

# IV. Environmental Impact Analysis

---

## L. Tribal Cultural Resources

### 1. Introduction

This section identifies and evaluates potential Project impacts on tribal cultural resources. The analysis in this section is based on the results of consultation with California Native American Tribes conducted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) for the Project, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended by Assembly Bill (AB) 52, as well as the results of the analysis of resources in the *Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Transportation Communication Network Project (Tribal Cultural Resources Report)*, prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants and included as Appendix L.1 of this Draft EIR.<sup>1</sup> The Native American consultation documentation is provided in Appendix L.2 of this Draft EIR.

### 2. Environmental Setting

#### a. Regulatory Framework

The following describes the primary regulatory requirements regarding tribal cultural resources. Applicable plans and regulatory documents/requirements include the following:

- Assembly Bill 52
- California Public Resources Code Section 5097

##### (1) State

###### (a) Assembly Bill 52

AB 52 was approved on September 25, 2014. The act amended California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.94, and added PRC Sections 21073, 21074,

---

<sup>1</sup> SWCA Environmental Consultants, *Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Transportation Communication Network Project, Los Angeles County, August 2022.*

21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3. The primary intent of AB 52 is to involve California Native American Tribes early in the environmental review process and to establish a category of resources related to Native Americans, known as tribal cultural resources, that require consideration under CEQA. PRC Section 21074(a)(1) and (2) defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe” that are either included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register or included in a local register of historical resources, or a resource that is determined to be a tribal cultural resource by a lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence. A tribal cultural resource is further defined by PRC Section 20174(b) as a cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape. PRC Section 20174(c) provides that a historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a “nonunique archaeological resource” as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

PRC Section 21080.3.1 requires that, within 14 days of a lead agency determining that an application for a project is complete, or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency provide formal notification to the designated contact, or a tribal representative, of California Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project (as defined in PRC Section 21073) and who have requested in writing to be informed by the lead agency of projects within their geographic area of concern.<sup>2</sup> Tribes interested in consultation must respond in writing within 30 days from receipt of the lead agency’s formal notification and the lead agency must begin consultation within 30 days of receiving the tribe’s request for consultation.<sup>3</sup>

PRC Section 21080.3.2(a) identifies the following as potential consultation discussion topics: the type of environmental review necessary; the significance of tribal cultural resources; the significance of the project’s impacts on the tribal cultural resources; project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation; and mitigation measures. Consultation is considered concluded when either: (1) the parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or (2) a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.1(b) and (c).*

<sup>3</sup> *Public Resources Code, Sections 21080.3.1(d) and 21080.3.1(e).*

<sup>4</sup> *Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.2(b).*

In addition to other CEQA provisions, the lead agency may certify an EIR or adopt a MND for a project with a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource, only if a California Native American tribe has requested consultation pursuant to Section 21080.3.1 and has failed to provide comments to the lead agency, or requested a consultation but failed to engage in the consultation process, or the consultation process occurred and was concluded as described above, or if the California Native American tribe did not request consultation within 30 days.<sup>5</sup>

PRC Section 21082.3(c)(1) states that any information, including, but not limited to, the location, description, and use of the tribal cultural resources, that is submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public without the prior consent of the tribe that provided the information. If the lead agency publishes any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process, that information shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public.

Confidentiality does not apply to data or information that are, or become publicly available, are already in lawful possession of the project applicant before the provision of the information by the California Native American tribe, are independently developed by the Applicant or the Applicant's agents, or are lawfully obtained by the Applicant from a third party that is not the lead agency, a California Native American tribe, or another public agency.<sup>6</sup>

*(b) California Public Resources Code*

California PRC Section 5097.98, as amended by AB 2641, provides procedures in the event human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project implementation. PRC Section 5097.98 requires that no further disturbances occur in the immediate vicinity of the discovery, that the discovery is adequately protected according to generally accepted cultural and archaeological standards, and that further activities take into account the possibility of multiple burials. PRC Section 5097.98 further requires the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), upon notification by a County Coroner, designate and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) regarding the discovery of Native American human remains. Once the MLD has been granted access to the site by the landowner and inspected the discovery, the MLD then has 48 hours to provide

---

<sup>5</sup> *Public Resources Code, Section 21082.3(d)(2) and (3).*

<sup>6</sup> *Public Resources Code, Section 21082.3(c)(2)(B).*

recommendations to the landowner for the treatment of the human remains and any associated grave goods. In the event that no descendant is identified, or the descendant fails to make a recommendation for disposition, or if the land owner rejects the recommendation of the descendant, the landowner may, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains and burial items on the property in a location that will not be subject to further disturbance.

