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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) is under contract to the City of Corona (City) to prepare a cultural resources assessment for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan, located in the City of Corona, Riverside County, California. This study was undertaken to determine whether the proposed project would cause impacts to any historical and/or archaeological resources. This cultural resources assessment was completed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

LSA’s study built upon prior work completed by McKenna et al. (McKenna and Brunzell 2003). LSA completed an update to the records search, contacted Native Americans, and completed a limited field survey. Changing environmental conditions and methods can often lead to the identification of resources that were not observed during past surveys. The purpose of this survey was to sample a percentage of the 2002 survey to verify the validity of that survey. The results of this study indicate that there are no known cultural resources that would be affected by the proposed project. The historic isolated find (33-12511) presented in the McKenna et al. report is no longer within the boundaries of the Arantine Hills Specific Plan. Due to the active nature of the alluvial sediments within the project, it is LSA’s opinion that the potential to uncover buried, preserved archaeological resources is low. LSA does not see the need or benefit for an archaeological monitor during ground-disturbing activities associated with construction.

However, if cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained. The archaeologist shall assess the nature and significance of the find and make recommendations for further study which may include archaeological excavation, laboratory analysis, consultation with Indian Tribes, curation of materials, and an archaeological report.

If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.
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INTRODUCTION
LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) is under contract to the City of Corona (City) to prepare a cultural resources assessment for the Arantine Hills Specific Plan, located in the City of Corona, Riverside County, California. This cultural resources assessment for the project was completed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code (PRC) Chapter 2.6, Section 21083.2, and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5.

PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION
The proposed project is an approximately 275-acre master planned community that includes residential, general commercial, mixed use, open space, and park land uses. In total the project supports 1,621 residential units with densities ranging from 3 units per acre to 35 units per acre and 745,300 square feet of commercial space. The project includes four public parks totaling 15 acres. The project location is depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Corona South, California (photo-revised 1988) 7.5-minute series topographic map (Figure 1).

The Arantine Hills Specific Plan is located in the Bedford Canyon area of the Santa Ana Mountain foothills in the southeastern portion of Corona. Interstate 15 (I-15) is located immediately east of the Specific Plan area. West of the I-15, Eagle Glen Parkway and the Eagle Glen Specific Plan area surround the project site on the north and west, and the Cleveland National Forest is to the south. Rural residential development within an unincorporated portion of Riverside County is located to the southeast.

NATURAL SETTING
Hydrology
The project region is characterized by a temperate climate, with dry, hot summers and moderate winters. Rainfall averages 12 inches annually (Beck and Haase 1974). Precipitation usually occurs in the form of winter rain, with warm monsoonal showers in summer. The nearest source of water is Bedford Wash, which traverses the project on the south side of Bedford Canyon.

Biology
At an elevation of approximately 1,000 feet above mean sea level (amsl), the project is within the Lower Sonoran Life Zone of California (Schoenherr 1992), which ranges from below sea level to 3,500 feet amsl. The project area largely consists of nonnative grasses. There are small portions of native coastal sage scrub.

Geology
The project is located within the Peninsular Ranges, east of the Elsinore fault zone. The geology of the project consists of mostly alluvial sediments, some of which are late Pleistocene/Holocene and some that are middle to late Pleistocene in age (Gray et al. 2002). The late Pleistocene/Holocene
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sediments are located within the Bedford Wash, which runs generally from southwest to northeast. The late Pleistocene/Holocene sediments are active and are not likely to contain preserved, buried, significant archaeological deposits. The middle to late Pleistocene alluvium is situated on a small terrace to the south of Bedford Wash. The age of this alluvial soil would make it unlikely to contain deeply buried cultural resources. The thin horizon of Holocene sediments overlying middle to late Pleistocene sediments is also not likely to contain significant buried archaeological deposits.

CULTURAL SETTING

Prehistory

Of the many chronological sequences proposed for southern California, two primary regional syntheses are commonly used in the archaeological literature. The first, advanced by Wallace (1955), defines four cultural horizons, each with characteristic local variations: Early Man Horizon, Millingstone, Intermediate, and Late Prehistoric. Employing a more ecological approach, Warren (1986) defined five periods in southern California prehistory: Lake Mojave, Pinto, Gypsum, Saratoga Springs, and Protohistoric. Warren viewed cultural continuity and change in terms of various significant environmental shifts, defining the cultural ecological approach for archaeological research of the California deserts and coast. Many changes in settlement patterns and subsistence focus are viewed as cultural adaptations to a changing environment, beginning with the gradual environmental warming in the late Pleistocene, the desiccation of the desert lakes during the early Holocene, the short return to pluvial conditions during the middle Holocene, and the general warming and drying trend, with periodic reversals, that continue to this day (Warren 1986).

