the San Bernardino South CA, 7.5-minute United States Geological Survey quadrangle (Figure 1-2).
Figure 1-1  Project vicinity map.
Figure 1-2  Project location map.
The Project proposes to redevelop the approximately 62.3-acre site through the construction and operation of one high cube logistics warehouse building. The building is proposed to contain 1,063,852 square feet of building area, 188 truck trailer dock doors, and 1,171 auto and trailer parking stalls, as well as drive aisles, utility infrastructure, landscaping, detention basin, transmission line easement, and other associated improvements.

The Project also includes off-site roadway improvements between the northern Project site boundary and Orange Show Road to the north. An interim off-site road (1.6 acres) is proposed to run due north from the Project site just east of the San Bernardino Flood Control Channel to a point 160 ft south of Orange Show Road, at which point the interim roadway would turn east to intersect with South Washington Avenue. Because the City of San Bernardino may require that the interim off-site roadway be replaced in the future with a permanent roadway in a different alignment, the proposed Project also includes two possible future permanent alignments. Option 1 (1.8 acres) would consist of widening South Washington Avenue on its west side between Orange Show Road and East Dumas Street to a right-of-way width of between 57 feet and 60 feet to accommodate 40 feet of pavement plus shoulders; Washington Avenue would be extended as a 60-foot right-of-way south of East Dumas Street to the planned parking area at the northern portion of the Project site. Option 2 (0.9 acres) would consist of widening Washington Avenue on its west side between Orange Show Road and approximately 80 feet north of existing East Dumas Street to a right-of-way width of between 57 feet and 60 feet to accommodate 40 feet of pavement plus shoulders. At the southerly extent of the Washington Avenue improvements (approximately 80 feet north of East Dumas Street, a 60-foot wide private street access easement containing 40 feet of pavement plus shoulders would be provided between Washington Avenue and the Project’s proposed interim off-site access roadway. At this point, access to the Project site under Option 2 would make use of the interim access roadway alignment, which would narrow to a 30-foot wide roadway and extend to the planned parking area at the northern portion of the Project site. In total, the off-site roadway improvements total 3.5 acres in area.

Other Project elements include the construction of a second driveway with access from Waterman Avenue near the northeast corner of the Project site. The Project also includes the relocation of the existing water wells.

1.3 REGULATORY CONTEXT

This section discusses the relevant state and local statutes, ordinances, or policies that govern the conservation and protection of cultural resources that must be considered during the decision-making process for projects that have the potential to impact cultural resources.

1.3.1 California Environmental Quality Act

The proposed Project is subject to compliance with CEQA, as amended. Therefore, cultural resource management work conducted as part of the proposed Project shall comply with the CEQA Statute (Public Resources Code [PRC] 21000–21777) and Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 15064.5), which directs lead agencies to first determine whether cultural resources are historically significant resources. A project with an effect 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). Generally, a cultural resource shall be considered historically significant if the resource is 45 years old or older, possesses integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and meets the requirements for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under any 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; or,

4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (14 CCR 4852).

Resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are automatically listed in the CRHR.

The cited statutes and guidelines specify how cultural resources are to be managed in the context of proposed projects, such as the California Alliance Gateway South Building 4 Project. Briefly, archival and/or field surveys are conducted and identified cultural resources are inventoried and evaluated in prescribed ways. Prehistoric and historical archaeological resources, as well as historical built-environment resources such as standing structures and other built environment, features deemed “historically significant” must be considered in project planning and development.

1.4 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report documents the results of E’s cultural resource assessment of the proposed Project. Chapter 1 has introduced the scope of the work, summarized the Project location and description, and outlined the regulatory context governing the Project. Chapter 2 synthesizes the natural and cultural setting of the Project area and surrounding region. Chapter 3 presents the results of the background research, which included a cultural resources literature and records search conducted at the SCCIC. The methods employed during the cultural resources analysis and findings are outlined in Chapter 4. An assessment of the Project’s impacts on cultural resources and management recommendations for the cultural resources identified within the Project’s impact area are included in Chapter 5, followed by bibliographic references (Chapter 6).
2
SETTING

This chapter describes the prehistoric, ethnographic, and historical cultural setting of the Project area to provide a context for understanding the nature and significance of cultural resources identified within the region. The nature and distribution of prehistoric, ethnographic, and historic human activities in the region have been affected by such factors as topography and the availability of water and biological resources. Therefore, prior to a discussion of the cultural setting, the environmental setting of the area is summarized below.

2.1 ENVIRONMENT

The Project area is situated just south of the San Bernardino Mountains, which comprise the easternmost portion of the Transverse Ranges, on the North American Plate in the eastern portion of the San Bernardino Valley (see Figure 1-1). The San Andreas Fault separates the San Bernardino Mountains from the San Gabriel Mountains, which were uplifted during the middle Pleistocene. The San Bernardino Valley is associated with erosion in the nearby mountains that occurred prior to their uplift. During the early Pliocene, sedimentary deposits formed in large freshwater lakes in the mountains. Late Pliocene rejuvenation of the mountains caused these lakes to fill in. As a result, streams coming down out of the mountains created a floodplain. During the late Pliocene and early Pleistocene, the sedimentary rocks folded, establishing the San Bernardino Valley by the late middle Pleistocene.

The Santa Ana River, which originates on the northern and eastern slopes of Mt. San Gorgonio, is the largest hydrological feature near the Project area. Mill Creek, which begins south of Mt. San Gorgonio, joins the Santa Ana River where it debouches from the mountains. Other major tributaries emerging from the southern slopes of the San Bernardino Mountains include Plunge Creek, City Creek, Waterman Creek, Devil Canyon Creek, and Warm Creek channel.

The hydrological characteristics of the Santa Ana River are determined by many factors, including seasonality of precipitation as well as its amount, duration, and intensity. Prehistorically and historically, the Santa Ana River was probably at the surface most of the year. Ahlborn (1982:40) notes that Portola, who named the Santa Ana River in 1769, described it as a perennial (i.e., year-round) stream. In the early 1900s, the flow was sufficiently continuous to support a hydroelectric plant between the cities of Riverside and Colton. Today, the water table is much lower due to groundwater pumping and decreased infiltration; the surface of the streambed is frequently dry during the summer and fall months.

As the climate of the region is largely determined by topographic features, climate, in turn, largely dictates the character of the biotic environment exploited by native populations. The climate of the Project area is characterized as Mediterranean, with hot, dry summers and cool, moist winters. It has a semi-arid precipitation regime; significant changes in temperature and moisture occur based on elevation and exposure, particularly in the nearby mountains.
Prior to development, the general Project area (i.e., San Bernardino Valley) was characterized by grassland vegetation communities. Indigenous plant species present prior to historical use and disturbance may have included rye grass (*Leymus condensatus*), blue grass (*Poa secunda*), bent grass (*Agrostis* spp.), needlegrass (*Stipa* spp.), three-awn (*Aristida divaricata*), and members of the sunflower family (*Asteraceae*). Restricted riparian communities also occurred near springs and along water courses. Within the San Bernardino Mountains to the north, chamise chaparral occurs on the south and west aspects below about 6,000 feet in elevation, desert scrub from about 3,000 to 9,000 feet, and coniferous forests above 6,000 feet.

### 2.2 PREHISTORIC CONTEXT

Native American occupation of the inland valleys of Southern California can be divided into seven cultural periods: Paleoindian (circa [ca.] 12,000–9,500 years before present [B.P.]); Early Archaic (ca. 9,500–7,000 B.P.); Middle Archaic (ca. 7,000–4,000 B.P.); Late Archaic (ca. 4,000–1,500 B.P.); Saratoga Springs (ca. 1,500–750 B.P.); Late Prehistoric (ca. 750–410 B.P.); and Protohistoric (ca. 410–180 B.P.), which ended in the ethnographic period. Due to the nature of prehistoric archaeological sites identified within a 1-mile radius of the Project area (see Chapter 3), the prehistoric cultural setting discussed below begins at the Late Archaic period.

The data presented herein are summarized from a synthesis of more than 10 years of archaeological research conducted at Diamond Valley Lake as part of the Eastside Reservoir Project (ESRP), located approximately 32 miles southeast of the Project area (Goldberg et al. 2001; McDougall et al. 2003). For the most part, the prehistory of the inland valleys of Southern California that characterizes the Project area has been less thoroughly understood than that of the nearby desert and coastal regions. Prior to the ESRP cultural resources studies, no comprehensive synthesis had been developed specifically for the interior valley and mountain localities of cismontane Southern California that characterize the region. The following has been adapted from Horne and McDougall (2003).

#### 2.2.1 Late Archaic (ca. 4,000 to 1,500 B.P.)

The Late Archaic period was a time of cultural intensification in Southern California. The beginning of the Late Archaic coincides with the Little Pluvial, a period of increased moisture in the region. Effective moisture continued to increase in the desert interior by approximately 3,600 B.P. and lasted throughout most of the Lake Archaic. This ameliorated climate allowed for more extensive occupation of the region. By approximately 2,100 B.P., however, drying and warming increased, perhaps providing motivation for resource intensification. Archaeological site types that typify this time period include residential bases with large, diverse artifact assemblages, abundant faunal remains, and cultural features as well as temporary bases, temporary camps, and task-specific activity areas. In general, sites showing evidence of the most intensive use tend to be on range-front benches adjacent to permanent water sources, such as perennial springs or larger streams, while less intensively used locales occur either on upland benches or on the margins of active alluvial fans (Goldberg 2001).

Data from Late Archaic component archaeological sites also suggest increased sedentism during this period, with a change to a semi-sedentary land-use and collection strategy. The profusion of
features, and especially refuse deposits in Late Archaic components, suggests that seasonal encampments saw longer use and more frequent reuse than during the latter part of the preceding Middle Archaic period, with increasing moisture improving the conditions of Southern California after ca. 3,100 B.P. (Horne 2001; Spaulding 2001). Drying and warming after ca. 2,100 B.P. likely extracted a toll on expanding populations, influencing changes in resource procurement strategies, promoting economic diversification and resource intensification, and perhaps resulting in a permanent shift towards greater sedentism (Goldberg 2001).

The subsistence base broadened during the Late Archaic period. The technological advancement of the mortar and pestle may indicate the use of acorns, an important storable subsistence resource. Hunting also presumably gained in importance. An abundance of broad, leaf-shaped blades and heavy, often stemmed or notched projectile points have been found in association with large numbers of terrestrial and aquatic mammal bones. Other characteristic features of this period include the appearance of bone and antler implements and the occasional use of asphaltum and steatite. Most chronological sequences for Southern California recognize the introduction of the bow and arrow by 1,500 B.P., marked by the appearance of small arrow points and arrow shaft straighteners.

Technologically, the artifact assemblage of this period was similar to that of the preceding Middle Archaic; new tools were added either as innovations or as “borrowed” cultural items. Diagnostic projectile points of this period are still fairly large (dart point size), but also include more refined notched (Elko), concave base (Humboldt), and small stemmed (Gypsum) forms (Warren 1984). Late in the period, Rose Spring arrow points appeared in the archaeological record in the deserts, reflecting the spread of the bow and arrow technology from the Great Basin and the Colorado River region. This projectile point type was not found at the ESRP study area, and there is no evidence suggesting that the bow and arrow had come into use at this time in the inland regions of Southern California.

2.2.2 Saratoga Springs Period (ca. 1,500 to 750 B.P.)

Because paleoenvironmental conditions were little changed from the preceding period, cultural trends in the early portion of the Saratoga Springs period were, in large part, a continuation of the developments begun during the end of the Late Archaic period. However, the Medieval Warm, a period of even more persistent drought, began by 1,060 B.P. Significantly warmer and drier conditions ensued. These climatic changes were experienced throughout the western United States (Jones et al. 1999; Kennett and Kennett 2000), although the inland areas of cismontane Southern California may have been less affected than the desert interior. The Medieval Warm continued through the first 200 years of the Late Prehistoric period until approximately 550 B.P. (Spaulding 2001).

Although it has been anticipated that intensive use of the inland areas of cismontane Southern California during the Medieval Warm may have been curtailed altogether, owing to inhospitable climate and a concomitant decline in water and food sources, this does not appear to be the case. While land-use and procurement strategies experienced profound changes during this time, the response to deteriorating conditions was not an abandonment of the inland areas, but rather an intensification. Climatic conditions of warming and drying that began ca. 2,100 B.P., toward the
end of the Late Archaic period, had already triggered an intensification process that established productive strategies for dealing with resource stress. With the onset of the Medieval Warm, those strategies were further refined and intensified (Goldberg 2001). The focal shift of prehistoric activity from alluvial fan margins to mountain-front benches adjacent to permanent water sources, which was initiated during the Late Archaic period, continues to be seen in the Saratoga Springs component archaeological sites (Goldberg 2001).

The frequency of refuse deposits and artifact and toolstone caches during the Medieval Warm is slightly higher than during the preceding Late Archaic period and much higher than during the latter portion of the subsequent Late Prehistoric period. The frequency of artifact and toolstone caches more than doubled during the Saratoga Springs period from the preceding period, while the frequency of human remains reached the highest point of any time in the archaeological record. The intentional caching of toolstone and ground stone tools suggests that people anticipated returning to the same locations. The midden-altered sediments, which appear for the first time during the Saratoga Springs period, support the continued re-use of desired locations (Horne 2001).

During the Medieval Warm, archaeological assemblages demonstrate the importance of plant foods as a primary food source than in any other prehistoric period; plant processing intensified and acorns apparently became an important staple (Klink 2001a). Faunal assemblages also show that resource stress was accommodated with similar strategies by intensifying the use of lagomorphs and by further expanding diet breadth, adding animals (i.e., medium-sized carnivores) to the diet that were rarely consumed during other periods of prehistory (McKim 2001). The most abundant evidence of trade also occurs during the Medieval Warm, suggesting that exchange was another mechanism for dealing with resource stress (Goldberg 2001).

2.2.3 Late Prehistoric Period (ca. 750 to 410 B.P.)

The Medieval Warm extended into the Late Prehistoric period, ending about 550 B.P. The cultural trends and patterns of land use that characterized the Medieval Warm Interval, including the portion that extends into the earlier part of the Late Prehistoric period, were discussed above. At the end of the Medieval Warm, however, and lasting throughout the ensuing Protohistoric period, a period of cooler temperatures and greater precipitation ushered in the Little Ice Age, during which time ecosystem productivity greatly increased along with the availability and predictability of water resources (Spaulding 2001).

During this time, Lake Cahuilla in the Coachella Valley began to recede (Waters 1983). As a result, the large Patayan populations occupying its shores began moving eastward to the Colorado River basin or westward into areas such as Anza Borrego, Coyote Canyon, the Upper Coachella Valley, the Little San Bernardino Mountains, and the San Jacinto Plain (Wilke 1976:172–183). The final desiccation of Lake Cahuilla, which had occurred by approximately 370 B.P. (A.D. 1580), resulted in a population shift away from the lakebed into the Peninsular Ranges and inland valleys to the west, such as the Project area, as well as to the Colorado River regions to the east.
With the return of more mesic conditions post-550 B.P., which resulted in less resource stress, studies at five residential sites comprising 16 separate components at ESRP indicate that that people returned to a less intensive, semi-sedentary land-use strategy similar to that identified during the Late Archaic period (Goldberg 2001). The number and frequency of artifact and toolstone caches were reduced; hearth features become slightly more common. Rock art also first appeared in association with Late Prehistoric components that post-date the Medieval Warm Interval. The decrease in the number of artifact and toolstone caches and the first appearance of rock art during this time suggest that residential sites are now occupied on a year-round basis (Horne 2001).

A reduction in emphasis on plant foods – especially acorns, which require intensive preparation, is also visible in the archaeological record, and likely accounts for the reduction in refuse deposits, fire-altered rock weights, and midden development visible toward the end of the Late Prehistoric period. The reduction in mortars, pestles, and other grinding tools after the Medieval Warm Interval suggests that the intensive procurement and processing of acorns and other plant foods was no longer as critical as previously; this pattern is further supported by a decline in the effort expended in shaping grinding tools (Klink 2001a). It is possible that the portable milling toolkit was supplemented substantially by bedrock milling features; however, bedrock features cannot be dated, and, therefore, cannot be assigned to any particular time period(s).

Percentages of projectile points also increased somewhat after the Medieval Warm Interval. Cottonwood Triangular points began to appear in inland assemblages at this time, and Obsidian Butte obsidian (located in the southeastern Salton Sea Basin and exposed by the desiccation of Lake Cahuilla) becomes much more common, suggesting an increased focus on large mammals. However, the lower ratio of late-stage bifaces indicates that hunting methods returned to random-encounter strategies, rather than the logistical forays of the preceding period (Klink 2001b). Of particular note, faunal assemblages produced an anomalously high lagomorph index after the Medieval Warm, suggesting a very wet climatic regime with dense undergrowth well suited to cottontails (McKim 2001). Finally, the percentage of nonutilitarian artifacts declined considerably, suggesting that trade was no longer critical for assuring food supplies (Klink 2001c).

