

## 4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section describes the cultural resources within the project site, and evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed project on these resources. Analysis within this section includes the potential for historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources to be present within the project site, and the potential effects of the proposed project on these resources.

Data from various sources were used for the preparation of this section, including an Archeological Survey Report (Jurich 2007) and update memorandum (Sanka 2011), included as Appendix E; Paleontological Resources Report (Burwasser 2007) and update memorandum (Burwasser 2010), included as Appendix F; and the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center (SBAIC). Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Section 4.4.5 (References).

One comment letter (provided in Appendix A) related to cultural resources was received in response to the notice of preparation (NOP) circulated on August 3, 2007, for the proposed project and was taken into consideration during preparation of this environmental impact report (EIR). This letter is from the Native American Heritage Commission, dated August 9, 2007, and provides a list of tribes/reservations/councils to contact who may have a vested interest in the project site. In addition, the letter also provides suggested actions for preparation of the EIR.

### 4.4.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed project will result in the construction of one warehouse/distribution facility for a total of 678,275 square feet (sf) on approximately 38.4 acres. The area analyzed (study area) for cultural resources includes the entire project site, as well as a review of all recorded historical and archaeological sites within and adjacent to the project site. As illustrated in Figure 3-1 (Regional Location Map), the project site is located at the northeast corner of Palm Avenue and Industrial Parkway, and south of the Interstate 215 (I-215)/Palm Avenue interchange, in the City of San Bernardino (City), San Bernardino County (County). The study area is within the United States Geological Survey's (USGS) San Bernardino North 7.5-minute Quadrangle.

#### ■ Background

Cultural resources are frequently defined in terms of tangible materials attributed to a culture. These include districts, sites, structures, networks, artifacts, and other evidence of human use considered important to a culture or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other reasons. These resources may be historical, archaeological, architectural, or archival in nature.

#### ***Archaeological Resources***

According to the Archaeological Survey Report (Jurich 2007), the study area is within the ethnographic area associated with the Tongva (historically known as the Gabrieliño, also referred to as the Gabrieliño/Tongva). The Tongva were one of the most influential and powerful Native American

groups in southern California. The Tongva inhabited a large area that includes present-day Los Angeles and its surroundings. Tongva populations are estimated to have numbered in the thousands. In the late eighteenth century, between 50 and 100 villages were observed, with village populations ranging between 50 and 200 inhabitants.

The Tongva can be divided into the Coastal and Inland Tongva. The Inland Tongva lived in primary villages occupied year round, supplemented by seasonal gathering camps. The Tongva lived in thatched, domed, circular structures. Other structures included sweathouses, menstrual huts, and ceremonial structures. The Inland Tongva subsistence economy included a variety of plants and animals, including deer, piñon nuts, and acorns. The Inland Tongva used acorns as trade items for marine resources acquired by coastal groups and other goods, such as obsidian, offered by desert groups. The material culture of the Inland Tongva included utilitarian and ceremonial items, bedrock and portable mortars, milling slabs, handstones, a variety of wooden, bone, and shell tools, flaked stone artifacts, coiled and twined baskets, and elaborately decorated steatite items.

In 1771 the San Gabriel Mission was established in Tongva territory. The first of many missions established throughout California, the primary focus of missionaries was the conversion of the native population to Catholicism. Once removed to the mission, the neophytes (as converted Native American were called) were not allowed to leave the premises. Abuse and poor living conditions were common occurrences. By 1800, most Tongva were missionized or dead. During the early 1800s, disease and smallpox epidemics took the lives of many of those living in the missions. Additional epidemics in the late 1800s further reduced the Tongva population, except for those living in isolated areas.

### ***Paleontological Resources***

Paleontological resources, usually referred to collectively as fossils, are the remains or traces of prehistoric animals and plants. Paleontology is the study of life in past geologic time based on fossil plants and animals. Fossils are important scientific and educational resources because of their use in documenting the presence and evolutionary history of particular groups of now-extinct organisms, reconstructing the environments in which those organisms lived, and determining the relative ages and geologic processes of the strata (sediment or rock layers) in which they occur. With few exceptions, fossils that are useful for these determinations are preserved in sedimentary rocks. Occasionally, rocks that have been metamorphosed (changed by heat or pressure), such as marble metamorphosed from limestone, retain fossil remnants which are identifiable, but not necessarily valuable for sedimentary age or process research.

