

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

551



FROM: Economic Development Agency

SUBMITTAL DATE:
February 13, 2013

SUBJECT: Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on the Environment and Adoption of Resolution No. 2013-028, Supporting Tax Credit Application for Perris Family Apartments in the City of Perris

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Adopt the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) Report and findings incorporated in the EA and in the FONSI for Perris Family Apartments, and conclude that the project is not an action which may affect the quality of the environment;
2. Approve the attached Request for Release of Funds (RROF);
3. Authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to execute the EA and RROF to be filed with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); and

(Continued)

Robert Field
Assistant County Executive Officer/EDA

FINANCIAL DATA	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ 1,000,000	In Current Year Budget:	Yes
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ 0	Budget Adjustment:	No
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ 0	For Fiscal Year:	2012/13

COMPANION ITEM ON BOARD COMMISSIONERS AGENDA: No

SOURCE OF FUNDS: HOME Investment Partnership Act Funds	Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE
BY:
Jennifer L. Sargent

County Executive Office Signature

FISCAL PROCEDURES APPROVED
 PAUL ANGULO, CPA, AUDITOR-CONTROLLER
 BY:
 ANNIE T. SAHAR
 DATE: 2/11/13
 Department of Co-SAMUEL WONG

Dep't Recomm.: Consent Policy
 Per Exec. Ofc.: Consent Policy

Prev. Agn. Ref.: 3.28 of 2/5/13 **District:** 5/5 **Agenda Number:** 3-24

RECOMMENDED MOTION: (Continued)

4. Adopt the attached Resolution No. 2013-028, supporting tax credit application for Perris Family Apartments in the City of Perris.

BACKGROUND:

Coachella Valley Housing Coalition ("CVHC"), an nonprofit public benefit corporation, and an affordable housing developer and certified Community Housing Development Organization, is proposing to use \$1,000,000 in HOME funds for a 75-unit multi-family affordable housing complex located on the northwest corner of Ruby Road and East Jarvis Street in the City of Perris. The project site is approximately 7.08 acres and is comprised of Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 311-180-013, 035, 036, 050, 051, 052, 053 and 054. The project will consist of 21 one-bedroom units, 30 two-bedroom units and 24 three-bedroom units. One of the three-bedroom units will be set aside for an onsite residential manager. Project amenities include open space, tot lots/play areas, basketball courts, laundry facilities, and a 2,800 square foot community center equipped with a full kitchen, computer learning center, lap top computers, educational software and internet access. Project services include parenting classes, tutoring, nutrition programs, English as a Second Language, GED preparation and after-school programs.

A total of 11 units will be designated as HOME-assisted units limited to households whose incomes do not exceed 50% of the area median income for the County of Riverside, adjusted by family size at the time of occupancy. The HOME-assisted units will be restricted for a period of at least 55 years from the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

The environmental effects of activities carried out with HOME grant funds must be assessed in accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 ("NEPA") and the related authorities listed in the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development's implementing regulations at 24 CFR parts 50 and 58. These regulations specify procedures for conducting environmental review, including finding a level of clearance and requesting release of funds.

The Riverside County Economic Development Agency ("EDA") has completed applicable review procedures and has evaluated the potential effects of the project on the environment. The attached documentation was prepared pursuant to NEPA and the environmental procedures cited in 24 CFR 58.5 and 58.6, and EDA has found that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment. Publishing requirements have been met in accordance with 24 CFR 58.43 and 58.45.

The estimated total cost for the project is \$20,549,586. Additional sources of funds will include a \$1,754,790 loan from Mental Health Services Act, a \$1,444,300 conventional loan, a \$740,000 loan from the Affordable Housing Program, \$307,679 Deferred Developer's Fee and the balance of \$15,302,817 will come from tax credit equity financing.

(Continued)

(Continued)

Low income housing tax credits will be used by CVHC to finance eligible project development costs. The California Tax Credit Allocation Committee ("CTCAC") deadline for the current round of funding is March 6, 2013. At present, there is a current financing gap of approximately \$1,000,000. CVHC has requested up to \$1,000,000 in HOME funds to fill the gap. In order to complete the tax credit application process, CVHC must provide TCAC with a Resolution from the local jurisdiction providing support for the project. The Resolution conditionally obligates \$1,000,000 in HOME funds for the project upon receiving all applicable permits, entitlements, legal requirements, and the successful negotiation of a HOME loan agreement satisfactory to the Board of Supervisors.

County Counsel has reviewed and approved as to form the attached Resolution No. 2013-028, the Environmental Assessment and Request for Release of Funds. Staff recommends that the Board approve the attached Resolution No. 2013-028, the Environmental Assessment and Request for Release of Funds.

FINANCIAL DATA:

All the costs related to the development of the project will be fully funded with HOME funds. The County of Riverside has budgeted this expense in the FY 2012/2013 budget.

Attachments:

- Resolution No. 2013-028
- Environmental Assessment
- Request for Release of Funds
- Public Notices (2 pages)

**RESOLUTION 2013-028
SUPPORTING THE COACHELLA VALLEY HOUSING COALITION
APPLICATION FOR
LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDITS FOR
PERRIS FAMILY APARTMENTS**

WHEREAS, the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee ("CTCAC") provides funding for affordable housing projects through its application process;

WHEREAS, the financial commitment deadline to be considered for the current funding availability through CTCAC is March 6, 2013;

WHEREAS, the County of Riverside has identified the Expansion of Affordable Rental Housing Stock for Low-Income and Special Needs Households as a high housing priority through the County of Riverside's Five Year Consolidated Plan and its One-Year Action Plan for the use of Federal Funds;

WHEREAS, the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition ("CVHC"), a nonprofit public benefit corporation, will be submitting an application for TCAC funding for the development of affordable rental units on a vacant site located at the northwest corner of Ruby Road and East Jarvis Street, in the City of Perris, CA 92570, on approximately 7.08 acres with assessor parcel numbers 311-180-013, 035, 036, 050, 051, 052, 053 and 054;

WHEREAS, the proposed development ("Project") will consist of seventy-five (75) affordable rental units including one (1) manager's unit;

WHEREAS, the Project currently has a financing gap of approximately \$1,000,000; and

WHEREAS, to complete the CTCAC application process CVHC must provide a Resolution from the local jurisdictions, including the County of Riverside, supporting the Project;

WHEREAS, CVHC is an experienced affordable housing developer and has successfully constructed numerous apartment complexes in the County of Riverside;

WHEREAS, CVHC has requested financing of up to \$1,000,000 in HOME Investment Partnership Act ("HOME") funds for construction of eligible activities on the Project.

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: *Annie T. Sahhar* DATE: *2/11/13*
ANNIE T. SAHHAR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, DETERMINED, AND ORDERED** by the Board
2 of Supervisors for the County of Riverside, State of California, in regular session assembled on
3 February 26, 2013, as follows:

- 4 1) That the Board of Supervisors hereby finds and declares that the above recitals are true
5 and correct.
- 6 2) The Board of Supervisors supports CVHC's application for a reservation of tax credits of
7 a proposed seventy-five (75) unit apartment complex located in the City of Perris in
8 Riverside County.
- 9 3) The Board of Supervisors agrees to provide financing of up to \$1,000,000 in HOME
10 funds to CVHC, with a loan term of 55 years at three (3%) percent, for construction of
11 eligible activities on the Project, subject to the following: applicable permits, entitlements,
12 legal requirements and negotiation of a HOME loan agreement satisfactory to the Board.
- 13 4) The Board of Supervisors commitment to provide funding is valid until March 1, 2014,
14 and shall thereafter have no force or effect, unless a HOME agreement has theretofore
15 been approved and executed by the Board of Supervisors and CVHC, with respect to
16 the Project.

17 //
18 //
19 //
20 //
21 //
22 //
23 //
24 //
25 //
26 //
27 //
28 //



U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development
Los Angeles Field Office
611 W. 6th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Environmental Assessment for HUD-funded Proposals

Recommended format per 24 CFR 58.36, revised February 2004
[Previously recommended EA formats are obsolete].

Project Identification: Perris Family Apartments (HM5-13-001)

Preparer: Benjamin Cendejas, Housing Specialist II

Responsible Entity: County of Riverside

Month/Year: February - 2013

Environmental Assessment

Responsible Entity: Riverside County Economic Development Agency

[24 CFR 58.2(a)(7)]

Certifying Officer: John J. Benoit, Chairman, Riverside County Board of Supervisors

[24 CFR 58.2(a)(2)]

Project Name: Perris Family Apartments

Project Location: The Project Site is on the northwest corner of Ruby Road and East Jarvis Street in the City of Perris. The project site is approximately 7.08 acres and is comprised of Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 311-180-013, 035, 036, 050, 051, 052, 053 and 054.

Estimated total project cost: \$21,000,000

Grant Recipient: Coachella Valley Housing Coalition

[24 CFR 58.2(a)(5)]

Recipient Address: 45-701 Monroe Street, Plaza 1, Ste. G, Indio, CA 92201

Project Representative: Mike Walsh


Telephone Number: (760) 347-3157

Conditions for Approval: (List all mitigation measures adopted by the responsible entity to eliminate or minimize adverse environmental impacts. These conditions must be included in project contracts and other relevant documents as requirements). [24 CFR 58.40(d), 40 CFR 1505.2(c)]
See Recommended Mitigation Measures as listed on Page 11.

FINDING: [58.40(g)]

Finding of No Significant Impact
(The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment)

Finding of Significant Impact
(The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment)

Preparer Signature:  **Date:** 1/23/13

Name/Title/Agency: Ben Cendejas, Housing Specialist II, Economic Development Agency

RE Approving Official Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Name/Title/ Agency: John J. Benoit, Chairman, Riverside County Board of Supervisors

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal: [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]

Coachella Valley Housing Coalition (CVHC), an affordable housing developer and certified Community Housing Development Organization, is proposing to use \$1,000,000 in HOME funds for a 75-unit multi-family affordable housing complex located on the northwest corner of Ruby Road and East Jarvis Street in the City of Perris. The project site is approximately 7.08 acres and is comprised of Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 311-180-013, 035, 036, 050, 051, 052, 053 and 054.

Description of the Proposal: Include all contemplated actions which logically are either geographically or functionally a composite part of the project, regardless of the source of funding. [24 CFR 58.32, 40 CFR 1508.25]

The project will consist of 21 one-bedroom units, 30 two-bedroom units and 24 three-bedroom units. One of the three-bedroom units will be set aside for an onsite residential manager. Project amenities include open space, tot lots/play areas, basketball courts, laundry facilities, and a 2,800 square foot community center equipped with a full kitchen, computer learning center, lap top computers, educational software and internet access. Project services include parenting classes, tutoring, nutrition programs, English as a Second Language, GED preparation and after-school programs.

The estimated total cost for the project is \$20,549,586. Additional sources of funds will include a \$1,754,790 loan from Mental Health Services Act, a \$1,444,300 conventional loan, a \$740,000 loan from the Affordable Housing Program, \$307,679 Deferred Developer's Fee and the balance of \$15,302,817 will come from tax credit equity financing.

Existing Conditions and Trends: Describe the existing conditions of the project area and its surroundings, and trends likely to continue in the absence of the project. [24 CFR 58.40(a)]

The Project is generally located on the corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road (north of Jarvis Street and west of Ruby Road) in the City of Perris in the County of Riverside. The existing condition at the Project site is primarily vacant land. The site location is surrounded by vacant land to the north and south; single-family subdivisions to the east and northeast; apartment communities to the west and southwest; and a cemetery northwest of the Project Site. Palms Elementary School is located southeast of the project site on the opposite corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road.

The trends of the substandard conditions do not appear to improve unless new units are built. The demand for affordable housing continues to grow. Constructing new units at the site would be beneficial for the surrounding area.

STATUTORY WORKSHEET

Use this worksheet only for projects that are Categorically Excluded per 24 CFR Section 58.35(a).
(Note: Compliance with the laws and statutes listed at 24 CFR §58.6 must also be documented).

24 CFR §58.5 STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS & REGULATIONS

Project Name: Perris Family Apartments

DIRECTIONS - Write "A" in the Status Column when the proposal, by its scope and nature, does not affect the resources under consideration; OR write "B" if the project triggers formal compliance consultation procedures with the oversight agency, or requires mitigation (see Statutory Worksheet Instructions). Compliance documentation must contain verifiable source documents and relevant base data.

