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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning a sediment removal project within the greater Prado Dam Basin. The OCWD retained BonTerra Psomas to complete a Phase I Cultural Resources Study for the proposed Sunnyslope Creek vegetation mitigation site and a rock gabion site that are required to mitigate impacts to riparian and wetland habitat that will occur as a result of the proposed project. The study was requested in support of a Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit to be issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and is, therefore, being completed to meet the standards of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Records searches and literature reviews were conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California (UC), Riverside, for three sites that are located in the northwestern corner of Riverside County (i.e., the Sunnyslope Creek site, and the Rock Gabion sites). Subsequently, BonTerra Psomas surveyed the sites, the results of which are contained herein. This report follows the guidelines contained in *Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format* (Office of Historic Preservation 1990).

DATES OF INVESTIGATION

Records searches for the three sites were conducted by the EIC on March 6, 2014 BonTerra Psomas conducted a second records search at the USACE offices in Los Angeles on April 14, 2015. The field studies for were completed on April 10, 2015.

FINDINGS OF THE INVESTIGATION

The EIC identified one cultural resource recorded within \( \frac{1}{8} \) mile of (but not on) the Sunnyslope Creek site. No cultural resources have been recorded on or within \( \frac{1}{8} \) mile of the Rock Gabions sites. The Sunnyslope Creek site was surveyed for cultural resources; however, none were observed.

CONSTRAINTS

Dense vegetation prevented the Rock Gabions sites from being adequately surveyed.

EFFECTS ANALYSIS

This impact analysis is provided to assist the USACE and OCWD in fulfilling its compliance responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations (listed in the *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR], Title 36, §800) were used to identify historic properties within the Area of Potential Effects (APE). The criteria of adverse effects codified at 36 CFR 800.5 are used to assess the effects of the proposed project on the three sites.

ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS

The pedestrian survey consisted of a visual examination of each of the sites to determine if a pedestrian survey was possible, given the knowledge that much of the Prado Basin is blanketed with thick vegetation. The Rock Gabions site could not be adequately surveyed because of the presence of thick vegetation. Monitoring is recommended for this site pursuant to Mitigation Measure Cult-1 contained under Regulatory Requirements.
The Sunnyslope Creek site was surveyed adequately. No cultural resources were observed during the pedestrian survey. The site will be stripped of all non-native vegetation and replanted with native species.

Although no known archaeological sites were previously recorded in the three mitigation areas or discovered during the current field surveys, there is a potential for unknown cultural resources to be discovered during vegetation removal and restoration activities on the sites. Potential adverse impacts to such resources, if found eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, would be considered significant.

In the event that unknown resources are uncovered during vegetation removal and implementation of vegetation restoration activities, the OCWD must comply with the Code of Federal Regulations (Title 36, §800.13, Post-Review Discoveries), which requires additional mitigation measures, as developed in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

RR Cult-1 Project-related earth disturbance has the potential to unearth previously undiscovered human remains, resulting in a potentially significant impact. If human remains are encountered during excavation activities, all work shall halt and the County Coroner shall be notified (California Public Resources Code §5097.98). The Coroner will determine whether the remains are of forensic interest. If the Coroner determines that the remains are prehistoric, s/he will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall be responsible for designating the most likely descendant (MLD), who will be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The MLD shall make his/her recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD’s recommendation shall be followed if feasible, and may include scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials (California Health and Safety Code §7050.5). If the landowner rejects the MLD’s recommendations, the landowner shall rebury the remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location that will not be subject to further subsurface disturbance (California Public Resources Code §5097.98).

Compliance with Section 5097.9 of the California Public Resources Code would preclude significant impacts to human remains.

MITIGATION MEASURE

MM Cult-1 A qualified Archaeological Monitor shall be retained to examine the results of ground-disturbing activities during vegetation removal and to examine spoil piles and other excavations related to mitigation planting and other restoration activities at the three sites. The Archaeologist shall be present at the pre-construction conference and shall establish a schedule for archaeological resource surveillance after the existing vegetation has been removed and again after the excavation of augur holes for the mitigation plantings. The Archaeologist shall establish, in cooperation with the applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work, if any is ongoing, to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of cultural resources as appropriate. If the archaeological resources are found to be significant, the archaeological observer shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with the project applicant, for exploration and/or salvage. Significant sites that cannot be
avoided will require data recovery measures and shall be completed upon approval of a Data Recovery Plan.

Implementation of the mitigation measure would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

DISPOSITION OF DATA

This report will be filed with OCWD, the EIC, the USACE, and with BonTerra Psomas. All field notes and other documentation related to the study are on file at the BonTerra Psomas Santa Ana office.
1.0 UNDERTAKING INFORMATION/INTRODUCTION

The Orange County Water District (OCWD), under on-call Agreement Number 0675, retained BonTerra Psomas to complete a Phase I cultural resources study for the proposed restoration project. The OCWD is planning a sediment removal project within the Prado Basin and must mitigate for the loss of habitat as a result of the proposed project. The mitigation entails removal of existing non-native vegetation from three sites and replace it with native species. The sites consist of the Rock Gabions sites and the Sunnyslope Creek site.

Exhibits 1 and 2 depict the locations of the Rock Gabions sites, and the Sunnyslope Creek site on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam 7.5-Minute quadrangle.

1.1 PROJECT PERSONNEL

The cultural resources study was completed by David M. Smith and Patrick O. Maxon, M.A., RPA.

2.0 REGULATORY SETTING

This section contains a discussion of the applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards that govern cultural resources and which must be adhered to both prior to and during project implementation. There is a federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as a result of a Section 404 Clean Water Act permit that will be issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Therefore, this Phase I Cultural Resources Study is being conducted under the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 United States Code [USC] §470f) and its implementing regulations (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] §800, Protection of Historic Properties). The report is also intended to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] §21083.2) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, §15064.5).

2.1 FEDERAL

Cultural resources are considered during federal undertakings chiefly under NEPA and under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (as amended) through one of its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800). Properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to Native Americans are considered under Section 101(d)(6)(A) of the NHPA. Other federal laws include the Archaeological Data Preservation Act of 1974, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1989, among others.

Section 106 of the NHPA (16 USC 470f) requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings (36 CFR 800.1). Under Section 106, the significance of any adversely affected cultural resource is assessed and mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the impacts to an acceptable level. Significant cultural resources are those resources that are listed in or are eligible for listing in the NRHP per the criteria listed at 36 CFR 60.4 below:
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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 that:

(a) Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

(b) Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

(c) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of installation, 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) Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

2.2 STATE

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency to determine whether a project would have a significant effect on one or more historical resources. According to Section 15064.5(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, a “historical resource” is defined as a resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] §21084.1); a resource included in a local register of historical resources (14 CCR §15064.5[a][2]); or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (14 CCR 15064.5[a][3]).

The basic guidelines that were used for the cultural resources study were Section 5024.1 of the PRC; Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR); and Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 of the CEQA Statutes. PRC 5024.1 requires evaluation of historical resources to determine their eligibility for listing on the CRHR. The purpose of the CRHR is to maintain a list of the State’s historical resources and to indicate which properties are to be protected from substantial adverse change. The criteria for listing resources in the CRHR, which were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP, per the criteria listed at 36 CFR 60.4), are stated below.