Numerous geologic studies have been conducted by the USGS within the San Bernardino North 7.5-Minute Quadrangle. According to the Paleontological Resources Report (Burwasser 2007) the study area contains very young wash deposits (late Holocene epoch, less than 3,000 years old), part of a southeast-sloping alluvial plain formed by sediment aggradations from the combined stream flows of the Cajon Wash and Cable Creek. The material is fine to coarse sand, and pebbly sandy gravel with boulders. The deposit is at least 30 to 50 feet thick and is underlain by at least 150 feet of bouldery sand and gravel. The soil on the flat portions of the study area developed on this unit is the Tujunga gravelly loamy sand. The hills are outcrops of the Pelona schist (Mesozoic era, probably between 165 million and 170 million

years old) and are represented by the Friant-Rock Outcrop Complex. The schist is metamorphosed sedimentary rock that retains none of its primary sedimentary structures and contains granitic intrusions.

Types of geologic units have a strong influence on the potential for a site to contain paleontological resources. The geologic sediments at the study area date from the middle to late part of the Holocene epoch, the youngest portion of the Quaternary period, and consist of unconsolidated sand and gravel deposited by relatively large rivers in an alluvial fan environment. Based on its youthful age and high-energy depositional history, this unit would be considered unlikely to contain important paleontological resources (vertebrate fossils) and would be assigned to the “Low Sensitivity” category. The metamorphic geologic unit at the study area has been subjected to heat and pressure for tens of millions of years and is assigned to the “Marginal Sensitivity” category with the granitic inclusions in the “Zero Sensitivity” category. The Paleontological Resources Report found that the fossil content of each geologic unit in the vicinity of the study area indicated no previously recorded fossil localities in the alluvial deposits.

## ■ Identification of Cultural Resources

### ***Archaeological Resources***

A Phase I Archeological Survey was completed by PBS&J personnel, with a field survey conducted on August 9, 2007. The Phase I Archeological Survey was undertaken to determine whether there were any prehistoric or historic archaeological resources within the study area. Preparation for the survey included sources consulted at the Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File, historical resources reports, and historic maps. In addition, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) was consulted for listed resources in or adjacent to the study area. The San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center (SBAIC) and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) were contacted to conduct archival research to determine the past ownership and historical significance of the study area. Information Scoping efforts were also completed with representatives from the: Cahuilla Band of Indians also, Ramona Band of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Ti’At Society, Gabrieliño/Tongva Tribal Council, Gabrieliño Band of Mission Indians of California, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and Serrano Nation of Indians. Only the Serrano Nation of Indians and the Cahuilla Band of Indians responded (Jurich 2007).

The record search completed in support of the 2007 archaeological survey did not identify any recorded historical resources within the study area. Two historic resources that are eligible for listing on the NRHP, U.S. Highway 66 (Route 66) and a segment of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad grade, occur within one-quarter mile of the study area, to the west. In addition, the study area is within the boundaries of the historic Rancho Muscupiabe. These records search data were supplemented by an updated SBAIC records search and NAHC search in 2011 to ensure that the records search data are considered current (Sanka 2011). During the 2011 NAHC records search, no resources listed in the NAHC Sacred Lands File (SLF) were detected within the study area or within one-half mile. The updated SBAIC records search indicated that three resources were located within the study area, and three additional resources were found within one mile of the study area. The three resources detected within the study area were identified during the 2007 field survey completed by PBS&J.

The 2007 field survey of the study area did not reveal any prehistoric archaeological sites; however, three historic sites were identified during the course of the survey. An updated records search performed in January 2011 (see Appendix E1) revealed no changes in the information obtained in the 2007 searches and field survey. Table 4.4-1 (Historical Period Sites) shows the identified historical period sites.

Investigations have revealed that none of the three sites retains sufficient integrity or meet the eligibility requirements for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources or the NRHP.

**Table 4.4-1 Historical Period Sites**

<i>Primary No.</i>	<i>Trinomial</i>	<i>Description</i>
36-013612	Site 36-013612	Concrete foundation of unknown age located to the east of the larger hill. A small piece of wire and a shard of aqua glass noted in the area.
36-013613	Site 36-013613	Consists of a concrete foundation and slab of unknown age situated along the eastern side the larger hill, at the base. Wire nail and several segments of milled lumber found in close proximity. Uphill from the foundation is a broken wooden fence post and section of wood fencing possibly associated with the foundation.
36-013617	CA-SBR-12608H	Consists of a concrete pad, a dirt road, asphalt, rusted metal, a palm tree stump, and segments of a palm tree trunk within a 960 square foot area along the eastern base of the smaller hill. A concrete pad to the south of the dirt road is partially buried by colluvium. Pieces of asphalt are noted in the vicinity of the concrete pad and the dirt road.

SOURCE: PBS&J, 2010.

Site records on file at the California Department of Parks and Recreation (Resource Agency).