Factors	Status (A/B)	Determination and Compliance Documentation
Historic Preservation [36 CFR 800]	A	The proposed Project is not expected to have an adverse impact on any historic, architectural or cultural resource provided that proper implementation of the mitigation program occurs, Riverside Co. Environmental Assessment Report and Historical/Archeological Resources Survey Report (CRM TECH, Colton, CA, January 8, 2013). Copies of Historical Verification Report submitted to State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and Historical/Archeological Resources Study Report are attached. The 30-day SHPO review period ended on February 13, 2013.
Floodplain Management [24 CFR 55, Executive Order 11988]	A	The project does not involve property acquisition, management, construction or improvements within a 100 year floodplain (Zones A or V) and does not involve a "critical action" within a 500 year floodplain (Zone B). The property is located in Zone X and identified by FEMA Map No. 06065C1440G Source: http://map1.msc.fema.gov/idms/IntraView.cgi?ROT=0&O_X=6599&O_Y=3564&O_ZM=0.434486&O_SX=1281&O_S_Y=646&O_DPI=400&O_TH=58066369&O_EN=58131697&O_PG=1&O_MP=1&CT=0&DI=0&WD=14400&HT=10350&O_JX=1419&O_JY=706&O_MPT=58131697&O_MPS=1&O_ACT=4&O_KE_Y=57923698&O_ITEM=1&O_PICK_VIEW_CENTER.x=797.5&O_PICK_VIEW_CENTER.y=332
Wetlands Protection [Executive Order 11990]	A	The Project is in a generally developed urban area per field observation and is not within or near a wetland identified by or delineated on maps issue by the US Fish and Wildlife Service or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Project is not located in a wetland, therefore it will not have an adverse impact on any wetlands. Source: http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Wetlands-Mapper.html
Coastal Zone Management Act [Sections 307(c),(d)]	A	There are no Coastal Zones within the County of Riverside. Source: Staff Review – January 2013
Sole Source Aquifers [40 CFR 149]	A	The project is not located within a United States (US) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-designated sole source aquifer watershed area per EPA Ground Water Office. Source: http://www.epa.gov/safewater/sourcewater/pubs/qrg_ssamap_reg_9.pdf
Endangered Species Act [50 CFR 402]	A	The project will have "no effect" or "is not likely to adversely affect" any federally protected (listed or proposed)

		Threatened or Endangered Species, nor adversely modify designated critical habitats as the project involves new construction of a new multi-family housing complex. An analysis on the Project site indicates that the Project is not located in an area containing any unique plant communities nor is it located in an endangered, rare or threatened wildlife range or habitat. <i>Source:</i> http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rcdis/viewer.html
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act [Sections 7 (b), (c)]	A	The project is not located within one mile of a listed Wild and Scenic Rivers according to the National Wild and Scenic River Systems. <i>Source:</i> http://www.rivers.gov/rivers/california.php
Air Quality [Clean Air Act, Sections 176 (c) and (d), and 40 CFR 6, 51, 93]	A	The project is within a "non-attainment" area and conforms to the EPA-approved State Implementation Plan per AQMD and SCAQMD web sites, standard rules apply. <i>Source:</i> http://www.epa.gov/oar/oaqps/greenbk/mapnpoll.html
Farmland Protection Policy Act [7 CFR 658]	A	The project site does not include prime or unique farmland or other farmland of statewide or local importance nor is it located on an agricultural preserve. The project site is designated as Urban Built-Up Land and is located in a residential neighborhood. <i>Source:</i> http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rcdis/viewer.html
Environmental Justice [Executive Order 12898]	A	The site is suitable for the proposed use and will not be impacted by adverse environmental conditions nor will it impact low-income or minority populations. Instead, the Project will provide new affordable housing to low-income, minority and/or farmworker populations. (<i>Staff Review, 2013</i>).

HUD Environmental Standards Status (A/B) Determination and Compliance Documentation

Noise Abatement and Control [24 CFR 51 B]	A	Recent acoustical studies performed for California Environmental Quality Act(CEQA)/Mitigated Negative Declaration show that Project site will experience only short term increases in existing noise levels. Construction will be shielded and located at least 100' from occupied residences. The Project will remain outside the 60 CNEL and 65 DNL minimal noise contour areas. Construction will result no greater than 55-60 CNEL from freeway, train, roadway, and airport noise sources. This is considered acceptable for noise sensitive uses such as housing of normal construction, without any special insulation. Additionally, during construction, compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance applies and no additional mitigation is necessary. (<i>Staff Review, 2013</i>).
Toxic/Hazardous/Radioactive Materials, Contamination, Chemicals or Gases [24 CFR 58.5(i)(2)]	A	The Project site is not listed in government databases as a generator, user, or disposer of hazardous materials (SWRCB, 2013). Future uses on the Project site, are not expected to create a significant hazard to residents, employees and visitors to Perris Family Apartments site. (http://www.geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov and <i>Staff Review, 2013</i>).
Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects near Hazardous Operations [24 CFR 51 C]	A	The proposed Project is not located adjacent to or near hazardous operations handling petroleum or chemicals of an explosive or flammable nature. No service stations, chemical and petroleum manufacturers, or automotive repair facilities were noted at or in the immediate vicinity of

		the site. As a result, no recommendations for site clean-up or remediation were made. Future uses are not expected to create a significant hazard to residents, employees and visitors of the project site. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones [24 CFR 51 D]	A	The proposed site is not located within an airport influence area, nor is the project adversely impacted by a military airfield. The closest commercial airport is the Riverside Municipal Airport, which is approximately 20 miles from the Project Site. In addition, the March Air Reserve Base, the closest, is approximately 10 miles from the Project site. (http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclis/print.htm , and <i>Staff Review, 2013</i>)

Environmental Assessment Checklist

[Environmental Review Guide HUD CPD 782, 24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 & 1508.27]

Evaluate the significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features and resources of the project area. Enter relevant base data and verifiable source documentation to support the finding. Then enter the appropriate impact code from the following list to make a determination of impact.

Impact Codes: (1) - No impact anticipated; (2) - Potentially beneficial; (3) - Potentially adverse; (4) - Requires mitigation; (5) - Requires project modification. Note names, dates of contact, telephone numbers and page references.

Attach additional material as appropriate. Note conditions or mitigation measures required.

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
Conformance with Comprehensive Plans and Zoning	1	<p>The developer has received full entitlements for the Project, which will include, but may not be limited to (1) a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)/Environmental Assessment, (2) Design Review, and (3) Parcel Map/Lot Line Adjustment.</p> <p>All abovementioned approvals allow for residential use on the Project site. The zoning for the site is MFR 14 (multi-family residential, 14 units/acre). The residential development will provide affordable housing units for public members at large. Any impacts created by this development will be addressed through the development review process and mitigated through conditions of approval as deemed appropriate by the responsible reviewing agencies, the Planning Commission and City Councils. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i></p>
Compatibility and Urban Impact	1	<p>The Project is compatible with neighboring and surrounding lands uses as there is a mixture of vacant land, commercial, and residential development. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i>.</p>
Slope	1	<p>The Project site is not located in a mountainous area in the General Plan. Topographically, the site is comprised of relatively flat parcels of land. The design and construction of the project is not expected to create any manufactured slopes. No adverse impacts are expected regarding slopes.</p> <p>http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclic/print.htm, or see attached).</p>
Erosion	1	<p>The applicant shall be responsible for erosion and dust control both during the grading and construction phases of the project. No adverse impacts, however, are expected regarding erosion.</p> <p><i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i>.</p>
Soil Suitability	1	<p>The Project site is not expected to have any adverse impacts regarding soil suitability. The project site is located in areas of suitable soil conditions. <i>(Staff Review, 2013 and</i> http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclic/print.htm).</p>
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety	1	<p>There are no known hazards nor are there any known nuisances that are expected to be created by or affect the Project. The project area is not located in areas subject to liquefaction. <i>(Staff Review, 2013 and</i> http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclic/print.htm).</p>
Energy Consumption	1	<p>Due to the increase in residential density, there is a potential for an increase in energy consumption. However, no impacts are anticipated. Energy efficient appliances will be installed and rough tolerant plants and landscaping will adhere to the surrounding environment. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i>.</p>
Noise - Contribution to Community Noise Levels	1	<p>Noise levels may increase during construction of the Project, but development will adhere to CEQA/MND and City Ordinances. Construction operations shall be conducted in compliance with Title 7 of the Municipal Code (Noise Control). There will be no operating or causing the operation of any tools or equipment used in construction, drilling, repair, alteration, grading, or demolition</p>

		work between the hours of 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM on week days and between 5:00 PM and 8:00 AM on Saturdays, or at any time on Sunday or federal holidays such that the sound creates a noise disturbance across a residential or commercial property line, or at any time exceeds the maximum permitted noise level for the underlying land use category, except for emergency work by variance. <i>(MND, Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Air Quality Effects of Ambient Air Quality on Project and Contribution to Community Pollution Levels	1	The Project may have a temporary impact of offensive odors and additional dust due to operation of heavy equipment, including gas or diesel vehicles. The Applicant is required to provide a water truck to continuously "water down" the graded areas to reduce the amount of dust from excavation as necessary to comply with AQMD Rule 403-Fugitive Dust. In addition, all heavy equipment must be regularly maintained to reduce emissions. <i>(MND, Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Environmental Design Visual Quality - Coherence, Diversity, Compatible Use and Scale	1	The Project is consistent with the General Plan and through its approved entitlements, allows for residential use Project site. The residential development will provide for affordable housing for public members at large. As the current site is currently adjacent to an existing housing and commercial uses, it will be compatible with its surrounding areas. No adverse impacts are therefore expected relating to visual quality, coherence, diversity, compatible uses, and scale. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .

Socioeconomic	Code	Source or Documentation
Demographic Character Changes	1	The Project will not alter or have an adverse impact on the demographics, nor will it significantly or adversely alter the character of other adjacent areas. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Displacement	1	No impact issues relating to displacement are expected as the site is vacant. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Employment and Income Patterns	1	Project construction is expected to generate some temporary part-time construction jobs, however, employment and income patterns in the area are not expected to be significantly impacted in any adverse way. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
Educational Facilities	1	The Project may have a minimal increase in students, however, it will not result in a need for new or altered schools. The Project will be located in the Perris Union High School District. The developer is required to pay applicable school fees prior to issuance of any building permits. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Commercial Facilities	1	No adverse impact is expected since the land use and zoning for the current use of the Project will not impact commercial facilities. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Health Care	1	The Project may have a minimal increase, however, it is not expected to have an adverse impact on existing health care services nor result in new construction in the City of Perris. Major medical care is available at Vista Hospital of Riverside, which is located within 3 miles of the Project site. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Social Services	1	The Project may have a minimal increase in existing social services; however no adverse impacts are expected. The closest social services provided by the County are dispensed through the Riverside County Social Services, which is within approximately 3 miles of the Project site. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Solid Waste	1	The Project will not have a significant or adverse impact on issues relating to solid waste, No adverse impacts are expected. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Waste Water	1	Minimal increase in waste water is anticipated as a result of this Project, which will be handled from existing entitlements,

		resources, and City Engineer requirements. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Storm Water	1	The Project will be designed in a manner that perpetuates the existing natural drainage patterns with respect to the tributary drainage areas, outlet points and outlet conditions; therefore no adverse impacts are expected. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Water Supply	1	There will be adequate and acceptable water supply for the Project. The Project is not expected to have a significant impact on the water supply. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Public Safety - Police	1	Police protection in the project area is provided by the City of Perris Police Dept. The project will result in a minimal increment of population that will be added to the area and is expected to have no adverse impact on the police protection. (http://www.cityofperris.org/residents/police/index-police.html and <i>Staff Review, 2013</i>).
- Fire	1	The Project is not expected to have an adverse impact on fire protection services due to the size of the project and the minimal increment of population that is expected to be added to the area. Sufficient service is currently provided by the City of Perris Fire Department. (http://www.cityofperris.org/city-hall/departments/fire.html and <i>Staff Review, 2013</i>).
- Emergency Medical	1	The Project may have a minimal increase, however, it is not expected to have an adverse impact on existing health care services nor result in new construction in the City of Perris. Major medical care is available at Vista Hospital of Riverside, which is located within 3 miles of the Project site. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Open Space and Recreation - Open Space	1	The Project will comply with the City Park Development Impact Fees and General Plan Policies. The proposed project is not expected to have a significant or adverse impact on open space resources in the City of Perris. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
- Recreation	1	Development of the Project will result in incremental increases in the demand for parkland and recreational services. The collection of City Park Development Impact Fees and other park impact fees will assist in funding any additional facilities required to adequately meet impacts created by additional development within the City, thereby reducing any impacts. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
- Cultural Facilities	1	Development of the Project will result in incremental increases in the demand for cultural facilities. The collection City Park Development Fees and other park impact fees will assist in funding any additional facilities required to adequately meet impacts created by additional development within the City, thereby reducing any impacts. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Transportation	1	The Project may generate an incremental increase in additional vehicular movement; however, current street systems will not be adversely impacted. Public transportation is readily available near the proposed project. No substantial impact upon existing transportation systems is expected. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .

Natural Features

Source or Documentation

Water Resources	1	Domestic water services are primarily provided by the City of Perris. The proposed project is not expected to have an adverse or significant impact on water resources in the City of Perris. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .
Surface Water	1	The Project will be designed in a manner that perpetuates the existing natural drainage patterns with respect to the tributary drainage areas, outlet points and outlet conditions; therefore no adverse impacts are expected. State and Federal regulations may require preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Compliance with this requirement is enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. <i>(Staff Review, 2013)</i> .

Unique Natural Features and Agricultural Lands	1	The Project will not have an adverse impact on any unique natural features. However, the project may have an impact on historical resources. Mitigation measures set forth in the Environmental Assessment and in the Historical/Archeological Resources Study Report (<i>CRM TECH, Colton, CA, January 8, 2013</i>) will be implemented during the construction phase of the Project.
Vegetation and Wildlife	1	The Project is not expected to have an adverse or significant impact on wildlife and vegetation. (<i>Staff Review, 2013</i>).

Other Factors

Source or Documentation

Flood Disaster Protection Act [Flood Insurance] [§58.6(a)]	1	The project does not involve property acquisition, management, construction or improvements within a 100 year floodplain (Zones A or V) and does not involve a "critical action" within a 500 year floodplain (Zone B). The property is located in Zone X and identified by FEMA Map No. 06065C1440G http://map1.msc.fema.gov/idms/IntraView.cgi?ROT=0&O_X=6599&O_Y=3564&O_ZM=0.434486&O_SX=1281&O_SY=646&O_DP/=/400&O_TH=58066369&O_EN=58131697&O_PG=1&O_MP=1&CT=0&DI=0&WD=14400&HT=10350&JX=1419&JY=706&MPT=58131697&MPS=1&ACT=4&KEY=57923698&ITEM=1&PICK_VIEW_CENTER.x=797.5&PICK_VIEW_CENTER.y=332
Coastal Barrier Resources Act/ Coastal Barrier Improvement Act [§58.6(c)]	1	There are no Coastal Zones within the County of Riverside. (<i>Staff Review, 2013</i>)
Airport Runway Clear Zone or Clear Zone Disclosure [§58.6(d)]	1	The project is not within an FAA-designated civilian airport Runway Clear Zone (RCZ) –or Runway Protection Zone, or within a military airfield Clear Zone (CZ) or Accident Potential Zone (APZ) –Approach Protection Zone. The property is within Perris Valley Zone E (Airport Compatibility Zone). http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclis/viewer.html

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The Project will compliment as well as benefit the surrounding land uses. The construction of the Project will provide jobs and increase affordable housing units.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

Alternatives and Project Modifications Considered [24 CFR 58.40(e), Ref. 40 CFR 1508.9]

(Identify other reasonable courses of action that were considered and not selected, such as other sites, design modifications, or other uses of the subject site. Describe the benefits and adverse impacts to the human environment of each alternative and the reasons for rejecting it).