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 that:

1. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or

2. Are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; or

3. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values; or

4. Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.
In addition, according to Section 15064.5(a)(3)(A–D) of the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR), a resource is considered historically significant if it meets the criteria for listing in the NRHP (per the criteria listed at 36 CFR 60.4). Impacts that affect those characteristics of the resource that qualify it for the NRHP or that would adversely alter the significance of a resource listed in or eligible for listing in the CRHR are considered to have a significant effect on the environment. Impacts to cultural resources from a proposed project are thus considered significant if the project would (1) physically destroy or damage all or part of a resource; (2) change the character of the use of the resource or physical feature within the setting of the resource that contributes to its significance; or (3) introduce visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of significant features of the resource.

The purpose of a cultural resources investigation is to evaluate whether any cultural resources remain exposed on the surface of the project site or can reasonably be expected to exist in the subsurface. If resources are discovered, management recommendations would be required for evaluation of the resources for NRHP or CRHR eligibility.

Broad mitigation guidelines for treating historical resources are codified in Section 15126.4(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines. To the extent feasible, public agencies should seek to avoid significant effects to historical resources, with preservation in place being the preferred alternative. If not feasible, a data recovery plan shall be prepared to guide subsequent excavation. Mitigation for historical resources (e.g., buildings, bridges, and other structures) that is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Weeks and Grimmer 1995) is generally considered mitigated to below a level of significance.

2.3 HUMAN REMAINS

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code provides for the disposition of accidentally discovered human remains. Section 7050.5 states that, if human remains are found, no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains.

Section 5097.98 of the PRC states that, if remains are determined by the Coroner to be of Native American origin, they must notify the NAHC within 24 hours which, in turn, must identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendant(s) shall complete his/her inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Situated generally north of Corona, California, the Prado Basin is generally bound by the Chino Hills to the west; the foothills of the Santa Ana Mountains to the south; the Jurupa Hills and Norco Bluff to the east; and an unnamed series of low hills to the north. Comprising nearly 9,000 acres, the Prado Basin is drained by the Santa Ana River and its main tributary in the basin, Chino Creek (Swope 2013:9). At a greater scale, Prado Basin is situated within the east-west trending Transverse Range Province at the western edge of the San Bernardino Valley east of the Los Angeles Basin (Swope 2013: 11).

Annual climate varies between dry, moderate summers and wet, temperate winters. Rainfall rarely exceeds 15 inches; occurring primarily in the winter months (Swope 2013: 11). The fertile alluvial sediments support a variety of coastal sage scrub, valley grassland, and riparian woodland community species (Swope 2013: 13). Buckwheat, prickly pear, sumac, and sage may be found
on the gently sloping hills; various grasses and wildflowers may be found in the valleys; and sycamore, willow, walnut, and cottonwood trees are found near the drainages.

Wildlife in the basin includes deer, antelope (historically), rabbits, and a variety of small rodents. Birds inhabiting the basin consist of pigeons, doves, owls, crows, sparrows, and various raptors; seasonal birds include ducks, geese, gulls, pelicans, and herons (Swope 2013: 13).

4.0 CULTURAL BACKGROUND

4.1 PREHISTORIC BACKGROUND

Several chronologies are generally used to describe the sequence of the later prehistoric periods of Southern California. William Wallace (1955) developed the first comprehensive California chronologies and defines four periods for the southern coastal region.

Wallace’s synthesis is largely “descriptive and classificatory, emphasizing the content of archaeological cultures and the relationships among them” (Moratto 1984:159). Wallace relies upon the concept of “cultural horizons”, which are generally defined by the temporal and spatial distribution of a set of normative cultural traits, such as the distribution of a group of commonly associated artifact types. As a result, Wallace’s model does not allow for much cultural variation in the same time period, nor does it provide precise chronological dates for each temporal division. Although now more than 50 years old, the general schema of the Wallace chronology has provided a general framework for Southern California prehistory that remains valid today.

Horizon I: Early Man or Paleo-Indian Period (11,000 BCE to 7,500 BCE). While Wallace (1955) initially termed this period the Early Man Horizon (I), this early stage of human occupation is commonly referred to as the Paleo-Indian Period today (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984:24). The precise start of this period is still a topic of considerable debate. At inland archaeological sites, the surviving material culture of this period is primarily lithic, consisting of large, extremely well made stone projectile points and tools such as scrapers and choppers. Encampments were probably temporary, located near major kills or important resource areas.

Horizon II: Milling Stone Assemblages (7,500 BCE to 1,000 BCE). Encompassing a broad expanse of time, the Milling Stone Period was named for the abundant millingstone tools associated with sites of this period. These tools, the mano and metate, were used to process small, hard seeds from plants associated with shrub-scrub vegetation communities. An annual round of seasonal migrations was likely practiced, with movements coinciding with ripening vegetal resources and the periods of maximal availability of various animal resources. Along the coast, shell midden sites are common site types. Some formal burials, occasionally with associated grave goods, are also evident. This period of time is roughly equivalent to Warren’s (1968) Encinitas Tradition. Warren (1968) suggests that, as millingstones are common and projectile points are comparatively rare during this period of time, hunting was less important than the gathering of vegetable resources.

More recent studies (Koerper 1981; Koerper and Drover 1983) suggest that a diversity of subsistence activities, including hunting of various game animals, were practiced during this period. At present, little is known about cultural change during this time period in Southern California. While this lack of noticeable change gives the appearance of cultural stasis, almost certainly many regional and temporal cultural shifts did occur. Future research that is focused on

---

1 BCE is defined as “Before Common Era” and generally refers to that time period commonly referred to as “Before Christ” (B.C.).
temporal change in the Milling Stone Period would greatly benefit the current understanding of Southern California prehistory.

Horizon III: Intermediate Cultures (1,000 BCE to 750 CE). The Intermediate Period is identified by a mixed strategy of plant exploitation, terrestrial hunting, and maritime subsistence strategies. Chipped stone tools (e.g., projectile points) generally decrease in size, but increase in number. Abundant bone and shell remains have been recovered from sites dating to these time periods. In coastal areas, the introduction of the circular shell fishhook and the growing abundance of fish remains in sites over the course of the period suggest a substantial increase in fishing activity during the Intermediate Horizon. It is also during this time period that mortar and pestle use intensified dramatically. The mano and metate continued to be in use on a reduced scale, but the greatly intensified use of the mortar and pestle signaled a shift away from a subsistence strategy based on seed resources to that of the acorn. It is probably during this time period that the acorn became the food staple of the majority of the indigenous tribes in Southern California. This subsistence strategy continued until European contact. Material culture became more diverse and elaborate and included steatite containers, perforated stones, bone tools, ornamental items, and asphalt adhesive.