### **Paleontological Resources**

A paleontological resources report was completed by PBS&J personnel, with a field survey conducted on August 9, 2007. No paleontological resources were identified in the course of the field survey. New database searches were performed in October 2010. Subsequent searches of the paleontological databases confirmed the youngest fossil finds in any surface exposures within 10 miles of the study area were in deposits at least 11,000 years old, 8,000 years older than the alluvial unit at the study area. The 150-foot-thick or greater bouldery sand and gravel formation underlying the late Holocene alluvium at depths of 30 to 50 feet may be as young as 11,000 years old, and is unlikely to contain paleontological resources because of its high-energy depositional history. No paleontological resources are expected to occur at the study area because the sediment and rock underlying the project site are unlikely to be fossil-bearing.

### **4.4.2 Regulatory Framework**

The treatment of cultural resources is governed by federal and California laws and guidelines. There are specific criteria for determining whether prehistoric and historic sites or objects are significant and/or protected by law. Federal and state significance criteria generally focus on the resource’s integrity and uniqueness, its relationship to similar resources, and its potential to contribute important information to scholarly research. Some resources that do not meet federal significance criteria may, nevertheless, be

considered significant by state criteria. The laws and regulations that seek to address and/or mitigate impacts on significant prehistoric or historic resources are summarized below.

## ■ Federal

### ***The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966***

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 established the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as the official federal list of cultural resources that have been nominated by state offices for their historical significance at the local, state, or national level. Properties listed in the NRHP, or “determined eligible” for listing, must meet certain criteria for historical significance and possess integrity of form, location, and setting. Significance is determined by four aspects of American history or prehistory recognized by the NRHP Criteria, which are listed below:

- A. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history
- B. Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past
- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type; period, or method of construction; represent the work of a master; possess high artistic values, represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (See 36 CFR Section 60.4)

Eligible properties must meet at least one of the criteria and exhibit integrity. Historical integrity is measured by the degree to which the resource retains its historical properties and conveys its historical character, the degree to which the original fabric has been retained, and the reversibility of changes to the property. Three of the four criteria are meant to apply to historic structures; however, Criterion D is also sometimes associated with archeological and paleontological materials.

## ■ State

### ***The California Register of Historic Resources (Public Resources Code Sections 5020 et seq.)***

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) maintains the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR). Properties listed, or formally designated as eligible for listing, on the NRHP are automatically listed on the CRHR, as are State Landmarks and Points of Interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

State law seeks to protect cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. A cultural resource is an important historical resource if it meets any of the criteria found in Section 15064.5(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines. The criteria, which are identified below, are nearly identical to those for the NRHP, but focus upon resources of statewide, rather than national, significance:

- A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage
- B. Is associated with lives of persons important in our past
- C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values
- D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(a)(4), also affords a lead agency the ability to determine whether a resource may be a historical resource without it being listed in the CRHR. Section 15064.5(a)(4) states:

The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

### **California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5, 7051, and 7054**

These sections collectively address the illegality of interference with human burial remains, as well as the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites. The laws protect such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction, and establishes procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction of a project, including the treatment of remains prior to, during, and after evaluation, and reburial procedures.

### **California Senate Bill 297 of 1982**

This bill addresses the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites and protects such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction; establishes procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction of a project; and establishes the NAHC to resolve disputes regarding the disposition of such remains. It has been incorporated into Section 15064.5(e) of the CEQA Guidelines.

## **■ Regional**

There are no regional policies that would apply to cultural resources for the proposed project.

## **■ Local**

### **City of San Bernardino General Plan—Historical and Archaeological Resources Chapter**

The Historical and Archaeological Resources Element of the City’s General Plan provides policy guidance that addresses the preservation and reuse of the City’s historic and archaeological resources. Goals presented in the Historical an Archaeological Resources Element of the City’s General Plan related

to cultural resources that are potentially relevant to the proposed project are listed below, along with an assessment of the proposed project's potential to conflict with the policies adopted in support of these goals and objectives.

**Goal 11.4** Protect and enhance our historic and cultural resources:

**Policy 11.4.1** Encourage the preservation, maintenance, enhancement, and reuse of existing buildings in redevelopment and commercial areas; the retention and renovation of existing residential buildings; and the relocation of existing residential buildings when retention on site is deemed not to be feasible.

**Goal 11.5** Protect and enhance our archaeological resources:

**Policy 11.5.1** Complete an inventory of areas of archaeological sensitivity in the planning area. Prior to public distribution, Native American tribes should be consulted to address any issues of confidentiality.