None.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

(Discuss the benefits and adverse impacts to the human environment of not implementing the preferred alternative).

No action for the construction of the Project will leave the site vacant and incompatible with the surrounding area as it is adjacent to residential neighborhoods.

Mitigation Measures Recommended [24 CFR 58.40(d), 40 CFR 1508.20]

(Recommend feasible ways in which the proposal or its external factors should be modified in order to minimize adverse environmental impacts and restore or enhance environmental quality.)

Unique Natural Features and Agricultural Lands:

The Historical/Archeological Resources Study Report (Tang, CRM TECH, Colton, CA, January 8, 2013) states that "In order to address the Project's potential to impact paleontological resources in subsurface sediments, CRM TECH recommends that a mitigation program be developed and implemented during the Project to prevent such impacts or reduce them to a level less than significant. As the primary component of the mitigation program, all grading, trenching, excavations, and/or other earth-moving operations in the undisturbed subsurface sediments within the Project area should be monitored by a historical archeologist/cultural resource specialist for any evidence of significant, nonrenewable paleontological resources." Therefore, the potential for impacts to significant cultural resources during construction will be considered "low" and additional mitigative efforts during the preplanning phase are not considered necessary.

Additional Studies Performed


(Attach studies or summaries)

- Historical/Archeological Resources Study Report for the Perris Family Apartments Project (CRM TECH, Colton, CA, January 8, 2013).
- Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Number 06065C1440G (FEMA Map Service Center:
http://map1.msc.fema.gov/idms/IntraView.cgi?ROT=0&O_X=6599&O_Y=3564&O_ZM=0.434486&O_SX=1281&O_SY=646&O_DPI=400&O_TH=58066369&O_EN=58131697&O_PG=1&O_MP=1&CT=0&DI=0&WD=14400&HT=10350&JX=1419&JY=706&MPT=58131697&MPS=1&ACT=4&KEY=57923698&ITEM=1&PICK_VIEW_CENTER_x=797.5&PICK_VIEW_CENTER.y=332)

List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]

- City of Perris General Plan.
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (MSA Consulting, Inc., January, 2011).
- Economic Development Agency Site Visit and Staff Review (Staff). January, 2013.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency Map Service Center (FEMA). <http://www.msc.fema.gov>, Retrieved January 2013.
- National Wild and Scenic Rivers (Rivers). <http://www.rivers.gov/maps.html> (Retrieved January 2013).
- State of California: State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker (Geotracker), <http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov>
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Sole Source Aquifer (SSA)
<http://cfpub.epa.gov/safewater/sourcewater/sourcewater.cfm?action=SSAJune>. (Retrieved January 2011).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services: National Wetlands Inventory (Wetlands)
<http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html>. (Retrieved January 2013).
- National Wild and Scenic Rivers <http://www.rivers.gov/wildriverslist.html#ca> (Retrieved January 2013).
- Riverside County Land Information System website (<http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rcslis/index.html>).
- City of Perris website. <http://www.cityofperris.org/>

Perris Family Apartments



Selected parcel(s):

311-180-013 311-180-035 311-180-036 311-180-050 311-180-051 311-180-052 311-180-053
311-180-054

IMPORTANT

Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.

- 311-180-035
ADDRESS NOT AVAILABLE
 - 311-180-036
ADDRESS NOT AVAILABLE
 - 311-180-050
ADDRESS NOT AVAILABLE
 - 311-180-051
ADDRESS NOT AVAILABLE
 - 311-180-052
ADDRESS NOT AVAILABLE
 - 311-180-053
ADDRESS NOT AVAILABLE
 - 311-180-054
ADDRESS NOT AVAILABLE
- STANDARD WITH PERMITS REPORT

NOT IN A GENERAL PLAN POLICY OVERLAY AREA

GENERAL PLAN POLICY AREAS

NONE

ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS (ORD. 348)

See the city for more information

ZONING DISTRICTS AND ZONING AREAS

NOT IN A ZONING DISTRICT/AREA

ZONING OVERLAYS

NOT IN A ZONING OVERLAY

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DISTRICTS

NOT IN AN HISTORIC PRESERVATION DISTRICT

SPECIFIC PLANS

NOT WITHIN A SPECIFIC PLAN

AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE

NOT IN AN AGRICULTURAL PRESERVE

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

NOT IN A REDEVELOPMENT AREA

AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREAS

PERRIS VALLEY

AIRPORT COMPATIBILITY ZONES

PERRIS VALLEY ZONE E

ENVIRONMENTAL

CVMSHCP (COACHELLA VALLEY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN) CONSERVATION AREA

NOT IN A CONSERVATION AREA

CVMSHCP FLUVIAL SAND TRANSPORT SPECIAL PROVISION AREAS

NOT IN A FLUVIAL SAND TRANSPORT SPECIAL PROVISION AREA

WRMSHCP (WESTERN RIVERSIDE COUNTY MULTI-SPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN) CELL GROUP

NOT IN A CELL GROUP

WRMSHCP CELL NUMBER

NOT IN A CELL

HANS/ERP (HABITAT ACQUISITION AND NEGOTIATION STRATEGY/EXPEDITED REVIEW PROCESS)

NONE

VEGETATION (2005)

DEVELOPED/DISTURBED LAND

FIRE

HIGH FIRE AREA (ORD. 787)

NOT IN A HIGH FIRE AREA

FIRE RESPONSIBILITY AREA

NOT IN A FIRE RESPONSIBILITY AREA

DEVELOPMENT FEES

CVMSHCP FEE AREA (ORD. 875)

NOT WITHIN THE COACHELLA VALLEY MSHCP FEE AREA

WRMSHCP FEE AREA (ORD. 810)

IN OR PARTIALLY WITHIN THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE MSHCP FEE AREA. SEE MAP FOR MORE INFORMATION.

ROAD & BRIDGE DISTRICT

NOT IN A DISTRICT

NOT WITHIN THE EASTERN TUMF FEE AREA

WESTERN TUMF (TRANSPORTATION UNIFORM MITIGATION FEE ORD. 824)
IN OR PARTIALLY WITHIN A TUMF FEE AREA. SEE MAP FOR MORE INFORMATION. CENTRAL

DIF (DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE AREA ORD. 659)
MEAD VALLEY

SKR FEE AREA (STEPHEN'S KANGAROO RAT ORD. 663.10)
IN OR PARTIALLY WITHIN AN SKR FEE AREA. SEE MAP FOR MORE INFORMATION.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS
NOT IN A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AREA

TRANSPORTATION

CIRCULATION ELEMENT ULTIMATE RIGHT-OF-WAY
NOT IN A CIRCULATION ELEMENT RIGHT-OF-WAY

ROAD BOOK PAGE
62

TRANSPORTATION AGREEMENTS
NOT IN A TRANSPORTATION AGREEMENT

CETAP (COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL TRANSPORTATION ACCEPTABILITY PROCESS) CORRIDORS
NOT IN A CETAP CORRIDOR.

HYDROLOGY

FLOOD PLAIN REVIEW
NOT REQUIRED

WATER DISTRICT
EMWD

FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

WATERSHED
SAN JACINTO VALLEY

GEOLOGIC

FAULT ZONE
NOT IN A FAULT ZONE

FAULTS
NOT WITHIN A 1/2 MILE OF A FAULT

LIQUEFACTION POTENTIAL
LOW

SUBSIDENCE
SUSCEPTIBLE

PALEONTOLOGICAL SENSITIVITY
HIGH SENSITIVITY (HIGH B).
SENSITIVITY EQUIVALENT TO HIGH A, BUT IS BASED ON THE OCCURRENCE OF FOSSILS AT A SPECIFIED DEPTH BELOW THE SURFACE.
THE CATEGORY HIGH B INDICATES THAT FOSSILS ARE LIKELY TO BE ENCOUNTERED AT OR BELOW FOUR FEET OF DEPTH, AND MAY BE IMPACTED DURING EXCAVATION BY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES.

MISCELLANEOUS

SCHOOL DISTRICT
PERRIS & PERRIS UNION HIGH

COMMUNITIES
NOT IN A COMMUNITY

NOT IN A COUNTY SERVICE AREA.

LIGHTING (ORD. 655)

ZONE B, 36.42 MILES FROM MT. PALOMAR OBSERVATORY

2000 CENSUS TRACT

042800

FARMLAND

OTHER LANDS
URBAN-BUILT UP LAND

TAX RATE AREAS

008101

- CITY OF PERRIS
- CITY OF PERRIS LIGHTING
- COUNTY FREE LIBRARY
- EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER
- ERAF RDV
- FLOOD CONTROL ADMINISTRATION
- FLOOD CONTROL ZONE 4
- GENERAL
- GENERAL PURPOSE
- METRO WATER EAST 1301999
- MT SAN JACINTO JUNIOR COLLEGE
- PERRIS AREA ELEM SCHOOL FUND
- PERRIS JR HIGH AREA FUND
- PERRIS RDV PROJECT 94 AB1290
- PERRIS SCHOOL
- PERRIS UNION HIGH SCHOOL
- PERRIS VALLEY CEMETERY
- RIV. CO. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
- SAN JACINTO BASIN RESOURCE CONS

SPECIAL NOTES

NO SPECIAL NOTES

BUILDING PERMITS

Case #	Description	Status
NO PLANNING PERMITS	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PERMITS

Case #	Description	Status
NO ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE

PLANNING PERMITS

Case #	Description	Status
NO PLANNING PERMITS	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE

REPORT PRINTED ON...Thu Jan 31 11:18:48 2013
Version 121101

Perris Family Apartments

APNs

311-180-013-2
311-180-035-2
311-180-036-3
311-180-050-5
311-180-051-6
311-180-052-7
311-180-053-8
311-180-054-9

OWNER NAME

NOT AVAILABLE ONLINE

ADDRESS

311-180-013
ADDRESS NOT AVAILABLE

MAILING ADDRESS

311-180-013
(SEE OWNER)
6280 TERRACINA AVE
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA. 91737

311-180-035
(SEE OWNER)
6280 TERRACINA AVE
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA. 91737

311-180-036
(SEE OWNER)
6280 TERRACINA AVE
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA. 91737

311-180-050
(SEE OWNER)
6280 TERRACINA AVE
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA. 91737

311-180-051
(SEE OWNER)
6280 TERRACINA AVE
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA. 91737

311-180-052
(SEE OWNER)
6280 TERRACINA AVE
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA. 91737

311-180-053
(SEE OWNER)
6280 TERRACINA AVE
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA. 91737

311-180-054
(SEE OWNER)
6280 TERRACINA AVE
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA. 91737

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

APN: 311180013
RECORDED BOOK/PAGE: MB 16/63
SUBDIVISION NAME: FIGADOTA FARMS 2
LOT/PARCEL: B, BLOCK:
TRACT NUMBER: NOT AVAILABLE

APN: 311180035
RECORDED BOOK/PAGE: MB 16/63
SUBDIVISION NAME: FIGADOTA FARMS 2
LOT/PARCEL: B, BLOCK: P
, Por. TRACT NUMBER: NOT AVAILABLE

APN: 311180036
RECORDED BOOK/PAGE: MB 16/63
SUBDIVISION NAME: FIGADOTA FARMS 2
LOT/PARCEL: C, BLOCK: P
, Por. TRACT NUMBER: NOT AVAILABLE

APN: 311180050
RECORDED BOOK/PAGE: MB 16/63
SUBDIVISION NAME: FIGADOTA FARMS 2
LOT/PARCEL: D, BLOCK:
TRACT NUMBER: NOT AVAILABLE

APN: 311180051
RECORDED BOOK/PAGE: MB 16/63
SUBDIVISION NAME: FIGADOTA FARMS 2
LOT/PARCEL: E, BLOCK:
TRACT NUMBER: NOT AVAILABLE

APN: 311180052
RECORDED BOOK/PAGE: MB 16/63
SUBDIVISION NAME: FIGADOTA FARMS 2
LOT/PARCEL: C, BLOCK:
TRACT NUMBER: NOT AVAILABLE

APN: 311180053
RECORDED BOOK/PAGE: MB 16/63
SUBDIVISION NAME: FIGADOTA FARMS 2
LOT/PARCEL: D, BLOCK:
TRACT NUMBER: NOT AVAILABLE

APN: 311180054
RECORDED BOOK/PAGE: MB 16/63
SUBDIVISION NAME: FIGADOTA FARMS 2
LOT/PARCEL: E, BLOCK:
TRACT NUMBER: NOT AVAILABLE

LOT SIZE

311-180-013
RECORDED LOT SIZE IS 1 ACRES

311-180-035
RECORDED LOT SIZE IS 0.97 ACRES

311-180-036
RECORDED LOT SIZE IS 0.97 ACRES

311-180-050
RECORDED LOT SIZE IS 1 ACRES

311-180-051
RECORDED LOT SIZE IS 0.57 ACRES

311-180-052
RECORDED LOT SIZE IS 1 ACRES

311-180-053
RECORDED LOT SIZE IS 1 ACRES

311-180-054
RECORDED LOT SIZE IS 0.57 ACRES

PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS

311-180-013
NO PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AVAILABLE

311-180-035
NO PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AVAILABLE

311-180-036
NO PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AVAILABLE

311-180-050
NO PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AVAILABLE

311-180-051
NO PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AVAILABLE

311-180-052

NO PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AVAILABLE

311-180-053
NO PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AVAILABLE

311-180-054
NO PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AVAILABLE

THOMAS BROS. MAPS PAGE/GRID

PAGE: 807 GRID: H1, H2

CITY BOUNDARY/SPHERE

CITY OF PERRIS
NOT WITHIN A CITY SPHERE
ANNEXATION DATE: NOT APPLICABLE
LAFCO CASE #: NOT APPLICABLE
PROPOSALS: NOT APPLICABLE

MARCH JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

NOT IN THE JURISDICTION OF THE MARCH JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

INDIAN TRIBAL LAND

NOT IN A TRIBAL LAND

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 2011 (ORD. 813)

MARION ASHLEY, DISTRICT 5

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT (2001 BOUNDARIES)

MARION ASHLEY, DISTRICT 5

TOWNSHIP/RANGE

T4SR3W SEC 29

ELEVATION RANGE

1436/1440 FEET

PREVIOUS APN

311-180-013
NO DATA AVAILABLE

311-180-035
311-180-004

311-180-036
311-180-005

311-180-050
311-180-037

311-180-051
311-180-037

311-180-052
311-180-037

311-180-053
311-180-037

311-180-054
311-180-037

PLANNING

LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

Consult with the city for land use information.