Horizon IV: Late Prehistoric Cultures (750 CE to 1769 CE). During the Late Prehistoric Period, exploitation of many food resources, particularly marine resources among coastal groups, continued to intensify. The material culture in the Late Prehistoric Horizon increased in complexity in terms of the abundance and diversity of artifacts being produced. The recovery and identification of a number of small projectile points during this period likely suggests a greater utilization of the bow and arrow, which was likely introduced near the end of the Intermediate Period. Shell beads, ornaments, and other elements of material culture continue to be ornate, varied, and widely distributed; the latter evidence suggests elaborate trade networks. Warren’s (1968) scheme divides the late prehistoric period into several regional traditions. Western Riverside County, Orange County, and the Los Angeles Basin area are considered part of the “Shoshonean” tradition, which may be related to a possible incursion of Takic speakers into these areas during this period. The Late Prehistoric Period includes the first few centuries of early European contact (1542–1769 CE); it is also known as the Protohistoric Period as there was a low level of interaction between native Californians and Europeans prior to Portolá’s overland expedition in 1769.

In the few centuries prior to European contact, the archaeological record reveals substantial increases in the indigenous population (Wallace 1955:223). Some village sites may have contained as many as 1,500 individuals. Apparently, many of these village sites were occupied throughout the year rather than seasonally. This shift in settlement strategy was likely influenced by improved food procurement and storage technology, which enabled population growth and may have helped stimulate changes in sociopolitical organization.

Evidence is growing that prehistoric cultural change has been much more variable through time and across culture areas than previously thought. Cultural traits such as maritime economies, seafaring, complex trade networks, and year-round occupation of villages appear to have developed much earlier than previously thought. Culture change during the Late Prehistoric Period, in particular, may have been driven more by environmental and resource pressures than optimal adaptation to the environment (Byrd and Raab 2007).

---

2 CE is defined as “Common Era” and generally refers to that time period commonly referred to as “annō Domini” (A.D.).
5.0 ETHNOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

5.1 GABRIELINO/TONGVA

At the time of European contact, this part of Riverside/San Bernardino Counties was the home of the Gabrielino. The Gabrielino are those people and their descendants who became associated with Mission San Gabriel Arcángel, which was established in south-central Los Angeles County on September 8, 1771, in what has ever since been called the San Gabriel Valley. Today, these people are sometimes referred to as the Tongva, although the term apparently originally (i.e., before the arrival of Euro-Americans) referred to the inhabitants of the San Gabriel Valley only. In either case, the inhabitants of Santa Catalina Island and San Clemente Island are often included as being parts of this tribe, as are the Fernandeño, who inhabited most of the San Fernando Valley.

The ancestral Gabrielino arrived in the Los Angeles Basin probably before 500 BCE as part of the so-called Shoshonean (Takic speaking) Wedge from the Great Basin region and gradually displaced the indigenous peoples, who were probably Hokan speakers. Large, permanent villages were established in the fertile lowlands along rivers and streams and in sheltered areas along the coast. Eventually, Gabrielino territory encompassed the watersheds of the Los Angeles, San Gabriel, Rio Hondo, and Santa Ana Rivers, which includes the greater Los Angeles Basin, to perhaps as far south as Aliso Creek, as well as portions of the San Fernando, San Gabriel, and San Bernardino Valleys. Gabrielino territory also included the islands of San Clemente, San Nicholas, and Santa Catalina (McCawley 1996:23–24; Bean and Smith 1978:538–540). Populations may have numbered as many as 10,000 individuals at their peak in the Precontact Period.

The subsistence economy of the Gabrielino was one of hunting and gathering. The surrounding environment was rich and varied, and the natives were able to exploit mountains, foothills, valleys, deserts, and coasts. As was the case for most native Californians, acorns were the staple food (by the Intermediate Horizon), supplemented by the roots, leaves, seeds, and fruit of a wide variety of flora (i.e., cactus, yucca, sage, and agave). Fresh and saltwater fish, shellfish, birds, insects, and large and small mammals were exploited.

Kroeber (1925:621) considered the Gabrielino:

. . . to have been the most advanced group south of Tehachapi, except perhaps the Chumash. They certainly were the wealthiest and most thoughtful of all the Shoshoneans of the State, and dominated these civilizations wherever contacts occurred.

A Gabrielino community known to be located near the project sites was named Pashiinonga. Located on the Rancho del Chino, the name was apparently the Tongva name for the Rancho. Its inhabitants were forcibly relocated to Mission San Gabriel (McCawley 1996:48-49).

The Prado Basin lies within the southernmost territory of the Serrano Indians (Kroeber 1925; Bean and Smith 1978). The Serrano, so named by the Spanish because of their tenure in the San Bernardino Mountains, occupied that region from the mountains, downstream along the Mojave River and eastward to the Mojave sink; southward to as far as the Prado Basin and the northern foothills of the Santa Ana Mountains. Serrano Indians in the vicinity of the Mojave sink were known by the Desert Mojave as Vanyume. The Serrano spoke a language from the Takic subfamily of the Uto-Aztecan linguistic family (Moratto 1984:534). Serrano territory was bound on the north, east, and west by Numic-speaking groups consisting of Paiute/Chemehuevi, Kawaiisu, and Panamint, respectively. Serrano territory was frequented by these groups and intermarriage was
common (Moratto 1984). The Serrano subsisted by hunting and gathering seasonally, exploiting large and small game as well as a variety of staple vegetal foods such as acorns, pinyon nuts, mesquite beans, chia, ricegrass, tubers, and greens (Bean and Smith 1978). Mountain and high desert resources were exploited seasonally and permanent and semi-permanent villages formed from autonomous political patrilineal clans, maintaining bonds with neighboring clans through economic, marital, and ceremonial reciprocity (Bean and Smith 1978).

5.2 PRADO BASIN HISTORY

The Prado Basin was named for the lush grassy flood plains that characterized that portion of the Santa Ana Canyon. The rich forage attracted Native Americans for thousands of years and provided a prehistoric route from the Colorado River region to the west coast. Similarly, the Santa Ana Canyon signified one of the most important overland routes for European travelers from California’s interior southern deserts to the west coast. In 1938, the Prado Dam was authorized. Periodic flooding down the Santa Ana Canyon was successfully halted following the construction of the dam.

6.0 METHODS

6.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES RECORDS SEARCHES

The records searches and literature reviews were conducted by the EIC on March 6, 2014 (Appendix A). On April 14, 2015, Patrick O. Maxon, M.A., RPA and David M. Smith reviewed documents on file at the USACE. Previously, the USACE determined that no more than a \( \frac{1}{8} \) mile radius was needed for the records search. Sources consulted included archaeological records, Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility, historic maps, and the Historic Property Data File (HPDF) maintained by the California Office of Historic Preservation. The HPDF contains listings for the CRHR and/or NRHP, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest.

6.2 PEDESTRIAN SURVEY

On April 10, 2015, BonTerra Psomas Archaeologist David M. Smith met with Daniel Bott and Bonnie Johnson at the OCWD Constructed Wetlands Prado Field Office to conduct a reconnaissance of the three locations, initially, to determine if vegetation cover might hinder a pedestrian survey, and, conditions permitting, survey one or all during that visit.