2.2.4 Protohistoric Period (ca. 410 to 180 B.P.)

The ameliorated, productive conditions of the Little Ice Age continued throughout the Protohistoric period. Generally speaking, sedentism intensified during the Protohistoric period, with small, but apparently fully sedentary villages forming. Increased hunting efficiency (through the use of the bow and arrow) and widespread exploitation of acorns and other hard nuts and berries (indicated by the renewed abundance of mortars and pestles) provided reliable and storable food resources. This, in turn, promoted greater sedentism. Related to this increase in resource utilization and sedentism are sites with deeper middens, suggesting central-based wandering or permanent habitation. These would have been the villages, or rancherias, noted by the early nonnative explorers (True 1966, 1970).

The most striking change in material cultural during this time is the local manufacture of ceramic vessels and ceramic smoking pipes. Although pottery was known in the Colorado Desert as long
ago as 800 B.P., ceramic technology in the Project region appears to date to approximately 350 B.P. As well, abundant amounts of Obsidian Butte obsidian were imported into the region. Cottonwood Triangular points were supplemented by Desert Side-notched points. Late in this period, some European trade goods (i.e., glass trade beads) were added to the previous cultural assemblages (Meighan 1954).

2.3 ETHNOGRAPHIC SETTING

Archival and published reports suggest the Project area is situated where the traditional use territories of the Serrano, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino meet, just southwest of the present-day city of San Bernardino. All of these cultural groups belonged to cultural nationalities speaking languages belonging to the Takic branch of the Shoshonean family, a part of the larger Uto-Aztecan language stock (Bean 1978:576; Geiger and Meighan 1976:19). In the following sections, specific aspects of Serrano, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino ethnography and ethnohistory are explored. This information has been summarized from Bean and Vane (2001) and McCawley (1996); portions have been adapted from Horne and McDougall (2003).

2.3.1 Social Structure

Prior to the Mission period (i.e., prior to 1769), the Cahuilla and Serrano had nonpolitical, nonterritorial patrimonieties that governed marriage patterns as well as patrilineal clans and lineages. The words for these moieties mean “Coyote” and “Wildcat.” These cultural groups had political-ritual-corporate units (clans) composed of three to 10 lineages, distinctly different, named, claiming a common genitor, with one lineage recognized as the founding lineage (Bean 1978:580; Bean and Vane n.d.:13). Clans owned a large territory in which each lineage owned a village site and specific resource areas. Clan lineages cooperated in large communal subsistence activities (e.g., animal drives and hunts, controlled burning) and in performing rituals. Founding lineages often owned the office of ceremonial leader, the ceremonial house, and a ceremonial bundle (Bean and Vane 2001:V.A-2-5).

The Gabrielino had a more sophisticated political social structure. They, too, had a system of patrilineal lineages. Each lineage belonged to one of two “Coyote” or “Wildcat” moieties (Harrington 1942:32). Gabrielino lineages were capable of being split and reorganized into segmentary lineages, which served as a mechanism for territorial expansion. Hunting and gathering territories were owned by the lineage; lineage membership gave individual families use rights. Unlike their Cahuilla and Serrano neighbors, the Gabrielino had a hierarchically ordered social class of elite, middle class, and commoners. Class membership played a major role in determining individual lifestyles, as it depended upon both ancestry and wealth (Bean and Smith 1978:543).

2.3.2 Subsistence and Domestic Resources

The Serrano, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino were, for the most part, hunting, collecting, and harvesting peoples. For the Serrano and Cahuilla, clans were apt to own land in the valley, foothill, and mountain areas, providing them with the resources of many different ecological niches. Individual lineages or families owned specific resource areas within the clan territory. As in most of California, acorns were a major staple, but the roots, leaves, seeds, and fruit of many other
plants were also used. Fish, birds, insects, and large and small mammals were available. Mountain sheep (*Ovis canadensis*), deer, and antelope were some of the large mammals hunted. Now extinct in this part of California, antelope were once numerous in the area (Harrington n.d.). As well, mountain lion, black bear, grizzly bear, deer, and wild boar were hunted. Similarly, the Gabrielino lineage ownership of land in valley, foothill, mountain, coastal, and estuary areas also offered a diverse array of food and other natural resources.

To gather food resources and to prepare them for eating, the Serrano, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino had an extensive inventory of equipment. The throwing stick and bow and arrow were the most important hunting tools for killing game, but snares, traps, slings, decoys, disguises, and hunting blinds were also part of the hunting technology. For fishing, nets, traps, spears, hooks and lines, and fish poisons were used. Many inland villages had access to creeks and rivers and to ancient Lake Cahuilla until its last desiccation about 400 to 450 years ago and during subsequent brief stands during the mid-1800s. Gathering required few tools: poles for shaking down pine nuts and acorns, cactus pickers, chia hooks, seed beaters, digging sticks and weights for digging sticks, and pry bars. Material culture items associated with transportation were mainly used to move food and included burden baskets, carrying nets, game bags, and saddle pads.

The food was usually stored in large storage baskets. Pottery ollas and baskets treated with asphaltum were also used to store and carry water and seeds. Wood, clay, and steatite were used to make jars, bowls, and trays. Skin and woven grass were used to make bags. Food processing required hammers and anvils for cracking nuts; mortars and pestles for grinding acorns and other hard nuts and berries; manos and metates for grinding seeds and berries; winnowing shells and baskets; strainers; leaching baskets and bowls; knives made of stone, bone, wood, and carrizo cane; bone saws; and drying racks made of wooden poles to dry fish. Basket mortars, with asphaltum used to attach an open-bottomed basket to a mortar, were important for food processing. The food was served in wooden and gourd dishes and cups and in basket bowls that were sometimes taret. Wood, shell, and horn were used for spoons.

In addition to gathering and hunting, the mainland Gabrielino were involved in an extensive trade network that extended as far east as the Colorado River and as far west as San Nicolas Island (Davis 1961). With the Serrano, the Gabrielino traded shell beads, fish, sea otter skins, and soapstone vessels for deerskin and seeds (Heizer 1968; Strong 1929:95-96); the Cahuilla received beads, soapstone, and asphaltum from the Gabrielino in exchange for food, furs, hides, obsidian, and salt (Bean and Saubel 1972:133). In addition to forging alliances with neighboring groups, trade and exchange were also a means of offsetting food shortages during winter months and in times of resource stress (e.g., drought).

2.3.3 Shelter and Community Structures

In prehistoric times, Serrano, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino shelters are believed to have been dome-shaped; during post-contact times they tended to be rectangular (Harrington 1942:10). The entryway into the shelter was usually covered with hides or woven mats, and a smoke hole with a removable cover was present at the apex of the dome for the smoke to escape. Serrano and Cahuilla shelters were made of brush, although some were wattled and plastered with adobe mud; Gabrielino were made of reed. Most of the Serrano and Cahuilla domestic activities were
performed outside the shelters within the shade of large, expansive ramadas; windbreaks, made of vertical poles covered with rush mats, provided open-air food preparation and cooking areas at Gabrielino settlements.

Within Serrano and Cahuilla villages, the chief's house was the largest and was usually next to the ceremonial house. Each village also had a men's sweathouse and several granaries (Bean 1978:578; Bean and Vane 2001, n.d.:7–13). At a typical Gabrielino settlement, a yovaar, an unroofed religious structure, was built in the center and surrounded first by the houses of the chief and elite members of society and then by the smaller houses of other community members; poor members occupied simple lean-to style structures along the outskirts of the settlement (Boscana 1933). Sweat huts and granaries were also present in Gabrielino settlements.

2.3.4 Religion, World View, and the Sacred

The Serrano, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino, like other California Indians, understand the universe in terms of power, and power, believed to be sentient and to have will, was assumed to be the principal causative agent for all phenomena. Unusual natural phenomena are viewed as especially sacred, being the repositories of concentrations of power. Mountaintops, and especially particular mountaintops, are held sacred, as are unusual rock formations, springs, and streams. Rock art sites are sacred, having been the sites of ceremonies. Burial and cremation sites are also sacred, as are many other places of residual power. In addition, various birds, but especially eagles, condors, hawks, and other birds of prey and their symbolic representations, are revered as sacred beings of great power and were sometimes ritually killed and mourned in mortuary ceremonies similar to those for human elites. For this reason, bird cremation sites are sacred.

Because of these strong beliefs, rituals were a constant factor in the life of every Native American individual. Some rituals were scheduled and routine (e.g., birth, puberty, death, mourning, and the eagle ritual and first fruits rites), whereas others were sporadic and situationally performed (e.g., deer ceremony, bird dance, enemy songs, and the rain ritual) (Bean and Vane 2001:VII.A-3-10).

2.4 HISTORICAL SETTING

For purposes of this analysis, Æ developed a historic context, which identifies the development of California, San Bernardino County, the City of San Bernardino, and the San Bernardino Golf Club

2.4.1 California History

Exploration of the California coast in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the basis for the Spanish claim to the region. In the eighteenth century, Spain recognized that to strengthen its claim, it would have to settle Alta California to preclude encroachment by the Russians and British. Therefore, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, Spain and the Franciscan Order founded a series of presidios, or military camps, and missions along the California coast, beginning at San Diego in 1769.
In 1821, Mexico opened the ports of San Diego and Monterey to foreign trade (Crouch et al. 1982:200). American ships docked at California ports to purchase tallow and hides, which were known as California banknotes. Americans also settled in California, some of them becoming citizens and owners of large ranchos.

Conflicts between the Californios and the central government in Mexico City led to a series of uprisings culminating in the Bear Flag Revolt of June 1846. However, Mexican control of California had effectively ended the year before when the Californios expelled Manuel Micheltorena, the last Mexican governor.

With the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo on February 2, 1848, California formally became an American territory, and two years later, on 9 September 1850, California became the thirty-first state in the Union. Between those two years came a large influx of Americans seeking their fortunes; the catalyst for this influx was James Marshall’s 1848 discovery of gold at Sutter’s Mill. The population and wealth in the early statehood years were concentrated in the northern part of the state. Ranching was the main occupation in the southern counties; the flood and drought of the 1860s brought that era to a close, and the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 opened California to agricultural settlement.

Southern California was promoted as an ideal agricultural area, with fertile soil and a mild climate. Books on California painted beautiful pictures that appealed to both Americans and Europeans. There were three land booms tied to railroad construction: (1) after the transcontinental railroad was completed, enabling easy travel to California; (2) late 1870s after the Southern Pacific was completed; and, (3) 1886–1888, when the Santa Fe transcontinental line was completed. Competition between the lines incited a rate war, and both tourists and potential settlers took advantage of the low fares to come to California (Lech 2004:222).

2.4.2 San Bernardino County

What is now known as San Bernardino County was initially settled by three Native American groups (see Section 2.3). Euro-American settlement began in the area in the early 1800s as persons seeking land and fortunes made their way west from the mid-west and east coast of the United States or north from what is now known as Mexico. The Catholic missionaries were a catalyst in the expansion of Euro-American influences in this region. A group of missionaries, Native Americans, and soldiers from the San Gabriel Mission named San Bernardino in honor of the feast day of San Bernardino of Sienna when they entered the valley on May 10, 1810. The Mission San Gabriel initially attempted to expand its influence in the San Bernardino Valley when Father Dumetz was sent to the valley in 1810 to establish the mission station known as Politana. An earthquake in 1812 followed by raids from neighboring Native American tribes caused a lull of interest in the Politana by the Mission San Gabriel. Beginning in the 1830s, the Mission San Gabriel established a branch at the Asistencia (California Historical Landmark No. 42). The Asistencia is currently located in the Mission District in eastern Loma Linda. During the years 1822 through 1827, the Mission Fathers traveled the San Bernardino-Sonora Road, also known as the Emigrant or Mormon Trail, (California Point of Historical Interest No. 96), which traversed Redlands, Old San Bernardino, Colton, and Agua Mansa, from the Mission San Gabriel to the San Bernardino Asistencia. After Mexico achieved independence from Spain in
1821, the Mexican government seized ownership of church properties through the Secularization Act of 1833, and lands were redistributed as ranchos through a tribute system. This land redistribution by the Mexican government fostered the development of ranchos in what is now known as California (Chasteen 2015).

As a result of the Mexican government seizing control of church properties, the Asistencia was largely abandoned by the late 1830s. The Lugo family, under the leadership of Jose del Carmen Lugo, moved into the former Asistencia buildings in order to establish a colony. Slover Mountain, also known as El Cerrito Solo, was the natural landmark used for establishing the boundaries of the Lugos’ land grant within the San Bernardino Rancho. What became known as San Bernardino County originally consisted of the following ranchos: Canon de Santa Ana, Jurupa and El Rincon, Cucamonga, Santa Ana del Chino, San Bernardino, and Muscupiabe. The ranchos largely subsisted on cattle ranching and raising crops that were irrigated from the Mill Creek Zanja and other irrigation ditches (Chasteen 2015).

In an effort to gain territory, the U.S. seized the territory of Texas from the Mexican government, which resulted in the Mexican-American War. The State of California was annexed by the U.S. in 1848 through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the Mexican-American War (California Point of Historical Interest No. 151). The end of the war further paved the way for Euro-American settlement from the east (Chasteen 2015).

Euro-American settlement in San Bernardino began in the early 1800s through the establishment of Politana and the Asistencia, but was largely fostered by the establishment of a Mormon colony under the leadership of Amasa Lyman and Charles Rich. Brothers Lyman and Rich bought the San Bernardino Rancho from Jose and Maria Armenta Lugo in 1851. San Bernardino County was established on April 26, 1853, and ceded a portion of its territory to the formation of Riverside County in 1892. Two Mormon colonies were established on either side of the Santa Ana River. The Mormons who settled in the San Bernardino area raised livestock, planted crops, and established civic services such as a school and a post office. The Mormon settlers were recalled to Salt Lake City, Utah in 1858 by Brigham Young in an effort to create a Mormon stronghold. The majority of the Mormon settlers in San Bernardino returned to Salt Lake City; however, some remained. Agriculture and livestock continued to be the chief industries in San Bernardino County (Chasteen 2015).

General agriculture and livestock raising pursuits were quickly overshadowed by the citrus industry in Southern California beginning in the 1870s. The first orange trees in San Bernardino were planted by Anson Van Leuven in 1857. Citrus quickly became the largest industry in Southern California; including growing, packing, and shipping. Other industries included cattle ranching, growing sugar beets, and viticulture and enology. The burgeoning citrus industry led to a population boom and spurred the development of transcontinental railroads (Chasteen 2015).

Several companies were formed beginning in the mid- to late-1800s in an effort to develop San Bernardino County and Southern California in general. Beginning in 1887 in San Bernardino County, Major George H. Bonebrake and F.C. Howes formed the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company, purchased 28,000 acres and the water rights to Lytle Creek, and laid out the townsites of Rosena (now known as Fontana), Rialto, Bloomington, and San Sevaine. The Semi-Tropic
Land and Water Company, though ultimately unsuccessful in its attempts, initiated much of the early residential and commercial development in San Bernardino County. After the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company failed, largely due to a nationwide economic depression, several other development companies, such as the Fontana Farms Company, were formed to purchase the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company holdings and also to further development of towns and industries throughout the county. The establishment of interstate and intercontinental rail lines brought an influx of people and money to Southern California, which lead to a real estate boom (Chasteen 2015).

2.4.3 City of San Bernardino

Shortly after San Bernardino County was established, the City of San Bernardino was established as the county seat. The townsite was surveyed in 1853 by Henry G. Sherwood. The township was originally one square mile with a grid of wide streets forming a grid of eight-acre blocks. What is now known as Pioneer Park was originally the central block, which was named Temple Block by the Mormon settlers. The City of San Bernardino was incorporated on April 13, 1854. By 1891, San Bernardino had established itself as a cosmopolitan settlement. The population had reached 5,000, the city had 26 miles of paved streets, an opera house, and the citizenry enjoyed other entertainments such as literary circles. The primary industries at that time were lumber, mining, and tourism.

In the following decades, citrus took hold as one of the chief sources of income in the area. In 1911, the City of San Bernardino held its first National Orange Show. Originally held in a tent at Fourth and E Streets, the show was later moved to permanent facilities on Mill and E streets. In that same year, the Pacific Electric Railway reached San Bernardino, which allowed residents to easily travel to Los Angeles and beyond. In 1920, the city had reached over 18,000 inhabitants. The 1920s brought more rapid growth, with the city limits extended north and west of the downtown area (San Bernardino Sun-Telegram 1960). Although the expansion of the City was curtailed by the Great Depression and World War II, the 1950s and 1960s saw post-war prosperity with a rapidly growing population. Vast housing tracts were built in the City’s northern and eastern areas. Today, the City of San Bernardino today is the regional hub for commercial activities, which draws a workforce from within the City and also from neighboring communities (Chasteen 2015).