### Consistency Analysis

As described above in Section 4.4.1 (Existing Conditions), there are no relevant archaeological or paleontological resources known to exist within, or in the vicinity of, the project site. The proposed project would not, therefore, conflict with the goals and policies contained in the Historical and Archaeological Resources Element of the City's General Plan.

## 4.4.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### ■ Analytic Method

Significant effects upon historic structures or features are evaluated by determining the presence or absence of historic status with respect to the feature in question, and then determining the potential for the proposed project to affect the structure or feature if it possesses historic status. The likelihood that the proposed project would affect historical resources is dependent upon the proximity of the proposed project to identified historical resources within or adjacent to the project site. If the implementation of the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, then it would represent a significant impact related to historical resources. The level of significance for an effect is dependent upon the existing integrity and nature of contributing elements to its historic or cultural significance, and the sensitivity of the current or historic use of the resource.

Surface examination often cannot reveal whether archaeological resources are present at a specific project location, particularly when fill has been deposited on a site and masks native soils. This analysis is based on the probability, based on previous studies and excavations in the vicinity of the project site, that an archaeological resource or human burial could be affected by activities that disturb the ground surface or subsurface, including grading or excavation.

As with archaeological resources, surface examination often cannot reveal whether paleontological resources are present at a specific project location, particularly when fill has been deposited on a site and masks native soils. However, this analysis considers the probability, based on previous studies of rock units similar to those under the project site, of affecting paleontological resources by activities that disturb the ground surface or subsurface, including grading or excavation. For the purposes of this EIR, impacts on paleontological resources are assessed in terms of significance based upon whether these resources meet the definition of a “unique archaeological resource” found in Section 21083.2(g) of CEQA.

### ■ Thresholds of Significance

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the 2011 CEQA Guidelines and City-specific thresholds, where applicable. For purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project may have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries

Effects related to the following threshold were found to have “no impact,” and are discussed in Section 4.14 (Effects Not Found to Be Significant):

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines

### ■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Threshold	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?
-----------	--

**Impact 4.4-1      Construction of the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of previously unknown archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure MM4.4-1 and MM4.4-2 would reduce this impact to *less than significant*.**

As described above in Section 4.4.1, no prehistoric archaeological materials have been recovered or recorded within the project site. Table 4.4-1 lists the historical period sites identified within the project site during the field survey and associated research. As described in Section 4.4.1, these sites do not constitute a archeological resource according to Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines due to the commonality of its type and its low potential to yield important information regarding history or prehistory. Consequently, the removal of this resource would not constitute a significant impact.

The likelihood of encountering archaeological resources during construction activities (e.g., excavation for foundations, utility improvements, etc.) with significant research potential within the project site is considered very low. Further, if any previously unknown resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with construction of the proposed project, implementation of mitigation measures MM4.4-1 and MM4.4-2 would ensure that such resources would be subject to evaluation and appropriate treatment and reduce the impact to less than significant.

*MM4.4-1 The Applicant shall arrange for a qualified professional archaeological and paleontological monitor to be present during all project-related ground-disturbing activities. In addition, all construction personnel shall be informed of the need to stop work on the project site in the event of a potential find, until a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist has been provided the opportunity to assess the significance of the find and implement appropriate measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel will also be informed that unauthorized collection of cultural resources is prohibited.*

*MM4.4-2 Areas found during construction to contain significant historic or prehistoric archaeological artifacts shall be examined by a qualified consulting archaeologist or historian for appropriate protection and preservation. If evidence of archaeological resources is observed, construction near the resources shall cease, the City and the appropriate Native American tribal groups shall be consulted, and a qualified archaeologist shall determine whether an archaeological resource uncovered during construction is considered to be significant. If the resource is determined to be significant, the archaeologist, as appropriate, shall prepare a research design for recovery of the resources in consultation with the State Office of Historic Preservation that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2 of CEQA.*

*If the archeologist determines that the resource is not a significant resource, the archeologist shall record the site and submit the recordation form to San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center.*

*The archaeologist shall prepare a report of the results of any survey, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the City and to the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center.*

Mitigation measures MM4.4-1 and MM4.4-2 would protect potential archeological resources that could be found within the project site. This impact would be ***less than significant***.