6.3 NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

On March 19, 2014, BonTerra Psomas notified the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in writing of the proposed project. The NAHC was requested to search their Sacred Lands files for any information regarding Native American sites on or near the project. All Native American correspondence involving this project is contained in Appendix B.

7.0 RESULTS

7.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES RECORD SEARCHES

7.1.1 Rock Gabion Sites

The result of the EIC records search show that no cultural resource sites have been recorded on or within \( \frac{1}{8} \) mile of the Rock Gabion sites. Both sites were completely surveyed in 1985 (Langenwalter and Brock 1985). The southernmost site has seen two other surveys covering only
small portions of the site (Table 1). The northern Rock Gabion site has had a second survey conducted within 1/8 mile that did not include the site.

**TABLE 1**

CULTURAL RESOURCES STUDIES CONDUCTED ON OR WITHIN ONE-EIGHTH MILE OF THE ROCK GABION SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Recorder/Year</th>
<th>Type of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI-00061**</td>
<td>Langenwalter and Brock 1985</td>
<td>Prado Basin Phase II Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-01954</td>
<td>Rosenthal and Schwarz</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-05905</td>
<td>Tang et al. 2002</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-08921</td>
<td>Tang 2013</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** included both Rock Gabions

The records search further revealed that no cultural resources were recorded on or within a 1/8 mile radius of the Rock Gabion sites.

7.1.2 **Sunnyslope Creek Site**

The results of the records search show that there have been three cultural resources studies completed within a 1/8 mile radius of the site (Table 2), two of which included the entire site. One cultural resource has been recorded within a 1/8 mile radius of the site, but not on the site (Table 2). Two included the entire site.

**TABLE 2**

CULTURAL RESOURCES SITES RECORDED WITHIN ONE-EIGHTH MILE OF SUNNYSLOPE CREEK SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Recorder/Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-RIV-559</td>
<td>Tang 2007</td>
<td>Pecan Grove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**

CULTURAL RESOURCES STUDIES CONDUCTED WITHIN ONE-EIGHTH MILE OF THE SUNNYSLOPE CREEK SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Type of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RI-02207</td>
<td>Parr 1988</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment Rubidoux Wastewater Treatment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-02307</td>
<td>Hampson et al. 1988</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey, Upper Santa Ana River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-03513</td>
<td>Taskiran and Greeley 1992</td>
<td>Tentative Tract 27444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-06420</td>
<td>Tang et al. 2005</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Rubidoux Wastewater Treatment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-07130</td>
<td>Tang and Jaquemain 2007</td>
<td>Evaluation Report, Pecan Grove (RIV-559)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI-08353</td>
<td>Tang 2009</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring Rubidoux Wastewater Treatment Facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 **USACE RECORDS SEARCH**

USACE District 12 Archaeologist John Killeen provided BonTerra Psomas archaeologists access to the District 12 library. The intent was to determine if that library had additional technical studies that were not included in the 1/8 mile radius provided by the EIC. Subsequently, numerous relevant studies were discovered at the District’s library which were loaned to BonTerra Psomas for research purposes for this project.

7.3 **PEDESTRIAN SURVEY**

On April 10, 2015, BonTerra Psomas Archaeologist David M. Smith met with Daniel Bott and Bonnie Johnson at the OCWD Constructed Wetlands Prado Field Office to conduct a reconnaissance of the three locations, initially, to determine if vegetation cover might hinder a pedestrian survey, and, conditions permitting, survey one or both during that visit. Conditions encountered at the Sunnyslope Creek site permitted a pedestrian archaeological survey along both banks of the creek. Conditions at the Gabions sites prevented a pedestrian archaeological survey.

7.4 **NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION**

The NAHC responded to BonTerra Psomas’ notification letter of March 19, 2014 on July 7 and July 9, 2014. They also provided a list of Native American contacts and recommended they be contacted for additional information regarding cultural resources in the project area. BonTerra Psomas, on behalf of OCWD, notified each of the tribes of the proposed project, including the Rock Gabions and Sunnyslope Creek sites, and requested additional information the tribes might have regarding the project area. No responses have been received to date. (Appendix B).

8.0 **EFFECTS ANALYSIS**

This impact analysis is provided to assist the USACE and OCWD in fulfilling its compliance responsibilities under NEPA. Section 106 of NHPA and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR, 800 were used to identify historic properties in the Area of Potential Effects (APE). The criteria of adverse effects codified at 36 CFR 800.5 are used to assess the effects of the proposed project on the three mitigation sites.

8.1 **ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS**

The pedestrian survey consisted of a visual examination of each of the mitigation sites to determine if a pedestrian survey was possible, given the knowledge that much of the Prado Basin is blanketed with thick vegetation. The Rock Gabions sites could not be adequately surveyed because of the presence of thick vegetation. Monitoring is recommended for these sites pursuant to Mitigation Measure Cult-1 contained in Section 8.3, Mitigation Measures.

The Sunnyslope Creek site was surveyed adequately. No cultural resources were observed during the pedestrian survey. The site will be stripped of all non-native vegetation and replanted with native species.

Although no known archaeological sites were previously recorded in the two mitigation areas or discovered during the current field survey, there is a potential for unknown cultural resources to be discovered during vegetation removal and restoration activities on the sites. Potential adverse impacts to such resources, if found eligible for listing in the NRHP would be considered significant.
In the event that unknown resources are uncovered during vegetation removal and implementation of vegetation restoration activities, the OCWD must comply with the Code of Federal Regulations (Title 36, §800.13, Post-Review Discoveries). 36 CFR 800.13 requires additional mitigation measures as developed in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).

8.2 REGULATORY REQUIREMENT

RR Cult-1  Project-related earth disturbance has the potential to unearth previously undiscovered human remains, resulting in a potentially significant impact. If human remains are encountered during excavation activities, all work shall halt and the County Coroner shall be notified (California Public Resources Code §5097.98). The Coroner will determine whether the remains are of forensic interest. If the Coroner determines that the remains are prehistoric, s/he will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall be responsible for designating the most likely descendant (MLD), who will be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The MLD shall make his/her recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD’s recommendation shall be followed if feasible, and may include scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials (California Health and Safety Code §7050.5). If the landowner rejects the MLD’s recommendations, the landowner shall rebury the remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location that will not be subject to further subsurface disturbance (California Public Resources Code §5097.98).

Compliance with Section 5097.9 of the California Public Resources Code would prevent significant impacts to human remains.

8.3 MITIGATION MEASURE

MM Cult-1  A qualified Archaeological Monitor shall be retained to examine the results of ground-disturbing activities during vegetation removal and to examine spoil piles and other excavations related to mitigation planting and other restoration activities at the three sites. The Archaeologist shall be present at the pre-grade conference and shall establish a schedule for archaeological resource surveillance after the existing vegetation has been removed and again after the excavation of augur holes for the mitigation plantings. The Archaeologist shall establish, in cooperation with the applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work, if any is ongoing, to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of cultural resources as appropriate. If the archaeological resources are found to be significant, the archaeological observer shall determine appropriate actions, in cooperation with the project applicant, for exploration and/or salvage. Significant sites that cannot be avoided will require data recovery measures and shall be completed upon approval of a Data Recovery Plan.

Implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.
9.0 CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this cultural resources report, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DATE: September 2015

SIGNED:

Patrick Maxon, RPA
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APPENDIX A

CULTURAL RESOURCES RECORDS SEARCH
March 6, 2015
CHRIS Access and Use Agreement No.: 16
EIC-RIV-ST-3004

David M. Smith
BonTerra Psomas
3 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 200
Santa Ana, CA 92707

Re: Cultural Resources Records Search for the Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Smith,

We received your request on February 26, 2015, for a cultural resources records search for the Prado Basin Pilot Program project located in an unsectioned portion, SBBM, in the Santa River area in Riverside County. We have reviewed our site records, maps, and manuscripts against the location map you provided.

Our records indicate that 22 cultural resources studies have been conducted within a 1/8 mile radius of your project area. Fifteen of these studies involved the project area. PDF copies of these reports are included for your reference. Seven additional studies provide overviews of cultural resources in the general project vicinity. All of these reports are listed on the attachments entitled "Eastern Information Center Report Listing" and "Eastern Information Center Report Details" and "Eastern Information Center Spreadsheet" are available upon request at 15¢/page plus $40/hour for hard copies, or 15¢/page plus $40/hour and a $25 flat fee for PDFs.

Our records indicate that ten cultural resources properties have been recorded within a quarter-mile radius of your project area. Six of these properties involved the project area. PDF Copies of the records are included for your reference. All of these resources are listed on the attachments entitled "Eastern Information Center Resource Listing" and "Eastern Center Information Resource Details".

The above information is reflected on the enclosed maps. Areas that have been surveyed are highlighted in yellow. Numbers marked in blue ink refer to the report number (RI #). Cultural resources properties are marked in red; numbers in black refer to Trinomial designations, those in green to Primary Number designations. National Register properties are indicated in light blue.

Additional sources of information consulted are identified below.

National Register of Historic Places: no listed properties are located within the boundaries of the project area.
Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility (ADOE): Three properties (33-001039 [RIV-001039]; 33-001044 [RIV-001044]; 33-002802 [RIV-002802]) are listed and are determined eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Three properties (33-005782 [RIV-005522]; 33-005783 [RIV-005523]; 33-005784 [RIV-005524]) are listed and are ineligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The applicable portion of the ADOE is enclosed for your reference.

Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), Historic Property Directory (HPD): no listed properties are located within the boundaries of the project area.

Note: not all properties in the California Historical Resources Information System are listed in the OHP ADOE and HPD; the ADOE and HPD comprise lists of properties submitted to the OHP for review.

Copies of the relevant portions of the 1947 USGS Corona 15’ and 1901 Elsinore 30’ and 1901 Riverside 15’ topographic maps are included for your reference.

As the Information Center for Riverside County, it is important that we receive a copy of all cultural resources reports and site information pertaining to this county in order to maintain our map and manuscript files for the benefit of cultural heritage. Confidential information provided with this record search regarding the location of cultural resources outside the boundaries of your project area should not be included in public reports addressing the project area.

Sincerely,

Celia Miranda
Information Officer

Enclosures
### Resource List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attribute codes</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-33-000559</td>
<td>CA-RIV-000559</td>
<td>Other - SBCM 49</td>
<td>Prehistoric, Historic</td>
<td>1939 (Smith, Gerald); 1972 (Kirkish, A.); 1975 (Hall, Matthew C., Archaeological Research Unit, UCR); 1987 (D. Adams, Greenwood and Associates); 1987 (R. S. Brown, Greenwood and Associates); 1987 (M. Irwille, Greenwood and Associates); 1987 (M.A. Doyle, Greenwood and Associates); 1987 (Hampson, P., Greenwood and Associates); 2007 (Jacquemain, Terri, CRM TECH)</td>
<td>RI-02307, RI-06420, RI-07129, RI-07130, RI-08353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-001039</td>
<td>CA-RIV-001039</td>
<td>Other - ACE-SAR-H2A</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1975 (M. Hall); 1995 (Mark D. Selverston)</td>
<td>RI-00062, RI-02148, RI-02881</td>
<td>RI-06065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-001044</td>
<td>CA-RIV-001044</td>
<td>Other - ACE-SAR-H2B</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1975 (M. Hall); 1980 (Steven Schwartz, Department of the Army, Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Quality Section); 1995 (Mark D. Selverson, Greenwood and Associates)</td>
<td>RI-00061, RI-00062, RI-02148, RI-02881, RI-02889, RI-03093, RI-06085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-003372</td>
<td>CA-RIV-003372</td>
<td>Other - PB-50</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1985 (James Brock, Archaeological Advisory Group)</td>
<td>RI-02194, RI-02195, RI-02196, RI-02197, RI-02881</td>
<td>RI-06062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-004730</td>
<td>CA-RIV-004730</td>
<td>Other - PB-100</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1992 (R. Paul Hampson and Neal Kaptain, Greenwood and associates)</td>
<td>RI-00061, RI-02148, RI-02881</td>
<td>RI-06062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Resource List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attribute codes</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-33-005762</td>
<td>CA-RIV-005522H</td>
<td>Other - So. Ca. Railway (San Bernardino &amp; San Diego Line) Atchison, Taos, &amp; Santa Fe RR Kite Route; Other - LSA-CST1204-S-1</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995 (A.G. Toren, Greenwood and Associates); 2012 (Riordan Goodwin, LSA Associates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-005763</td>
<td>CA-RIV-005523H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995 (A.G. Toren, Greenwood and Associates)</td>
<td>RI-00052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-005764</td>
<td>CA-RIV-005524H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995 (A.G. Toren, Greenwood and Associates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary No.</td>
<td>Trinomial</td>
<td>Other IDs</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Attribute codes</td>
<td>Recorded by</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-000100</td>
<td>CA-RIV-000100</td>
<td>Other - AASC RV-34, Moreno Ranch</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1941 (S.L. Peck); 1951 (Eberhart); 1979 (M. Brown); 1989 (R. McLean, Chambers Group, Inc.); 1990 (K. Swope, D. Pierce, UCRARU); 1998 (I. Strudwick and G. King, LSA Associates, Inc.); 1998 (Michael E. Macko, Macko, Inc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-00060, RI-00061, RI-02678, RI-04144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-000283</td>
<td>CA-RIV-000283</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-000652</td>
<td>CA-RIV-000652</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>1972 (Alex Kirkish); 1983 (J. Brock &amp; P. Langenwalter, ECOS Management Criteria, Inc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-00060, RI-00061, RI-0063, RI-00534, RI-02678, RI-03629, RI-05649, RI-05052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-001039</td>
<td>CA-RIV-001039</td>
<td>Other - ACE-SAR-H2A</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1975 (M. Hall); 1995 (Mark D. Silverston)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-00062, RI-02148, RI-02681, RI-06085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-001044</td>
<td>CA-RIV-001044</td>
<td>Other - ACE-SAR-H2B</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1975 (M. Hall); 1980 (Steven Schwartz, Department of the Army, Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Quality Section); 1995 (Mark D. Selverson, Greenwood and Associates)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-00061, RI-00062, RI-02148, RI-02881, RI-02689, RI-03093, RI-06085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-001451</td>
<td>CA-RIV-001451</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1977 (S. Hammond, Caltrans)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-00634, RI-05049, RI-05652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-002201</td>
<td>CA-RIV-002201</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1981 (Steven Schwartz)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-01111, RI-01873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-002754</td>
<td>CA-RIV-002754</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>1983 (J. Brock and P. Langenwalter, ECOS Management Criteria, Inc.); 2012 (J. Sanka and W. Gillean, Atkins)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-00061, RI-02878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-002755</td>
<td>CA-RIV-002755</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>1983 (J. Brock and P. Langenwalter, ECOS Management Criteria, Inc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-00061, RI-02878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-002778</td>
<td>CA-RIV-002778</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1984 (P.E. Langenwalter and J.P. Brock, ECOS Management Criteria, Inc., Cypress, CA.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-00061, RI-02001, RI-02689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-002802</td>
<td>CA-RIV-002802</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>1984 (P.E. Langenwalter and J. Brock, ECOS Management Criteria, Inc., Cypress, CA.); 1984 (S. Maupin and S. Briggs); 1984 (S. Briggs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-00061, RI-02148, RI-02149, RI-02881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Resource List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attribute codes</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-33-003372</td>
<td>CA-RIV-003372</td>
<td>Other - PB-90</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1985 (James Brock, Archaeological Advisory Group)</td>
<td>RI-02'94, RI-02195, RI-02'96, RI-02197, RI-02881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-003694</td>
<td>CA-RIV-003694</td>
<td>Other - PF-5; Other - Includes: H2C, PF5, PB-89, PB-102; Other - PB-102A</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1989 (J. Brock and J. Elliot, Archaeological Advisory Group, Newport Beach, CA); 1992 (R. Paul Hampson and Neal Kaptain, Greenwood and Associates, Pacific Palisades, CA); 1994 (Frank R. Dittmer, Greenwood and Associates, Pacific Palisades, CA)</td>
<td>RI-0062, RI-02881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-003740</td>
<td>CA-RIV-003740</td>
<td>Other - H2B</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1989 (J. Brock and J. Elliot, Archaeological Advisory Group, Newport Beach, CA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-004728</td>
<td>CA-RIV-004728</td>
<td>Other - PB-26</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1992 (R. Paul Hampson, Neal Kaptain, Greenwood and Associates)</td>
<td>RI-03907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-004730</td>
<td>CA-RIV-004730</td>
<td>Other - PB-100</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1992 (R. Paul Hampson and Neal Kaptain, Greenwood and associates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-004731</td>
<td>CA-RIV-004731</td>
<td>Other - PB-07</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1992 (R. Paul Hampson, Neal Kaptain, Greenwood and Associates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-005782</td>
<td>CA-RIV-005522H</td>
<td>Other - So. Ca. Railway (San Bernardino &amp; San Diego Line) Atchison, Topeka, &amp; Santa Fe RR, Kite Route; Other - LSA-RCT1204-S-1</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995 (A.G. Toren, Greenwood and Associates); 2012 (Riordan Goodwin, LSA Associates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-005826</td>
<td>CA-RIV-005553</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
<td>1994 (T. Kearns, Western Cultural Resource Management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-005881</td>
<td>CA-RIV-005783</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995 (B. Love, CRM TECH)</td>
<td>RI-0382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-012900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RI-01112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-020282</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other - 14950 River Road; Other - Riverside County APN 130-040-002</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (Tim Yates, ICF International)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-020283</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other - Riverside County APN 130-040-005; Other - 14610 River Road</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (Tim Yates, ICF International)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RIV-00010 33-00010 1S 06/13/72 NPS-72000247 KPNP COACHELLA VALLEY FISH TRAPS
7L SHL-0101