Ethnography

Although Spanish explorative incursions into California had occurred since 1540, the Late Prehistoric Period ended abruptly in 1769 with the beginning of the Spanish Mission Period. It was then that Franciscan friars and Spanish soldiers began establishing mission outposts along the California coast. Impact to native populations was greatest in those areas where Spanish missions were established, and this was primarily along the California coast between San Diego and San Francisco (see maps in Goodman 1962; Lowman 1993). This period of time has also been referred to as the Protohistoric Period, although because of the previously named Protohistoric (Shoshonean) Period, placed A.D. 1200–historic times (Warren 1984), the designation “Ethnohistoric Period” is less confusing, and is used here.

Typically, native culture groups in coastal central and southern California were named after the mission within which ecclesiastical jurisdiction they lived. For instance, the Gabrielino are named after Mission San Gabriel Archangel, the Luiseño are named after Mission San Luis Rey de Francia, and the Juaneño are named after Mission San Juan Capistrano. Farther inland, tribes such as the Cahuilla, Serrano, and Chemehuevi are not named after missions, since there were no local missions, and Spanish influence was not as great.

During the Ethnohistoric Period, the area that is now coastal northern San Diego/southern Orange County, inland as far as Lake Elsinore and Palomar Mountain, was inhabited by the Luiseño. Eastward, the Cahuilla inhabited a large area extending from the San Bernardino Mountains to the ranges extending southward from Mt. San Jacinto. In a small area, about 10 square miles near the
headwaters of the San Luis Rey River in the vicinity of Warner’s Hot Springs, the Cupéno were located just east of the Luiseño and southwest of the Cahuilla. Along the coast north of the Luiseño were the Juaneño, who inhabited a small area in what is now San Juan Capistrano. North of the Juaneño and still along the coast, the Gabriélino inhabited the fertile Tustin and Los Angeles Plains eastward as far as Mt. Rubidoux and San Bernardino. Although many other California Tribal territories exist, these are the nearest to the current project.

These ethnohistorically recorded tribes and their territories are defined in Kroeber (1925) and within Volume 8 of the Handbook of North American Indians (Bean 1978; Bean and Shipek 1978; Bean and Smith 1978a, 1978b). Traditional Cahuilla and the Luiseño tribal territory descriptions are also presented by James (1960), White (1963), and Oxendine (1983), while Gabriélino territory is well-described by Johnston (1962) and McCawley (1996).

The vicinity of the project has been occupied by three native groups: the Cahuilla, Luiseño, and Gabriélino. These three groups are all from the Takic (Uto-Aztecan or Shoshonean) linguistic group (Kroeber 1925), and resembled one another in terms of culture and tradition, often interacting across each of their permeable ethnographic boundaries. Since the project is located within Luiseño territory, they are discussed below.

Luiseño. Prior to Spanish occupation of California, the territory of the Luiseño extended along the coast south to Agua Hedionda Lagoon, northwestward to Aliso Creek just north of San Juan Capistrano, and eastward to the Elsinore Valley and Palomar Mountain. These territorial boundaries changed over time, but they are generally southward of Gabriélino territory and westward of Cahuilla territory. They encompassed an extremely diverse environment that included coastal beaches, lagoons and marshes, inland river valleys and foothills, and mountain groves of oaks and evergreens (Bean and Shipek 1978). Kroeber (1925:648) describes them as a hill rather than a mountain people and states that they “…scarce anywhere reached the summit of the watershed.”

As stated, the Luiseño were named because they lived within the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Mission San Luis Rey de Francia. Mission San Luis Rey was founded on June 13, 1798 (Hoover et al. 1962:47; Lowman 1993:2) by Father Fermín Francisco de Lasuén, Father Presidente of the missions after Father Junípero Serra’s death on August 28, 1784 (McGroarty 1911:365). Although Mission San Luis Rey, known as the “King of the Missions,” was the last of the southern missions to be founded, it was one of the most successful, with an enormous pasturage and many thousands of sheep, cattle, and horses, as well as fields of wheat and grapes.