Threshold	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
-----------	--

**Impact 4.4-2 Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed project could directly or indirectly result in damage to, or the destruction of, unique paleontological resources. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures MM4.4-1 through MM4.4-3 would reduce this impact to *less than significant*.**

No unique geological features are known to exist within the project site, and as described above in Section 4.4.1, no fossils have been documented within the project site. There are two small hills along the longitudinal centerline of the project site, and the probability of encountering paleontological resources within the project site, including the hills, are marginal to zero. The geologic sediments within the project site consist of unconsolidated sand and gravel deposited by relatively large rivers in an alluvial fan

environment. Based on its youthful age and high-energy depositional history, this unit would be considered unlikely to contain important paleontological resources (vertebrate fossils). Subsequent searches of the paleontological databases confirmed the youngest fossil finds in any surface exposures within 10 miles of the project site were in deposits at least 11,000 years old, 8,000 years older than the alluvial unit at the project site. No paleontological resources were identified in the course of the field survey. The sediment and rock underlying the project site are unlikely to be fossil-bearing. Therefore, no paleontological resources are expected to occur at project site. However, to reduce any potential impact to previously undiscovered paleontological resources, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

*MM4.4-3 Areas found during construction to contain paleontological resources shall be examined by a qualified paleontologist who shall first determine whether a paleontological resource uncovered during construction is considered to be significant. If the resource is determined to be significant, the paleontologist, as appropriate, shall formulate a mitigation plan in consultation with the City and the State Office of Historic Preservation that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2 of CEQA.*

*If the paleontologist determines that the paleontological resource is not a significant resource, the paleontologist may record the site and submit the recordation form to the San Bernardino County Museum.*

*The paleontologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the City and to the San Bernardino County Museum.*

Although no paleontological resources are expected to occur at the project site, an instructional program to assist construction personnel in identifying paleontological resources and requiring the scientific recovery and evaluation of any paleontological resources or unique geologic features that could be encountered would ensure that important scientific information that could be provided by paleontological resources regarding history or prehistory would not be lost. Implementation of mitigation measures MM4.4-1 through MM4.4-3 would reduce any potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources to a ***less than significant level***.

Threshold	Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
-----------	---

**Impact 4.4-3 Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure MM4.4-4 would reduce this impact to *less than significant*.**

No formal cemeteries are known to have occupied the project site, so any human remains encountered would likely come from archaeological or historical contexts. As described above in Section 4.4.1, no prehistoric archaeological materials, including human burials, have been discovered within the project site. Although a small potential still exists for such resources to be present, and for excavation during

construction activities to disturb these resources, the likelihood of discovery of such resources is extremely low.

Human burials, in addition to being potential archaeological resources, are protected under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097. Disturbing human remains could violate the Health Code and City policy, as well as destroy the resource. As required by the Health Code and City policy, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented if human remains are discovered within the project site:

*MM4.4-4 In the event of the discovery of a burial, human bone, or suspected human bone, all excavation or grading in the vicinity of the find shall halt immediately, the area of the find shall be protected, and the Contractor shall immediately notify the County Coroner of the find and comply with the provisions of PRC Section 5097 with respect to Native American involvement, burial treatment, and re-burial, if necessary.*

Implementation of mitigation measure MM4.4-4 would ensure that this impact would be ***less than significant*** by ensuring appropriate examination, treatment, and protection of human remains, if any is found.

#### 4.4.4 Cumulative Impacts

A cumulative impact analysis is only provided for those thresholds that result in a less-than-significant or significant and unavoidable impact. A cumulative impact analysis is not provided for Effects Found Not to Be Significant, which result in no project-related impacts.

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development within the vicinity of the City of San Bernardino. Cumulative development would require grading and excavation that could potentially affect archaeological or paleontological resources. The cumulative effect of these projects is the continued loss of these resources. The potential loss of paleontological and archaeological resources under the project would not contribute to the degradation of the historic fabric of the City of San Bernardino. Project-specific mitigation measures associated with the proposed project would be implemented to reduce the effect of construction of the proposed project, by ensuring the evaluation of, and—where appropriate—scientific recovery and study of, any cultural resources encountered. This would ensure that important scientific information that is provided by these resources regarding history and prehistory, should they be encountered, would not be lost. The cumulative impact of the proposed project to cultural resources would be ***less than significant***.

#### 4.4.5 References

Burwasser, George. 2007. *Paleontological Resources: Palm Avenue and Industrial Parkway, San Bernardino, California*. PBSJ. October 11.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. *Update of Baseline Data for Paleontological Resources: Palm Avenue and Industrial Avenue, San Bernardino, California*, October 7.

Jurich, Denise M. 2007. *Archaeological Survey Report for the Palm Avenue Distribution Center*. PBSJ, September.

San Bernardino County Museum. Archaeological Information Center. 2007. *Historical Resources Record Search: Palm Ave Distribution Center Project*.

Sanka, Jennifer. 2011. Updated California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Records Search Results and Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) Search Results for the Palm Avenue Distribution Center Project, City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California, January 7.