SANTA ROSA ESCARPMENT BOUNDARY

NOT IN THE SANTA ROSA ESCARPMENT BOUNDARY


AREA PLAN (RCIP)

MEAD VALLEY

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCILS

NOT IN A COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL AREA

GENERAL PLAN POLICY OVERLAYS



LEGEND



SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS SUBJECT TO INUNDATION BY THE 1% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD

The 1% annual flood (100-year flood), also known as the base flood, is the flood that has a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. The Special Flood Hazard Area is the area subject to flooding by the 1% annual chance flood. Areas of Special Flood Hazard include Zones A, AE, AH, AO, AR, A99, V, and VE. The Base Flood Elevation is the water-surface elevation of the 1% annual chance flood.

- ZONE A** No Base Flood Elevations determined.
- ZONE AE** Base Flood Elevations determined.
- ZONE AH** Flood depths of 1 to 3 feet (usually areas of ponding); Base Flood Elevations determined.
- ZONE AO** Flood depths of 1 to 3 feet (usually sheet flow on sloping terrain); average depths determined. For areas of alluvial fan flooding, velocities also determined.
- ZONE AR** Special Flood Hazard Area formerly protected from the 1% annual chance flood by a flood control system that was subsequently decertified. Zone AR indicates that the former flood control system is being restored to provide protection from the 1% annual chance or greater flood.
- ZONE A99** Area to be protected from 1% annual chance flood by a Federal flood protection system under construction; no Base Flood Elevations determined.
- ZONE V** Coastal flood zone with velocity hazard (wave action); no Base Flood Elevations determined.
- ZONE VE** Coastal flood zone with velocity hazard (wave action); Base Flood Elevations determined.



FLOODWAY AREAS IN ZONE AE

The floodway is the channel of a stream plus any adjacent floodplain areas that must be kept free of encroachment so that the 1% annual chance flood can be carried without substantial increases in flood heights.



OTHER FLOOD AREAS

- ZONE X** Areas of 0.2% annual chance flood; areas of 1% annual chance flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 1% annual chance flood.



OTHER AREAS

- ZONE X** Areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain.
- ZONE D** Areas in which flood hazards are undetermined, but possible.



COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM (CBRS) AREAS



U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

National Wetlands Inventory

Perris Apartments

Jan 31, 2013



Wetlands

- Freshwater Emergent
- Freshwater Forested/Shrub
- Estuarine and Marine Deepwater
- Estuarine and Marine
- Freshwater Pond
- Lake
- Riverine
- Other

Riparian


- Herbaceous
- Forested/Shrub

This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy or currentness of the base data shown on this map. All wetlands related data should be used in accordance with the layer metadata found on the Wetlands Mapper web site.

User Remarks:

Designated Sole Source Aquifers in EPA Region IX

Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Guam, and American Samoa



DESIGNATED SOLE SOURCE AQUIFERS IN REGION IX:

State	Sole Source Aquifer Name	Federal Reg. Cit.	Publ. Date	GIS map
AZ	Upper Santa Cruz & Avra Basin Aquifer	49 FR 2948	01/24/84	yes (PDF)
AZ	Bisbee-Naco Aquifer	53 FR 38337	09/30/88	yes (PDF)
CA	Fresno County Aquifer	44 FR 52751	09/10/79	yes (PDF)
CA	Santa Margarita Aquifer, Scotts Valley	50 FR 2023	01/14/85	yes (PDF)
CA	Campo/Cottonwood Creek	58 FR 31024	05/28/93	yes (PDF)
CA	Ocotillo-Coyote Wells Aquifer	61 FR 47752	09/10/96	yes (PDF)
GU	Northern Guam Aquifer System	43 FR 17867	04/26/78	yes (PDF)
HI	Southern Oahu Basal Aquifer	52 FR 45496	11/30/87	yes (PDF)

Return to: [Sole Source Aquifer program home page](#)



HOME | NATIONAL SYSTEM | MANAGEMENT | RESOURCES | PUBLICATIONS | CONTACT US | KID'S SITE

5:

CALIFORNIA

California has approximately 189,454 miles of river, of which 1,999.6 miles are designated as wild & scenic—1% of the state's river miles.

- Amaragosa River**
- American River (Lower)**
- American River (North Fork)**
- Bautista Creek**
- Big Sur River**
- Black Butte River**
- Cottonwood Creek**
- Eel River**
- Feather River**
- Fuller Mill Creek**
- Kern River**
- Kings River**
- Klamath River**
- Merced River**
- Owens River Headwaters**
- Palm Canyon Creek**
- Piru Creek**
- San Jacinto River (North Fork)**
- Sespe Creek**
- Sisquoc River**
- Smith River**
- Trinity River**
- Tuolumne River**

Choose a State


Choose a River

Seen as barren by the first explorers to today's first-time visitors, the rivers of the high desert simply hide their treasures well.

NATIONWIDE RIVERS INVENTORY | KID'S SITE | CONTACT US | PRIVACY NOTICE | Q & A SEARCH ENGINE | SITE MAP

Counties Designated "Nonattainment"

for Clean Air Act's National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) *




Guam - Piti and Tanguisson Counties are designated nonattainment for the SO₂ NAAQS

* The National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are health standards for Carbon Monoxide, Lead (1978 and 2008), Nitrogen Dioxide, 8-hour Ozone (1997 and 2008), Particulate Matter (PM-10 and PM-2.5 (1997 and 2006)), and Sulfur Dioxide.

** Included in the counts are counties designated for NAAQS and revised NAAQS pollutants. 1-hour Ozone is excluded. Partial counties, those with part of the county designated nonattainment and part attainment, are shown as full counties on the map.

The Illinois portion of the St. Louis, MO-IL 8-hr Ozone multi-state nonattainment area has been redesignated, but the area is not considered a maintenance area until both states in the area are redesignated. All of the counties for this area are displayed as being in nonattainment

GEOTRACKER



- SIGNIFES A CLOSED SITE
- Leaking Underground Tank (LUST) Cleanup Sites
- Other Cleanup Sites
- Land Disposal Sites
- Military Sites
- WDR Sites
- Permitted Underground Storage Tank (UST) Facilities
- Monitoring Wells*

- DTSC Cleanup Sites
- DTSC Haz Waste Permit

* ZOOM IN TO SEE IMWS

LAYERS

MAP SIZE

640x480

OPTIONS

Site List - [EXPORT TO EXCEL](#)

11 Sites

MAP

SATELLITE

HYBRID

TERRAIN

Map data ©2014 Google - [Terms of Use](#)

POWERED BY Google

1000 ft 200 m



January 11, 2013

VIA UPS DELIVERY

Ms. Lucinda Woodward
State Historic Preservation Officer
Office of Historic Preservation
1416 9th Street, Room 1442
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: Historical Verification Report for Perris Family Apartments in the City of Perris
in the County of Riverside, California**

Dear Ms. Woodward:

Enclosed is a Historical Verification Report by Riverside County EDA and the Historical/Archeological Resources Study Report (prepared by CRM TECH, Colton, CA) for the **Perris Family Apartments**, in the City of Perris, in the County Riverside, California. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed new construction project will not have an effect on any known existing historical or cultural resources.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (951) 343-5454.

Please send all correspondences to:

Attn. to: Mervyn Manalo, Housing Specialist
Housing Authority of the County of Riverside
5555 Arlington Avenue
Riverside, CA 92504

Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Mervyn Manalo".

Mervyn Manalo
Housing Specialist

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (EDA)
HISTORIC VERIFICATION NOTICE**

HISTORICAL VERIFICATION: Supplemental information and analysis pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

PROJECT NAME: Perris Family Apartments – Perris, CA

PROJECT SPONSOR: Coachella Valley Housing Coalition (CVHC)

PROJECT LOCATION (Project Site): The project site is located on the corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road in the City of Perris with Assessor Parcel Numbers: 311-180-013, -035, -036, -050, -051, -052, -053 and -054. See Exhibit “A” for map and photos.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

CVHC has requested \$1,000,000 in HOME funds to develop a 75-unit affordable housing complex on approximately 7.08 acres of vacant land. The project will comprised of 21 one-bedroom units, 30 two-bedroom units, and 24 three-bedroom units located in two-story town homes and one-story flats. Project amenities include a community room, computer lab, two large tot lots and a swimming pool.

Analysis:

1. Proposed Project is an Undertaking for Purposes of Historical Review

It is considered an undertaking for purposes of historical review in that new construction could potentially result in changes in the character or use of historic properties, should any such properties be located within the Area of Potential Effect (APE).

2. Project Location and Surroundings

The Project is generally located on the corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road (north of Jarvis Street and west of Ruby Road) in the City of Perris in the County of Riverside. The site location is surrounded by vacant land to the north and south; single-family subdivisions to the east and northeast; apartment communities to the west and southwest; and a cemetery northwest of the Project Site. Palms Elementary School is located southeast of the project site on the opposite corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road.

3. Area of Potential Effect (APE)

Due to the fact that the proposed project involves new construction, the APE shall be defined to include the Project Site as well as the properties contiguous to and within 500 feet of the Project Site. The Project Site is currently vacant and generally flat. The lot is covered by grass and vacant dirt. The area is comprised of vacant land, single-family and multi-family residential units, an elementary school, and cemetery.

4. Additional Information from Other Sources

- The National Register of Historical Places – Riverside County (January 11, 2013)
- Riverside County Points of Historical Interest
- Historical/Archeological Resources Survey Report for Perris Family Apartments (attached) (CRM TECH, Colton, CA – 1/8/2013).

5. Evaluation of Properties Listed or Eligible for Listing in the National Register of Historic Places within the “Area of Potential Effect”

A staff site visit on January 3, 2013, confirmed that there are no historic structures within the APE. Therefore, the project will not impact any National Register properties. Neither the Project Site nor properties within the APE are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Places or Riverside County Points of Historical Interest.

6. Effect of Proposed Project on Historic Properties or Potentially Historic Properties

The project proposes new construction and will require infrastructure, on and off-site improvements.

Based on the completed staff site visit and the information in Nos. 3, 4 and 5, above, neither the Project Site nor the APE appear to contain structures or items of historical or cultural significance.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposed new construction project will not have an effect on any known existing historical or cultural resources.

EXHIBIT "A"

Project Site & Photos
(Photos taken January 3, 2013)



Project Site



Facing Northwest across Project Site



Facing West across Project Site



Facing West across Project Site



Facing North across Project Site

HISTORICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES SURVEY REPORT

PERRIS FAMILY APARTMENTS PROJECT

**City of Perris
Riverside County, California**

For Submittal to:

**Planning Division
Development Services Department
City of Perris
101 North D Street
Perris, CA 92570-1998**

and

**County of Riverside Planning Department
County Administrative Center
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92501**

Prepared for:

**Mike Walsh
Coachella Valley Housing Coalition
45-701 Monroe Street, Plaza 1, Suite G
Indio, CA 92201**

Prepared by:

**CRM TECH
1016 E. Cooley Drive, Suite A/B
Colton, CA 92324**

**Bai "Tom" Tang, Principal Investigator
Michael Hogan, Principal Investigator**

**January 8, 2013
CRM TECH Contract No. 2664**

NATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATABASE INFORMATION

Author(s): Bai "Tom" Tang, Principal Investigator/Historian
Michael Hogan, Principal Investigator/Archaeologist
Laura H. Shaker, Archaeologist/Native American Liaison

Consulting Firm: CRM TECH
1016 E. Cooley Drive, Suite A/B
Colton, CA 92324
(909) 824-6400

Date: January 8, 2013

Title: Historical/ Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Perris Family
Apartments Project, City of Perris, Riverside County, California

For Submittal to: Planning Division
Development Services Department
City of Perris
101 North D Street
Perris, CA 92570-1998
(951) 943-5003
and
County of Riverside Planning Department
County Administrative Center
4080 Lemon Street
Riverside, CA 92501
(951) 951-5000

Prepared for: Mike Walsh
Coachella Valley Housing Coalition
45-701 Monroe Street, Plaza 1, Suite G
Indio, CA 92201
(760) 347-3157

USGS Quadrangle: Perris, Calif., 7.5' quadrangle (Section 29, T4S R3W, San Bernardino
Baseline and Meridian)

Project Size: Approximately 7.1 acres

Keywords: Perris Valley, Riverside County; Phase I historical/archaeological
resources survey; Assessor's Parcel Nos. 311-180-013, -035, -036, and
-050 to -054; no "historic properties" or "historical resources"
identified

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

In December 2012 and January 2013, at the request of the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition, CRM TECH performed a cultural resources study on approximately 7.1 acres of vacant land in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California. The subject property of the study encompasses Assessor's Parcel Nos. 311-180-013, -035, -036, and -050 to -054, located on the northwestern corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road, in the southwest quarter of Section 29, T4S R3W, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian.

