

## CULTURAL RESOURCES

### Cultural Setting

Cultural resources refer to the imprint of human occupation left on the landscape. This imprint is manifested in prehistoric and historic archeological sites, historic buildings, structures, and other objects. Archeological sites consist of artifacts, plant and faunal remains, trash deposits, and many types of features. Artifacts are defined as that was manufactured or modified by human hands. Features can include structural remains, fire pits, and storage areas.

Prehistoric archeological sites are loci of human activity occurring before European contact. The Spanish entrada in A.D. 1540 was the first European contact in what is now the southwestern United States. Prehistoric artifacts include: flaked stone tools such as projectile points, knives, scrapers, and chopping tools; ground stone implements like manos and metates; plain and decorated ceramics; and features or facilities which include subterranean and above ground architectural units, hearths, granaries and storage cysts, and trash deposits known as middens.

Historic archeological sites reflect occupation after the advent of written records. Historic structures may include: commercial and residential buildings, industrial facilities, bridges, and roadways. Material remains on historic archeological sites may include: refuse dumps, structure foundations, roads, privies or any other physical evidence of historic occupation. Refuse consists of food waste, bottles, ceramic dinnerware, and cans. There is usually a strong interplay between historic archeological sites and written records. The archeological data is frequently used to verify or supplement historic records.

Cultural resources are located using two principal methods. Before starting a project, a records and literature search is conducted at any number of repositories of archeological site records. The search may show that an archeological or historical survey has been conducted and some cultural resources have been identified. That information may be enough to proceed with the significance evaluation stage of the project. If (1) no previous survey has been done, or (2) a previous survey is either out of date or inadequate, the project cultural resources expert, either an historian or archeologist, will need to conduct a surface survey to determine the likelihood of any cultural resources occurring within the proposed project boundaries.

After a cultural resource(s) has been identified during a survey or record and literature search the Federal agency overseeing the project, using a process mandated by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, determines whether the cultural resource is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). The Federal Regulation that guides the process is 36 CFR 800. For a cultural resource to be determined eligible for listing in the National Register it has to meet certain criteria and either be minimally 50 years old or exhibit

exceptional importance. If the cultural resource meets this requirement, it is then evaluated according to four criteria. These National Register criteria for evaluation are defined in 36 CFR 60.4:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and (a) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or (b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or (c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or (d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

After a cultural resource has been determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register it is accorded the same level of protection as a property that is included. It then becomes formally known as a “historic property” regardless of age. Historic property status may be applied to individual cultural resources or to a group of cultural resources that are united by a theme or context. The combined historic properties are then designated as either a historic or archeological “district” and the individual elements are called contributors.

### ***Chronology and Cultural Background***

For the purposes of the present study the area of potential effects (APE) falls primarily within the Juaneño/Luiseño sphere of influence with a Gabrielino presence in the northeastern portion of the study area. The Indian Tribes acquired their present names from the association with various missions that had become a dominant element in their lives. The Gabrielino are associated with the Mission San Gabriel Arcángel in San Gabriel, Los Angeles County, and the Juaneño with the Mission at San Juan Capistrano, and the Luiseño with the Mission at San Luis Rey de Francia near Oceanside in northern San Diego County. The Juaneño and Luiseño are considered to be ethnologically and linguistically the same, but subdivided due to Mission associations (Bean and Shippek 1978). The Juaneño keep a cultural identity separate from the Luiseño and that separation is generally universally recognized. Today the Juaneño Indians have distinguished themselves by gaining State recognition and seeking Federal recognition as a discrete Indian tribe.

### **Traditional Cultural Chronology**

When dealing with a cultural history for Southern California and this particular study area it is important to view the prehistoric, and ethnographic periods for the range of human occupation. Generally, researchers in Orange County refer to what has become a standardized chronological system that focuses on three principal sequences. The three sequences for prehistory through European contact and occupation were developed by William Wallace (1971; 1978) and Claude Warren (1961). These sequences are based primarily on the presence or absence of traits and artifacts rather than culture dynamics. Wallace originally published his chronology in 1955, and it was reprinted in 1971 (Wallace 1971:186-201). The sequence that more adequately addresses the principle transitional aspects is Wallace's configuration published in 1978. The sequences are below in Table 1.