RIV-00014H 33-00014 1S 08/22/75 NPS-75000452-9999 KPNP BLYTHE INTAGLIO

RIV-00032 33-00032 1S 10/30/98 NPS-98001286-0000 CHRG CORN SPRINGS
1S 10/30/98 33-0061 CHRG CA-RIV-32

RIV-00045H 33-00045 7L 01/01/81 629.0-81-HPF-33-02 TANQUITZ CANYON
7L 01/01/77 629.0-77-HPF-33-03 KPNP
7L 01/01/75 629.0-75-HPF-33-01 KPNP

RIV-00046H 33-00046 1S 08/22/75 NPS-75000452-0001 KPNP BLYTHE INTAGLIO
7L 03/29/33 SHL-0101

RIV-00050H 33-00050 1D 04/24/73 73000424 KPNP TEMEKU

RIV-00052H 33-00052 1S 08/22/75 NPS-75000452-0002 KPNP BLYTHE INTAGLIO
7L 03/29/33 SHL-0101

RIV-00068H 33-00068 1D 01/08/73 73000422 KPNP

RIV-00092 2S2 12/06/99 ADDO-33-99-002-000 SGPR RIV-27,28
2S2 12/06/99 NPS99104A SGPR

RIV-00101H 33-00101 6Y 11/01/97 ADDO-33-97-006-00 JMRP
6Y 11/01/97 BUR971010A JMRP

RIV-00114 33-00114 1S 05/07/65 76000509 KPNP BUTTERCUP FARMS PICTOGRAPH
7L 01/01/79 HPF-06-10577 ROCK SHELTER AREA

RIV-00119 33-00119 2D 11/23/78 078 0050122 LA QUINTA EVAC. CH. AD.

RIV-00132 33-00132 1S 05/10/82 NPS-82002226 KPNP MC COY SPRING ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE

RIV-00158 33-00158 2D 11/23/78 078 0050122 LA QUINTA EVAC. CH. AD.

RIV-00193 33-00193 2S2 01/08/04 ADDO-33-04-002-000 J DPR

RIV-00193 2S2 01/08/04 BUR021020A J DPR

RIV-00208 33-00208 2D 11/28/78 078 0050122 LA QUINTA EVAC. CH. AD.

RIV-00269 33-00269 2 12/15/86 COB060411A YAMISCVL.