2.4.4 San Bernardino Golf Club

2.4.4.1 Golf in the United States

Golf began as a game established by and for the very wealthy who owned and designed their own courses. It was broadened to include the development of private clubs for elite members and as such the craft of course design evolved. Public courses became more common in the twentieth century and they opened up golf to a wider range of people which has increased the popularity of the sport.

Modern golf has its roots in Scotland beginning in the mid-fifteenth century on hilly grazing land along the coastline. Early golf courses in the United States were referred to as “golf links”
because they were designed in the tradition of Scottish links—the sandy seaside wasteland that links the ocean with the arable soil inland is the location where the Scottish used to construct golf greens (Graves and Cornish 1998:3). Earliest courses developed as a response to the natural setting and the number of holes was dictated by the allowances in the topography. Early players could only drive the ball 160-180 yards since their balls were stuffed with feathers and simple clubs did not allow for greater distances (Rowlinson 2010:12). Course hazards were natural topographical hindrances such as water bodies, with bunkers developing over time. Wealthier golf clubs had begun maintaining courses by the 1840s (Rowlinson 2010:12-13). Creating the standard 18-hole course likely developed from the first Open Championship in 1860 when it was decided that 36 holes would be played (Rowlinson 2010:13). As golf gained in popularity into the twentieth century, the way the game was played began to change as golf course design matured.

In 1911, Charles Blair Macdonald designed the national Golf Links of America taking a more strategic approach to design, rejecting the nineteenth-century approach of allowing the landscape completely dictate the design of the course. McDonald’s departure from tradition heralded what some have called the Golden Age of Golf in the United States. The Golden Age is largely characterized as such due to the quality and strategic design by golf architects as well as the number of courses. Most golf courses in the early twentieth century were designed by prominent golfers, however as the popularity of the sport began to grow, professional golf course architects emerged. Golf courses grew from 750 in 1916 to 6,000 in 1930 (Rowlinson 2010:156). Prior to and following World War I, the booming economies in the world made the Golden Age of golf architecture possible. While the popularity of golf proliferated in this period, it was still largely relegated to the wealthy. Advancement in technology and the capital available to fund projects opened up wider possibilities for golf course design since designers were no longer restricted by the quality of the soil or the natural topography of the terrain. It was during this period that bunkers became prominent visual features on the golf course (Rowlinson 2010:14). In the United States, country clubs grew out of the opulence of the period and at a time when most golf architects or designers were amateur golf enthusiasts who had the financial resources to improve their clubs (Rowlinson 2010:14).

Financial strain during the Great Depression ended the Golden Age of Golf in the United States (Rowlinson 2010:14). The federal Works Progress Administration (WPA) program worked with municipalities to hire golf architects design public municipal golf courses. The labor intensive nature of golf course construction helped provide jobs for many during this period. As a result of the WPA, a small proliferation of public golf courses was constructed during the Great Depression which helped contribute to widening the appeal of the sport beyond the upper classes (Fazio 2000: 98-100).

Interest in private and public golf course construction was renewed due to the economic boom following World War II. Golf course design changed significantly with the development of tract housing. Communities and resorts designed around and associated with golf courses informed the design of the courses during this period (Rowlinson 2010:14). Robert Trent Jones, Sr., a Cornell-educated golf architect, was the first to market himself commercially spawning a new era of “signature designs” which appealed to real estate developers (Rowlinson 2010:18). Jones initiated a new trend for larger greens and longer courses made possible with motorized golf...
carts in the United States, as well as bolder courses with more sand and water (Rowlinson 2010:18). The design style of this era was more uniform and generic and not many courses constructed during the 1950s to the 1960s are considered to be among the best in the United States (Rowlinson 2010:18). In 1969, Harbour Town Golf Links, designed by Pete Dye and Jack Nicklaus, offered a more strategic design with Old World features such as railway sleeper, unmanicured rough and pot bunkers with shorter courses that placed less emphasis on power (Rowlinson 2010:157). That design prompted the splintering of the art form. Two schools of golf course design emerged during this period, one which focused on incorporating the beauty of the property with less focus on championship-level difficulty and others signified their designs with their own characteristics. Courses increasingly became identified by the course designers and golf resort areas associated with course designers developed in places like Palm Springs in the Southwest and Myrtle Beach on the coastal Lowlands (Rowlinson 2010:18). Joining Pete Dye as preeminent designers developing in the post-1970s were Tom Fazio, Arthur Hill, and Robert Trent Jones’s sons Rees Jones and Robert Jones, Jr. New takes on course design also came out of the player/architect with courses designed by Jack Nicklaus, Arnold Palmer, Gary Player, Tom Weiskopf, and Greg Norman, where the name of the designer became essential for marketing (Rowlinson 2010:157).

2.4.4.2 Golf Course Architecture and Design Principles

Golf draws players for different reasons from courses on prime natural locations with tees offering spectacular viewsheds to camaraderie and ease of play (Rowlinson 2010:21). Design goals focus on routing the course to “make the best use of natural features of the property,” easy to walk, greens positioned nearby previous tee, variety of slopes (uphill, downhill, and sidehill), “frequent changes of direction in windy places,” and variety of lengths and configurations (Rowlinson 2010:23). Elements of a designed golf course include intent of course (who should play the course), natural and man-made topography (contours and hills – uphill, downhill, sidehill), vegetation, natural and man-made hazards (bunkers, ponds, terrain), tees, fairways (length, width, and shape), and greens (tilt and shape).

Changes to a golf course are a natural progression in the life of a course. Because golf courses are both natural and manmade, it is common for golf courses to be redesigned over time. Courses are redesigned, replaced, or remodeled for two primary reasons to accommodate for advances in golf technology and to improve the layout of the course to accommodate the natural changes that occur within a natural landscape such as vegetation growth, soil erosion, and changes in slope pitch. Some examples are the impact mature trees have on how a hole plays, as well as the effects of daily maintenance of the greens and fairways changing the shape slightly. As clubs competed, many focused on updating their greens that meant recontouring the greens to alter the tilt to change the speed of the ball (Rowlinson 2010:29). Even the best courses were improved over time.

2.4.4.3 Golf in Southern California

The first games of golf in California were played in Riverside (Riverside County) and Burlingame (San Francisco County) in the early 1890s; golf clubs for the elite soon followed with golf courses developing along the coast, such as Pebble Beach, and Southern California
During the Golden Age of Golf, the sport “captured the country and nowhere was that more evident than in Southern California” (Southern California Golf Association 2013a). In only six years (between 1919 and 1925), the number of golf course clubs in Southern California more than doubled (Southern California Golf Association 2013a). Some of the most famous Golden Age courses in Southern California are George Thomas’s Riviera, North Course at the Los Angeles Country Club, and Bel-Air (Rowlinson 2010:234). Public courses were few but grew on account of public projects funded during the Great Depression (Southern California Golf Association 2013b). World War II production and ingenuity not only brought the United States out of the Great Depression, it spurred new economies and as such the post-World War II boom has been considered an “unparalleled period of golf course construction and another glorious era for Southern California amateur golfers” (Southern California Golf Association 2013b). Between 1960 and 1979, over 150 golf courses ranging from modest municipal layouts to elaborate country clubs were constructed in Southern California (Southern California Golf Association 2013c).

2.4.4.4 The Development of the San Bernardino Golf Club

The San Bernardino Public Golf Club was developed in 1968 by real estate developer William E. Leonard. Leonard was a local real estate developer and philanthropist. Leonard was born in San Bernardino in 1922. After serving in the United States Army, Leonard joined the Leonard Realty and Building Company, a firm established in 1905 by his grandfather. By the early 1960s, Leonard had transformed his grandfather’s firm into a leading development firm in San Bernardino. He became the founding director of Inland Action, Inc., a group of business and education leaders originally founded to oppose the closure of Norton Air Force Base in 1962. The group evolved to address the broader economic issues of the Inland Empire. Leonard took an active interest in the economic wellbeing of San Bernardino and was a strong advocate for the establishment of Cal State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) and the construction of Interstate 215. Leonard chaired the California Highway Commission from 1973-1977 and the California Transportation Commission from 1985-1983 (Gallagher 2007). For his contributions to CSUSB and the transportation infrastructure of San Bernardino, CSUB named their transportation center The William and Barbara Leonard Transportation Center in 2006 (California State University, San Bernardino 2016).

Leonard commissioned Daniel Brown, a golf enthusiast living in San Bernardino, to design the course. Daniel Brown served in the Army Air Corps during World War II and reportedly survived five plane crashes. After World War II, Brown served in the Korean War and retired in 1963 as a major in the United States Air Force (News-Mirror: 2016). While a dedicated and avid golfer, Brown was not a golf course architect. He did work at the Orange Show Public Golf Course in San Bernardino prior to designing and managing the San Bernardino Public Golf Club (Grant 1968) The circumstances of how he became involved with Leonard and came to design the San Bernardino Golf Club are unclear and research has not indicated that he designed any other golf courses.

The San Bernardino Public Golf Club opened on April 1, 1968. It was constructed on lands leased from Riverside Public Utilities. On opening day, only the back nine holes of the 6,480-yard course were available to play, the front nine holes were completed later that year. A
clubhouse, golf cart storage building, access road, and cart paths, and paved parking lots were constructed in 1968 (Grant 1968). A golf cart storage shed was added to the property in 1970 (City of San Bernardino 1970) and in 1972 an addition was constructed on the clubhouse (City of San Bernardino 1972). The golf course has undergone alterations since its construction, including lengthening, relocating and renumbering fairways, lengthening tees, adding tee boxes, and other forms of standard golf course maintenance and operation.
3 SOURCES CONSULTED

3.1 SOUTH CENTRAL COASTAL INFORMATION CENTER RECORDS SEARCH

A cultural resource literature and records search of the Project area, along with a 1-mile buffer, was conducted by staff at the SCCIC on November 16, 2016. The objective of this records search was to obtain baseline data on previously identified archaeological and historic built-environment resources within the records search area in order to evaluate the potential impacts of the Project on significant cultural resources.

In addition to SCCIC’s historical resource files, the following resources were consulted during the records search:

- The National Register of Historic Places website (www.cr.nps.gov/nr);
- The Office of Historic Preservation’s (OHP) Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility;
- The OHP’s Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File.

The records search indicates that no fewer than 60 cultural resource studies have been completed within the records search area since 1972 (Table 3-1). Two of these studies (SB-01808 and SB-7959) included portions of the current Project area.

Table 3-1
Cultural Resource Studies within 1-Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB-00122</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Smith, Gerald A.</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of the Lytle and Warm Creek Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-00791</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Hearn, Joseph E.</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment of Mill Street at Warm Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-00967</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Westec Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of the Cooley Ranch East, San Bernardino County, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-01287</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Lerch, Michael K.</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment of the Santa Ana Regional Interceptor, Reaches IV-D and IV-E, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-01499</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Foster, John M. And Roberta S. Greenwood</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Overview: California Portion, Proposed Pacific Texas Pipeline Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-01669</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Singer, Clay A. And Richard L. Wessel</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey and Impact Assessment for Five Areas in the City of Colton, San Bernardino County, California, for the Mt. Vernon Corridor Redevelopment Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-01764</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hatheway, Roger G.</td>
<td>A Windshield Survey And Preliminary Architectural/Historical Inventory Of Loma Linda, California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3-1 (Continued)
#### Cultural Resource Studies within 1-Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB-01808*</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hampson, R. P., J. Sorensen, S. K. Goldberg, M. T. Swanson, and J. E. Arnold</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey, Upper Santa Ana River, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-01852</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Hampson, R. Paul and Mark T. Swanson</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey, San Timoteo Wash Flood Control Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-02009</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>De Barros, Philip</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey and Assessment of Tentative Tract 14706, City of San Bernardino, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-02030</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Kielusiak, Carol</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment - Sari, Reaches IV D &amp; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-02232</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Part 1 -- Cultural Resources Assessment of the San Bernardino County and Riverside County Sections of AT&amp;T'S Proposed San Bernardino to San Diego Fiber Optic Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-02784</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Hallaran, Kevin B. and Christopher Foord</td>
<td>The Gage Canal (Draft Copy of 2 Chapters of Unknown Publication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-02889</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Wlodarski, Robert J.</td>
<td>An Archaeological Survey Report Documenting the Effects of the RCTC I-15 Improvement Project in Moreno Valley, Riverside County to Orange Show Road in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-03009</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Lukkarila, Dave Walter</td>
<td>The Summer of 1861: Establishing a Military Camp in San Bernardino at the Civil War's Beginning; A Review of the Official War Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-03228</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Lerch, Michael K.</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report: Orange Show Road Extension, City of San Bernardino, CA. 100pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-03656</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Love, Bruce</td>
<td>The Hub Project, City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, CA. 17pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-03923</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Billat, Lorna</td>
<td>Spectr-Site Communications Tower at 855 Inland Center Dr, San Bernardino, CA. 11pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-04335</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Goodwin, Riordan and Robert E. Reynolds</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment: Hunts Lane Grade Separation, San Bernardino County, CA. 24pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-05248</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>White, Robert S. and Laura S. White</td>
<td>A Cultural Resources Assessment of the 24.1 Acre Northpointe Project Site, Northwest Corner of East Hospitality Lane and Tippecanoe Avenue, City of San Bernardino, County of San Bernardino.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-05614</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Fulton, Terri</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report, New grade separation at the Hunts Lane/Union Pacific Railroad crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-05616</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>McKenna, Jeanette A.</td>
<td>SAWPA RIX Site and Associated Pipeline Archaeological Monitoring Program—Inventory of Artifacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-05621</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Shaver, Christopher and Noelle Shaver</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Study for the Central Avenue Road Improvements Project, City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-05669</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>White, Rober S. and Laura S. White</td>
<td>A Cultural Resources Assessment of Tract 17263, an 11.8 Acre Parcel Located Adjacent to Church Street South of Baseline Street, City of Highland, San Bernardino County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-06756</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Andrews, Sherri</td>
<td>Records Search and Survey Results for the Yucaipa Valley Water District Brineline Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-06785</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Bonner, Wayne H. and Marnie Aislin-Kay</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Records Search and Site Visit Results for Tower Co Assets LLC Candidate CA2358 (Cajon Summit), 5900 Mariposa Road, Hesperia, San Bernardino County, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-06994</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Sanka, Jennifer</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment: San Bernardino Redevelopment Project Area Merger—Area B Project, City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-07256</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Puckett, Heather R.</td>
<td>Holden, 299 W. Orange Show Road, San Bernardino, California 92408.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-07368</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Tang, Bai “Tom” and Harry Quinn</td>
<td>Archaeological and Paleontological Monitoring of Earth-Moving Activities, Yucaipa Valley Water District Regional Brineline Extension Project, Phase III, Cities of Loma Linda and San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-07371</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Billat, Lorna</td>
<td>BTS Waterman Visayan/MLAX 04211A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-07451</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Walters, Andrew M. and Daniel Paul</td>
<td>Interstate 215 Bi-County HOV Lane Gap Closure Project, Historical Resources Evaluation Report, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-07679</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Travers, Aniela</td>
<td>Mill Creek/3CA60034, 36833 Hiltop Road, Mentone, San Bernardino County, California.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The archaeological records search also indicated that 16 cultural resources have been identified previously within a 1-mile radius of the Project area (Table 3-2). None of these previously identified cultural resources is reported to be located within the Project area. The 16 cultural resources located within one mile of the Project area are made up of 12 historic-period archaeological resources including the remains of a ranch, two railroad segments, a bridge, a canal, a flour mill site, an agricultural exposition arena, a historical monument, two structural remains, and two refuse scatters; one multi-component (prehistoric and historical) archaeological site; one archaeological site of unknown age; and two historical built-environment single-family residences. Two of the historic-period archaeological resources (P-36-017723 and P-36-017818) are Points of Historical Interest and one historic-period archaeological resource (P-36-01522) is a California Historical Landmark. Of the 16 cultural resources, one (P-36-007168) has been evaluated and determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP; none of the cultural resources have been evaluated for listing on the CRHR.