**Table 1. Traditional Regional Chronology**

Wallace (1978)	Wallace (1971)	Warren (1961)
	<b>Historic: A.D. 1782 to --</b>	
	Horizon IV ( <i>Luiseno</i> ) Late Prehistoric A.D. 1000 to A.D. 1800	Shoshonean Tradition A.D. 500 to European contact
Period III Diversified subsistence 3000-2000 B.C.	Horizon III Intermediate 1000 B.C. to A.D. 1000	Campbell Tradition 1000 B.C. to A.D. 1
Period II Food Collecting 6000 to 3000 B.C.	Horizon II Millingstone 5500 to 1000 B.C.	Encinitas Tradition 5500 B.C. to A.D. 1
Period I Hunting 9000 to 6000 B.C.	Horizon I Early Man (?) to 5500 B.C.	San Diegito Tradition (?) to 5500 B.C.

### **Traditional Regional Chronology**

The earlier sequences of Wallace (1971) and Warren (1961) were constructed to encompass Coastal Southern California, which includes: Santa Barbara, Ventura, Orange, Non-desert Los Angeles, and San Diego Counties as well as the Channel Islands; San Nicolas, Santa Catalina, San Clemente, and Santa Barbara (Wallace 1971:186; Bean and Smith 1978). The Southern California province runs from Point Conception in the north to the Mexican border. Locally, the Gabrielino Indians inhabited an area that stretched from between Topanga and Malibu to Aliso Creek in Orange County, and inland to the desert. The Juaneño Indians inhabit the area south of

Aliso Creek to point midway between San Mateo Creek and the Santa Margarita River. The boundary between the Juaneño and the Luiseño to the south is blurred with a substantial zone of overlap.

#### *Early Man Horizon or San Diegito Tradition*

The key feature of this period is the near absence of seed grinding implements. Subsistence revolved around hunting. The type of artifacts that are usually associated with this horizon are flake knives, leaf-shaped projectile points, flake scrapers, hammerstones, eccentric crescentics, and atlatl spurs.

#### *Millingstone Horizon or Encinitas Tradition*

The economy did a reverse turn in this horizon; hunting and fishing became secondary in importance behind plant foods, specifically seed-gathering. Wallace proposed a model to account for this transitional state. He determined that a warming trend dried up the interior lakes driving the inhabitants towards the more moderate coastal areas (1978:28). Wallace speculates that a seed-gathering people from the Great Basin brought the different subsistence mode with them to the coastal regions. He observed that a thinning of inland populations supports this theory.

This period has a distinct paucity of projectile points (the ones that are found are leaf-shaped atlatl and dart points) and an abundance of milling equipment, usually manos and metates. In addition, the basic artifact assemblages included cog stones, crude core and flake tools, and simple polished charmstones (Wallace 1978). A tendency towards sedentism is typified by the size and depth of some coastal sites. During this period sites are typically situated on bluffs above the shoreline.

#### *Intermediate Horizon or Campbell Tradition*

This horizon generally reflected a return to a reliance on hunting. However in the Los Angeles area the emphasis on seed grinding remained strong, indicating a slower movement from the previous millingstone horizon than in neighboring areas (Wallace 1978:30). Mortars and pestles came into importance during this period. These implements were mainly used for acorn processing, reflecting the invention of a leaching process for acorns and an emphasis on the food source. Projectile points were still large leaf-shaped points with a few smaller points present. At some point in this horizon the bow and arrow were adopted but were not heavily represented. Otherwise technological changes are not especially appreciable.