Like other Native American groups in southern California, the Luiseño caught and collected seasonally available food resources and led a semi-sedentary lifestyle. The geographical-political unit used by the Spanish to describe individual groups of Luiseño and Juaneño was the ranchería (White 1963:104). This term was also used for other California tribes. The term ranchería is generally equivalent with the term town or village. White (1963:115, 117) states that the average Luiseño village included approximately 30 square miles of territory, although Oxendine (1983:57) states that it was somewhat less than 30 square miles. Average population of the Luiseño village was approximately 60 individuals, with a documented range of about 14 to 100 individuals (Oxendine 1983:57).
Luiseño villages were generally located in valley bottoms, along streams, or along coastal strands near mountain ranges sheltered in coves or canyons, near a fresh water source that contained diverse available resources, and often on an elevated landform. As described by Oxendine (1983:4, 178–179) the prehistoric Luiseño village exhibits certain attributes and environmental characteristics. These include midden sediment, bedrock milling features, ceramic sherd features, and usually pictographs and Cottonwood series projectile points. Specifically, the sites were located along the edge of a valley, at the interface of two or more plant communities, and at locations containing a spring or creek, sandy loam sediment, a slope of approximately 9 percent or less, and bedrock outcrops with horizontal or slightly sloping faces useful for milling purposes (Oxendine 1983:4, 178–179). Village locations could include both sides of a creek, but the village was always located within 100 m (328 ft) of water (Oxendine 1983:172).

As stated by Kroeber (1925:616) concerning the Gabrielino, the time for creating an accurate map of Gabrielino villages is past. This statement is also more or less true of the Luiseño. Known Luiseño village sites have been documented near the current APE at Lake Elsinore (Paiakche; Kroeber 1925: Plate 57) as well as Temeku, located in the Temecula area (McCown 1955). It is possible that another village existed in the area near Glen Ivy Hot Springs, less than 1.0 mile (1.6 km) from where Don Leandro Serrano built the first house in Riverside County and approximately 3.5 miles (5.6 km) south-southeast of the western edge of the APE. The fact that an early occupant of Riverside County constructed a residence in an area indicates that it is likely that the locale possessed a native population and village since early residents of the area used the native population for labor purposes.

The Luiseño took advantage of the various available resources. Village location is an indication that they subsisted on a variety of foods, plant and animal. Village populations were completely sedentary, with the majority of individuals residing at the village for the entire year (Oxendine 1983:57). At any given time, however, some individuals may have been away procuring food. Subsistence was based primarily on seeds from local grasses, manzanita, sunflower, sage, chía, and pine nuts, as well as acorns. Seeds were dried, ground, and cooked into a mush. Acorns accounted for 10–25 percent of the food supply of coastal Luiseño, while acorns accounted for as much as 50 percent of the food supply of inland Luiseño (White 1963:121–122). Each autumn, the majority of a village probably camped near oak groves for a few weeks while collecting acorns that were stored and eaten over the course of the next year (Oxendine 1983:57).

Seasonal camps were also established along the coast and near bays and estuaries to gather shellfish and hunt waterfowl (Hudson 1971). Game animals such as deer, rabbit, jackrabbit, wood rat, mice, antelope, and many types of birds were regularly hunted (Bean and Shipek 1978). In addition, the Luiseño utilized fire for crop management and communal rabbit drives (Bean and Shipek 1978). Small seasonal habitation sites in the area would contain quantities of fire-affected rock (FAR), some burned bone, and small amounts of ground and flaked stone tools. They might be found as open sites atop knolls or ridges, or in protected areas near streams, or even in rock shelters.

The Luiseño community was the focus of family life. Patrilineally linked extended families occupied each village (Kroeber 1925; Bean and Shipek 1978). The Luiseño had a well-developed sense of ownership (White 1963:122), and their concept of property rights included the idea of private property. Property rights covered items and land owned by the village as well as items such as houses, gardens, ritual equipment, trade beads, eagle nests, and songs that were owned by individuals.
Trespass against any property was punished (Bean and Shipek 1978). Luiseño villages were politically independent and were administered by a chief, who inherited his position from his father.