Table 3-2
Cultural Resources within 1-Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Trinomial/Temp</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-36-001419</td>
<td>CA-SBR-001419</td>
<td>Urbita Springs Site; no other details provided in site record, age unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-002999</td>
<td>CA-SBR-</td>
<td>Historic-period Hunt's Ranch (Jumba) house and outbuildings, also prehistoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-2 (Continued)
Cultural Resources within 1-Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Trinomial/Temp</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-36-006099</td>
<td>CA-SBR-006099H</td>
<td>Historic-period refuse scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-006103</td>
<td>CA-SBR-006103H</td>
<td>Historic-period Atchison Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-006847</td>
<td>CA-SBR-006847H</td>
<td>Historic-period spur of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad, associated with the Old Kite Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-007168</td>
<td>CA-SBR-007168H</td>
<td>Historic-period Gage Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-010330</td>
<td>CA-SBR-010330H</td>
<td>Historic-period Southern Pacific Railroad at Monte Vista Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-014919</td>
<td>CA-SBR-013148H</td>
<td>Historic-period concrete foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-015222</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic-period Fort Benson Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-017668</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bungalow style single family residence (1176 Amos Avenue) built circa 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-017723</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic-period Mormon Flour Mill Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-017813</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-war Tract single family residence (Marshall residence; 604 Orange Show Road) built circa 1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-017818</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic-period National Orange Show and Events Center, 150-acre agricultural exposition area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-023628</td>
<td>CA-SBR-014924H</td>
<td>Two historic-period residential concrete slabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-025232</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported Politana village site associated with the Mission San Gabriel (contains prehistoric and historic-period associations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-36-029448</td>
<td>CA-SBR-029448H</td>
<td>Large historic-period refuse scatter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 NATIVE AMERICAN COORDINATION

As part of the cultural resource assessment, Æ also requested a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search from the NAHC located in Sacramento, California, on December 2, 2016. The NAHC responded that no SLF resources are known to exist in the vicinity of the Project area, but cautioned that the absence of specific site information does not indicate the absence of such resources. The NAHC provided a list of regional Native Americans who have an interest in and/or knowledge of the region and detailed the process of recommended consultation efforts. Tribal communities listed on the NAHC list include: Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians, Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, Gabriellino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, Gabriellino/Tongva Nation, Gabrielleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Gabriellino-Tongva Tribe, Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians, San Fernando Band of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians, and Serrano Nation of Mission Indians. Scoping letters were sent on December 9, 2016, to each of the listed tribes and individuals recommended by the NAHC requesting information on Native American cultural resources that may be present within the Project area. Æ also conducted follow-up telephone calls with the Native American groups and individuals on December 23, 2016. An example of this letter, the list of contacts, and the responses received are included in Appendix A.

Of the 16 groups and/or individuals that were contacted, six responses have been received to date. Mr. Raymond Huaute, of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, indicated that there are
several prehistoric village sites in the Project vicinity; however, the Tribe does not know of any resources located within the Project area. In addition, Mr. Huaute stated that the Morongo Band of Mission Indians would like to be included in consultation with the City regarding this Project. Ms. Goldie Walker, Chairperson of the Serrano Nation of Mission Indians, indicated that the Project area is within the Serrano Ancestral Territory and expressed concerns about the Project’s proximity to the Santa Ana Riverbed. Ms. Walker stated that there are likely burials and cultural artifacts within the riverbed. She requested to be involved with any monitoring and/or repatriation efforts. In addition, Ms. Walker requested a copy of the final cultural resource report. Mr. Anthony Morales, Chairperson of the Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, advised that any findings should be treated as sensitive and requested that he be informed if resources are found and if monitoring efforts are required.

Mr. Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department of the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, indicated that the Tribe does not have any specific information on the Project area and recommended that we contact the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. Ms. Diane Versaggi, on behalf of Lee Clauss, Cultural Resources Management Director of the San Manual Band of Mission Indians, informed us, via email correspondence, that the Project area is not located within the Serrano ancestral territory. As such, the Tribe will not be requesting to be acknowledged as a consulting party or to participate in the scoping, development, and/or review of documents drafted for the Project. Ms. Katie Croft, from the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Office, stated that the Project area is not within the Tribe’s Traditional Use Area and, as such, the Tribe defers to other tribes in the area. A table of responses summarizing consultation with Native American groups and/or individuals is located in Appendix A.

3.3 OTHER SOURCES CONSULTED

As discussed in detail in Section 4.2, four built-environment resources, including a golf course, two residential buildings, and a road, were identified during the Phase I survey of the Project area. In order to develop a historical context within which to evaluate these resources, numerous sources were consulted as part of historical background research. These sources included historical USGS maps; aerial photographs; archived records of the San Bernardino County Assessor’s Office; the San Bernardino Historical Society; and literature on various American architectural styles of the twentieth century. The purpose of this research was to determine if the built-environment resources have significant associations with historic trends and persons and to assess the architectural quality of the resources.
4
CULTURAL RESOURCE METHODS AND RESULTS

This section details the methods and results that were used during the cultural resource assessment of the Project area.

4.1 SURVEY METHODS

A Phase I pedestrian survey of the main Project site and off-site interim roadway alignment was completed by Ms. Roberta Thomas on November 30, 2016 (Figure 4-1). The survey area encompassed portions of the San Bernardino Golf Club (Figure 4-2), a fenced utility area situated south of East Dumas Street and east of the San Bernardino Flood Control Channel (Figure 4-3), and a fallow agricultural field situated south of Orange Show Road, west of South Washington Avenue, and north of East Dumas Street (Figure 4-4). A supplemental survey of the two proposed off-site permanent roadway improvement areas was completed by Dr. Tiffany Clark on May 25, 2017. The supplemental survey included a linear area immediately south of East Dumas Street and north of the existing golf course parking lot (Figure 4-5), a segment of South Washington Avenue south of Orange Show Road and north of East Dumas Street, and a small portion of the fenced undeveloped lot located south of Orange Show Road, west of South Washington Avenue, and north of East Dumas Street (Figure 4-1).

Due to the developed nature of the Project site, a reconnaissance-level survey was conducted of the golf course with various buildings and structures, including greens, tees, and sand pits, inspected and documented by the cultural resource specialist (Figure 4-1). Any areas of the golf course likely to contain or exhibit archaeologically or historically sensitive cultural resources were inspected carefully to ensure that visible, potentially significant cultural resources were identified and documented. The fenced utility area situated south of East Dumas Street and east of the San Bernardino Flood Control Channel was inaccessible to the archaeologist. As such, this area was visually inspected from the public right-of-way.

The proposed off-site interim and permanent roadway improvement areas were systematically inspected by the archaeologist walking parallel transects spaced no more than 10 meters (m) (33 feet [ft]) apart. The surveyor investigated any unusual landforms, contours, soil changes, features (e.g., road cuts, drainages), and other potential cultural site markers. Developed portions of the off-site improvement areas, which included the paved roadbed along South Washington Avenue and two residential lots along Dumas Street, were subject to a reconnaissance-level survey (Figure 4-1).

4.2 RESULTS

Ground visibility across much of the main Project site was extremely limited (less than five percent). This lack of ground visibility is due to the presence of buildings and structures, paved parking lots and roadways, manicured and landscaped greens, tees, and water features associated with the golf course. The main Project site appears to have been extensively disturbed by the
Figure 4-1  Survey coverage of the Project site and off-site improvement areas.
Figure 4-2 San Bernardino Golf Club Overview, facing northeast

Figure 4-3 Fenced Utility Area South of East Dumas Street, facing south
Figure 4-4 Fallow Field south of Orange Show Road and west of South Washington Avenue, facing north

Figure 4-5 Off-site Improvement Area Located north of the Existing Golf Course Parking Lot and South of East Dumas Street, facing southwest
construction and maintenance of the golf course, the installation and maintenance of utilities, grading activities, and off-road vehicle use.

The proposed off-site improvement areas exhibited varying levels of ground visibility. The fallow agricultural fields situated south of Orange Show Road and west of South Washington Avenue, as well as portions of the linear alignment south of East Dumas Street, displayed excellent visibility (80 to 90 percent). In these areas, the exposed ground surface consisted of a grayish to light brown sandy silt with very few small pebble and small cobble inclusions. Both areas displayed a light scatter of modern refuse, which included chunks of concrete, asphalt, brick, milled wood, plastic and metal piping, carpet, and plastic sheeting. A much lower level of visibility (10 to 20 percent) was observed in the undeveloped areas immediately north of the existing golf course parking lot; in this area, the ground surface was covered with dried grasses and small scrubs. Piles of cut wood, along with several wooden poles, were noted in this area (Figure 4-5). Finally, a lack of ground visibility (less than five percent) was observed in the developed portions of the off-site improvement areas, which included the paved roadbed along South Washington Avenue and two residential lots along East Dumas Street.

No historic-period or prehistoric archaeological materials were observed during the pedestrian survey of the Project site or off-site improvement areas. However, archival research conducted for the Project found that four built-environment resources were located within the Project area (Figure 4-6). These resources include the San Bernardino Golf Club, two residential buildings along East Dumas Street, and a segment of South Washington Avenue. All of these resources meet the 45-year threshold for consideration as potential historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. A description of these resources, along with an evaluation of their historical significance, is provided below. A Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 recording form was also completed for the cultural resource (Appendix B).

### 4.2.1 San Bernardino Golf Club

The San Bernardino Golf Club is an 18-hole golf course (Figure 4-7) and associated facilities located in the southern portion of the City of San Bernardino. The golf course is bounded by the Santa Ana River to the south, South D Street to the west, East Dumas Street to the north, and South Waterman Avenue to the east. The course is bisected by the San Bernardino Flood Control Channel. The land is owned by Riverside Public Utilities and the golf course is leased from Riverside Public Utilities by J.G. Golfing Enterprises Inc.

In addition to the 18-hole course, the facility includes a clubhouse, practice green, driving range, golf cart storage, and maintenance area. The clubhouse and course were completed in 1968. A parking lot is located adjacent to the clubhouse to the east and reached by an access road that extends east to S. Waterman Avenue. Holes 12-17, one man-made water hazard, and five bunkers are located west of flood control channel; Holes 1-11 and 18, five man-made water hazards and sixteen bunkers are located east of flood control channel. A bridge that spans the flood control channel at the southern portion of the golf course. Routing of the course is accomplished by fairways running parallel to each other and divided by mature trees. Various forms of equipment fixtures, such as ball washers and course markers, and utility structures that house power and irrigation equipment are located throughout the golf course.
Figure 4-6  Location of Cultural Resources Identified in Project area.
The clubhouse is a one-story Modern-style building (Figure 4-8). The building features a steep pitched side-gabled roof with secondary dropped medium-pitched side-gabled roofs on the east and west elevations covered is asphalt shingle. The building is clad in stucco with intermittent shingle-covered accents. The primary entrance is centered on the north elevation and is filled with wood double doors with diamond patterned pane glass windows. Sliding windows are arranged in a band beneath a fabric awning on the north elevation and are flanked by fixed decorative shutters. A faux chimney clad in shingle is centered on the east elevation. Sliding windows flanked by fixed decorative shutters are located on both sides of the faux chimney. A low-pitches front-gabled roof covered is asphalt shingle is centered over a shingle-clad glad projection on the south elevation. The roof extends to a flat roof to the east and the west of the gable that forms a pillar supported covered patio. The shingle-clad projection features sliding windows and an entrance door. The north elevation features a building extension that extends north off center of the façade. The extension features a flat roof with a short parapet. The east elevation of the extension has fixed and sliding windows flanked by fixed decorative shutters, intermittent decorative shingles, and an entrance located off center on the façade that is recessed and filled with a glass commercial door. The extension was expanded in 1972 (City of San Bernardino 1972).

North of the clubhouse building is a one-story rectangular golf cart storage building constructed in 1970 (Figure 4-9). The building has a flat roof. The building is clad in vertical wood siding intermittently broken up by decorative wood shingles. Roll-tape metal doors are located on the north and south elevations. A corrugated metal maintenance and storage shed constructed the 1970s with a low pitched corrugated metal roof and a rectangular plan is located north of the golf cart storage building.
Figure 4-8 South side of clubhouse, facing northwest

Figure 4-9 East side of golf cart storage building, facing southwest
An evaluation of the significance of the San Bernardino Golf Club indicates that the historical built environment resource does not meet the criteria for listing on the CRHR. Specifically, no information has been found to suggest that the San Bernardino Golf Club is directly associated with historical events of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 1. The golf course was constructed in 1968 during a period of golf course construction proliferation in Southern California and the nation. The golf course is not the earliest constructed in San Bernardino, Riverside County, California, or the United States. No significant events related to the history of golf or the general history of California or the United States have occurred at this golf course. The design of the course is not particularly significant or unique and did not initiate changes in golf course design or the way in which golf is played. The presence of the golf course in San Bernardino did not represent a significant enough tourist draw for the City of San Bernardino or represent a significant contribution to the culture and character of the city to be considered historically significant. While it does appear that the golf course is currently the oldest golf course in the City of San Bernardino, it is not the oldest within the region or the state. Its status as the oldest golf course in San Bernardino County does not merit historical significance since the economic development, history, and cultural identity of San Bernardino is not significantly tied to golf. Therefore, the San Bernardino Golf Club is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 1.

In addition, no information has been found to suggest that the San Bernardino Golf Club is directly associated with the productive life of a historical person of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 2. The golf course was initially developed by William E. Leonard, a prominent San Bernardino real estate developer and philanthropist. While Leonard may be considered a person of significance with the history of San Bernardino, his contributions to the community are many and the construction of the golf course is not among his most significant accomplishments. Therefore, the San Bernardino Golf Club is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 2.

The San Bernardino Golf Club does not appear to embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic value. The course was designed by Daniel Brown, an amateur golf course architect who does not appear to have designed any other golf course besides the San Bernardino Golf Club. Brown is not considered a master in the field of golf course architecture and his design for the San Bernardino Golf Club does not appear to be a unique example of or significant departure from established golf course design. The clubhouse is a fairly common example of the Modern-style of architecture and does not exhibit any significant character-defining features or design elements that would make it significant. The remaining buildings and structures on the golf course are utilitarian in design and exhibit no indication of being architecturally significant. The architect and builder of the club house and other ancillary buildings could not be identified. Therefore, the San Bernardino Golf Club is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 3.

Finally, the San Bernardino Golf Club does not meet CRHR Criterion 4 since it has not yielded and is unlikely to yield information important in prehistory or history. This criterion is typically reserved for archaeological resources, ruins, or rare built-environments resources of which little is already known, that are considered to be the sole sources of historical data. Therefore, the San Bernardino Golf Club is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 4.
Because the San Bernardino Golf Club does not appear to meet any of the criteria to be considered eligible for listing in the CRHR, the structures are not considered to be historical resources for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines).

4.2.2 141 East Dumas Street

141 E. Dumas Street is a one-story Minimal Traditional style single family residence constructed in 1955. The building has stucco siding and a low-pitched hipped roof with asphalt shingles (Figure 4-10). The north elevation features a gabled patio cover supported by wood poles. The primary entrance is centered beneath the patio cover. Fenestration on the north elevation includes a band of three wood frame double-hung windows and aluminum sliding windows. The south elevation features a shed roof addition with lateral wood siding and doors and windows filled with plywood. The west elevation features a double hung wood frame window and a replacement vinyl window.

Research has yielded little information regarding the owners and occupants of 141 E. Dumas Street. In 1979 the building was owned by Aldora Barrier. In 1981, Lonnie S. Barrier was also listed as an owner of the property. In 2006 the ownership of the property was passed to a group of individuals including Wanda Walker, Brenda Sams, Wayne Lewis, Bernice Lewis, Kenneth Lewis, Donna Lewis, Charles Lewis, and Charlene Earl (San Bernardino County Assessor).

An evaluation of the significance of 141 East Dumas Street indicates that the historical built environment resource does not meet the criteria for listing on the CRHR. No information has been found to suggest that the building is directly associated with historical events of importance.

Figure 4-10 141 East Dumas Street, facing south
in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 1. The building was constructed in 1955 during the post-WWII housing boom in Southern California. It is one of many small single-family homes constructed during this period throughout Southern California and the United States. Research has yielded no evidence that important historical events are specifically associated with this building. Therefore, 141 East Dumas Street does not appear eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 1.

Furthermore, no information has been found to suggest that 141 East Dumas Street is directly associated with the productive life of a historical person of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 2. No one associated with the ownership or occupancy of this building appears to be persons of importance in local, state, or national history. Therefore, the building does not appear eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 2.

141 East Dumas Street does not appear to embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic value. The building is a fairly common and unremarkable example of Minimal Traditional-style architecture. While the building does exhibit some of the character-defining features of the style, it is not a particularly good example. It is essentially similar to many other single family residences constructed during this period throughout California and the United States. The architect and builder were not identified, but this building is unlikely to be the work of a master. Therefore, 141 East Dumas Street is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 3.

Finally, 141 East Dumas Street does not meet CRHR Criterion 4 since it has not yielded and is unlikely to yield information important in prehistory or history. This criterion is typically reserved for archaeological resources, ruins, or rare built-environments resources of which little is already known, that are considered to be the sole sources of historical data. Therefore, 141 East Dumas Street does not appear eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 4.