#### *Late Prehistoric Horizon or Shoshonean Tradition*

The distinctive feature of this horizon is the Shoshonean incursion into the area about A.D. 500, when Shoshonean speakers began to replace Hokan-speaking tribes. Following this influx of new people, the tribal landscape in the Southern California Coastal regions was altered by differentiation of tribes into the discrete cultural groups that were present at the time of European contact (Johnston 1962; Wallace 1971:195). Important technological and social developments in this period include the increased use of the bow and arrow, circular shell fishhooks, canoes, perforated stones, ceramic vessels in the south, trade networks, elaborate art, sedentary village life, and distinctive mortuary customs. Population increases spurred the growth of larger villages with their concomitant increase in food resource exploitation. The Late Prehistoric Period drew to close with the arrival of Franciscan Friars and Spanish soldiers. The Friars and their military escorts began their occupation of coastal California with the introduction of Missions. As mentioned earlier the Mission at San Juan Capistrano was established in the area in 1776.

#### *Ethnohistoric and Historic Period*

Two developmental periods define the ethnohistoric period in Luiseño culture history (Bean and Shippek 1978). They are San Luis Rey I (A.D. 1400-1750) and San Luis Rey II (A.D. 1750-1850). Luiseño cultural identity became more pronounced and distinctive from neighboring cultures. However, the results of borrowing material culture from their neighbors is seen during the second phase in the form of ceramics and cremation urns. The Luiseño generally only interacted with their neighbor through warfare and marriage. Their neighbors considered them to be a hostile society with overtly expansionist tendencies. Frequently Native American groups have tribal names that designate them as “the People” or some variation thereof. The Luiseño, like other California tribes, do not have a tribal name at all. Nonetheless, neighboring tribes had a variety of names for them, sometimes referring to them by their geographic proximity (Kroeber 1976).

Luiseño territory ranges from Aliso Creek on the northwest to Agua Hedionda Creek on the south. Inland it goes as far east as the Elsinore Fault Valley, south to the Valley of San Jose, then west back to Agua Hedionda. Village groups tended to be sedentary and independent and were usually situated in valley bottoms, adjacent to streams, and along coastal strands by mountain ranges (Bean and Shippek 1978). They did not share their hunting, fishing, or collecting areas with other villages.

First contact between the Indians and the Spanish occurred in 1769 when Gaspar de Portola’s expedition landed within the confines of what is now Orange County. Upon first visiting the lush valley of San Juan Capistrano, Fray Juan Crespi described it as a virtual Garden of Eden and the Spanish named it the Valley of Santa Maria Magdalena (Hoover et al. 1990). At the future site of the mission, The first Holy Mass was offered by Fray Lasuén on October 30, 1775, following the feast honoring San Juan Capistrano, Patron Saint of the mission. Father Lasuén

put up a cross and dedicated the ground. A crowd of local, but curious Indians watched the activity and offered to help build the first temporary chapel. News of an Indian attack at the mission in San Diego stopped the project after only eight days of building. Twelve months later, Fray Serra noted that the cross-raised by Father Lausén was still standing and facilitated erection of an arbor on the spot. On November 1, 1776 the mission of San Juan Capistrano was formally founded.

In the 1700s when the Franciscans arrived to missionize the Indians they found them practicing a ritual system that was associated with the Gabrielino Indians to the north. The centerpiece of the ritual system was the *Chiniginich* cult. Between the years 1814 and 1826 Friar Geronimo Boscana lived at the Missions at San Luis Rey and San Juan Capistrano. During this period he observed and fully recorded the ritual practices of the Juaneño Indians (Bean and Smith 1978).

After nine years of construction the mission was consecrated September 8, 1806. Six years later in December 1812 an earthquake leveled much of the church, killing 40 neophytes. It was not until 1860 that restoration was finally initiated. This was only after the California mission lands were secularized in 1833 and 1834. Mission San Juan Capistrano was one of earliest missions to be secularized (Hines and Rivers 1991). Secularization of the mission lands was complete by 1841 when the Indian settlement at San Juan Capistrano was declared an open pueblo and as many as 100 ex-neophytes were provided lots.

Before secularization, San Juan Capistrano was growing at a rapid pace. A building boom was well underway by the 1790s. Construction of adobe homes and other buildings was rampant during this decade. After the apportionment of mission's lands to the Indians, the pueblo of San Juan de Arguello was conceived. However, shortly thereafter the pueblo backtracked and recaptured the name of San Juan Capistrano. Thereafter, Indians began intermarrying with the Spanish and soon were adopting surnames such as Aguilar, Rios, Yorba, and Valenzuela. On December 8, 1865 Abraham Lincoln issued a proclamation returning control of the church to the Catholic Church (Wieman and Winterbourne 1938).