PRC Section 5097.99 prohibits acquisition or possession of Native American artifacts or human remains taken from a Native American grave or cairn after January 1, 1984, except in accordance with an agreement reached with the NAHC.

PRC Section 5097.5 provides protection for tribal resources on public lands, where Section 5097.5(a) states, in part, that:

*No person shall knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure, or deface, any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, rock art, or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over the lands.*

## **b. Existing Conditions**

### **(1) Physical Setting**

The Project Area, defined by SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) as the Site Locations and associated ground disturbance required for utility trenching, occupies the eastern portions of the San Fernando Valley and northern and western portions of the Los Angeles Basin. The San Fernando Valley is a 20 mile-long alluvial plain, oriented east–west in a zone of compression between the San Gabriel Mountains to the northeast, the Verdugo Mountains to the east, and the Santa Monica Mountains to the south. The valley is triangular in shape, and measures approximately 10 miles wide at the west end and three miles wide at the east end near the Project Area. The San Fernando Valley is primarily defined by deposits of alluvium—sediments deposited by water. These deposits began accumulating during the Pleistocene Epoch, which ended approximately 12,000 years ago, and are overlaid by Holocene age deposits—those that were formed fewer than 12,000 years ago. The maximum thickness of Holocene age deposits in the San Fernando Valley varies geographically and ranges between 900 feet (ft) thick near Burbank and 100 ft thick in the north. The Los Angeles Basin is a broad, level plain bound by the Pacific Ocean to the west, the Santa Monica Mountains and Puente Hills to the north, and the

Santa Ana Mountains and San Joaquin Hills to the south. This extensive alluvial wash basin is also composed primarily of Quaternary alluvial sediments.

The San Fernando Valley is drained by the Los Angeles River and its tributaries. The main channel of the Los Angeles River flows along the southern portions of the San Fernando Valley. The western portions of the Los Angeles Basin are drained by the Los Angeles River, Ballona Creek, and several unnamed tributaries. Historically the Los Angeles River did not have a permanent, well-defined channel within much of the San Fernando Valley. Rather, significant portions of the water were located underground, and the surface was often characterized by several smaller-order streams that would drain east and form tributaries of the Los Angeles River. Cycles of flooding would alter these stream courses and establish channels in some places, but through a series of flood control projects in the early to mid-twentieth century, a permanent channel for the Los Angeles River was established in its current location and by 1964, the river was lined with concrete. It was not just the Los Angeles River that was prone to flooding. Several of the stream courses extending from the surrounding foothills, which may have been nothing more than dry washes for years at a time, could become saturated and subject large areas to violent flooding during significant storms. In 1981, the United States Geological Survey (USGS) published a report that collated flood data collected between 1934 and 1956 and included a map of field observations showing flooded areas from specific years.

Within the Los Angeles Basin, the channel of the Los Angeles River has shifted courses several times during flood events. Among the first recorded shifts is one that occurred in 1815 when floodwaters overflowed the former channel, shifting the course at 0.5 mile to the southwest, near the present route of Spring Street. That flood is reported to have destroyed structures built as part of the original Los Angeles Pueblo and may have also flooded all or parts of the Native American site of Yaanga, which is believed to have been located nearby portions of the Project Area.

Some of the shifts in the river's course were more dramatic. Before 1825, the river flowed west from what is now downtown Los Angeles and discharged into the Ballona Wetlands in what is now Playa del Rey. The river followed a western course approximated by Washington Boulevard and then turned southwest at the Baldwin Hills, flowing along the northwest-facing side of the slopes—the course now occupied by Ballona Creek. Heavy rains in 1825 caused the channel to overflow its banks and the Los Angeles River shifted its course fully south, emptying into the bay near San Pedro, where the river has discharged ever since. In subsequent years, the river would frequently shift its course within the southern floodplain, which in some areas measures up to two miles wide. However, these more dramatic shifts between the western and southern routes are likely to have occurred during most of the life of the watercourse, and certainly during the last 13,000 years—the period in which there is evidence of Native Americans in southern California. Flood events such as those recorded in more recent history have produced

massive deposits of alluvial sediments within the respective floodplains. Alluvial terraces formed where flooding water eroded into uplifted landforms. In the downtown Los Angeles area, the backslopes in the location of Bunker Hill delineate the edge of the historical floodplain.