4.2.3 145 East Dumas Street

145 E. Dumas Street is a one-story Minimal Traditional style single family residence constructed in 1955. The building has stucco siding and a low-pitched hipped roof with asphalt shingles that extends into a small gable on the north elevation (Figure 4-11). The north elevation features a large picture window with a gabled pop-out and two vinyl sliding windows. The primary entrance is located on the north elevation and recessed beneath a covered porch. The north elevation features an attached garage that has been converted into an addition. The door of the garage has been filled and covered with stucco. The garage and north elevation patio are covered by a roof with a slight pitch. The south elevation features an addition.

Research has yielded little information regarding the owners and occupants of 145 East Dumas Street. In 1979 the building was owned by Aldora Barrier and Jess Ellis. In 1981, Bank of America took ownership of the property and sold it to Jim Currie in 1982. The property transferred to Gregory Hile in 1985 and then to Weyerhauser Mortgage Company and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1988. Israel Rivera purchased the property in 1988 and is the current owner (San Bernardino County Assessor).
An evaluation of the significance of 145 East Dumas Street indicates that the historical built environment resource does not meet the criteria for listing on the CRHR. No information has been found to suggest that the property is directly associated with historical events of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 1. The building was constructed in 1955 during the post-WWII housing boom in Southern California. It is one of many small single-family homes constructed during this period throughout Southern California and the United States. Research has yielded no evidence that important historical events are specifically associated with this building. Therefore, 145 East Dumas Street does not appear eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 1.

In addition, no information has been found to suggest that 145 East Dumas Street is directly associated with the productive life of a historical person of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 2. No one associated with the ownership or occupancy of this building appears to be persons of importance in local, state, or national history. Therefore, 145 East Dumas Street does not appear eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 2.

145 East Dumas Street also does not appear to embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic value. The building is a fairly common and unremarkable example of Minimal traditional style architecture and has been heavily altered. While the building does exhibit some of the character defining features of the style, it is not a particularly good example. It is essentially similar to many other single family residences constructed during this period throughout California and the United States. The architect and builder were not identified, but
this building is unlikely to be the work of a master. Therefore, 145 East Dumas Street is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 3.

Finally, 145 East Dumas Street does not meet CRHR Criterion 4 since it has not yielded and is unlikely to yield information important in prehistory or history. This criterion is typically reserved for archaeological resources, ruins, or rare built-environments resources of which little is already known, that are considered to be the sole sources of historical data. Therefore, 145 East Dumas Street does not appear eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 4.

4.2.4 South Washington Avenue

The Project area includes an approximately 700-ft-long section of the historical South Washington Avenue that runs south of Orange Show Road and north of East Dumas Street (Figure 4-6). The asphalt-concrete paved road measures approximately 24 ft in width and is flanked by approximately 5 ft wide dirt shoulders (Figure 4-12). No historic-period signage, guardrails, or other historical roadway features were observed along this road segment.

Historical maps indicate that the section of South Washington Avenue located north of East Dumas Street has been in use since at least 1898 (USGS 1898). When first constructed, South Washington Avenue was a four-lane road with a center median and a 24-ft-wide, two-way divided roadway (Figure 4-13). The original road was a levee road and was constructed with a combination of earth fill and clay embankment material. The embankments were designed to control the flow of water and provide a stable surface for the road.

Figure 4-12 South Washington Avenue, facing north
Washington Avenue consisted of an approximately 0.14-mile-long (740-ft-long) roadway that could only be accessed off East Dumas Street. By the late 1930s, the road had been extended 0.45 miles further north to connect to Central Avenue. On the 1938 and 1943 Colton 7.5’ topographic quad maps, the full length of South Washington Avenue appears to have been used as a light duty road (USGS 1938, 1943). Topographic maps dating to the latter half of the 20th century show no major changes in the road alignment between the 1950s and the 1980s (USGS 1954, 1967, 1975, and 1981).

An evaluation of South Washington Street indicates that the road does not meet the criteria for listing on the CRHR. The road is completely modern in appearance, design, and construction, and lacks any historical features. Only the alignment itself appears historic in age based upon its depiction on historical maps. Although the road is broadly associated with the early development of the San Bernardino area, no information has been found to suggest that this portion of South Washington Avenue is directly associated with historical events of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 1. Moreover, the road was likely built by the county and consequently, a specific individual responsible for building this section of South Washington Street cannot be identified. Therefore, the structure cannot be directly associated with the productive life of an important historical figure (CRHR Criterion 2). The road is similar in its design and materials to numerous other roads in the area and as such, it does not qualify as an important example of its type, period, region, or method of construction (CRHR Criterion 3).

Finally, the South Washington Avenue does not have the potential to yield any information important to the study of our local, state, or national history and is thus not eligible for listing under CRHR Criterion 4.
MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The cultural resource assessment of the Project area resulted in the identification of four historical built-environment resources that include the San Bernardino Golf Club, two residential buildings, and a road. The historical significance of the golf course was assessed within the context of the development of golf courses in the United States and southern California. The two residential buildings and road were evaluated within the context of the development of the City of San Bernardino. None of the resources appear to meet any of the criteria for listing on the CRHR and as such, are not considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. No further management of the four built-environment resources is recommended.

The results obtained from the SCCIC records search and the Phase I pedestrian survey indicates that there are no known archaeological resources within the Project area. In addition, the majority of the Project area lies within the flood plain of the Santa Ana River which is a very dynamic and high energy flow area. The northern part of the Project area consists of soil deposits that are derived from overbank flows of the Santa Ana River and Warm Creek with very weak soil development possibly indicating the geologic unit is very young. Both of these deposits are down-cut by drainages revealing that they were deposited prior the current bed alignment and suggesting that this area has changed a lot in the late Holocene. Due to the high energy of the flood plain deposits and the young age of the northern part of the Project area, there is a low potential for encountering intact buried archaeological deposits within the Project area. As such, no further archaeological resource management is recommended, at this time, for the Project.

In the unlikely event that potentially significant archaeological materials are encountered during Project-related ground-disturbing activities, all work must be halted in the vicinity of the archaeological discovery until a qualified archaeologist can visit the site of discovery and assess the significance of the archaeological site. Additionally, Health and Safety Code 7050.5, CEQA 15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code 5097.98 mandate the process to be followed in the unlikely event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Finally, if the Project area is expanded to include areas not covered by this assessment, additional cultural resource studies may be required.
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APPENDIX A

Native American Coordination Efforts
December 9, 2016

Roberta Thomas  
Applied EarthWorks, Inc.

Sent by E-mail: rthomas@appliedearthworks.com

RE: Proposed Hillwood Gateway South Building 4 Project, City of San Bernardino; San Bernardino South USGS Quadrangle, San Bernardino County, California

Dear Ms. Thomas:

Attached is a contact list of tribes with traditional lands or cultural places located within the boundaries of the above referenced counties. A search of the SFL was completed for the USGS quadrangle information provided with negative results.

Our records indicate that the lead agency for this project has not requested a Native American Consultation List for the purposes of formal consultation. Lists for cultural resource assessments are different than consultation lists. Please note that the intent of the referenced codes below is to avoid or mitigate impacts to tribal cultural resources, as defined, for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) projects under AB-52.

As of July 1, 2015, Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 require public agencies to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purpose mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources:

Within 14 days of determining that an application for a project is complete or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency shall provide formal notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, which shall be accomplished by means of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section. (Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(d))

The law does not preclude agencies from initiating consultation with the tribes that are culturally and traditionally affiliated with their jurisdictions. The NAHC believes that in fact that this is the best practice to ensure that tribes are consulted commensurate with the intent of the law.

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(d), formal notification must include a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. The NAHC believes that agencies should also include with their notification letters information regarding any cultural resources assessment that has been completed on the APE, such as:

1. The results of any record search that may have been conducted at an Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), including, but not limited to:
   - A listing of any and all known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE;
   - Copies of any and all cultural resource records and study reports that may have been provided by the Information Center as part of the records search response;
   - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   - Whether the records search indicates a low, moderate or high probability that unrecorded cultural resources are located in the potential APE; and
If a survey is recommended by the Information Center to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. The results of any archaeological inventory survey that was conducted, including:
   - Any report that may contain site forms, site significance, and suggested mitigation measurers.
   - All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure in accordance with Government Code Section 6254.10.

3. The results of any Sacred Lands File (SFL) check conducted through Native American Heritage Commission.

4. Any ethnographic studies conducted for any area including all or part of the potential APE; and

5. Any geotechnical reports regarding all or part of the potential APE.

Lead agencies should be aware that records maintained by the NAHC and CHRS is not exhaustive, and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of a cultural place. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of a tribal cultural resource.

This information will aid tribes in determining whether to request formal consultation. In the case that they do, having the information beforehand will help to facilitate the consultation process.

The results of these searches and surveys should be included in the “Tribal Cultural Resources” section or in a separate subsection of the Cultural Resources section of the environmental document submitted for review. Please reference California Natural Resources Agency (2016) “Final Text for tribal cultural resources update to Appendix G: Environmental Checklist Form,” http://resources.ca.gov/cega/docs/ab52/Clean-final-AB-52-App-G-text-Submitted.pdf.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our consultation list contains current information.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gayle Totton, M.A., PhD.
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation
Andrew Salas, Chairperson
P.O. Box 393
Covina, CA, 91723
Phone: (626) 926 - 4131
gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com

Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Director
5401 Dinah Shore Drive
Palm Springs, CA, 92264
Phone: (760) 699 - 6907
Fax: (760) 699-6924
ACBCI-TIPO@aguacaliente.net

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
P.O. Box 693
San Gabriel, CA, 91778
Phone: (626) 483-3564
Fax: (626) 266-1252
GTTRI@Gabrieleno-Tongva.com

Gabrieleno/Tongva Nation
Sandonne Goad, Chairperson
106 ½ Judge John Aiso St., #231
Los Angeles, CA, 90012
Phone: (951) 807-0479
sgoad@gabrieleno-tongva.com

Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
Amanda Vance, Chairperson
P.O. Box 846
Coachella, CA, 92236
Phone: (760)398-4722
Fax: (760)398-7161

Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson
P.O. Box 490
Bellflower, CA, 90707
Phone: (562) 761-6417
Fax: (562) 761-6417
gtongva@verizon.net

Gabrieleno Tongva Tribe
Linda Candelaria, Co-Chairperson
1969 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA, 90067
Phone: (213) 676 - 1184

Cabazon Band of Mission Indians
Doug Welmas, Chairperson
84-245 Indio Springs Parkway
Indio, CA, 92203
Phone: (760)342-2593
Fax: (760)347-7980

Cahuilla Band of Indians
Luther Salgado, Chairperson
52701 U.S. Highway 371
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951) 703 - 5549
Fax: (951) 763-2808
Chairman@cahuilla.net

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians
John Perada, Environmental Director
P. O. Box 189
Warner Springs, CA, 92086
Phone: (760) 782 - 0712
Fax: (760) 782-2730

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 7059.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5977.94 of the Public Resource Section 5977.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Hillwood Gateway South Building 4 Project, San Bernardino County.
Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians
Shane Chapparosa, Chairperson
P.O. Box 189
Warner Springs, CA, 92086-0189
Phone: (760)782-0711
Fax: (760)782-0712
Chapparosa@msn.com

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA, 91322
Phone: (760) 885 - 0955
tsen2u@hotmail.com

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Denise Torres, Cultural Resources Manager
12700 Pumara Road
Banning, CA, 92220
Phone: (951) 846-8807
Fax: (951)922-8146
dtorres@morongo-nsn.gov

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

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Robert Martin, Chairperson
12700 Pumara Road
Banning, CA, 92220
Phone: (951)846-8807
Fax: (951)922-8146

cita@morongo-nsn.gov

Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians
Steven Estrada, Chairperson
P.O. Box 391820
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951)659-2700
Fax: (951)659-2228

deaestrada@sanmanuel-nsn.gov

Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
Joseph Hamilton, Chairperson
P.O. Box 391670
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951)763-4105
Fax: (951)763-4325
admin@ramonatrib.com

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

Ramona Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians
John Gomez, Environmental Coordinator
P. O. Box 391670
Anza, CA, 92539
Phone: (951) 763 - 4105
Fax: (951) 763-4325
jgomez@ramonatrib.com

Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians
Rosemary Morillo, Chairperson
P. O. Box 497
San Jacinto, CA, 92583
Phone: (951) 654 - 2765
Fax: (951) 654-4198
rmorillo@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 7059.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5897.94 of the Public Resource Section 5007.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Hillwood Gateway South Building 4 Project, San Bernardino County.
Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contact List
San Bernardino County
12/9/2016

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

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
Carrie Garcia, Cultural Resources Manager
P. O. Box 487
San Jacinto, CA, 92583
Phone: (951)654-2765
Fax: (951)654-4198
carrieg@soboba-nsn.gov

Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
Michael Mirelez, Cultural Resource Coordinator
P.O. Box 1160
Thermal, CA, 92274
Phone: (760)399-0022, Ext. 1213
Fax: (760)397-6146
mmirelez@tmdci.org

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 6067.94 of the Public Resources 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 Hillwood Gateway South Building 4 Project, San Bernardino County.
Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION
915 Capitol Mall, RM 364
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4082
(916) 657-5390 – Fax
nahc@pacbell.net

Information Below is Required for a Sacred Lands File Search

Date: October 4, 2106

Project: Hillwood Gateway South Building 4

County: San Bernardino

USGS Quadrangle Name:

Township __ Range ___ Section(s) Unsectioned, San Bernardino Land Grant


Contact Person: Roberta Thomas

Street Address: 133 N. San Gabriel Blvd, Suite 201

City: Pasadena Zip: 91107

Phone: (626) 578-0119

Fax: (951) 766-0020

Email: rthomas@appliedearthworks.com

Project Description: Project involves the construction of a 1,064,800 square foot warehouse on 62.04 acres of land located north of the Santa Ana River in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California.
December 9, 2016

Lee Clauss, Director of Cultural Resources  
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians  
26569 Community Center Drive  
Highland, CA 92346  
Transmitted via email to lclauss@sanmanuel-nsn.gov

Re: Cultural Resource Investigation for the Gateway South Building 4 Project, San Bernardino County, California

Dear Ms. Clauss,

On behalf of Hillwood Investment Properties, Applied EarthWorks, Inc. (Æ) is conducting a cultural resource study, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for the proposed Gateway South Building 4 Project (Project) within the city of San Bernardino, in San Bernardino County, California. The Project involves developing the 62-acre property with an approximately 1,064,880 square foot distribution warehouse building and associated site improvements, including but not limited to, site access improvements, parking lots, water quality basins, landscaping, and utility infrastructure. The Project area is located on the San Bernardino South, Calif. 7.5’ USGS quadrangle map, within an unsectioned area (see attached map).

A cultural resource literature review and records search conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) housed at California State University, Fullerton, indicates that no less than 48 cultural resource studies have been conducted within a one-mile radius of the Project area; two of these studies intersects the Project area. The records search also indicated that 16 cultural resources have been identified within a one-mile radius of the Project area; none of which have been recorded within or immediately adjacent to the Project boundaries.

Æ performed a site visit of the Project area on November 29, 2016. The majority of the Project area has been developed and is currently occupied by the San Bernardino Golf Club. During the site visit, the San Bernardino Golf Club was visually inspected as were areas within the Project area just outside the golf course boundaries. No prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources were identified during the survey.

As part of the cultural resource assessment of the Project area, Æ requested a search of the Native American Heritage Commission’s (NAHC’s) Sacred Lands File on December 2, 2016. The NAHC responded on December 9, 2016 indicating that no Native American cultural resources were identified within the Project area. However, should your records show that cultural properties exist within or near the Project area shown on the enclosed map, please contact me at (626) 578-0119 (ext. 104) or via e-mail at wborkan@appliedearthworks.com. If I do not hear from you within the next two weeks, I will contact you with a follow-up phone call or email.

Your comments are very important to us, and to the successful completion of this Project. I look forward to hearing from you in the near future. Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to review this request.