During the depression, a WPA report written by C. E. Roberts separated the San Juan Capistrano adobes and land into three groups. The groupings are based on relationships to the mission and the surrounding village townsite. The Capistrano Ranch adobes are within the first group. The Ranch adobes are the ones that remained within the confines of the mission but were not part of the townsite. The next group, the Capistrano Village Adobes, are the located within the village townsite but are outside the current mission grounds. The last group, are the Capistrano Mission buildings that are within the current mission complex. San Juan Capistrano resisted modernization for the longest time, preferring to keep its Spanish roots, and still retains a strong "Californio" identity.

### Refined Cultural Chronology

McKenna and Shepard (1996) synthesized an updated coastal chronology for the Newport Coast that they extracted from the Newport Coast Archaeological Project (NCAP) (Mason and Peterson 1994). They reiterated Mason and Peterson's affirmations that the early horizon concepts based on artifact assemblages were still valid in spite of their revised chronology. Mason and Peterson analyzed 326 radiocarbon dates that were collected from 31 culture bearing contexts. The dates they reviewed came from sites in the Newport Beach and Irvine areas of Orange County. As a general rule the dates were from single component Millingstone or Late Prehistoric Period sites. Four sites were multicomponent, and two sites were from the Intermediate Period. The terms horizon and period are frequently used interchangeably.

Basically, the chronology remains the same, but with a finer-grained separation of occupational episodes. Their refinements allude to a more inclusive chronology reflecting culture dynamics that are not necessarily reflected in the artifact assemblages. Mason and Peterson's findings are summarized in McKenna and Shepard's table.

Cultural horizons	Defined 1986	Cultural periods	Redefined 1994	Temporal correlations
Paleo-Coastal	Pre-6000 B.C.	Paleo-Coastal	Pre-8000 B.P.	Pre-6000 B.C.
Milling Stone	6000-1000 B.C.	Milling Stone 1	8000-5800 B.P.	6000-3800 B.C.
		Milling Stone 2	5800-4650 B.P.	3800-2650 B.C.
		Milling Stone 3	4650-3000 B.P.	2650-1000 B.C.
Intermediate	1000 B.C. -A.D. 750	Intermediate	3000-1350 B.P.	1000 B.C.-A.D. 650
Late Prehistoric	A.D. 759-European Contact	Late Prehistoric 1	1350-650 B.P.	A.D. 650-1350
		Late Prehistoric 2	650-200 B.P.	A.D. 1350-Present

Source: McKenna and Shepard (1996:9)

## Records and Literature Search Results

A records and literature search was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center. This facility is part of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), which is a statewide system for managing information on prehistoric and historical resources identified in California. It is authorized and directed by the state

Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) with twelve regional Information Centers. In-house Corps of Engineers documents were also reviewed.

The information available at the Information Centers consists of hardcopy of both current and historic records and maps. The main body of the information is in individual site record forms, copies of archeological and historical survey reports, and copies of historic maps. Using this information, the location and description of known historic and prehistoric resources can be determined. It is also possible to determine if a field survey has been conducted on a particular piece of property. An analysis of this information makes it possible to evaluate the potential for resources to be located in areas that have not yet been surveyed. The information is also useful in planning for future studies of an area.

The area of this records search included a review of all materials within 1/4 mile of Aliso Creek from the Pacific Ocean to the northern extent of the study area, including a portion of Wood Canyon. Materials reviewed included site record forms and cultural resources reports. In addition, the California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, California Register of Historical Resources, the National Register of Historic Places, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory. Copies of historic maps reviewed included the Santa Ana (1896) and Santiago Peak (1942, 1943) USGS topographic quadrangles.

Forty-six cultural resources studies of varying types have been conducted within 1/4 mile radius of the Aliso Creek study area. That includes records searches, field surveys, subsurface significance evaluations, and data recovery.