The Project Area is characterized predominantly by urban developments that are devoid of native vegetation. Historic vegetation conditions within the Project Area were identified using data compiled for the Los Angeles River Master Plan, which were based on information published in a 1977 vegetation map. The majority of the Site Locations are plotted within areas characterized as Shrub Formations, which are composed of species in the coastal sage community. Site Locations around Universal City and those in the northern portions of the downtown Los Angeles region are plotted in units defined as Broad-Leaved Forests Formations, which are composed of species in the Southern Oak Woodland vegetation community.

*(a) Historical Ecology of the Ballona Region*

The harbor in Marina del Rey was constructed within the extensive Ballona Wetland, referred to in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by several names including Port Ballona, Ballona Lagoon, and Ballona Lake. Historical records, photographs, and accounts from Gabrielino and early non Native inhabitants describe what was once an active ecosystem characterized by freshwater marshes, dense vegetation, and permanently saturated soils amid sand bars and dunal deposits.

As discussed above, prior to 1825, the Los Angeles River discharged into the wetland, along what is now the approximate course of Ballona Creek, rather than the current course emptying into the harbor near San Pedro. Ballona Creek is now a perennial southwest-flowing stream that serves as a major drainage for the Ballona Valley Watershed, fed by water from the Baldwin Hills and Santa Monica Mountains. Since it was channelized with a concrete lining beginning in 1935, the creek no longer discharges into the Ballona Lagoon and instead flows directly into the ocean.

Using historical maps and other sources, Dark et al. reconstructed features of the wetland as they would have existed in the nineteenth century. In their work, Dark et al. documented 174 unique wetland features classified into five wetland types (in order of total surface area): alkali meadow, valley freshwater wet meadow, valley freshwater marsh, brackish to salt marsh/tidal marsh, and alkali flat. In addition to these environments, the authors also note that freshwater seeps and springs and vernal pools were common features. Two of the proposed Site Locations are located within one of the historical ecological zones identified in the Dark et al. study. Site Locations FF-29 and FF-30 are located within an alkali meadow that was situated on the periphery of the historic period wetland.

Through a series of in-depth studies and detailed reports, researchers from by Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI), were able to provide greater time depth to the reconstruction of the ecology in the Ballona area. The SRI team reconstructed the formation of the Ballona wetlands environment through the Holocene. Their work demonstrates that up to 8,500 years before present (B.P.), what is now Marina del Rey was primarily a terrestrial environment. After fluctuations in sea levels and periodic river flooding, the character of a wetland gradually took shape, and conditions began to vary among freshwater, brackish, and saltwater.

The wetland areas would have supported a variety of plant and animal species that were used through the early historic period by native Gabrielino people and their ancestors. An intensive survey of vegetation in the Ballona region conducted in 1981 identified three habitats and six plant communities that would have existed prehistorically. The survey noted that “pickleweed saltmarsh, mudflat, and saltflat plant communities of the estuary contrast sharply with the freshwater willow and marsh habitat, and the coastal dune and coastal sage plant communities that dominate terrestrial landscapes.” SRI’s previously mentioned work revealed a rich variety of faunal remains represented in the assemblages, which are considered representative of those that would have been available near the Project Area. These include vertebrate species (mammals, bony fish, reptiles, birds) and invertebrates (gastropods, clams, mussels, oyster, and scallop).

## (2) Cultural Setting

### *(a) Prehistoric Overview*

Numerous chronological sequences have been devised to aid in understanding cultural changes within southern California. Building on early studies and focusing on data synthesis, Wallace developed a prehistoric chronology for the southern California coastal region that is still widely used today and is applicable to near-coastal and many inland areas. Four periods are presented in Wallace’s prehistoric sequence: Early Man, Milling Stone, Intermediate, and Late Prehistoric. Although Wallace’s synthesis initially lacked chronological precision due to a paucity of absolute dates, this situation has been alleviated by the availability of thousands of radiocarbon dates that have been obtained by southern California researchers in the past three decades. Several revisions have been made to Wallace’s synthesis using radiocarbon dates and projectile point assemblages. The regional prehistoric cultural chronology is summarized in Table IV.L-1 on page IV.L-8.