Respectfully yours,

William Borkan  
Staff Archaeologist  
Applied EarthWorks, Inc.
Records Search location map for the Hillwood Gateway South Building 4 Project - AE3574.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initial Letter Contact</th>
<th>Follow Calls</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Salas, Chairperson Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail message left. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Director Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail message left. Email received January 3, 2017 from THPO office Katie Croft: “A records check of the ACBCI cultural registry revealed that this project is not located within the Tribe’s Traditional Use Area (TUA). Therefore we defer to the other tribes in the area. This letter shall conclude our consultation efforts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Vance, Chairperson Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Transferred to David Saldivar, voicemail message left. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Welmas, Chairperson Cabazon Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail message left. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther Salgado, Chairperson Cahuilla Band of Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail full. Follow-up email sent on December 23, 2016. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Morales, Chairperson Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail message left. Mr. Morales did not have any information to offer, but advised we treat any findings sensitively and inform him if resources are found and monitoring efforts are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Initial Contact</td>
<td>Follow Calls</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandonne Goad, Chairperson Gabrieleno/Tongva Nation</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Spoke on phone, Sam Dunlap is now point of contact. Called and emailed him with information – he will respond via email. No further contact has occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail unavailable, follow-up email sent. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Candelaria, Co-Chairperson Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail message left. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Perada, Environmental Director Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail message left. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denisa Torres, Cultural Resource Manager Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>No voicemail available. Follow-up email sent. Raymond Huaute called on January 3, 2017 to say that there are several villages in the project vicinity but they don’t have any specific resources in the Project area. Morongo would like to be included in any consultation with the city. Ray also followed-up with email requesting that we provide information about the project as it continues so as to assess impacts to potential cultural resources and assist in monitoring efforts if applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Martin, Chairperson Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Office closed. No voicemail available. See response from Raymond Huaute above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Initial Letter Contact</td>
<td>Follow Calls</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gomez, Environmental Coordinator</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Out of office until New Year; receptionist recommended I email the request – sent on December 23, 2016. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Valenzuela, Chairperson</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Spoke on phone, informed AE that he does not handle any resources south of Palmdale. Recommends that AE get in contact with the tribal office. John Valenzuela was the only contact recommended on the NAHC list, so AE called the tribal office. No voicemail setup. No other contact information provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Clauss, Director of Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Email received December 13, 2016</td>
<td>Diane Versaggi responded on behalf of Ms. Clauss; reported that the project exists outside of Serrano ancestral territory and, as such, SMBMI will not be requesting consulting party status under CEQA nor requesting to participate in the scoping, development, and/or review of documents created pursuant to these legal and regulatory mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Estrada, Chairperson</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail message left with tribal office. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Initial Letter Contact</td>
<td>Follow Calls</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldie Walker, Chairperson Serrano Nation of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Spoke with son, Mark Cochran, informed Goldie will call back in one hour. 12/23/2016. Goldie and Mark called back on January 4, 2017. Goldie informed AE that the project is within the Serrano Ancestral Territory and expressed concerns because there are likely burials and artifacts near and within the Santa Ana Riverbed. Ms. Walked indicated that the general vicinity is sensitive and stated that her grandfather, a captain of the San Manuel Indian Reservation, had lived at an Indian camp in the area. She also discussed a cemetery near 5th and Waterman and indicated that that was a sensitive area. [Ms. Walker can provide a more detailed information about that particular area.] She is concerned about construction activities in the area of her ancestral home and would like to be involved with monitoring efforts and repatriation of artifacts, if any. Ms. Walker also requested that the City send a final copy of the Cultural Resources report to her PO box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Spoke with Mr. Ontiveros and he asked to be emailed the information. Email sent on December 23, 2016. Email response received on 12/28, stating: “We have no specific information about the location. I would like to recommend that you contact San Manuel to see if they have any information to offer.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mirelez, Cultural Resource Coordinator Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>Letter/email sent on December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Follow-up call placed on December 23, 2016</td>
<td>Voicemail message left. No response to date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
William Borkan

From: Diane Versaggi
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 10:24 AM
To: William Borkan
Subject: RE: Cultural Resource Investigation for the Gateway South Building 4 Project, San Bernardino County, CA

Dear Mr. Borkan:

On December 9, 2016, the Cultural Resources Management Department for San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI) received your correspondence regarding the Cultural Resource Investigation for the Gateway South Building 4 Project located in San Bernardino County. I am writing today to inform you and the City of San Bernardino that the above-referenced project exists outside of Serrano ancestral territory and, as such, SMBMI will not be requesting consulting party status under CEQA nor requesting to participate in the scoping, development, and/or review of documents created pursuant to these legal and regulatory mandates.

Should you have any questions about the content of this communication, please do not hesitate to contact Lee Clauss at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Diane Versaggi on Behalf of
Lee Clauss
Cultural Resources Management Director
SAN MANUEL BAND OF MISSION INDIANS
O: (909) 864-8933 x3248
M: (909) 633-5851
lclauss@sanmanuel-nsn.gov
26569 Community Center Drive
Highland, CA 92346

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying it and notify the sender by reply e-mail so that the email address record can be corrected. Thank You
William Borkan

From: Joseph Ontiveros
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 11:48 AM
To: William Borkan
Cc: Jessica Valdez
Subject: Re: Gateway South Building 4 Project
Attachments: image001.jpg

?William,

We have no specific information about the location. I would like to recommend that you contact San Manuel to see if they have any information to offer.

Thank you,

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

From: William Borkan <wborkan@appliedearthworks.com>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Joseph Ontiveros
Subject: RE: Gateway South Building 4 Project

See attached for project location.

William Borkan | Applied EarthWorks, Inc.
Staff Archaeologist
626.578.0119 x 104 office
503.752.4090 cell

From: William Borkan [mailto:wborkan@appliedearthworks.com]
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 12:27 PM
To: 'jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov'<jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov> <jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov>
Subject: Gateway South Building 4 Project

Hello,
I’m emailing today to follow up about an information request about the Gateway South Building 4 Project in San Bernardino County. Please see attached for information pertaining to the aforementioned project.

I have included the original attachments mailed to you on December 9th. This is merely a follow-up of the same project.

Do not hesitate to contact me if you have information about cultural resources in the vicinity or would like to be included in project updates by the City of San Bernardino.

Thank you,
William

William Borkan | Applied EarthWorks, Inc.
Staff Archaeologist

[AE 20th.jpg]

133 N. San Gabriel Blvd, Ste. 201
Pasadena, CA 91107

626.578.0119 x 104 office
503.752.4090 cell

Dear Mr. Borkan,
Thank you for contacting the Morongo Band of Mission Indians on behalf of your client. Please read the attached letter of intent to consult on the above mentioned project, which may contain requests for additional information. Once we receive the requested documents or information, we will be better able to assist you in assessing whether there would be a significant impact to tribal cultural resources and any appropriate mitigation measures that may be necessary. If you have any further questions or concerns feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Raymond Huaute
Cultural Resource Specialist
Morongo Band of Mission Indians
12700 Pumarra Road
Banning, CA 92220
Phone: (951) 755-5025
Fax: (951) 572-6004
Email: rhuaute@morongo-nsn.gov
Date: 1/4/2017

Re: Cultural Resource Investigation for the Gateway South Building 4 Project, San Bernardino County, California.

Dear, William Borkan
Staff Archaeologist
Applied Earthwords

Thank you for contacting the Morongo Band of Mission Indians regarding the above referenced project(s). The tribe greatly appreciates the opportunity to comment on the project. After reviewing our records and consulting with our tribal elders and cultural experts, we would like to respectfully offer the following comments and/or recommendations:

☐ The project is outside of the Tribe’s current reservation boundaries and is not within an area considered to be a traditional use area or one in which the Tribe has cultural ties (i.e. Cahuilla or Serrano Territory). We recommend contacting the appropriate tribes who have cultural affiliation to the project area. We have no further comments at this time.

☐ The project is outside of the Tribe’s current reservation boundaries but within in an area considered to be a traditional use area or one in which the Tribe has cultural ties (i.e. Cahuilla or Serrano Territory). At this time, we are not aware of any cultural resources on the property; however, that is not to say there is nothing present. At this time, we ask that you impose specific conditions regarding all cultural and/or archaeological resources and buried cultural materials on any development plans or entitlement applications (see Standard Development Conditions attachment).

☒ The project is outside of the Tribe’s current reservation boundaries but within in an area considered to be a traditional use area or one in which the Tribe has cultural ties (i.e. Cahuilla or Serrano Territory). At this time we ask that you impose specific conditions regarding all cultural and/or archaeological resources and buried cultural materials on any development plans or entitlement applications (see Standard Development Conditions attachment). Furthermore, we would like to formally request the following:

☒ A thorough records search be conducted by contacting one of the CHRIS (California Historical Resources Information System) Archaeological Information Centers and have a copy of the search results be provided to the tribe.

☒ A comprehensive archaeological survey be conducted of the proposed project property and any APE’s (Areas of Potential Effect) within the property. We would also like to
request that a tribal monitor be present during the initial pedestrian survey and that a copy of the results be provided to the tribe as soon as it can be made available.

☐ Morongo would like to request that our tribal monitors be present during any test pit or trenching activities and any subsequent ground disturbing activities during the construction phase of the project.

☐ The project is located with the current boundaries of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians Reservation. Please contact the Morongo Band of Mission Indians planning department for further details.

Once again, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project. Please be aware that receipt of this letter does not constitute “meaningful” tribal consultation nor does it conclude the consultation process. This letter is merely intended to initiate consultation between the tribe and lead agency, which may be followed up with additional emails, phone calls or face-to-face consultation if deemed necessary. If you should have any further questions with regard to this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

Raymond Huaute
Cultural Resource Specialist
Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Email: rhuaute@morongo-nsn.gov
Phone: (951) 755-5025
Standard Development Conditions

The Morongo Band of Mission Indians asks that you impose specific conditions regarding cultural and/or archaeological resources and buried cultural materials on any development plans or entitlement applications as follows:

1. If human remains are encountered during grading and other construction excavation, work in the immediate vicinity shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5.

2. In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during project development/construction, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the overall project may continue during this assessment period.
   a. If significant Native American cultural resources are discovered, for which a Treatment Plan must be prepared, the developer or his archaeologist shall contact the Morongo Band of Mission Indians.
   b. If requested by the Tribe¹, the developer or the project archaeologist shall, in good faith, consult on the discovery and its disposition (e.g. avoidance, preservation, return of artifacts to tribe, etc.).

¹ The Morongo Band of Mission Indians realizes that there may be additional tribes claiming cultural affiliation to the area; however, Morongo can only speak for itself. The Tribe has no objection if the archaeologist wishes to consult with other tribes and if the city wishes to revise the condition to recognize other tribes.
Greetings,

A records check of the ACBCI cultural registry revealed that this project is not located within the Tribe’s Traditional Use Area (TUA). Therefore, we defer to the other tribes in the area. This letter shall conclude our consultation efforts.

Thank you,

Katie Croft
Archaeologist
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
5401 Dinah Shore Drive
Palm Springs, CA 92264
760-699-6829 Office
760-413-6253 Cell 760-699-6924
Fax kcroft@aguacaliente.net

From: William Borkan [mailto:wborkan@appliedearthworks.com]
Sent: Friday, December 09, 2016 4:26 PM
To: THPO Consulting <ACBCI-THPO@aguacaliente.net>
Subject: Gateway South Building 4 Project

Good afternoon,

Attached please find a scoping letter and map for the Gateway South Building 4 Project in San Bernardino County.

Thank you,
William

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of
this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.
APPENDIX B

Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Forms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Listings</th>
<th>Review Code</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

P1. **Other Identifier:**

P2. **Location:**
- **a. County:** San Bernardino
- **b. USGS 7.5' Quad:** San Bernardino South
- **Date:** 1967
- **c. Address:** 1494 S. Waterman Avenue, City of San Bernardino, Zip 92408
- **d. Zone:** 11S 474067 mE/ 3770365 mN/
- **e. Other Locational Data:** This golf course is located at 17494 S. Waterman Avenue. The Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs) are listed as 014121180000, 0141421190000, 01412120000, 0141431180000.

P3a. **Description** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries):

In addition to the 18-hole course, the facility includes a clubhouse, practice green, driving range, golf cart storage, and maintenance area. The clubhouse and course were completed in 1968. A parking lot is located adjacent to the clubhouse to the east and reached by an access road that extends east to S. Waterman Avenue. Holes 12-17, one man-made water hazard, and five bunkers are located west of East Twin Creek; Holes 1-11 and 18, five man-made water hazards, and sixteen bunkers are located east of East Twin Creek. The east and west portions of the course are reached by a bridge that spans East Twin Creek at the southern portion of the golf course. Routing of the course is accomplished by fairways running parallel to each other and divided by mature trees. Various forms of equipment fixtures, such as ball washers and course markers, and utility structures that house power and irrigation equipment are located throughout the golf course.

The clubhouse was constructed in 1968 and is a one-story Modern-style building. The building features a steep pitched side-gabled roof with secondary dropped medium-pitched side-gabled roofs on the east and west elevations covered is asphalt shingle. The building is clad in stucco with intermittent shingle-covered accents. The primary entrance is centered on the north elevation and is filled with wood double doors with diamond patterned pane glass windows. Sliding windows are arranged in a band beneath a fabric awning on the north elevation and are flanked by fixed decorative shutters. A faux chimney clad in shingle is centered on the east elevation. Sliding windows flanked by fixed decorative shutters are located on both sides of the faux chimney. A low-pitches front-gabled roof covered is asphalt shingle is centered over a gable-clad glad projection on the south elevation. The roof extends to a flat roof to the east and the west of the gable that forms a pillar supported covered patio. The shingle-clad projection features sliding windows and an entrance door. The north elevation features a building extension that extends north off center of the façade. The extension features a flat roof with a short parapet. The east elevation of the extension has fixed and sliding windows flanked by fixed decorative shutters, intermittent decorative shingles, and an entrance located off center on the façade that is recessed and filled with a glass commercial door. The extension was expanded in 1972 (City of San Bernardino 1972).

North of the clubhouse building is a one-story rectangular golf cart storage building constructed in 1970. The building has a flat roof. The building is clad in vertical wood siding intermittently broken up by decorative wood shingles. Roll-top doors are located on the north and south elevations. A corrugated metal maintenance and storage shed constructed ca. 1970s with a low pitched corrugated metal roof and a rectangular plan is located north of the golf cart storage building.

P3b. **Resource Attributes** (List all attributes and codes):

HP29: Landscape Architecture; HP13: Clubhouse; HP39: storage building

P4. **Resources Present:**

- ☒ Building
- ☒ Structure
- ☐ Object
- ☐ Site
- ☐ District
- ☐ Element of District
- ☐ Other:
P5. **Photograph or Drawing:** (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects.) Photographs taken November 29, 2016. See continuation sheets for photographs.

P6. **Date Constructed/Age and Source:** 1968 (City of San Bernardino)
- □ Prehistoric
- ☒ Historic
- □ Both

P7. **Owner and Address:** Riverside Public Utilities, 3025 Madison Street, Riverside, CA 92504

P9. **Date Recorded:** November 29, 2016

P10. **Type of Survey:**
- □ Intensive
- ☒ Reconnaissance
- □ Other


**Attachments:**
- □ None
- ☒ Location Map
- □ Site Map
- ☒ Continuation Sheet
- ☒ Building, Structure, and Object Record
- □ Archaeological Record
- □ District Record
- □ Linear Feature Record
- □ Milling Station Record
- □ Rock Art Record
- □ Artifact Record
- □ Photograph Record
- Other:
Golf in Southern California

The first games of golf in California were played in Riverside (Riverside County) and Burlingame (San Francisco County) in the early 1890s; golf clubs for the elite soon followed with golf courses developing along the coast, such as Pebble Beach, and Southern California (Rowlinson 2010:232-234). During the Golden Age of Golf, the sport “captured the country and nowhere was that more evident than in Southern California” (Southern California Golf Association 2013a). In only six years (between 1919 and 1925), the number of golf course clubs in Southern California more than doubled (Southern California Golf Association 2013a). Some of the most famous Golden Age courses in Southern California are George Thomas’s Riviera, North Course at the Los Angeles Country Club, and Bel-Air (Rowlinson 2010:234). Public courses were few but grew on account of public projects funded during the Great Depression (Southern California Golf Association 2013b). World War II production and ingenuity not only brought the United States out of the Great Depression, it spurred new economies and as such the post-World War II boom has been considered an “unparalleled period of golf course construction and another glorious era for Southern California amateur golfers” (Southern California Golf Association 2013b). Between 1960 and 1979, over 150 golf courses ranging from modest municipal layouts to elaborate country clubs were constructed in Southern California (Southern California Golf Association 2013c).

The Development of the San Bernardino Golf Club

The San Bernardino Golf Club was developed in 1968 by real estate developer William E. Leonard. Leonard was born in San Bernardino in 1922. After serving in the United States Army, Leonard joined the Leonard Realty and Building Company, a firm established in 1905 by his grandfather. By the early 1960s, Leonard had transformed his grandfather’s firm into a leading development firm in San Bernardino. He became the founding director of Inland Action, Inc., a group of business and education leaders originally founded to oppose the closure of Norton Air Force Base in 1962. The group evolved to address the broader economic issues of the Inland Empire. Leonard took an active interest in the economic wellbeing of San Bernardino and was a strong advocate for the establishment of Cal State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) and the construction of Interstate 215. Leonard chaired the California Highway Commission from 1973-1977 and the California Transportation Commission from 1985-1983 (Gallagher 2007). For his contributions to CSUSB and the transportation infrastructure of San Bernardino, CSUB named their transportation center The William and Barbara Leonard Transportation Center in 2006 (California State University, San Bernardino 2016).