The study is part of the environmental review process for the proposed Perris Family Apartments Project, which entails the construction of a minimum of 75 multi-family housing units. The City of Perris, as the lead agency for the project, required the study in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In preparation for project review by the County of Riverside on behalf of the federal government, the study was conducted in compliance with both CEQA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The purpose of the study is to provide the City of Perris, the County of Riverside, and any other responsible public agency or agencies with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the proposed undertaking would have an effect on any "historic properties," as defined by 36 CFR 800.16(l), or "historical resources," as defined by Title 14 CCR §15064.5(a)(1)-(3), that may exist in or near the Area of Potential Effects (APE). In order to identify such "historic properties" or "historical resources," CRM TECH conducted a historical/archaeological resources records search, pursued historical background research, contacted Native American representatives, and carried out an intensive-level field survey.

Throughout the course of the study, no "historic properties" or "historical resources" were encountered within or adjacent to the APE. Therefore, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1) and Calif. PRC §21084.1, CRM TECH recommends to the City of Perris, the County of Riverside, and other responsible public agency or agencies a finding that no "historic properties" or "historical resources" will be affected by the proposed undertaking.

No further cultural resources investigation is recommended for the undertaking unless project plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study. However, if buried cultural materials are encountered during any earth-moving operations associated with the undertaking, all work in that area should be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY	i
INTRODUCTION	1
SETTING.....	3
Current Natural Setting	3
Cultural Setting	4
Prehistoric Context.....	4
Ethnohistoric Context	4
Historic Context.....	5
RESEARCH METHODS.....	6
Records Search.....	6
Historical Research.....	6
Native American Participation	7
Field Survey	7
RESULTS AND FINDINGS.....	7
Records Search.....	7
Historical Research.....	8
Native American Participation	9
Field Survey	10
DISCUSSION.....	10
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11
REFERENCES.....	13
APPENDIX 1: Personnel Qualifications.....	14
APPENDIX 2: Correspondence with Native American Representatives.....	17

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Project vicinity	1
Figure 2. Area of Potential Effects	2
Figure 3. Overview of the current natural setting.....	3
Figure 4. The APE and vicinity in 1853-1855	8
Figure 5. The APE and vicinity in 1897-1898	8
Figure 6. The APE and vicinity in 1939	9
Figure 7. The APE and vicinity in 1951	9

INTRODUCTION

In December 2012 and January 2013, at the request of the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition, CRM TECH performed a cultural resources study on approximately 7.1 acres of vacant land in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California (Fig. 1). The subject property of the study encompasses Assessor's Parcel Nos. 311-180-013, -035, -036, and -050 to -054, located on the northwestern corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road, in the southwest quarter of Section 29, T4S R3W, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian (Fig. 2).

The study is part of the environmental review process for the proposed Perris Family Apartments Project, which entails the construction of a minimum of 75 multi-family housing units. The City of Perris, as the lead agency for the project, required the study in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In preparation for project review by the County of Riverside on behalf of the federal government, the study was conducted in compliance with both CEQA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The purpose of the study is to provide the City of Perris, the County of Riverside, and any other responsible public agency or agencies with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the proposed undertaking would have an effect on any "historic properties," as defined by 36 CFR 800.16(l), or "historical resources," as defined by Title 14 CCR §15064.5(a)(1)-(3), that may exist in or near the Area of Potential Effects (APE). In order to identify such "historic properties" or "historical resources," CRM TECH conducted a historical/archaeological resources records search, pursued historical background research, contacted Native American representatives, and carried out an intensive-level field survey. The following report is a complete account of the methods, results, and final conclusion of the study.




Figure 1. Project vicinity. (Based on USGS Santa Ana, Calif., 1:250,000 quadrangle [USGS 1979a])




Figure 2. Area of Potential Effects. (Based on USGS Perris, Calif., 1:24,000 quadrangle [USGS 1979b])

SETTING

CURRENT NATURAL SETTING

The City of Perris lies in the Perris Valley, an inland alluvial valley that extends generally in a northwest-southeast direction. A number of isolated granitic mountains, such as the Lakeview Mountains and the Bernasconi Hills, separate the Perris Valley from the nearby Moreno, San Jacinto, and Menifee Valleys. These four valleys are sub-basins of the San Jacinto Watershed, one of the three major geographical subdivisions of the Santa Ana Basin. This valley complex is bounded on the northeast by the San Jacinto Mountains and on the southwest by the Santa Ana Mountains.

The APE is located in the central portion of the City of Perris, approximately 2,000 feet northeast of the city's downtown area. It is surrounded by vacant land to the north and the south and by existing residential tracts to the east and the west, with a school and a cemetery also lying nearby. The terrain in the APE is level, and the elevation is around 1,435 feet above mean sea level. The ground surface has been recently disked, and hosts only a light growth of newly sprouting grasses (Fig. 3). The soils in the vicinity consist of a dark tan loam.



Figure 3. Overview of the current natural setting. (Photo taken on January 4, 2013; view to the northeast from the southwestern corner of the property)

CULTURAL SETTING

Prehistoric Context

It is widely acknowledged that human occupation in what is now the State of California began 8,000-12,000 years ago. In order to understand Native American cultures before European contact, archaeologists have devised chronological frameworks that endeavor to correlate the observable technological and cultural changes in the archaeological record to distinct periods. Unfortunately, none of these chronological frameworks has been widely accepted, and none has been developed specifically for the so-called Inland Empire region of southern California, the nearest ones being for the Colorado Desert and Peninsular Ranges area (Warren 1984) and for the Mojave Desert (Warren and Crabtree 1986).

The development of an overall chronological framework for the region is hindered by the lack of distinct stratigraphic layers of cultural sequences that could be dated by absolute dating methods. Since results from archaeological investigations in this region have yet to be synthesized into an overall chronological framework, most archaeologists tend to follow a chronology adapted from a scheme developed by William J. Wallace in 1955 and modified by others (Wallace 1955; 1978; Warren 1968; Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984; Moratto 1984). Although the beginning and ending dates of the different horizons or periods may vary, the general framework of prehistory in this region under this chronology consists of the following four periods:

- Early Hunting Stage (ca. 10000-6000 B.C.), which was characterized by human reliance on big game animals, as evidenced by large, archaic-style projectile points and the relative lack of plant-processing artifacts;
- Millingstone Horizon (ca. 6000 B.C.-A.D. 1000), when plant foods and small game animals came to the forefront of subsistence strategies, and from which a large number of millingstones, especially heavily used, deep-basin metates, were left;
- Late Prehistoric Period (ca. A.D. 1000-1500), during which a more complex social organization, a more diversified subsistence base—as evidenced by smaller projectile points, expedient milling stones and, later, pottery—and regional cultures and tribal territories began to develop;
- Protohistoric Period (ca. A.D. 1500-1700s), which ushered in long-distance contact with Europeans and led to the historic period.

Ethnohistoric Context

The Perris Valley has long been a part of the homeland of the Luiseño Indians, a Takic-speaking people whose territory extended from present-day Riverside to Escondido and Oceanside. The name of the group derived from Mission San Luis Rey, which held jurisdiction over most of the traditional Luiseño territory during the mission period. Luiseño history, as recorded in traditional songs, tells the creation story from the birth of the first people, the *kaamalam*, to the sickness, death, and cremation of *Wiyoot*, the most powerful and wise one, at Lake Elsinore. In modern anthropological literature, the leading sources on Luiseño culture and history are Kroeber (1925), Strong (1929), and Bean and Shipek (1978).

Anthropologists have divided the Luiseño into several autonomous lineages or kin groups, which represented the basic political unit among most southern California Indians. According to Bean and Shipek (1978:551), each Luiseño lineage possessed a permanent base camp, or village, on the valley floor and another in the mountain regions for acorn collection. Luiseño villages were made up of family members and relatives, where chiefs of the village inherited their rank and each village owned its own land. Villages were usually located in sheltered canyons or near year-round sources of freshwater, always near subsistence resources.

The Luiseño exploited nearly all resources of the environment in a highly developed seasonal mobility system. The Luiseño people were primarily hunters and gatherers. They collected seeds, roots, wild berries, acorns, wild grapes, strawberries, wild onions, and prickly pear cacti, and hunted deer, elks, antelopes, rabbits, wood rats, and a variety of insects. Bows and arrows, atlatls or spear throwers, rabbit sticks, traps, nets, clubs, and slings were the main hunting tools. Each lineage had exclusive hunting and gathering rights in their procurement ranges. These boundaries were respected and only crossed with permission (Bean and Shipek 1978:551).

It is estimated that when Spanish colonization of Alta California began in 1769, the Luiseño had approximately 50 active villages with an average population of 200 each, although other estimates place the total Luiseño population at 4,000-5,000 (Bean and Shipek 1978:557). Some of the villages were forcefully moved to the Spanish missions, while others were largely left intact (*ibid.*:558). Ultimately, Luiseño population declined rapidly after European contact because of diseases such as small pox and harsh living conditions at the missions and, later, on the Mexican ranchos, where the Native people often worked as seasonal ranch hands.

After the American annexation of Alta California, the large number of non-Native settlers further eroded the foundation of the traditional Luiseño society. During the latter half of the 19th century, almost all of the remaining Luiseño villages were displaced, their occupants eventually removed to the various reservations. Today, the nearest Native American groups of Luiseño heritage live on the Soboba, Pechanga, and Pala Indian Reservations.

Historic Context

In California, the so-called "historic period" began in 1769, when an expedition sent by the Spanish authorities in Mexico founded Mission San Diego, the first European outpost in Alta California. For several decades after that, Spanish colonization activities were largely confined to the coastal regions, and left little impact on the arid hinterland of the territory. Although the first explorers, including Pedro Fages and Juan Bautista de Anza, traveled through the inland region as early as 1772-1774, no Europeans were known to have settled in the vicinity until the beginning of the 19th century.

During much of the Spanish and Mexican Periods in California history, the Perris Valley were nominally under the control of Mission San Luis Rey, which was established near present-day Oceanside in 1798. By 1821, it had become a part of the loosely defined Rancho San Jacinto for the mission, a vast cattle ranch that was first mentioned by that

name in mission records in 1821 (Gunther 1984:467). The rancho was headquartered on a small hill near the Lakeview Mountains, where an adobe house for the *mayordomo*, known in later years as Casa Loma, was built sometime before 1827 (*ibid.*:102).

In the 1840s, after secularization of the mission system, the Mexican government issued three large land grants on the former mission rancho of San Jacinto, resulting in the establishment of Rancho San Jacinto Viejo, Rancho San Jacinto Nuevo y Potrero, and El Sobrante de Rancho San Jacinto. As elsewhere in southern California, cattle raising was the most prevalent economic activity on these ranchos, until the influx of American settlers eventually brought an end to this much-romanticized lifestyle in the second half of the 19th century. The APE was not included in any of these land grants, and thus remained public land when the U.S. annexed Alta California in 1848.

In 1882-1883, the Perris Valley received a major boost in its early development when the California Southern Railway was constructed through the area, to be connected to the Santa Fe Railroad's nationwide system a few years later. In a scenario repeated frequently in the American West, a string of towns soon emerged along the railroad line. The town of Perris was founded in 1886, and named in honor of Frederick Thomas Perris, the California Southern Railway's chief engineer and superintendent of construction. In 1893, with the creation of Riverside County, Perris was designated as one of the 12 original judicial townships (Gunther 1984:120). On May 16, 1911, Perris was incorporated as the sixth city in the county.

RESEARCH METHODS

RECORDS SEARCH

On January 2, 2012, CRM TECH Archaeologist Nina Gallardo (see App. 1 for qualifications) conducted the historical/archaeological resources records search at the Eastern Information Center (EIC), University of California, Riverside. During the records search, Gallardo examined maps and records on file at the EIC for previously identified cultural resources in or near the APE and existing cultural resources reports pertaining to the vicinity. Previously identified cultural resources include properties designated as California Historical Landmarks, Points of Historical Interest, or Riverside County Landmarks, as well as those listed in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the California Historical Resources Inventory.

HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Historical background research for this study was conducted by CRM TECH Principal Investigator/Historian Bai "Tom" Tang (see App. 1 for qualifications) on the basis of published literature in local and regional history and historic maps of the Perris area. Among maps consulted for this study were the U.S. General Land Office's (GLO) land survey plat maps dated 1855 and the U.S. Geological Survey's (USGS) topographic maps dated 1901-1979. These maps are collected at the Science Library of the University of California, Riverside, and the California Desert District of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, located in Moreno Valley.

NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION

On December 19, 2012, CRM TECH submitted a written request to the State of California's Native American Heritage Commission for a records search in the commission's sacred lands files. Following the commission's recommendations, CRM TECH further contacted a total of 18 Native American representatives in the region both in writing and by telephone between December 20, 2012, and January 8, 2013, to solicit local Native American input regarding any potential cultural resources concerns over the proposed undertaking. In addition, CRM TECH notified the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians of the upcoming archaeological field survey, and invited tribal participation. The correspondences between CRM TECH and the Native American representatives are attached to this report in Appendix 2.

FIELD SURVEY

On January 4, 2013, CRM TECH Principal Investigator/ Archaeologist Michael Hogan (see App. 1 for qualifications) carried out the intensive-level, on-foot field survey of the APE with the assistance of Native American monitors Josh Lane from the Pechanga Band and Talitha Arceo from the Soboba Band. The survey commenced from the southeastern corner of the property and proceeded along parallel north-south transects spaced seven meters (approx. 23 feet) apart. All possible signs of cultural remains were closely inspected during the survey. In this way, the ground surface in the entire project area was systematically and carefully examined for any evidence of human activities dating to the prehistoric or historic period (i.e., 50 years ago or older). Ground visibility was excellent (85-100%) in the entire APE due to recent disking.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

RECORDS SEARCH

According to EIC records, the APE had not been surveyed for cultural resources prior to this study, and no cultural resources had been recorded on or adjacent to the property. Outside the APE but within a one-mile radius, EIC records show nearly 30 previous cultural resources studies on various tracts of land and linear features, including an adjacent property to the south, across Jarvis Street. The total acreage covered by these studies, however, accounts for only roughly a quarter of the area within the scope of the records search.