The results of this review indicate that there are twenty-three prehistoric archeological sites within 1/4 mile of Aliso Creek. These include aboriginal camp, resources procurement and village sites. Ten of these sites are located very close to and along Aliso Creek. Two of these sites have been previously determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, one historical feature, the Aliso Creek Bridge spanning Highway 1, is present within the Aliso Creek project area.

There are no sites present which are listed on the California Points of Historical Interest or the list of California Historical Landmarks.

There are 50 non-archeological properties listed on the California Register of Historical Resources, 49 on the National Register of Historic Places, and 54 on the California State Historic Resources Inventory which have been evaluated. These are located at the southern extreme of the project area near the mouth of Aliso Creek.



## **Field Survey**

An archeological field survey of the area of potential effects will be conducted for the proposed project once alternatives are identified. The entire area will be examined for the presence of historic and prehistoric resources.

A report detailing the results of this future work will be prepared and submitted to the California State Historic Preservation Officer for review in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA. In addition, interested Native American groups must be given the opportunity to review and comment on project proposals.

## **Native American Concerns**

The Corps requested initial comments from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). They responded indicating their knowledge of numerous prehistoric archeological sites within ½ mile of Aliso Creek. A list of Native American contacts was also provided. Letters will be sent to these contacts to obtain their comments on any proposed undertaking.

The NAHC also separately responded to the NOP with comments of a generic nature on standard identification and consultation procedures commonly used during the environmental review process.

## **National Historic Preservation Act**

Section 106 of the act requires the Corps to do two basic things. First, the Corps is required to take into account the effects of an undertaking on resources listed on, or eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Furthermore, the Corps is required to provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment on the effects of the project on NRHP properties. The specific procedures to accomplish these two requirements are in implementing regulations found in 36 CFR 800 (January 11, 2001).

## **References**

Bean, Lowell J. and Florence Shippek  
1978 Luiseno. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer. Handbook of North American Indians. William C. Sturtevant, General Ed. Vol. 8. Smithsonian Institution. Washington.

Bean, Lowell J. and Charles R. Smith

- 1978 Gabrielino. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer. Handbook of North American Indians. William C. Sturtevant, General Ed. Vol. 8. Smithsonian Institution. Washington.
- Hoover, Mildred B., Hero E. Hoover and Ethel G. Rensch  
1948 *Historic Spots in California*. Revised by R. Teiser. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Johnston, Bernice Eastman  
1962 *California's Gabrielino Indians*. Southwest Museum. Los Angeles.
- Kroeber, A. L.  
1976 [1925] *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Reprinted. Dover Publications. New York. Originally published 1925, Bulletin 78, Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- McKenna, Jeanette, and Richard S. Shepard  
1996 *A Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation for the Proposed Whittier Narrows Soccer Complex, Whittier Narrows Dam County Recreational Area, Los Angeles County, California*. McKenna et al./EIP Associates, Chino. Submitted to the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation.
- Mason, Roger D., and Mark L. Peterson  
1994 Newport Coast Archaeological Project. *Newport Coast Settlement systems: Analysis and Discussion*, vol. 1. The Keith Companies Archeological Division. Submitted to Coastal Community Builders, Newport Beach.
- Wallace, William J.  
1971 A suggested chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. In *The California Indians: a Sourcebook* (Second ed.), Compiled and edited by R.F. Heizer and M.A. Whipple, pp. 186-201. University of California Press. Berkeley.  
1978 Post-Pleistocene Archeology. 9000 to 2000 B.C. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer. Handbook of North American Indians. William C. Sturtevant, General Ed. Vol. 8. Smithsonian Institution. Washington.
- Warren, Claude N.  
1961 Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. *Eastern New Mexico University contributions in anthropology*. Portales

Wieman, W. W., and J. W. Winterbourne

1938 *Report of the San Joaquin Home Ranch Site Excavation*. WPA Anthropological Project #0-7680-1938.

Van Wormer, Steven R.

2002 *La Casa de la Mission Vieja: CA-ORA-29, Project 2000 Phase II-A Test Excavations, South Orange County, California*. Report prepared for Rancho Mission Viejo L.L.C. Prepared by Archaeological Resource Management Corp.

DRAFT