Leonard commissioned Daniel Brown, a golf enthusiast living in San Bernardino, to design the course. Daniel Brown served in the Army Air Corps during World War II and reportedly survived five plane crashes. After World War II, Brown served in the Korean War and retired in 1963 as a major in the United States Air Force (News-Mirror: 2016). While a dedicated and avid golfer, Brown was not a golf course architect. He did work at the Orange Show Public Golf Course in San Bernardino prior to designing and managing the San Bernardino Public Golf Club (Grant 1968). The circumstances of how he became involved with Leonard and came to design the San Bernardino Golf Club are unclear and research has not indicated that he designed any other golf courses.
The San Bernardino Public Golf Club opened on April 1, 1968. It was constructed on lands leased from Riverside Public Utilities. On opening day, only the back nine holes of the 6,480-yard course were available to play, the front nine holes were completed later that year. A clubhouse, access road, cart paths, and paved parking lots were constructed in 1968 (Grant 1968). A golf cart storage shed was added to the property in 1970 (City of San Bernardino 1970) and in 1972 an addition was constructed on the clubhouse (City of San Bernardino 1972). The golf course has undergone alterations since its construction, including lengthening, relocating and renumbering fairways, lengthening tees, adding tee boxes, and other forms of standard golf course maintenance and operation.

Evaluation

CRHR Criterion 1: No information has been found to suggest that the San Bernardino Golf Club is directly associated with historical events of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 1. The golf course was constructed in 1968 during a period of golf course construction proliferation in Southern California and the nation. The golf course is not the earliest constructed in San Bernardino, Riverside County, California, or the United States. No significant events related to the history of golf or the general history of California or the United States have occurred at this golf course. The design of the course is not particularly significant or unique and did not initiate changes in golf course design or the way in which golf is played. The presence of the golf course in San Bernardino did not represent a significant enough tourist draw for the City of San Bernardino or represent a significant contribution to the culture and character of the city to be considered historically significant. While it does appear that the golf course is currently the oldest golf course within the City of San Bernardino, it is not the oldest within the region or the state. Its status as the oldest golf course in San Bernardino County does not merit historical significance since the economic development, history, and cultural identity of San Bernardino is not significantly tied to golf. Therefore, the San Bernardino Golf Club is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 1.

CRHR Criterion 2: No information has been found to suggest that the San Bernardino Golf Club is directly associated with the productive life of a historical person of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 2. The golf course was initially developed by William E. Leonard, a prominent San Bernardino real estate developer and philanthropist. While Leonard may be considered a person of significance with the history of San Bernardino, his contributions to the community are many and the construction of the golf course is not among his most significant accomplishments. Therefore, the San Bernardino Golf Club is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 2.

CRHR Criterion 3: The San Bernardino Golf Club does not appear to embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic value. The course was designed by Daniel Brown, an amateur golf course architect who does not appear to have designed any other golf course besides the San Bernardino Golf Club. Brown is not considered a master in the field of golf course architecture and his design for the San Bernardino Golf Club does not appear to be a unique example of or significant departure from established golf course design. The clubhouse is a fairly common example of the Modern-style of architecture and does not exhibit any significant character defining features or design elements that would make it significant. The remaining buildings and structures on the golf course are utilitarian in design and exhibit no indication of being architecturally significant. The architect and builder of the club house and other ancillary buildings could not be identified. Therefore, the San Bernardino Golf Club is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 3.

CRHR Criterion 4: The San Bernardino Golf Club does not meet CRHR Criterion 4 since it has not yielded and is unlikely to yield information important in prehistory or history. This criterion is typically reserved for archaeological resources, ruins, or rare built-environments resources of which little is already known, that are considered to be the sole sources of historical data. Therefore, the San Bernardino Golf Club is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 4.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes (List attributes and codes):  None

B12. References:
California State University, San Bernardino
2016  “About William and Barbara Leonard”
City of San Bernardino
1970  Building Permit #22442
City of San Bernardino
1972  Building Permit #25786
Gallagher, Jill
2007 “CSUSB honors businessman, developer, and public servant William E. Leonard with honorary doctorate.”

Grant, Bruce
1968 “Grant on Golf: New Golf Opens”
*San Bernardino County Sun*, Saturday, April 4, 1968. Page 64

News Mirror
2016 “Obituary: Daniel Dale Brown, Sr.”

Rowlinson, Mark (editor)

Southern California Golf Association


B13. Remarks:


Date of Evaluation: December 7, 2016
*Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder)  San Bernardino Golf Club

North elevation of the clubhouse, facing south (photograph taken November 29, 2016)

East elevation of clubhouse, facing west (photograph taken November 29, 2016)
South elevation of clubhouse, facing northwest (photograph taken November 29, 2016)

East elevation of clubhouse addition, facing west (photograph taken November 29, 2016)
Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder) San Bernardino Golf Club

East Elevation of golf cart storage building, facing southwest (photograph taken November 29, 2016)

Overview of course from green at Hole 18, facing east (photograph taken November 29, 2016)
*Resource Name or #:* (Assigned by recorder) San Bernardino Golf Club

Overview of course from tee at Hole 10, facing southeast (photograph taken November 29, 2016)

Overview of course from Hole 11, facing northeast (photograph taken November 29, 2016)
*Resource Name or #*: (Assigned by recorder) San Bernardino Golf Club

Overview of course from Hole 1, facing east (photograph taken November 29, 2016)

Utility structure and overview of course, facing south (photograph taken November 29, 2016)
Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder)  141 E. Dumas Street

P1. Other Identifier:

P2. Location:  
  a. County  San Bernardino  Not for Publication  Unrestricted  
  b. USGS  7.5' Quad  San Bernardino South  Date  1967 (photorevised 1980)  
    T. 1S, R. 4W; NE ¼ of SE ¼ of Sec. 22  
  c. Address:  141 E. Dumas Street  City  San Bernardino  Zip  92408  
  d. Zone  11S  473798 mE/3770786 mN/  
  e. Other Locational Data (e.g., parcel #, legal description, directions to resource, additional UTM's, etc., when appropriate): 0141-421-04-0000

P3a. Description  (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries):  141 E. Dumas Street is a one-story Minimal Traditional style single family residence constructed in 1955. The building has stucco siding and a low-pitched hipped roof with asphalt shingles. The north elevation features a gabled patio cover supported by wood poles. The primary entrance is centered beneath the patio cover. Fenestration on the north elevation includes a band of three wood frame double-hung windows and aluminum sliding windows. The south elevation features a shed roof addition with lateral wood siding and doors and windows filled with plywood. The west elevation features a double hung wood frame window and a replacement vinyl window.

P3b. Resource Attributes  (List all attributes and codes):  HP2: Single family property

P4. Resources Present:  Building  Structure  Object  Site  District  Element of District  Other:

P5. Photograph or Drawing:  (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects.)  Photographs taken May 27, 2017. See continuation sheets for photographs.

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:  1955  
  Prehistoric  Historic  Both

P7. Owner and Address:  Charles Lewis, 141 E. Dumas Street, San Bernardino, CA 92408

P9. Date Recorded:  May 30, 2017

P10. Type of Survey:  Intensive  Reconnaissance  Other  
  Describe:


Attachments:  None  Location Map  Site Map  Continuation Sheet  Building, Structure, and Object Record  Archaeological Record  District Record  Linear Feature Record  Milling Station Record  Rock Art Record  Artifact Record  Photograph Record  Other:
California was annexed by the U.S. in 1848 and raising crops that were irrigated from the San Gorgonio Project, which traversed Redlands, Old San Bernardino, Colton, and Agua Mansa, from the Santa Ana River. Beginning in the 1830s, the Mission San Gabriel established a branch at San Bernardino. After Mexico achieved independence from Spain in 1821, the Mexican government seized ownership of church properties through the Secularization Act of 1833, and lands were redistributed as ranchos through a tribute system. This land redistribution by the Mexican government fostered the development of ranchos in what is now known as California (Chasteen 2015).

Euro-American settlement began in the San Bernardino County area in the early 1800s as persons seeking land and fortunes made their way west from the mid-west and east coast of the United States or north from what is now known as Mexico. The Catholic missionaries were a catalyst in the expansion of Euro-American influences in this region. A group of missionaries, Native Americans, and soldiers from the San Gabriel Mission named San Bernardino in honor of the feast day of San Bernardino of Siena when they entered the valley on May 10, 1810. The Mission San Gabriel initially attempted to expand its influence in the San Bernardino Valley when Father Dumetz was sent to the valley in 1810 to establish the mission station known as Politana. An earthquake in 1812 followed by raids from neighboring Native American tribes caused a lull of interest in the Politana by the Mission San Gabriel. Beginning in the 1830s, the Mission San Gabriel established a branch at the Asistencia (California Historical Landmark No. 42). The Asistencia is currently located in the Mission District in eastern Loma Linda. During the years 1822 through 1827, the Mission Fathers traveled the San Bernardino–Sonora Road, also known as the Emigrant or Mormon Trail, which traversed Redlands, Old San Bernardino, Colton, and Agua Mansa, from the Mission San Gabriel to the San Bernardino Asistencia. After Mexico achieved independence from Spain in 1821, the Mexican government seized ownership of church properties through the Secularization Act of 1833, and lands were redistributed as ranchos through a tribute system. This land redistribution by the Mexican government fostered the development of ranchos in what is now known as California (Chasteen 2015).

As a result of the Mexican government seizing control of church properties, the Asistencia was largely abandoned by the late 1830s. The Lugo family, under leadership of Jose del Carmen Lugo, moved into the former Asistencia buildings in order to establish a colony. Slover Mountain, also known as El Cerrito Solo, was the natural landmark used for establishing the boundaries of the Lugo’s land grant within the San Bernardino Rancho. What became known as San Bernardino County originally consisted of the following ranchos: Canon de Santa Ana, Jurupa and El Rincon, Cucamonga, Santa Ana del Chino, San Bernardino, and Muscupiabe. The ranchos largely subsisted on cattle ranching and raising crops that were irrigated from the Mill Creek Zanja and other irrigation ditches. In an effort to gain territory, the U.S. seized the territory of Texas from the Mexican government, which resulted in the Mexican-American War. The State of California was annexed by the U.S. in 1848 through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the Mexican-American War (California Point of Historical Interest No. 151). The end of the war further paved the way for Euro-American settlement from the east (Chasteen 2015).

Euro-American settlement in San Bernardino began in the early 1800s through the establishment of Politana and the Asistencia, but was largely fostered by the establishment of a Mormon colony under the leadership of Amasa Lyman and Charles Rich. Brothers Lyman and Rich bought the San Bernardino Rancho from Jose and Maria Armenta Lugo in 1851. San Bernardino County was established on April 26, 1853, and ceded a portion of its territory to the formation of Riverside County in 1892. Two Mormon colonies were established on either side of the Santa Ana River. The Mormons who settled in the San Bernardino area raised livestock, planted crops, and established civic services such as a school and a post office. The Mormon settlers were recalled to Salt Lake City, Utah in 1858 by Brigham Young in an effort to create a Mormon stronghold. The majority of the Mormon settlers in San Bernardino returned to Salt Lake City; however, some remained. Agriculture and livestock continued to be the chief industries in San Bernardino County (Chasteen 2015).
General agriculture and livestock raising pursuits were quickly overshadowed by the citrus industry in Southern California beginning in the 1870s. The first orange trees in San Bernardino were planted by Anson Van Leuven in 1857. Citrus quickly became the largest industry in Southern California; including growing, packing, and shipping. Other industries included cattle ranching, growing sugar beets, and viticulture and enology. The burgeoning citrus industry led to a population boom, and spurred the development of transcontinental railroads (Chasteen 2015).

Several companies were formed beginning in the mid- to late-1800s in an effort to develop San Bernardino County and Southern California in general. Beginning in 1887 in San Bernardino County, Major George H. Bonebrake and F.C. Howes formed the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company, purchased 28,000 acres and the water rights to Lytle Creek, and laid out the townsites of Rosena (now known as Fontana), Rialto, Bloomington, and San Sevaine. The Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company, though ultimately unsuccessful in its attempts, initiated much of the early residential and commercial development in San Bernardino County. After the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company failed, largely due to a nationwide economic depression, several other development companies, such as the Fontana Farms Company, were formed to purchase the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company holdings and also to further development of towns and industries throughout the county. The establishment of interstate and intercontinental rail lines brought an influx of people and money to Southern California, which lead to a real estate boom (Chasteen 2015).

Shortly after San Bernardino County was established, the City of San Bernardino was established as the county seat. The townsite was surveyed in 1853 by Henry G. Sherwood. The township was originally one square mile with a grid of wide streets forming a grid of eight-acre blocks. What is now known as Pioneer Park was originally the central block, which was named Temple Block by the Mormon settlers. The City of San Bernardino was incorporated on April 13, 1854. By 1891, San Bernardino had established itself as a cosmopolitan settlement. The population had reached 5,000, the city had 26 miles of paved streets, an opera house, and the citizenry enjoyed other entertainments such as literary circles. The primary industries at that time were lumber, mining, and tourism; citrus had yet to take hold as the chief source of income. The City of San Bernardino today is the regional hub for commercial activities, which draws a work force from within the City and also from neighboring communities (Chasteen 2015).

Minimal Traditional homes proliferated throughout the United States after World War II as a response to demand for housing from returning soldiers. The minimal design elements and simple construction made the style popular for its cost effectiveness and short construction time. Large tract homes were built using this style throughout the United States. Between 1946 and 1949 approximately 5.21 million new homes were constructed in the United States, a significant portion of which were Minimal Traditional-style homes. The style was widely popular until the 1950s, when post-war prosperity allowed for the construction of more spacious homes and the Ranch style became the dominant suburban home design. Minimal Traditional homes are typically small houses with a low- or medium-pitched gabled roof. They typically feature double-hung windows and minimal amounts of architectural detail (McAlester 2013).

Research has yielded little information regarding the owners and occupants of 141 E. Dumas Street. In 1979 the building was owned by Aldora Barrier. In 1981, Lonnie S. Barrier was also listed as an owner of the property. In 2006 the ownership of the property was passed to a group of individuals including Wanda Walker, Brenda Sams, Wayne Lewis, Bernice Lewis, Kenneth Lewis, Donna Lewis, Charles Lewis, and Charlene Earl (San Bernardino County Assessor).

**Evaluation**

**CRHR Criterion 1:** No information has been found to suggest that the 141 E. Dumas Street is directly associated with historical events of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 1. The building was constructed in 1955 during the post-WWII housing boom in Southern California. It is one of many small single-family homes constructed during this period throughout Southern California and the United States. Research has yielded no evidence that important historical events are specifically associated with this building. Therefore, 141 E. Dumas Street does not appear eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 1.
CRHR Criterion 2: No information has been found to suggest that 141 E. Dumas Street is directly associated with the productive life of a historical person of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 2. No one associated with the ownership or occupancy of this building appears to be persons of importance in local, state, or national history. Therefore, 141 E. Dumas Street does not appear eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 2.

CRHR Criterion 3: 141 E. Dumas Street does not appear to embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic value. The building is a fairly common and unremarkable example of Minimal Traditional-style architecture. While the building does exhibit some of the character-defining features of the style, it is not a particularly good example. It is essentially similar to many other single family residences constructed during this period throughout California and the United States. The architect and builder were not identified, but this building is unlikely to be the work of a master. Therefore, 141 E. Dumas Street is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 3.

CRHR Criterion 4: 141 E. Dumas Street does not meet CRHR Criterion 4 since it has not yielded and is unlikely to yield information important in prehistory or history. This criterion is typically reserved for archaeological resources, ruins, or rare built-environments resources of which little is already known, that are considered to be the sole sources of historical data. Therefore, 141 E. Dumas Street does not appear eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 4.