As a result of these previous studies, 5 archaeological sites, 1 isolate (i.e., a locality with fewer than three artifacts), 1 historic district, and more than 40 individual historic-period buildings have been recorded into the California Historical Resources Inventory within the one-mile radius. Among these, the isolate and one of the archaeological sites were prehistoric (i.e., Native American) in nature, consisting of a chipped-stone flake and a group of bedrock milling features, respectively. The other four sites dated to the historic period, and included a concrete slab foundation, a possible well and pump stand, the 1880s California Southern/San Jacinto Valley Railway, and a manhole on a sewer line with a concrete cover.

The manhole, designated Site 33-015115 in the California Historical Resources Inventory, was recorded directly to the south of the APE, approximately 115 feet south of Jarvis Street. None of the other sites, nor the isolate, was located in the immediate vicinity of the APE. The historic-period buildings were recorded mostly to the south of the APE, in the downtown area of Perris, including many within the Fourth Street Historic District. None of these previously identified cultural resources, therefore, is likely to receive any impact from the proposed undertaking.

HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Historic maps consulted for this study suggest that the APE is relatively low in sensitivity for cultural resources dating to the historic period. In the 1850s, when the U.S. government conducted the first systematic land surveys in the Perris Valley, no man-made features were found in or near the APE, although a prominent trail was noted less than a half-mile to the west (Fig. 5). By the end of the 19th century, the surrounding area had evidently undergone some growth, as demonstrated by the scattered buildings and crisscrossing roads, including the forerunners of both Jarvis Street and Ruby Road, on the outskirts of the town of Perris, but the APE showed no signs of any settlement or development activities (Fig. 6).

In the late 1930s, the early 1950s, and the late 1970s, despite the gradual growth of Perris and the surrounding area, the APE was again shown to be devoid of any notable man-made features (Figs. 2, 7, 8). Based on its depiction in the historic maps, the APE was apparently unsettled and undeveloped, except perhaps as agricultural fields, throughout the historic period, and has remained so to the present time.




Figure 4. The APE and vicinity in 1853-1855.
(Source: GLO 1855)




Figure 5. The APE and vicinity in 1897-1898.
(Source: USGS 1901)




Figure 6. The APE and vicinity in 1939. (Source: USGS 1943)




Figure 7. The APE and vicinity in 1951. (Source: USGS 1953)

NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION

In response to CRM TECH's inquiry, the Native American Heritage Commission reports in a letter dated December 19, 2012, that the sacred lands record search identified no Native American cultural resources within a half-mile of the APE, but recommends that local Native American groups be contacted for further information. For that purpose, the commission provided a list of potential contacts in the region (see App. 2).

Upon receiving the commission's response, CRM TECH initiated correspondence with all 13 individuals on the referral list and the organizations they represent (see App. 2). Yvonne Markle, Environmental Officer Manager for the Cahuilla Band of Indians, John Gomez, Jr., Cultural Resources Coordinator for the Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indian, and Steven Estrada, Environmental director for the Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, were also contacted in writing. In addition, Justine Murphy, Assistant to the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer of the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, and Dick Watenpaugh, Director of Tribal Administration for the Rincon Band, were included in the phone consultations.

As of this time, tribal representatives of the Soboba, Pala, and Pechanga Bands have responded to the requests for comments in writing, while those of the Cahuilla and Santa Rosa Bands have commented by telephone (see App. 2). Meanwhile, Justine Murphy of the Rincon Band requested additional time to respond (see App. 2). As mentioned above, Native American monitors Josh Lane and Talitha Arceo, representing the Pechanga Band and the Soboba Bands, respectively, participated in the field survey of the APE.

Among the tribal representatives who have responded to date, Joseph Ontiveros, Director of Cultural Resources for the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, Anna Hoover, Cultural Analyst for the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, and Yvonne Markle of the Cahuilla Band identified the APE as lying within their tribes' Traditional Use Area. Therefore, Mr. Ontiveros requested Native American monitoring of the undertaking by a representative of the Soboba Band as well as further, government-to-government consultation with the lead agencies. Ms. Markle recommended Native American monitoring if any cultural resources were discovered in the APE. Ms. Hoover requested copies of all pertinent documentation and future consultation with the lead agencies regarding the treatment and disposition of subsurface cultural remains if any were found during the undertaking (see App. 2).

Shasta Gaughen, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Pala Band of Mission Indians, found the project location to be outside the tribe's Traditional Use Area. Therefore, the Pala Band wished to defer to other tribes located closer to the APE. Similarly, Steven Estrada of the Santa Rosa Band stated that his tribe would defer to the Soboba Band for future consultations on this undertaking (see App. 2).

Due to time constraints, this report has been completed before all local Native American representatives have had a chance to respond. After submittal of the report, CRM TECH will continue to collect local Native American input should any be forthcoming. Any additional concerns raised by the tribes will be reported immediately to the Coachella Valley Housing Coalition and the lead agencies for the undertaking.

FIELD SURVEY

The field survey produced completely negative results for potential cultural resources. The entire project area was closely inspected for any evidence of human activities dating to the prehistoric or historic periods, but none was found. The surface soil in the APE has been extensively disturbed in the past, and no bedrock boulders or outcrops were found on the property. Much of the APE was littered with typical urban trash, concentrated mostly along the eastern and western boundaries of the property, but none of the items appears to be of any historic/archaeological interest. In sum, no buildings, structures, objects, sites, features, or artifacts more than 50 years of age were encountered during the field survey.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to identify and evaluate any "historic properties" or "historical resources" that may exist within or adjacent to the Area of Potential Effects of the proposed undertaking. "Historic properties," as defined by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, include "any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places maintained by the Secretary of the Interior" (36 CFR 800.16(1)). The eligibility for inclusion in the National Register is determined by applying the following criteria, developed by the National Park Service as per provision of the National Historic Preservation Act:

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

- (a) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- (b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- (c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- (d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (36 CFR 60.4)

For CEQA-compliance considerations, the State of California's Public Resources Code (PRC) establishes the definitions and criteria for "historical resources," which require similar protection to what NHPA Section 106 mandates for historic properties. "Historical resources," according to PRC §5020.1(j), "includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California."

More specifically, CEQA guidelines state that the term "historical resources" applies to any such resources listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, included in a local register of historical resources, or determined to be historically significant by the Lead Agency (Title 14 CCR §15064.5(a)(1)-(3)). Regarding the proper criteria of historical significance, CEQA guidelines mandate that "a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be 'historically significant' if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources" (Title 14 CCR §15064.5(a)(3)). A resource may be listed in the California Register if it meets any of the following criteria:

- (1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
- (2) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.
- (3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
- (4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (PRC §5024.1(c))

In summary of the research results presented above, all research procedures completed during this study have yielded negative results, and no potential "historic properties"/ "historical resources" of either prehistoric or historic origin were encountered throughout the course of the study. Based on these findings, and in light of the criteria listed above, the present study concludes that *no "historic properties" or "historical resources" exist within or adjacent to the APE.*

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

CEQA establishes that "a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment" (PRC §21084.1). "Substantial adverse change," according to PRC §5020.1(q), "means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of an historical resource would be impaired."

Since no "historic properties" or "historical resources" have been identified within the APE, CRM TECH presents the following recommendations to the City of Perris, the County of Riverside, and other responsible public agency or agencies:

- No "historic properties" or "historical resources" are located within or adjacent to the APE, and thus no "historic properties" or "historical resources" will be affected by the undertaking as currently proposed.
- No further cultural resources investigation is necessary for the proposed undertaking unless project plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study.
- If buried cultural materials are discovered during any earth-moving operations associated with the undertaking, all work in that area should be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds.

REFERENCES

- Bean, Lowell John, and Florence C. Shipek
1978 Luiseño. In Robert F. Heizer (ed.): *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8: *California*; pp. 550-563. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Chartkoff, Joseph L., and Kerry Kona Chartkoff
1984 *The Archaeology of California*. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, California.
- GLO (General Land Office, U.S. Department of the Interior)
1855 Plat Map: Township No. 4 South Range No. 3 West, San Bernardino Meridian; surveyed in 1853-1855.
- Gunther, Jane Davies
1984 *Riverside County, California, Place Names: Their Origins and Their Stories*. Jane Davies Gunther, Riverside.
- Kroeber, Alfred L.
1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Moratto, Michael J. (ed.)
1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, Orlando, Florida.
- Strong, William Duncan
1929 *Aboriginal Society in Southern California*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 26. Reprinted by Malki Museum Press, Banning, California, 1972.
- USGS (United States Geological Survey, U.S. Department of the Interior)
1901 Map: Elsinore, Calif. (30', 1:125,000); surveyed in 1897-1898.
1943 Map: Perris, Calif. (15', 1:62,500); aerial photographs taken in 1939.
1953 Map: Perris, Calif. (7.5', 1:24,000); aerial photographs taken in 1951.
1979a Map: Santa Ana, Calif. (1:250,000); 1959 edition revised.
1979b Map: Perris, Calif. (7.5', 1:24,000); 1967 edition photorevised in 1978.
- Wallace, William J.
1955 A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Archaeology* 11(3):214-230.
1978 Post-Pleistocene Archeology, 9000 to 2000 BC. In Robert F. Heizer (ed.): *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8: *California*; pp. 25-36. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Warren, Claude N.
1968 Cultural Traditions and Ecological Adaptations on the Southern California Coast. In Cynthia Irwin-Williams (ed.): *Archaic Prehistory in Western United States*; pp. 1-14. Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology 1(3). Portales, New Mexico.
1984 The Desert Region. In Michael J. Moratto (ed.): *California Archaeology*; pp. 339-430. Academic Press, Orlando, Florida.
- Warren, Claude N., and Robert H. Crabtree
1986 Prehistory of the Southwestern Area. In Warren L. D'Azevedo (ed.): *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 11: *Great Basin*; pp. 183-193. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

**APPENDIX 1:
PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS**

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/HISTORIAN
Bai "Tom" Tang, M.A.**

Education

- 1988-1993 Graduate Program in Public History/Historic Preservation, UC Riverside.
1987 M.A., American History, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.
1982 B.A., History, Northwestern University, Xi'an, China.
- 2000 "Introduction to Section 106 Review," presented by the Advisory Council on
Historic Preservation and the University of Nevada, Reno.
1994 "Assessing the Significance of Historic Archaeological Sites," presented by the
Historic Preservation Program, University of Nevada, Reno.

Professional Experience

- 2002- Principal Investigator, CRM TECH, Riverside/Colton, California.
1993-2002 Project Historian/Architectural Historian, CRM TECH, Riverside, California.
1993-1997 Project Historian, Greenwood and Associates, Pacific Palisades, California.
1991-1993 Project Historian, Archaeological Research Unit, UC Riverside.
1990 Intern Researcher, California State Office of Historic Preservation,
Sacramento.
1990-1992 Teaching Assistant, History of Modern World, UC Riverside.
1988-1993 Research Assistant, American Social History, UC Riverside.
1985-1988 Research Assistant, Modern Chinese History, Yale University.
1985-1986 Teaching Assistant, Modern Chinese History, Yale University.
1982-1985 Lecturer, History, Xi'an Foreign Languages Institute, Xi'an, China.

Honors and Awards

- 1988-1990 University of California Graduate Fellowship, UC Riverside.
1985-1987 Yale University Fellowship, Yale University Graduate School.
1980, 1981 President's Honor List, Northwestern University, Xi'an, China.

Cultural Resources Management Reports

Preliminary Analyses and Recommendations Regarding California's Cultural Resources Inventory System (with Special Reference to Condition 14 of NPS 1990 Program Review Report). California State Office of Historic Preservation working paper, Sacramento, September 1990.

Numerous cultural resources management reports with the Archaeological Research Unit, Greenwood and Associates, and CRM TECH, since October 1991.

Membership

California Preservation Foundation.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR/ARCHAEOLOGIST
Michael Hogan, Ph.D., RPA*

Education

- 1991 Ph.D., Anthropology, University of California, Riverside.
1981 B.S., Anthropology, University of California, Riverside; with honors.
1980-1981 Education Abroad Program, Lima, Peru.
- 2002 Section 106—National Historic Preservation Act: Federal Law at the Local Level. UCLA Extension Course #888.
2002 "Recognizing Historic Artifacts," workshop presented by Richard Norwood, Historical Archaeologist.
2002 "Wending Your Way through the Regulatory Maze," symposium presented by the Association of Environmental Professionals.
1992 "Southern California Ceramics Workshop," presented by Jerry Schaefer.
1992 "Historic Artifact Workshop," presented by Anne Duffield-Stoll.

Professional Experience

- 2002- Principal Investigator, CRM TECH, Riverside/Colton, California.
1999-2002 Project Archaeologist/Field Director, CRM TECH, Riverside.
1996-1998 Project Director and Ethnographer, Statistical Research, Inc., Redlands.
1992-1998 Assistant Research Anthropologist, University of California, Riverside
1992-1995 Project Director, Archaeological Research Unit, U. C. Riverside.
1993-1994 Adjunct Professor, Riverside Community College, Mt. San Jacinto College, U.C. Riverside, Chapman University, and San Bernardino Valley College.
1991-1992 Crew Chief, Archaeological Research Unit, U. C. Riverside.
1984-1998 Archaeological Technician, Field Director, and Project Director for various southern California cultural resources management firms.

Research Interests

Cultural Resource Management, Southern Californian Archaeology, Settlement and Exchange Patterns, Specialization and Stratification, Culture Change, Native American Culture, Cultural Diversity.

Cultural Resources Management Reports

Author and co-author of, contributor to, and principal investigator for numerous cultural resources management study reports since 1986.

Memberships

* Register of Professional Archaeologists.
Society for American Archaeology.
Society for California Archaeology.
Pacific Coast Archaeological Society.
Coachella Valley Archaeological Society.