The Luiseño conducted an elaborate toloache ritual related to the god *Chinigchinich*, including the ceremonial ingestion of Jimson weed (*Datura meteloides*), or datura, a hallucinogenic substance used to induce visions (Kroeber 1925:666; Bean and Shipek 1978). The Luiseño also practiced ground or sand painting (DuBois 1908:87–91; Kroeber 1925:661), which was a significant ritual-cosmological component associated with most of their rituals (Bean and Shipek 1978:556). Although known to have been made by the Juaneño, Gabrielino, Diegueño, and Cupeño, sand painting has been best documented for the Luiseño and is not known for most Hokan language groups such as the Chumash, or Yuma, or by nearby Penutian language groups such as the Central Valley Yokuts. As such, Kroeber (1925:661) states that sand painting in prehistoric California was a development of the coastal Shoshonean, or Takic, language groups and was connected with similar paintings made by the Navajo and Pueblo groups of the Southwest. Furthermore, Kroeber (1925:661) stated that Luiseño sand painting was conducted in relation to the ingestion of datura during the toloache ritual.

**History**

**Corona.** Originally known as “The Circle City,” Corona was founded in 1886 by the South Riverside Water and Land Company. Grand Boulevard formed a complete circle within which city commerce was concentrated. Houses were arranged around the perimeter, and citrus groves were planted to the south. Packing houses were constructed in the northern portion of the circle, strategically placed for access to the nearby railroad. Between 1913 and 1916, an international speedway was formed out of Grand Boulevard, which cumulatively attracted over one million spectators. In spite of its popularity, the race was discontinued due to its failure to attract additional commerce and development. The citrus industry began to expand, and by 1954, the City had grown to over 11,000 residents. In 1962, State Route 91 was constructed, fueling several construction booms over the next decades. These resulted in significant growth of Corona’s population and commerce. By 1986, Corona’s population was almost 45,000 and is currently over 100,000 (Corona Public Library 2002).

**Butterfield Stage Station.** The site of the Butterfield Stage Station (California Historical Landmark Number 188; site number P33-06439) is located ¼ mile east of the Arantine Hills Specific Plan. The station was known as “Greenwade’s,” named for James Greenwade, the station operator from 1861 until his death in 1869. According to a former plaque commemorating the station, it was “Where mail was delivered and horses changed. First Stage carrying overland mail left Tipton, Missouri September 15, 1858 and passing through Temescal arrived in Los Angeles October 7, 1858” (Scott 1983). The station building was in disrepair by the 1930s and photographs from that area show a small, crumbling adobe structure shaded by a large tree (Jones 1934). A recent survey has indicated that the plaque is no longer in place and in its original location single-family residential townhomes have been constructed (Patterson 2007a).

**The P.J. Weisal/Owens-Illinois Glass/Sand Plant.** The glass and sand plant (site number 33-04112) was located ¼ mile east of the current project. The plant was built by P.J. Weisal of Anaheim in the 1920s and expanded substantially in 1947 (Swope 1991:10-14). It was a major supplier of glass sand, blasting sand, and sand for stucco used in Los Angeles as well as Fullerton and Santa Ana (Gunther
1984:566). The property also contained the site of the Butterfield Stage Station. The glass and sand plant was evaluated as potentially eligible for listing on the National Register under Criterion A (Love 1997), but the most recent recording indicated that it had been completely demolished (Patterson 2007b).

See the McKenna et al. report for a more detailed discussion of local history (McKenna and Brunzell 2003:8-11).

METHODS

Research

The cultural resources records search for the current project was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California, Riverside, in 2010. The EIC houses the pertinent archaeological site and survey information necessary to determine whether cultural resources are recorded within the study area boundaries and which specific areas have been previously surveyed. The research included a review of all recorded historic and prehistoric archaeological sites within one mile of the project, as well as a review of known cultural resource survey and excavation reports. In addition, LSA examined the California State Historic Property Data File (HPD), which includes the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), California Points of Historical Interest (CHLI), various local historic registers, and historic maps.

Limited Field Survey

The project location was last surveyed for cultural resources in 2002 (McKenna and Brunzell 2003). Changing environmental conditions and methods can often lead to the identification of resources that were not observed during past surveys. The purpose of this survey was to sample a percentage of the 2003 survey to verify the validity of that survey. LSA Archaeologists Curt Duke and Victoria Avalos conducted a limited reconnaissance pedestrian survey of the on May 21, 2010. The archaeologists were accompanied by two monitors from the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians (Pechanga) and one monitor from the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians (Soboba). The survey utilized 15–20-meter transects in four locations: the bluff above Bedford Canyon at the east extent of the project; in Bedford Canyon in the northern portion of the project; the relatively undisturbed area (natural) west of Bedford Wash; and the southwest portion of the project. The project area was photographed using digital format cameras.