### *(b) Ethnographic Overview*

Post-contact history for the state of California is generally divided into three periods: the Spanish period, Mexican period, and American period. Although Spanish, Russian, and British explorers visited the area for brief periods between 1529 and 1769, the Spanish

**Table IV.L-1  
Prehistoric Cultural Chronology**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Key Characteristics</b>	<b>Date Range</b>
Early Man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diverse mixture of hunting and gathering</li> <li>• Greater emphasis on hunting</li> </ul>	ca. 10,000–6000 B.C.
Milling Stone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsistence strategies centered on collecting plant foods and small animals</li> <li>• Extended and loosely flexed burials</li> </ul>	6000–3000 B.C.
Intermediate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shift toward a hunting and maritime subsistence strategy, along with a wider use of plant foods</li> <li>• Trend toward greater adaptation to regional or local resources</li> <li>• Fully flexed burials, placed facedown or faceup, and oriented toward the north or west</li> </ul>	3000 B.C.–A.D. 500
Late Prehistoric	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in the use of plant food resources, as well as an increase in land and sea mammal hunting</li> <li>• Increase in the diversity and complexity of material culture</li> <li>• Increased usage of the bow and arrow</li> <li>• Increase in population size, accompanied by the advent of larger, more permanent villages</li> </ul>	A.D. 500–Historic Contact
<p><i>Source: SWCA Environmental Consultants, 2022.</i></p>		

period in California begins with the establishment in 1769 of a settlement at San Diego and the founding of Mission San Diego de Alcalá, the first of 21 missions constructed between 1769 and 1823. Independence from Spain in 1821 marks the beginning of the Mexican period, and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, ending the Mexican–American War, signals the beginning of the American period, when California became a territory of the United States.

The Project Area is within the traditional territory of the Gabrielino. Surrounding native groups included the Chumash and Tataviam/Alliklik to the north, the Serrano to the east, and the Luiseño/Juaneño to the south. SWCA’s understanding of traditional tribal territories, sometimes referred to as ethnogeography, relies on multiple sources of information, including ethnographic, linguistic, and archaeological data. Revisions have been made over time to account for new insights and there continues to be discussion among scholars and researchers over specific designations. For example, King has argued that adjustments should be made to ethnolinguistic territories within the San Fernando Valley, which were originally made by Kroeber and maintained in Heizer’s seminal ethnographic summary. Specifically, he cites the boundary between the Gabrielino and the Serrano, commonly delineated as the crest of the San Gabriel Mountains, which he claims may have been actually extended to the south side of the range. King also

maintains a division between western and eastern Gabrielino territories. Johnson urges caution in adopting all of King's proposed revisions, and in pointing out some of the shortcomings in his approach, Johnson highlights many of the subtleties inherent to ethnogeography.

The context in which a traditional territory is put forth should always be considered, especially where there are implications regarding tribal identities of the past and present. Even with the attempts by scholars to incorporate Native American oral history, the conclusions of any one scholarly work may not necessarily be shared by those within descendant Native American communities, and the ancestral ties of a contemporary group to a specific location may vary from published sources. The Fernandño Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) offer an example of this, which has relevance to the Project. The FTBMI, descendants of the Tataviam, are based in the San Fernando Valley, and define their ancestral territory within a range that overlap portions of territories, which would otherwise be ascribed to Gabrielino, Chumash, and Serrano. An overview of the various traditional tribal territories that intersect with the Project Area is provided below

*(i) Gabrielino*

The Project Area is in the ancestral territory of the Gabrielino. The name "Gabrielino" (sometimes spelled Gabrieleno or Gabrieleño) denotes those people who were enslaved by the Spanish from Mission San Gabriel. By the same token, Native Americans in the sphere of influence of Mission San Fernando were historically referred to as Fernandño. This group's language is now considered to be a regional dialect of the Gabrielino language, along with the Santa Catalina Island and San Nicolas Island dialects. In the post-European contact period, Mission San Gabriel included Natives of the greater Los Angeles area, as well as members of surrounding groups such as Kitanemuk, Serrano, and Cahuilla.