RIV-00270H 33-00270 1D 04/24/73 73000424 KPNP AR09/13 MURRIETA CREEK ARCH. AREA

RIV-00271H 33-00271 2S2 02/06/95 ADDO-33-95-001-00 SGPR VILLAGE OF TENAVA
2S2 02/06/95 USFS941121C SGPR

RIV-00289M 33-00289 2S2 07/13/12 NPS120525A MBPR LOST HORSE MINE AND MILL-MINE OFFICE FOUNDATION

RIV-00308H 33-00308 1D 01/08/73 73000422 KPNP

RIV-00309H 33-00309 1D 01/08/73 73000422 KPNP

RIV-00343 33-00343 6Y2 02/11/09 WAPA060221A MBPR EAST/WEST TRAIL SEDiments

RIV-00365H 33-00365 1D 04/24/73 73000424 KPNP MURRIETA CREEK ARCH. AREA

RIV-00381 33-00381 2S 01/14/80 TT-12 KPNP

RIV-00504H 33-00504 1S 03/12/03 NPS-03000121-9999 KPNP MULE TANK DISCONTIGUOUS ROCK ART DISTRICT

RIV-00515H 33-00515 7L 01/01/81 629.0-81-HPF-33-02 TANQUITZ CANYON
7L 01/01/77 629.0-77-HPF-33-03 KPNP
7L 01/01/75 629.0-75-HPF-33-01 KPNP

RIV-00516H 33-00516 1D 01/08/73 73000422 KPNP

RIV-00517H 33-00517 1D 01/08/73 73000422 KPNP

RIV-00518H 33-00518 1D 01/08/73 73000422 KPNP

RIV-00621 33-00621 6Y 11/17/97 ADDO-33-97-007-00 JMRP A LATE PREHISTORIC 4/ OR ETHNOHISTORIC FOOD PROCESSING SITE

RIV-00630H 33-00630 6Y 11/03/97 ADDO-33-97-007-00 JMRP

RIV-00657 33-00657 6Y 09/20/93 ADDO-33-93-013-00 NDRP

RIV-00658 33-00658 6Y 09/20/93 FHWA930722A NDRP

RIV-00773H 33-00773 1D 01/30/03 NPS-03000121-0001 KPNP MULE CANYON

RIV-00776 33-00776 1S 11/06/90 NDRP

RIV-00902 33-00902 2S2 12/06/99 ADDO-33-99-003-000 SGPR JT-BD-20

RIV-00903 33-00903 2S2 12/06/99 NPS991004A SGPR

RIV-00981 33-00981 1S 03/12/03 NPS-03000118-0000 KPNP GUS LEADER SITES, THE, RIV-901
3S 11/21/02 33-0075 HHRG

RIV-01015 33-00101 7Y 09/19/91 USFS91017D LHPR

RIV-01018 33-00101 6Y2 02/11/03 WAPA060221A JMRP CERAMIC SCATTER

RIV-01022 33-00102 2S2 04/17/03 ADDO-33-03-001-000 JMRP MILLING SLECK

RIV-01039H 33-001039 2S2 06/11/97 COB911223A NDRP ASHCROFT RANCH
APPENDIX B

NATIVE AMERICAN CORRESPONDENCE
July 7, 2014

Mr. Patrick Maxon, M.A., RPA - Director, Cultural Resources

**BonTerra PSOMAS**
2 Executive Circle, Suite 175
Irvine, CA 92614

Sent by FAX to: 714-444-9599
No. of Pages: 4

RE: Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Contacts list for the **Prado Basin Sediment Management Project**; located north of the City of Corona, Riverside County, California

Dear Mr. Maxon:

A record search of the NAHC Sacred Lands Inventory failed to indicate the presence of Native American traditional sites/places of the Project site(s) or 'areas of Potential effect' (APEs), submitted to this office. However, there are Native American cultural resources in close proximity to the APE. Note also that the absence of archaeological features, Native American cultural resources does not preclude their existence at the subsurface level.

In the 1985 Appellate Court decision (170 Cal App 3rd 604), the Court hold 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 to Native American burial sites.

When the project becomes public, please inform the Native American contacts as to the nature of the project (e.g. residential, renewable energy, infrastructure or other appropriate type). Attached is a list of Native American tribes, Native American individuals or organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the proposed project area (APE). As part of the consultation process, the NAHC recommends that local government and project developers contact the tribal governments and Native American individuals on the list in order to determine if the proposed action might impact any cultural places or sacred sites. If a response from those listed on the attachment is not received in two weeks of notification, the NAHC recommends that a follow-up telephone call be made to ensure the project information has been received.

California Government Code Sections 65040.12(e) defines 'environmental justice' to provide "fair treatment of people...with respect to the development, adoption,
implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies.” Also, Executive Order B-10-11 requires that state agencies “consult with Native American tribes, their elected officials and other representatives of tribal governments in order to provide meaningful input into...the development of legislation, regulations, rules and policies on matter that may affect tribal communities.”

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 373-3715.

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachments
Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
July 7, 2014

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

Morongo Band of Mission Indians
William Madrigal, Jr., Cultural Resources Manager
12700 Pumarra Road
Banning, CA 92220
wmadrigal@morongo-nsn.gov
(951) 201-1866 Cell
(951) 572-6004 Fax

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

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

Juaneno Band of Mission Indians
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675
Chiefdavidbelardes@yahoo.com
(949) 493-4933 Home
(949) 293-8522

William J. Pink
48310 Pechanga Road
Temecula, CA 92592
wjpink@hotmail.com
(909) 936-1216
Prefers e-mail contact

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

Cahuilla Band of Indians
Luther Salgado, Chairperson
P.O. Box 391760
Anza, CA 92539
Chairman@cahuilla.net
(760) 763-5549
(760) 763-2631 Tribal EPA

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 5087.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5087.89 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed The Waterfront Project, located in the City of Redondo Beach, Los Angeles County, California for which a Sacred Lands file search and Native American Contacts list were requested.
Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
July 7, 2014

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

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

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 3987.04 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5087.28 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed The Waterfront Project; located in the City of Redondo Beach, Los Angeles County, California for which a Sacred Lands file search and Native American Contacts list were requested.
Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
tattnlaw@gmail.com
(310) 570-6567

Gabrielino /Tongva Nation
Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
P.O. Box 693
San Gabriel, CA 91778
GTTribalcouncil@aol.com
(626) 483-3564 Cell
(626) 286-1262 Fax

Gabrieleno /Tongva Nation
Sandonne Goad, Chairperson
P.O. Box 86908
Los Angeles, CA 90086
sgoad@gabrielino-tongva.com
(951) 845-0443

Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians
Andrew Salas, Chairperson
P.O. Box 393
Covina, CA 91723
gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com
(626) 926-4131

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 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting locative Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Prado Basin Project located in Riverside County, California for which a Native American Contacts list supplemental was requested.
March 19, 2015

Ms. Joyce Perry  
Juaneño Band of Mission Indians Ajachemen Nation  
32161 Avenida Los Amigos  
San Juan Capistrano, California 92675-3702

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Belardes:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017

Office: (213) 452-3861  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

[Signature]

Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner
March 19, 2015

Mr. Samuel H. Dunlap, Cultural Resources Director
Gabrielino Tongva Nation
P.O. Box 86908
Los Angeles, California 90086

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Dunlap:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Office: (213) 452-3861  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Daniel Bolt  
Principal Planner
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March 19, 2015

Sandonne Goad, Chairperson
Gabrielino Tongva Nation
106 1/2 Judge John Aiso Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Sandonne Goad:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M.).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gab on Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch

US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017

Office: (213) 452-3881  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

[Signature]
Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner
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March 19, 2015

Mr. Joseph Hamilton, Chairman
Ramona Band of Mission Indians
P.O. Box 391670
Anza, California 92539

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Hamilton:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHIC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
Mr. Joseph Hamilton  
March 19, 2015  
Page 2

A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gab on Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Office: (213) 452-3881  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District  

Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner
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March 19, 2015

Ms. Anna Hoover, Cultural Analyst
Pechanga Cultural Resources Department
P.O. Box 2183
Temecula, California 92593

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Ms. Hoover:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M.).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHIC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
Ms. Anna Hoover  
March 19, 2015  
Page 2

A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Office: (213) 452-3861  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner

R:\Projects\OGW\OGWD\OGW000590\CulturalPrado NA Stopping Letters\031915.doc
March 19, 2015

Mr. Mark Macarro, Chairperson
Pechanga Band of Mission Indians
P.O. Box 1477
Temecula, California 92593

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Macarro:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrantment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Office: (213) 452-3861  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District  

Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner
March 19, 2015

Mr. Paul Macarro, Cultural Resources Manager  
Pechanga Band of Mission Indians  
P.O. Box 1477  
Temecula, California 92593  

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program  

Dear Mr. Macarro:  

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment, in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.  