PROJECT ARCHAEOLOGIST
Nina Gallardo, B.A.

Education

2004 B.A., Anthropology/Law and Society, University of California, Riverside.

Professional Experience

2004- Project Archaeologist, CRM TECH, Riverside/Colton, California.

Honors and Awards

2000-2002 Dean's Honors List, University of California, Riverside.

PROJECT ARCHAEOLOGIST/NATIVE AMERICAN LIAISON
Laura Hensley Shaker, B.S.

Education

1998 B.S., Anthropology (with emphasis in Archaeology), University of California, Riverside.

1997 Archaeological Field School, University of California, Riverside.

2002 "Historic Archaeology Workshop," presented by Richard Norwood, Base Archaeologist, Edwards Air Force Base; presented at CRM TECH, Riverside, California.

1999 "Unexploded Ordnance Training," presented by EOD officers; Fort Irwin Army Training Facility, Barstow, California.

Professional Experience

1999- Project Archaeologist/Native American Liaison, CRM TECH, Riverside/Colton, California.

1999 Archaeological survey and excavation at Vandenburg Air Force Base; Applied Earthworks, Lompoc, California.

1999 Archaeological survey at Fort Irwin Army Training Facility, Barstow; A.S.M. Affiliates, Encinitas, California.

1998-1999 Paleontological fieldwork and laboratory procedures, Eastside Reservoir Project; San Bernardino County Museum, Redlands, California.

1998 Archaeological survey at the Anza-Borrego State Park; Archaeological Research Unit, University of California, Riverside.

1997-1998 Archaeological survey and excavation at the Twentynine Palms Marine Corps Air and Ground Combat Center; Archaeological Research Unit, University of California, Riverside.

APPENDIX 2

**CORRESPONDENCE WITH
NATIVE AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES***

* A total of 18 local Native American representatives were contacted; a sample letter is included in this report.

December 19, 2012

David Singleton
Native American Heritage Commission
915 Capitol Mall, RM 364
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Sacred Lands File Check & Native American Contacts List Request

Dear Mr. Singleton:

This is to request a records search of the Sacred Lands Files and a Native American contacts list for a multi-family housing project on the northwest corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road, in the City of Perris, Riverside County. Pertinent information is provided below.

Project: Perris Family Apartments: 75-unit multi-family housing project; APNs 311-180-013, -035, -036, and -050 through -054; northwest corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road (CRM TECH Contract No. 2664)

City and County: City of Perris, Riverside County

USGS Quadrangle Name: Perris

Section 29 Township 4 South Range 3 West SB BM (see attached map)

Contact: Michael Hogan/Laura H. Shaker Company: CRM TECH

Address: 1016 E. Cooley Drive, Suite A/B, Colton, CA 92324

Phone: (909) 824-6400 Fax: (909) 824-6405 Email: mhogan@crmtech.us

Project Description: The Coachella Valley Housing Coalition proposes to facilitate the construction of a minimum of 75 multi-family housing units on approximately 7.1 acres of land in the City of Perris. The project is know as "Perris Family Apartments."

Please conduct your search of the Sacred Lands Files and provide us with a list of Native Americans representatives who should be contacted regarding the proposed undertaking at your earliest convenience.

Do not hesitate to contact us if you need more information or have any questions. Thank you for your assistance.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 354
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 653-6251
Fax (916) 657-5390
Web Site www.nahc.ca.gov
ca_nahc@pacbell.net



December 19 2012

Dr. Michael Hogan, Ph.D., RPA

CRM TECH

1016 E. Cooley Drive, Suite A/B
Colton, CA 92124

Sent by FAX to: 909-824-6405
No. of Pages: 5

Re: Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Contacts list for the proposed Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Contacts list for the proposed "25-Unit Multi-Family Project known as "Perris Family Apartments," located in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California

Dear Dr. Hogan:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) conducted a search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) *Sacred Lands File* was completed for the area of potential project effect (Area of Potential Effect or APE) referenced above. Please note that the absence of specific site information in the *Sacred Lands File* does not indicate the absence of Native American traditional cultural places or cultural landscapes in any APE. While in this case, a search of the NAHC *Sacred Lands File* did not indicate the presence of any sites within one-half mile of the APE location data you provided

Also, a Native American tribe or individual may be the only source for the presence of traditional cultural places. For that reason, enclosed is a list of Native American individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of traditional cultural places in your project area. This list should provide a starting place in locating any areas of potential adverse impact.

California Public Resources Code §§5097.94 (a) and 5097.96 authorize the NAHC to establish a Sacred Land Inventory to record Native American sacred sites and burial sites. These records are exempt from the provisions of the California Public Records Act pursuant to California Government Code §6254 (r). The purpose of this code is to protect such sites from vandalism, theft and destruction.

In the 1985 Appellate Court decision (170 Cal App 3rd 604), the court held that the NAHC has jurisdiction and special expertise, as a state agency, over affected Native American resources, impacted by proposed projects including archaeological, places of religious significance to Native Americans and burial sites

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – CA Public Resources Code §§ 21000-21177, amendments effective 3/18/2010) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental

Impact Report (EIR) per the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as 'a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including ...objects of historic or aesthetic significance.' In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE), and if so, to mitigate that effect. CA Government Code §65040.12(e) defines "environmental justice" provisions and is applicable to the environmental review processes. The NAHC recommends *avoidance* as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15370(a) to pursuing a project that would damage or destroy Native American cultural resources and California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 (Archaeological Resources) that requires documentation, data recovery of cultural resources, construction to avoid sites and the possible use of covenant easements to protect sites.

Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries once a project is underway. Local Native Americans may have knowledge of the religious and cultural significance of the historic properties of the proposed project for the area (e.g. APE). Consultation with Native American communities is also a matter of environmental justice as defined by California Government Code §65040.12(e). We urge consultation with those tribes and interested Native Americans on the list that the NAHC has provided in order to see if your proposed project might impact Native American cultural resources. Lead agencies should consider avoidance as defined in §15370 of the CEQA Guidelines when significant cultural resources as defined by the CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b)(c)(f) may be affected by a proposed project. If so, Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as "substantial," and Section 21083.2 which requires documentation, data recovery of cultural resources.

The NAHC makes no recommendation or preference of any single individual, or group over another. All of those on the list should be contacted, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe or group. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the NAHC requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

The 1992 *Secretary of the Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11593 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The aforementioned Secretary of the Interior's *Standards* include recommendations for all 'lead agencies' to consider the historic context of proposed projects and to "research" the cultural landscape that might include the 'area of potential effect.'

Partnering with local tribes and interested Native American consulting parties, on the NAHC list, should be conducted in compliance with the requirements of federal NEPA (42 U.S.C 4321-43351) and Section 106 4(f), Section 110 and (k) of the federal NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq*), Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (23 CFR 774); 36 CFR Part 800.3 (f) (2) & .5, the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ, 42 U.S.C 4371 *et seq.* and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013) as appropriate. The 1992 *Secretary of the Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including

cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11593 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The NAHC remains concerned about the limitations and methods employed for NHPA Section 106 Consultation.


Also, California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, California Government Code §27491 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction and mandate the processes to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a project location other than a 'dedicated cemetery', another important reason to have Native American Monitors on board with the project.

To be effective, consultation on specific projects must be the result of an ongoing relationship between Native American tribes and lead agencies, project proponents and their contractors, in the opinion of the NAHC. An excellent way to reinforce the relationship between a project and local tribes is to employ Native American Monitors in all phases of proposed projects including the planning phases.

Confidentiality of "historic properties of religious and cultural significance" may also be protected under Section 304 of the NHPA or at the Secretary of the Interior discretion if not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary may also be advised by the federal Indian Religious Freedom Act (cf. 42 U.S.C., 1996) in issuing a decision on whether or not to disclose items of religious and/or cultural significance identified in or near the APE and possibility threatened by proposed project activity.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions about this response to your request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 653-6251.

Sincerely,


Dave Singleton

Attachment: Native American Contact List

**Native American Contacts
Riverside County
December 19, 2012**

Pala Band of Mission Indians
Historic Preservation Office/Shasta Gaughen
 35008 Pala Temecula Road, Luiseno
 Pala, CA 92059 Cupeno
 PMB 50
 (760) 891-3515
 sgaughen@palatribe.com
 (760) 742-3189 Fax

Pauma & Yuima Reservation
Randall Majel, Chairperson
 P.O. Box 369 Luiseno
 Pauma Valley CA 92061
 paumareservation@aol.com
 (760) 742-1289
 (760) 742-3422 Fax

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

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

Rincon Band of Mission Indians
Vincent Whipple, Tribal Historic Preationv. Officer
 P.O. Box 68 Luiseno
 Valley Center, CA 92082
 jmurphy@rincontribe.org
 (760) 297-2635
 (760) 297-2639 Fax

Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians
John Marcus, Chairman
 P.O. Box 391820 Cahuilla
 Anza, CA 92539
 (951) 659-2700
 (951) 659-2228 Fax

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Michael Contreras, Cultural Heritage Prog.
 12700 Pumarra Road Cahuilla
 Banning, CA 92220 Serrano
 (951) 201-1866 - cell
 mcontreras@morongo-nsn.
 gov
 (951) 922-0105 Fax

Rincon Band of Mission Indians
Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson
 P.O. Box 68 Luiseno
 Valley Center, CA 92082
 bomazzetti@aol.com
 (760) 749-1051
 (760) 749-8901 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.38 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Ferris Family Apartments Project, located in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California for which a Sacred Lands File search and Native American Contacts were requested.

**Native American Contacts
Riverside County
December 19, 2012**

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

SOBOBA BAND OF LUISENO INDIANS
Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department
P.O. BOX 487 Luiseno
San Jacinto , CA 92581
jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov
(951) 663-5279
(951) 654-5544, ext 4137

La Jolla Band of Mission Indians
Lavonne Peck, Chairwoman
22000 Highway 76 Luiseno
Pauma Valley CA 92061
rob.roy@lajolla-nsn.gov
(760) 742-3796
(760) 742-1704 Fax

Cahuilla Band of Indians
Luther Saigado, Chairperson
PO Box 391760 Cahuilla
Anza , CA 92539
tribalcouncil@cahuilla.net
915-763-5549

Pechanga Cultural Resources Department
Anna Hoover, Cultural Analyst
P.O. Box 2183 Luisefio
Temecula , CA 92593
ahoover@pechanga-nsn.gov
951-770-8104
(951) 694-0446 - FAX

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5087.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Perris Family Apartments Project, located in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California for which a Sacred Lands File search and Native American Contacts were requested.

December 20, 2012

LaVonne Peck, Chairwoman
La Jolla Band of Mission Indians
22000 Highway 76
Pauma Valley, CA 92061

RE: Perris Family Apartments; 75-Unit Multi-Family Project
Seven acres in APNs 311-180-013, -035, -036 and -050 to -054
Located in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California
CRM TECH Contract #2664

Dear Ms. Peck:

CRM TECH is preparing a Phase I cultural resources study for the Perris Family Apartments Project. The Area of Potential Effects (APE) is located on the northwest corner of Jarvis Street and Ruby Road, in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California. The proposed project will involve the construction of a 75-unit multi-family apartment complex. The accompanying map, based on the USGS Perris, Calif. 7.5' quadrangle, depicts the location of the APE in Section 29, T4S R3W, SBBM.

In a letter dated December 19, 2012, the Native American Heritage Commission states that the sacred lands record search did not indicate the presence of any sites within a half-mile of the APE, but recommends that local Native American groups be contacted for further information. Therefore, as part of the cultural resources study for this project, I am writing to request your input on potential Native American cultural resources at or near the project location.

Please respond at your earliest convenience if you have any specific knowledge of sacred / religious sites or other sites of Native American traditional cultural value within or near the APE. Any information or concerns regarding Native American cultural resources or sacred sites in the vicinity may be forwarded to CRM TECH by telephone, e-mail, facsimile, or standard mail.

The lead agency for this project is the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the study is being prepared under the provisions of Section 106. CRM TECH, as the cultural resources consultant for the project, is not the appropriate entity to initiate government-to-government consultations. Requests for documentation or information we cannot provide will be forwarded to our client and/or the lead agency.

Respectfully,

Laura Hensley Shaker
CRM TECH

Encl.: APE map

From: "Laura Shaker" <lshaker@crmtech.us>
To: "Anna Hoover" <ahover@pechanga-nsn.gov>, rvasquez@pechanga-nsn.gov,
"Jontiveros" <jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov>
Sent: Friday, December 21, 2012 8:37:23 AM
Subject: Survey for CRM TECH 2664 Perris Family Apartments (Jarvis and Ruby)

Hello-

I just sent over a notification letter for a new CRM TECH project in the City of Perris, the Perris Family Apartment Project located on the northwest corner of Jarvis and Ruby. CRM TECH will be conducting an archaeological field survey in the near future. If you are interested in having a representative from your group on the survey, please contact either Daniel Ballester at 909-376-7842 or Michael Hogan at 909-376-7843/909-824-6400.

Thank you and happy holidays!

Laura

December 27, 2012

Attn: Laura Shaker
CRM TECH
1016 E. Cooley Drive, Ste. A/B
Colton, CA 92324



**Re: Perris Valley Apartments, located in the City of Perris, Riverside County
CRM TECH #2664**

The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians appreciates your observance of Tribal Cultural Resources and their preservation in your project. The information provided to us on said project has been assessed through our Cultural Resource Department, where it was concluded that although it is outside the existing reservation, the project area does fall within the bounds of our Tribal Traditional Use Areas. This project location is in close proximity to known village sites and is a shared use area that was used in ongoing trade between the Luiseno and Cahuilla tribes. Therefore it is regarded as highly sensitive to the people of Soboba.