There is little evidence that the people now called Gabrielino had a broad term for their group; rather, they identified themselves as an inhabitant of a specific community with locational suffixes (e.g., a resident of Yaanga was called a Yabit, much the same way that a resident of New York is called a New Yorker). Native words suggested as labels for the broader group of Native Americans in the Los Angeles region include Tongva (or Tong-v) and Kizh (Kij or Kichereno), although there is evidence that these terms originally referred to local places or smaller groups of people within the larger group that are now called Gabrielino. Nevertheless, many present-day descendants of these people have taken on Tongva as a preferred group name because it has a Native rather than Spanish origin. The term Gabrielino is used in the remainder of the Tribal Cultural Resources Report to designate Native people of the Los Angeles Basin, San Fernando, San Bernardino, and San Gabriel Valleys, San Nicolas, Santa Catalina, and San Clemente Islands. Gabrielino

also refers to the living descendants of ancestral Native Americans within these areas, whose cultural affiliations and identities may not be strictly confined to one group.

The Gabrielino subsistence economy was centered on gathering and hunting. The surrounding environment was rich and varied, and the tribe exploited mountains, foothills, valleys, deserts, riparian, estuarine, and open and rocky coastal eco-niches. Like most Native Californians, acorns were their staple food (an established industry by the time of the Early Intermediate period). Inhabitants supplemented acorns with the roots, leaves, seeds, and fruits of a variety of flora (e.g., islay, cactus, yucca, sages, and agave). Freshwater and saltwater fish, shellfish, birds, reptiles, and insects, as well as large and small mammals, were also consumed.

The Gabrielino used a variety of tools and implements to gather and collect food resources. These included the bow and arrow, traps, nets, blinds, throwing sticks and slings, spears, harpoons, and hooks. Groups residing near the ocean used oceangoing plank canoes and tule balsa canoes for fishing, travel, and trade between the mainland and the Channel Islands. Gabrielino people processed food with a variety of tools, including hammer stones and anvils, mortars and pestles, manos and metates, strainers, leaching baskets and bowls, knives, bone saws, and wooden drying racks. Food was consumed from a variety of vessels. Catalina Island steatite was used to make ollas and cooking vessels.

At the time of Spanish arrival in the region, the basis of Gabrielino religious life was the Chinigchinich religion, centered on the last of a series of heroic mythological figures. Chinigchinich gave instruction on laws and institutions, and also taught the people how to dance, the primary religious act for this society. He later withdrew into heaven, where he rewarded the faithful and punished those who disobeyed his laws. The Chinigchinich religion seems to have been relatively new when the Spanish arrived. It was spreading south into the southern Takic groups even as Christian missions were being built and may represent a mixture of Native and Christian belief and practices.

Deceased Gabrielino were either buried or cremated, with inhumation more common on the Channel Islands and the neighboring mainland coast, and cremation predominating on the remainder of the coast and in the interior. Remains were buried in distinct burial areas, either associated with villages or without apparent village association. Cremation ashes have been found in archaeological contexts buried within stone bowls and in shell dishes, as well as scattered among broken ground stone implements. Archaeological data such as these correspond with ethnographic descriptions of an elaborate mourning ceremony that included a variety of offerings, such as seeds, stone grinding tools, otter skins, baskets, wood tools, shell beads, bone and shell ornaments, and projectile points and knives. Offerings varied with the sex and status of the deceased.

The earliest European visits to the Gabrielino and Tataviam region began with the Cabrillo, Viscaïno, and other naval explorers who reached the southern California coast in the 1500s. The first land expedition through the study area occurred in A.D. 1769 when Gaspar de Portolá led an overland expedition from the newly established settlement at San Diego to San Francisco Bay. The traditional lifeways of Native California peoples were dramatically altered by the Spanish mission system and later Mexican and American settlement of the area. The dissolution of their culture alienated them from their traditional subsistence patterns, social customs, and marriage networks. European diseases, against which they had no immunity, reached epidemic proportions, and Native American populations were rapidly decimated. With the secularization of mission lands after 1834, traditional Gabrielino and Tataviam territories were distributed among grants to private owners. The increase in agriculture and the spread of grazing livestock into their collecting and hunting areas made maintaining traditional lifeways increasingly difficult. Although many Gabrielino were eventually subsumed by the mission system, some refused to give up their traditional existence and escaped into the interior regions of the State, where they survived as refugees living with other tribes. Some Gabrielino managed to make a living in the area into the early twentieth century as cowboys, farm hands, and town laborers.