B11. Additional Resource Attributes (List attributes and codes): None

B12. References:
Chasteen, Carrie  

McAlester, Virginia  

San Bernardino County Assessor  
2017 PIMS Package Report for Parcel 0141-421-04-0000

B13. Remarks:

Date of Evaluation: May 30, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of California — The Resources Agency</th>
<th>Primary #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION</td>
<td>HRI #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUATION SHEET</td>
<td>Trinomial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NRHP Status Code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 5 of 7  
*Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder)*  141 E. Dumas Street

North elevation, facing south (photograph taken May 27, 2017)
South elevation, facing northeast (photograph taken May 27, 2017)
Resource Name or #: 141 E. Dumas Street

Map Name: San Bernardino South (1967, photorevised 1980), CA, USGS 7.5' quadrangle

Date: 2017

SCALE 1:24,000
State of California — The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

PRIMARY RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Listings</th>
<th>Review Code</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder) 145 E. Dumas Street

**P1.** Other Identifier:

**P2.** Location:
- **a. County** San Bernardino
- **b. USGS 7.5' Quad** San Bernardino South
- **c. Address:** 145 E. Dumas Street
- **d. Zone** 11S 473816 mE/ 3770786 mN

**P3a.** Description (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries): 145 E. Dumas Street is a one-story Minimal Traditional style single family residence constructed in 1955. The building has stucco siding and a low-pitched hipped roof with asphalt shingles that extends into a small gable on the north elevation. The north elevation features a large picture window with a gabled pop-out and two vinyl sliding windows. The Primary entrance is located on the north elevation and recessed beneath a covered porch. The north elevation features an attached garage that has been converted into an addition. The door of the garage has been filled and covered with stucco. The garage and north elevation patio are covered by a roof with a slight pitch. The south elevation features an addition.

**P3b.** Resource Attributes (List all attributes and codes): HP2: Single family property

**P4.** Resources Present:

- ☑ Building
- ☑ Structure
- ☑ Object
- ☑ Site
- ☑ District
- ☑ Element of District
- ☑ Other

**P5.** Photograph or Drawing: (Photograph required for buildings, structures, and objects.) Photographs taken May 27, 2017. See continuation sheets for photographs.

**P6.** Date Constructed/Age and Source: 1955

- ☑ Prehistoric
- ☑ Historic
- ☑ Both

**P7.** Owner and Address: Israel and Ana Rivera, 18475 Orange Street, Hesperia, CA 92345

**P9.** Date Recorded: May 30, 2017

**P10.** Type of Survey:

- ☑ Intensive
- ☑ Reconnaissance
- ☑ Other

Describe:

**P11.** Report Citation (Provide full citation or enter “none”): Thomas, Roberta, and Justin Castells 2017. Cultural Resource Assessment for the Proposed Alliance California Gateway South Building 4 Project, City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California. Applied EarthWorks, Inc., Hemet, CA. Prepared for Hillwood Investment Properties, Ontario, CA.

**Attachments:**

- ☑ None
- ☑ Location Map
- ☑ Site Map
- ☑ Continuation Sheet
- ☑ Building, Structure, and Object Record
- ☑ Archaeological Record
- ☑ District Record
- ☑ Linear Feature Record
- ☑ Milling Station Record
- ☑ Rock Art Record
- ☑ Artifact Record
- ☑ Photograph Record
- ☑ Other
Euro-American settlement began in the San Bernardino County area in the early 1800s as persons seeking land and fortunes made their way west from the mid-west and east coast of the United States or north from what is now known as Mexico. The Catholic missionaries were a catalyst in the expansion of Euro-American influences in this region. A group of missionaries, Native Americans, and soldiers from the San Gabriel Mission named San Bernardino in honor of the feast day of San Bernardino of Silos when they entered the valley on May 10, 1810. The Mission San Gabriel initially attempted to expand its influence in the San Bernardino Valley when Father Dumetz was sent to the valley in 1810 to establish the mission station known as Politana. An earthquake in 1812 followed by raids from neighboring Native American tribes caused a lull of interest in the Politana by the Mission San Gabriel. Beginning in the 1830s, the Mission San Gabriel established a branch at the Asistencia (California Historical Landmark No. 42). The Asistencia is currently located in the Mission District in eastern Loma Linda. During the years 1822 through 1827, the Mission Fathers traveled the San Bernardino-Sonora Road, also known as the Emigrant or Mormon Trail, which traversed Redlands, Old San Bernardino, Colton, and Agua Mansa, from the Mission San Gabriel to the San Bernardino Asistencia. After Mexico achieved independence from Spain in 1821, the Mexican government seized ownership of church properties through the Secularization Act of 1833, and lands were redistributed as ranchos through a tribute system. This land redistribution by the Mexican government fostered the development of ranchos in what is now known as California (Chasteen 2015).

As a result of the Mexican government seizing control of church properties, the Asistencia was largely abandoned by the late 1830s. The Lugo family, under leadership of Jose del Carmen Lugo, moved into the former Asistencia buildings in order to establish a colony. Slover Mountain, also known as El Cerrito Solo, was the natural landmark used for establishing the boundaries of the Lugos’ land grant within the San Bernardino Rancho. What became known as San Bernardino County originally consisted of the following ranchos: Canon de Santa Ana, Jurupa and El Rincon, Cucamonga, Santa Ana del Chino, San Bernardino, and Muscupiabe. The ranchos largely subsisted on cattle ranching and raising crops that were irrigated from the Mill Creek Zanja and other irrigation ditches. In an effort to gain territory, the U.S. seized the territory of Texas from the Mexican government, which resulted in the Mexican-American War. The State of California was annexed by the U.S. in 1848 through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the Mexican-American War (California Point of Historical Interest No. 151). The end of the war further paved the way for Euro-American settlement from the east (Chasteen 2015).

Euro-American settlement in San Bernardino began in the early 1800s through the establishment of Politana and the Asistencia, but was largely fostered by the establishment of a Mormon colony under the leadership of Amasa Lyman and Charles Rich. Brothers Lyman and Rich bought the San Bernardino Rancho from Jose and Maria Armenta Lugo in 1851. San Bernardino County was established on April 26, 1853, and ceded a portion of its territory to the formation of Riverside County in 1892. Two Mormon colonies were established on either side of the Santa Ana River. The Mormons who settled in the San Bernardino area raised livestock, planted crops, and established civic services such as a school and a post office. The Mormon settlers were recalled to Salt Lake City, Utah in 1858 by Brigham Young in an effort to create a Mormon stronghold. The majority of the Mormon settlers in San Bernardino returned to Salt Lake City; however, some remained. Agriculture and livestock continued to be the chief industries in San Bernardino County (Chasteen 2015).
General agriculture and livestock raising pursuits were quickly overshadowed by the citrus industry in Southern California beginning in the 1870s. The first orange trees in San Bernardino were planted by Anson Van Leuven in 1857. Citrus quickly became the largest industry in Southern California; including growing, packing, and shipping. Other industries included cattle ranching, growing sugar beets, and viticulture and enology. The burgeoning citrus industry led to a population boom, and spurred the development of transcontinental railroads (Chasteen 2015).

Several companies were formed beginning in the mid- to late-1800s in an effort to develop San Bernardino County and Southern California in general. Beginning in 1887 in San Bernardino County, Major George H. Bonebrake and F.C. Howes formed the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company, purchased 28,000 acres and the water rights to Lytle Creek, and laid out the townsite of Rosena (now known as Fontana), Rialto, Bloomington, and San Sevaine. The Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company, though ultimately unsuccessful in its attempts, initiated much of the early residential and commercial development in San Bernardino County. After the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company failed, largely due to a nationwide economic depression, several other development companies, such as the Fontana Farms Company, were formed to purchase the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company holdings and also to further development of towns and industries throughout the county. The establishment of interstate and intercontinental rail lines brought an influx of people and money to Southern California, which lead to a real estate boom (Chasteen 2015).

Shortly after San Bernardino County was established, the City of San Bernardino was established as the county seat. The townsite was surveyed in 1853 by Henry G. Sherwood. The township was originally one square mile with a grid of wide streets forming a grid of eight-acre blocks. What is now known as Pioneer Park was originally the central block, which was named Temple Block by the Mormon settlers. The City of San Bernardino was incorporated on April 13, 1854. By 1891, San Bernardino had established itself as a cosmopolitan settlement. The population had reached 5,000, the city had 26 miles of paved streets, an opera house, and the citizenry enjoyed other entertainments such as literary circles. The primary industries at that time were lumber, mining, and tourism; citrus had yet to take hold as the chief source of income. The City of San Bernardino today is the regional hub for commercial activities, which draws a work force from within the City and also from neighboring communities (Chasteen 2015).

Minimal Traditional homes proliferated throughout the United States after World War II as a response to demand for housing from returning soldiers. The minimal design elements and simple construction made the style popular for its cost effectiveness and short construction time. Large tract homes were built using this style throughout the United States. Between 1946 and 1949 approximately 5.21 million new homes were constructed in the United States, a significant portion of which were Minimal traditional-style homes. The style was widely popular until the 1950s, when post-war prosperity allowed for the construction of more spacious homes and the Ranch style became the dominant suburban home design. Minimal Traditional homes are typically small houses with a low- or medium-pitched gabled roof. They typically feature double-hung windows and minimal amounts of architectural detail (McAlester 2013).

Research has yielded little information regarding the owners and occupants of 145 E. Dumas Street. In 1979 the building was owned by Aldora Barrier and Jess Ellis. In 1981, Bank of America took ownership of the property and sold it to Jim Currie in 1982. The property transferred to Gregory Hile in 1985 and then to Weyerhauser Mortgage Company and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1988. Israel Rivera purchased the property in 1988 and is the current owner (San Bernardino County Assessor).

**Evaluation**

**CRHR Criterion 1:** No information has been found to suggest that the 145 E. Dumas Street is directly associated with historical events of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 1. The building was constructed in 1955 during the post-WWII housing boom in Southern California. It is one of many small single-family homes constructed during this period throughout Southern California and the United States. Research has yielded no evidence that important historical events are specifically associated with this building. Therefore, 145 E. Dumas Street does not appear eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 1.
**CRHR Criterion 2:** No information has been found to suggest that 145 E. Dumas Street is directly associated with the productive life of a historical person of importance in local, state, or national history under CRHR Criterion 2. No one associated with the ownership or occupancy of this building appears to be persons of importance in local, state, or national history. Therefore, 145 E. Dumas Street does not appear eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 2.

**CRHR Criterion 3:** 145 E. Dumas Street does not appear to embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represent the work of an important creative individual, or possess high artistic value. The building is a fairly common and unremarkable example of Minimal traditional style architecture and has been heavily altered. While the building does exhibit some of the character defining features of the style, it is not a particularly good example. It is essentially similar to many other single family residences constructed during this period throughout California and the United States. The architect and builder were not identified, but this building is unlikely to be the work of a master. Therefore, 145 E. Dumas Street is not eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 3.

**CRHR Criterion 4:** 145 E. Dumas Street does not meet CRHR Criterion 4 since it has not yielded and is unlikely to yield information important in prehistory or history. This criterion is typically reserved for archaeological resources, ruins, or rare built-environments resources of which little is already known, that are considered to be the sole sources of historical data. Therefore, 145 E. Dumas Street does not appear eligible for inclusion of CRHR under Criterion 4.

**B11. Additional Resource Attributes** (List attributes and codes): None

**B12. References:**

Chasteen, Carrie

McAlester, Virginia

San Bernardino County Assessor
2017  PIMS Package Report for Parcel 0141-421-03-0000

**B13. Remarks:**

**B14. Evaluator:** Justin Castells, Applied EarthWorks, Inc., 3550 E. Florida Ave., Suite H, Hemet, CA 92544
**Date of Evaluation:** May 30, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder)</th>
<th>145 E. Dumas Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North elevation, facing south</strong> (photograph taken May 27, 2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Dumas Street
East elevation, facing southwest (photograph taken May 27, 2017)
Resource Name or #: South Washington Avenue

P1. Other Identifier:

P2. Location:  
   a. County       San Bernardino   □ Not for Publication  ✗ Unrestricted  
   b. USGS 7.5' Quad  San Bernardino South  Date 1967  
   Unsectioned portion of San Bernardino Land Grant
   
   c. Address:  
      City  San Bernardino  Zip 92408  
   d. Zone 11S 473808 mE/ 3770805 mN/  
   e. Other Locational Data (e.g., parcel #, legal description, directions to resource, additional UTMs, etc., when appropriate): The road is located south of Orange Show Road and north of Dumas Street, 0.3 miles west of South Waterman Avenue.

P3a. Description: The historic-period segment of South Washington Avenue extends north from Dumas Street for a distance of approximately 700 feet to Orange Road Show. The asphalt-concrete paved road that measures approximately 24 feet wide flanked by dirt shoulders that measure 5 to 10 feet in width. Historic maps indicate that the section of South Washington Avenue located north of Dumas Street has been in use since at least 1898 (USGS 1898). When first constructed, South Washington Avenue consisted of an approximately 0.14-mile-long (740-ft-long) roadway that was accessed off Dumas Street. By the late 1930s, the road had been extended 0.45 miles further north to connect to Central Avenue. On the 1938 and 1943 Colton 7.5' topographic quad maps (USGS 1938, 1943), a number of houses are depicted along this stretch of South Washington Avenue. The full length of South Washington Avenue appears to have been a light duty road since at least the mid-1950s (USGS 1954). Topographic maps dating to the latter half of the 20th century show no major changes in the road alignment between the 1950s and the 1980s (USGS 1954, 1967, 1975, and 1981).

P3b. Resource Attributes:  
   HP 37: Highway/trail, road

P4. Resources Present:  
   □ Building  ✗ Structure  ☐ Object  ☐ Site  ☐ District  ☐ Element of District  ☐ Other:

P5. Photograph or Drawing:  
   See attached photographs

P6. Date Constructed/Age and Source:  
   □ Prehistoric  ✗ Historic  ☐ Both

P7. Owner and Address:  
   Unknown

P8. Recorded by:  
   Tiffany Clark, Applied EarthWorks, Inc., 133 N. San Gabriel Blvd, Suite 201, Pasadena, CA 91107.

P9. Date Recorded:  
   May 25, 2017

P10. Type of Survey:  
   □ Intensive  ✗ Reconnaissance  ☐ Other
   Describe:  
   Reconnaissance and intensive-level survey for CEQA compliance purposes

P11. Report Citation:  

Attachments:  
   □ None  ✗ Location Map  □ Site Map  ✗ Continuation Sheet  □ Building, Structure, and Object Record  □ Archaeological Record  □ District Record  □ Linear Feature Record  □ Milling Station Record  □ Rock Art Record  □ Artifact Record  □ Photograph Record  Other:
Historic Name: South Washington Avenue

Common Name: South Washington Avenue

Original Use: Local road

Present Use: Local road

Architectural Style: 24 ft wide asphalt-concrete paved road with dirt shoulders

Construction History: Historic maps indicate that the section of South Washington Avenue located north of Dumas Street has been in use since at least 1898 (USGS 1898). When first constructed, South Washington Avenue consisted of an approximately 0.14-mile-long (740-ft-long) roadway that could only be accessed off Dumas Street. By the late 1930s, the road had been extended 0.45 miles further north to connect to Central Avenue (USGS 1938). The full length of South Washington Avenue appears to have been a light duty road since at least the mid-1950s (USGS 1954). Topographic maps dating to the latter half of the 20th century show no major changes in the road alignment between the 1950s and the 1980s (USGS 1954, 1967, 1975, and 1981).

Moved? No Yes Unknown Date: Original Location: Original Location: None

Related Features: None

Architect: San Bernardino County Transportation Department

Builder: same

Significance: Theme Twentieth century development of the city of San Bernardino

Area San Bernardino

Period of Significance None

Property Type Automobile road

Applicable Criteria None

The subject segment of South Washington Avenue does not appear to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR. The subject segment is a 24 ft wide asphalt-concrete paved road with dirt shoulders, similar in its materials, design, and construction as the numerous other paved roads found in the region. It is among numerous roads constructed within and adjacent to the City of San Bernardino during the late 1800s and early 1900s, and it has never achieved any recognition as an important alignment or thoroughfare. In addition, it does not exhibit any architectural or engineering merits that would set it apart from the many similar roads in the region. There is no evidence that it is directly associated with any events or persons of recognized historical significance (CRHR Criterion 1 and 2); represents the work of a prominent architect, designer, or builder, or qualifies as an important example of its type, period, region, or method of construction (CRHR Criterion 3); and it does not have the potential to yield any information important to the study of our local, state, or national history (CRHR Criterion 4).

Additional Resource Attributes: None

References:

1898 San Bernardino, Calif. 15-minute topographic quadrangle (1:62,500).

1938 Colton, Calif. 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (1:31,680).

1954 San Bernardino South, Calif. 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (1:24,000).

1967 San Bernardino South, Calif. 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (1:24,000).

1975 San Bernardino South, Calif. 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (1:24,000).

1981 San Bernardino South, Calif. 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (1:24,000).
B13. Remarks: segment of South Washington Street

B14. Evaluator: Tiffany Clark & Justin Castells
   Date of Evaluation: May 25, 2017

(Sketch Map with north arrow required.)

(This space reserved for official comments.)
South Washington Street (view to the north).

South Washington Street (view to the south).