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians is requesting the following:

1. **Government to Government** consultation in accordance to Section 106. Including the transfer of information to the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians regarding the progress of this project should be done as soon as new developments occur.
2. Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians continue to be a lead consulting tribal entity for this project.
3. Working in and around traditional use areas intensifies the possibility of encountering cultural resources during the construction/excavation phase. For this reason the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians requests that Native American Monitor(s) from the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians Cultural Resource Department to be present during any ground disturbing proceedings. Including surveys and archaeological testing.
4. Request that proper procedures be taken and requests of the tribe be honored (Please see the attachment)

Sincerely,

Joseph Ontiveros
Soboba Cultural Resource Department
P.O. Box 487
San Jacinto, CA 92581
Phone (951) 654-5544 ext. 4137
Cell (951) 663-5279
jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov

Cultural Items (Artifacts). Ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony reflect traditional religious beliefs and practices of the Soboba Band. The Developer should agree to return all Native American ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony that may be found on the project site to the Soboba Band for appropriate treatment. In addition, the Soboba Band requests the return of all other cultural items (artifacts) that are recovered during the course of archaeological investigations. When appropriate and agreed upon in advance, the Developer's archeologist may conduct analyses of certain artifact classes if required by CEQA, Section 106 of NHPA, the mitigation measures or conditions of approval for the Project. This may include but is not limited or restricted to include shell, bone, ceramic, stone or other artifacts.

The Developer should waive any and all claims to ownership of Native American ceremonial and cultural artifacts that may be found on the Project site. Upon completion of authorized and mandatory archeological analysis, the Developer should return said artifacts to the Soboba Band within a reasonable time period agreed to by the Parties and not to exceed (30) days from the initial recovery of the items.

Treatment and Disposition of Remains:

- A. The Soboba Band shall be allowed, under California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a), to (1) inspect the site of the discovery and (2) make determinations as to how the human remains and grave goods shall be treated and disposed of with appropriate dignity.
- B. The Soboba Band, as MLD, shall complete its inspection within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving notification from either the Developer or the NAHC, as required by California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a). The Parties agree to discuss in good faith what constitutes "appropriate dignity" as that term is used in the applicable statutes.
- C. Reburial of human remains shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a) and (b). The Soboba Band, as the MLD in consultation with the Developer, shall make the final discretionary determination regarding the appropriate disposition and treatment of human remains.
- D. All parties are aware that the Soboba Band may wish to rebury the human remains and associated ceremonial and cultural items (artifacts) on or near, the site of their discovery, in an area that shall not be subject to future subsurface disturbances. The Developer should accommodate on-site reburial in a location mutually agreed upon by the Parties.
- E. The term "human remains" encompasses more than human bones because the Soboba Band's traditions periodically necessitated the ceremonial burning of human remains. Grave goods are those artifacts associated with any human remains. These items, and other funerary remnants and their ashes are to be treated in the same manner as human bone fragments or bones that remain intact.


Coordination with County Coroner's Office. The Lead Agencies and the Developer should immediately contact both the Coroner and the Soboba Band in the event that any human remains

are discovered during implementation of the Project. If the Coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, the Coroner shall ensure that notification is provided to the NAHC within twenty-four (24) hours of the determination, as required by California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 (c).

Non-Disclosure of Location Reburials. It is understood by all parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or cultural artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The Coroner, parties, and Lead Agencies, will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code § 6254 (r).

Ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony reflect traditional religious beliefs and practices of the Soboba Band. The Developer agrees to return all Native American ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony that may be found on the project site to the Soboba Band for appropriate treatment. In addition, the Soboba Band requests the return of all other cultural items (artifacts) that are recovered during the course of archaeological investigations. Where appropriate and agreed upon in advance, Developer's archeologist may conduct analyses of certain artifact classes if required by CEQA, Section 106 of NHPA, the mitigation measures or conditions of approval for the Project. This may include but is not limited or restricted to include shell, bone, ceramic, stone or other artifacts.

SOBOBA



INDIANS

**PALA TRIBAL HISTORIC
PRESERVATION OFFICE**

PMB 50, 35008 Pala Temecula Road
Pala, CA 92059
760-891-3510 Office | 760-742-3189 Fax



December 28, 2012

Laura Hensley Shaker
CRM Tech
1016 E. Cooley Dr. Suite A/B
Colton, CA 92324

Re: Perris Family Apartments, CRM Tech Contract # 2664

Dear Ms. Shaker,

The Pala Band of Mission Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Office has received your notification of the project referenced above. This letter constitutes our response on behalf of Robert Smith, Tribal Chairman.

We have consulted our maps and determined that the project as described is not within the boundaries of the recognized Pala Indian Reservation. The project is also beyond the boundaries of the territory that the tribe considers its Traditional Use Area (TUA). Therefore, we have no objection to the continuation of project activities as currently planned and we defer to the wishes of Tribes in closer proximity to the project area.

We appreciate involvement with your initiative and look forward to working with you on future efforts. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone at 760-891-3515 or by e-mail at sgaughen@palatribe.com.

Sincerely,

Shasta C. Gaughen, PhD
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Pala Band of Mission Indians

ATTENTION: THE PALA TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL REQUESTS FOR CONSULTATION. PLEASE ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE TO SHASTA C. GAUGHEN AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS. IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO ALSO SEND NOTICES TO PALA TRIBAL CHAIRMAN ROBERT SMITH.



PECHANGA CULTURAL RESOURCES
Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians

Post Office, Box 2183 • Temecula, CA 92593
Telephone (951) 308-9295 • Fax (951) 506-9491

January 7, 2013

VIA E-Mail and USPS

RE: Request for Information for the Perris Family Apartments Project, APNs 311-180-013, -035, -036 and -050 to -054, Perris, HUD, CRM Tech Project No 2664

Dear Ms. Shaker;

The Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians ("the Tribe") appreciates your request for information regarding the above referenced Undertaking. After reviewing the provided maps and our internal documents, we have determined that the APE is not within reservation lands although it is within our ancestral territory. At this time, the Tribe does not have any concerns with the proposed Undertaking and are not requesting a formal Section 106 consultation from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

However, we are requesting that the Tribe be sent copies of the archaeological study and any pertinent site records as well as the environmental documents being prepared for public review. The Tribe is requesting the opportunity to review and comment on the Undertaking during the public review period.

Furthermore, in the event that cultural resources are identified during any earthmoving activity, the Tribe requests to be contacted immediately so that we can go to the property to assist with identification and the proper preservation and/or mitigation of the resources. Additionally, the Tribe would like to thank the Project Proponent and CRM Tech for inviting a tribal representative to be present during the survey.

Currently the Tribe requests the following:

- 1) Copies of all applicable archaeological reports, site records, proposed grading plans and environmental documents (EA/ES/MND/EIR, etc) for our files;
- 2) The Tribe reserves its right to make additional comments and recommendations once the environmental documents have been received and fully reviewed;
- 3) As outlined above, in the event that subsurface cultural resources are identified, the Tribe requests consultation with the Lead Agency regarding the treatment and disposition of all artifacts.

As a sovereign governmental entity, the Tribe is entitled to appropriate and adequate government-to-government consultation regarding the proposed Project. We would like you and your client to know that the Tribe does not consider initial inquiry letters from project consultants to constitute appropriate government-to-government consultation, but rather tools to obtain further information about the Project area. Therefore, the Tribe reserves its rights to participate in the formal environmental review process, including government-to-government consultation with the Lead Agency, and requests to be included in all correspondence regarding this Project.

Chairperson:
Germaine Arenas

Vice Chairperson:
Mary Bear Magee

Committee Members:
Evie Gerber
Darlene Miranda
Bridgett Barcello Maxwell
Aurelia Maruffo
Richard B. Seearoe, III

Director:
Gary DuBois

Coordinator:
Paul Macarro

Cultural Analyst:
Anna Hoover

Sacred Is The Duty Trusted Unto Our Care And With Honor We Rise To The Need

Please note that we are interested in participating in surveys within Luiseño ancestral territory. Prior to conducting any surveys, please contact the Cultural Department to schedule specifics. If you have any additional questions or comments, please contact me at ahoover@pechanga-nsn.gov or 951-770-8104.

Sincerely,



Anna M. Hoover
Cultural Analyst

*Pechanga Cultural Resources • Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians
Post Office Box 2183 • Temecula, CA 92592*

Sacred Is The Duty Trusted Unto Our Care And With Honor We Rise To The Need

From: Justine Murphy <jmurphy@RinconTribe.org>
To: Laura Shaker <lshaker@crmtech.us>
Sent: Monday, January 7, 2013 1:41:44 PM
Subject: RE: CRM TECH project #2664 Perris Valley Apartments

Hello Laura,

Can you please give me until Wednesday to get Rincon's response signed by the Culture Committee Chairwoman? I can email or fax a copy to you by the close of business Wednesday. I hope that isn't asking too much, thank you kindly. Hope your new year is off to a good start.

Sincerely,

Justine Murphy
Administrative Assistant
Rincon Cultural Resource Center
1 W. Tribal Rd. Bldg. D
Valley Center, CA 92082
Ph-(760) 297-2635

From: Laura Shaker <lshaker@crmtech.us>
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2013 2:22 PM
To: Justine Murphy <jmurphy@RinconTribe.org>
Subject: Re: CRM TECH project #2664 Perris Valley Apartments

Hello Justine,

I know that the client really wants to wrap it up tomorrow. We will contact them and try to see if they would be willing to postpone it until the end of the day on Wednesday. In the meantime, did the tribe have any major concerns? Keep in mind that even if the letter does not get into the report, it will still be submitted to the client as an addendum to the report.

Thanks,
Laura Hensley Shaker
CRM TECH
909-376-7844

From: Justine Murphy <jmurphy@RinconTribe.org>
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2013 3:20 PM
To: Laura Shaker <lshaker@crmtech.us>
Subject: RE: CRM TECH project #2664 Perris Valley Apartments

Okay, I can have it to you tomorrow!

Thanks,

Justine Murphy
Rincon Cultural Resource Center
Ph-(760) 297-2635

From: Justine Murphy <jmurphy@RinconTribe.org>
To: Laura Shaker <lshaker@crmtech.us>
Sent: Monday, January 7, 2013 3:27:58 PM
Subject: RE: CRM TECH project #2664 Perris Valley Apartments

Hi Laura,

This is a follow up to my previous message concerning CRM TECH Project # 2664. I do need an extra day, at least until Wednesday, January 09, 2013. I have noted the mail date (December 20, 2012) and arrival date (January 03, 2013), which doesn't give the department enough time to respond. Can you please ask your client to reconsider a new wrap up date? Thank you kindly.

Justine Murphy
Rincon Cultural Resource Center
PH-(760) 297-2635

From: Laura Shaker <lshaker@crmtech.us>
To: Justine Murphy <jmurphy@RinconTribe.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 8, 2013 7:35:02 AM
Subject: Re: CRM TECH project #2664 Perris Valley Apartments

Hello Justine,

The mail must have been slow because of the holidays. Go ahead and send in the response on Wednesday or ASAP, we will make sure that the client receives it.

I hope that you are having a good new year as well.

Thank you so much for your time.

Laura Hensley Shaker
CRM TECH
909-376-7844

TELEPHONE LOG

Name	Tribe/Affiliation	Telephone Contacts	Comments
Yvonne Markle, Environmental Office Manager	Cahuilla Band of Indians	11:47 am, January 4, 2013	Ms. Markle stated that the APE was located in the Traditional Use Area of the Cahuilla Band. The tribe is unaware of any specific cultural resources in the APE but recommends that a Native American monitor be on site if any cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities.
Luther Salgado, Chairperson	Cahuilla Band of Indians	None	Yvonne Markle is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see above).
Lavonne Peck, Chairwoman	La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians	12:05 pm, January 4, 2013 11:40 am, January 7, 2013	Left messages; no response to date.
Mike Contreras, Jr., Cultural Heritage Program Coordinator	Morongo Band of Mission Indians	12:39 pm, January 4, 2013 12:00 pm, January 7, 2013	Left messages; no response to date.
Shasta Gaughen, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer	Pala Band of Mission Indians	None	Ms. Gaughen responded in a letter dated December 28, 2012 (copy attached).
Randall Majel, Chairperson	Pauma and Yuima Reservation	12:09 pm, January 4, 2013 12:25 pm, January 7, 2013	Left messages; no response to date.
Anna Hoover, Cultural Analyst	Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians	11:44 am, January 4, 2013 11:16 am, January 7, 2013	Ms. Hoover responded in a letter dated January 7, 2013 (copy attached).
Mark Macarro, Cultural Resources Coordinator	Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians	None	Anna Hoover is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see above).
Paul Macarro, Cultural Resources Coordinator	Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians	None	Anna Hoover is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see above).
John Gomez, Jr., Cultural Resources Coordinator	Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians	12:17 pm, January 4, 2013 12:04 pm, January 7, 2013	Left messages; no response to date.
Joseph Hamilton, Chairman	Ramona Band of Cahuilla Indians	None	John Gomez, Jr., is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see above).
Bo Mazzetti, Chairperson	Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians	11:38 am, January 4, 2013	Left a message; no response to date.
Justine Murphy, Assistant to THPO	Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians	12:17 pm, January 4, 2013	Ms. Murphy stated that the tribe wished to respond but needed additional time (see attached e-mail exchanges).
Dick Watenpaugh, Director of Tribal Administration	Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians	11:15 am, January 7, 2013	Left a message; no response to date.

Vincent Whipple, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer	Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians	12:17 pm, January 4, 2013 11:21 am, January 7, 2013	Mr. Whipple wished to speak to Justine Murphy to see if a response letter had been sent out for this undertaking.
Steven Estrada, Environmental Director	Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians	12:50 pm, January 4, 2013 12:20 pm, January 7, 2013	Mr. Estrada wished to defer to the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians.
John Marcus	Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians	None	Steven Estrada is the designated spokesperson for the tribe (see above).
Joseph Ontiveros, Director of Cultural Resources	Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians	None	Mr. Ontiveros responded in a letter dated December 27, 2012 (copy attached).