Native American Contacts

A request was made to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on January 29, 2010, for a sacred lands file (SLF) search and list of potentially interested Native American groups. The NAHC responded on February 1, 2010 indicating that there are no recorded Native American cultural resources within the project. The NAHC provided LSA with a contact list of 13 individuals representing 12 Native American groups. Letters were sent out via certified mail and email on February 18, 2010.
RESULTS

Research

Data from the EIC indicate there have been 49 previous cultural resources studies conducted within a one mile radius of the project, one of which included the project location (McKenna and Brunzell 2003). Twenty-three cultural resources are located within one mile of the project; the closest of which is an isolated historic glass scatter (McKenna 2002) located on the east side of I-15 (Primary number 33-12511). The majority of the other sites are located more than ½ mile from the project, these consist primarily of prehistoric artifact scatters and milling stations and historic sites. See Appendix A for the records search letter.

Limited Field Survey

No cultural resources were identified in any of the four sample survey areas. The orchards reported by McKenna and Brunzell (2003) have been removed and are now open fields with non-native grasses. Figures 2–4 are photographs depicting project conditions.

Figure 2: Photograph showing the bluff at the eastern extent of the project. View to east.
Figure 3: Photograph of the field crew in Bedford Canyon in the northern part of the project. View to southeast.

Figure 4: Photograph of the field crew in Bedford Canyon in the central part of the project. View to east.
Native American Contacts

[Native American coordination is ongoing in conjunction with SB-18]

RECOMMENDATIONS

LSA completed an update to the records search, contacted Native Americans, and completed a limited field survey. Changing environmental conditions and methods can often lead to the identification of resources that were not observed during past surveys. The purpose of this survey was to sample a percentage of the 2002 survey to verify the validity of that survey. The results of this study indicate that there are no known cultural resources that would be affected by the proposed project. The historic isolated find (33-12511) presented in the McKenna et al. report is no longer within the boundaries of the Arantine Hills Specific Plan. Due to the active nature of the alluvial sediments within the project, it is LSA’s opinion that the potential to uncover buried, preserved archaeological resources is low. LSA does not see the need or benefit for an archaeological monitor during ground-disturbing activities associated with construction.

However, if cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained. The archaeologist shall assess the nature and significance of the find and make recommendations for further study which may include: archaeological excavation, laboratory analysis, consultation with Indian Tribes, curation of materials, and an archaeological report.

If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.
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APPENDIX A

RECORDS SEARCH LETTER
February 5, 2010

City of Corona Community Department
Attn: Terri Manuel, AICP, Planning Manager
400 S. Vicentia Avenue
Corona, California 92882

Subject: Records Search Results for a Cultural Resources Assessment for the Arantine Hills Project (LSA Project No. CCR0901)

Dear Ms. Manuel:

LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) is under contract to provide a records search for the Arantine Hills Project in Riverside County, California. The records search was performed at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) located at the University of California, Riverside. It included a review of all recorded historic and prehistoric archaeological sites within a one-mile radius of the project area, as well as a review of known cultural resources survey and excavation reports. In addition, LSA examined the California State Historic Property Data File (HPD), which includes the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), and various local historic registers. The following are the results of the records search:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USGS</th>
<th>Archaeological Sites</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake Mathews</td>
<td>CA-RIV-4121, 4122</td>
<td>RI-2659, 2660, 3153, 2743, 3175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Within property boundaries

The records search at the EIC indicated there have been 49 previous cultural resources studies conducted within a one-mile radius of the project, including one located within the project boundaries. Twenty-three archaeological sites are located within one mile, the closest of which (P-33-12511) is a historic isolated scatter of an amethyst glass bottle located approximately 200 meters to the east.
Thank you for the opportunity to assist you on this project. If LSA can be of further assistance, or if you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact me at (951) 781-9310.

Sincerely,

LSA ASSOCIATES, INC.

Victoria Avalos
Archaeologist
APPENDIX B

NATIVE AMERICAN COORDINATION

[Native American coordination is ongoing in conjunction with SB-18]