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.  

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.  

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).  

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
Mr. Paul Macarro  
March 19, 2015  
Page 2

A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  

US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017

Office: (213) 452-3861  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

[Signature]
Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner
March 19, 2015

Mr. William Madrigal, Jr., Cultural Resources Manager
Morongo Band of Mission Indians
12700 Pumarra Road
Banning, California 92220

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Madrigal, Jr.:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen
Senior Archeologist
Environmental Resources Branch
US Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District
915 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90017

Office: (213) 452-3861
Fax: (213) 452-4204
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

Daniel Bott
Principal Planner
March 19, 2015

Mr. John Marcus, Chairman
Santa Rosa Band of Mission Indians
P.O. Box 391820
Anza, California 92539

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Marcus:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quad(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 600.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
Mr. John Marcus  
March 19, 2015  
Page 2  

A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter. 

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site. 

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a 1/4 mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements. 

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at: 

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  

US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017  

Office: (213) 452-3881  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil. 

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence. 

Sincerely, 

Orange County Water District  

[Signature]

Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner  
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March 19, 2015

Mr. Anthony Morales, Chairperson
Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Board of Mission Indians
P.O. Box 693
San Gabriel, California 91778

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Morales:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen
Senior Archeologist
Environmental Resources Branch
US Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District
915 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90017

Office: (213) 452-3861
Fax: (213) 452-4204
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

Daniel Bott
Principal Planner
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March 19, 2015

Mr. Joseph Ontiveros, Cultural Resource Department
Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
P.O. Box 487
San Jacinto, California 92581

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Ontiveros:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Office: (213) 452-3861  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner
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March 19, 2015

Mr. John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Administrator
Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Rosas:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
Mr. John Tommy Rosas  
March 19, 2015  
Page 2

A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/6 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  

US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017

Office: (213) 452-3861  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.  

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District  

Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner  
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March 19, 2015

Mr. Andrew Salas, Chairperson
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians
P.O. Box 393
Covina, California 91723

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Salas:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
Mr. Andrew Salas  
March 19, 2015  
Page 2

A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen  
Senior Archeologist  
Environmental Resources Branch  

US Army Corps of Engineers  
Los Angeles District  
915 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90017

Office: (213) 452-3861  
Fax: (213) 452-4204  
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

[Signature]

Daniel Bott  
Principal Planner
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March 19, 2015

Mr. Luther Salgado, Sr., Chairperson
Cahuilla Band of Indians
P.O. Box 391760
Anza, California 92539

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Salgado, Sr.:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Waters of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/8 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen
Senior Archeologist
Environmental Resources Branch

US Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District
915 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90017

Office: (213) 452-3861
Fax: (213) 452-4204
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

Daniel Bott
Principal Planner
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March 19, 2015

Mr. John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Administrator  
Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation

Subject: Prado Basin Pilot Program

Dear Mr. Rosas:

The Orange County Water District (OCWD) is planning the Prado Basin Pilot Program in the Prado Basin located in the northwest corner of Riverside County and southwest corner of San Bernardino County, California. The project would remove between 250,000 and 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from the Prado Basin and re-entrain it in a controlled manner back into the lower Santa Ana River, downstream of Prado Dam. The Santa Ana River was identified as the most feasible water body from which to remove sediment; in terms of quantity of sediment removed and least amount of impacts to sensitive biological resources. In comparison to the other water bodies, the Santa Ana River provides significantly more favorable sediments (more sand and less silt) for downstream re-entrainment as well as constant source of sediment replenishment. A second element of the project includes three mitigation sites within Prado Basin that will be planted with native plant species to mitigate for the temporary loss of native vegetation communities resulting from implementation of the project.

A letter was sent to you on July 14, 2014 regarding the project (previously referred to Prado Basin Sediment Management Project). This letter is to inform you of changes to the proposed project. As part of the modified project, three of the mitigation sites previously identified have been dropped from the planned project and two have been added.

A cultural resources study is currently being conducted for the two additional proposed mitigation sites in the Prado Basin area: (1) the Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site; and (2) the River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site; as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two.

The project would be implemented behind Prado Dam within the Prado Basin reservoir area. It is generally located north of SR-91 and east of SR-71 and is shown on the attached portion of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Prado Dam and Corona North, CA 7.5 Minute Quadrangle(s) (Township 3 South; Range 7 West) (S.B.B.M).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) must issue a Permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act because of impacts to Wetlands of the United States, making the project subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 requires scoping and potential consultation with affiliated Native American tribes and individuals [36 CFR 800.3(f)(1)] identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). This letter is to inform you of the modified project and to request any relevant information you may have regarding cultural resources on or near the project site(s). This project does not require a General or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; therefore, the project is not subject to the statutory requirements of Senate Bill 18 (Tribal Consultation Guidelines).
A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the NAHC failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural places on the project site(s). The NAHC also provided OCWD with a list of Native American individuals/organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. Your name and contact information was included on the list and serves as the basis for this letter.

A records search was conducted at the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at University of California, Riverside on April 15, 2014, for the Demonstration Garden Extension site located in Riverside County. According to the EIC, no cultural resources have been recorded within 1/6 mile of this site. Additionally, no cultural resources were discovered on the site as a result of the survey for this site.

A second records search was conducted at the EIC on March 6, 2015 for the two additional proposed mitigation sites (Sunnyslope Creek Mitigation Site and River Road Bridge Gabion Project Mitigation Site) as well as the Sediment Storage Site, Sediment Re-entrainment area, and the road connecting the two. According to the EIC, 10 cultural resources have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius. It should be noted that the proposed Sediment Removal channel and pipeline will not be surveyed due to extremely dense, virtually impenetrable vegetation; however, it should be possible to survey the other project elements.

Your participation in this local planning process is important. If you have any additional knowledge of Native American Sacred Lands or other cultural resources on or near the study area, or any comment on the project, please contact the USACE archaeologist D. Stephen Dibble at your earliest convenience at:

John Killeen
Senior Archeologist
Environmental Resources Branch

US Army Corps of Engineers
Los Angeles District
915 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90017

Office: (213) 452-3861
Fax: (213) 452-4204
John.J.Killeen@usace.army.mil.

Thank you in advance for your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your correspondence.

Sincerely,

Orange County Water District

Daniel Bolt
Principal Planner
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