It is estimated that several thousand Gabrielino descendants currently live in the Los Angeles area, though no reservation or rancherias were ever set aside and tribal organizations have not been federally recognized. Several groups of Gabrielino descendants are represented by the Gabrielino-Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, the Gabrielino-Tongva Indian Tribe, the Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, the Gabrielino/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians (Gabrielino-Tongva Indian Tribe), and the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation (Kizh Nation), all of whom actively strive to maintain their cultural legacy.

*(ii) Tataviam*

The Tataviam lived in the upper drainage of the Santa Clara River between the San Fernando Valley to the south and the top of Pastoria Creek in the Tehachapi Mountains to the north. To the east, their ancestral lands extended to part of the southern fringe of Antelope Valley. The core Tataviam population centered on the south sides of the Liebre, Sawmill, and Sierra Pelona Mountains. Neighboring groups include the Ventureño Chumash to the west, Emigdiano Chumash to the north, Kitanemuk to the northeast, Vanyume Serrano to the east, and Western Gabrielino to the south in the San Fernando Valley.

The Tataviam language is a part of the Takic branch of the Uto-Aztecan language family, also spoken by the Western Gabrielino and Kitanemuk. This language family can be traced to the Great Basin area, which represents an origin different from the Chumash. According to Bright, the Tataviam language may be “the remnant, influenced by Takic, of a

language family otherwise unknown in southern California” or the language was probably Takic but not from the Serran or Cupan branches like Kitanemuk and Vanyume, respectively. The Tataviam language probably began to differentiate itself from the others around 1000 B.C. The name “Tataviam” itself is derived from the Kitanemuk’s designation for this group. Kroeber referred to them as the “Alliklik,” named by the Ventureño Chumash to separate them from the Beñeme Serrano in the western Mojave Desert and Antelope Valley.

Information about Tataviam social organization and political structure is relatively limited, but there is no evidence that would substantially differentiate them from the Kitanemuk and Western Gabrielino. Tataviam villages ranged from large centers of around 200 individuals to small settlements of 10 to 15 people. Intermediate-sized settlements were dispersed between the larger centers, with the smaller settlements spaced around the larger ones.

King and Blackburn estimate the total Tataviam population at the time of historic contact at no more than 1,000 people, with the widest possible territorial extent considered. Mortuary practices probably included cremation, as well as a mourning ceremony practiced in late summer or early fall.

Archaeological data, the primary source of information available, indicate broad similarities among the Tataviam, Chumash, and Gabrielino. Considering their environment and available data, it is probable that Tataviam relied more heavily on yucca as a staple than neighboring groups. Additional plant foods most likely included acorns, sage seeds, juniper seeds, and islay berries. Animal resources included small mammals such as rabbits and rodents, as well as deer and possibly antelope. Extensive trade networks developed between inland groups of the desert regions. They traded lithic material and large game animals with coastal groups for marine resources, shell, asphaltum, and steatite.

The first European visit to the general Tataviam area occurred in A.D. 1769, when Lieutenant Colonel Gaspar de Portolá led an overland expedition from the newly established settlement at San Diego in an attempt to find Monterey Bay. They traversed the San Fernando Valley in August 1769, passing to the north of where Mission San Fernando would be founded 28 years later. From there, they entered Tataviam territory in the Newhall-Saugus area through the Fremont Pass. The general vicinity was probably crossed again during the second Portolá expedition in 1770 and by the Friar Francisco Garces expedition in 1776. The Mission of San Fernando was founded in 1798 on the southern fringe of Tataviam lands, and by 1820, most of the population had been baptized at the mission. During this time, Tataviam often intermarried with surrounding Native American groups, most notably the Kitanemuk, and often attended and participated in Chumash ceremonies.

Following the Spanish period, interest in the Santa Clara Valley grew as fur trappers in the early 1800s, the discovery of gold in Placerita Canyon in 1842, and provisioning of miners heading for the gold strikes in the 1850s led to Euro-American settlement, ranching, and agriculture within the valley. Beef, grain, and other foodstuffs in demand by the miners resulted in an economic windfall for the ranches in the valley. As a consequence, the ranchers expanded their range into Tataviam hunting grounds and harvesting fields. Tataviam families and communities intermarried with and were absorbed into other Native American settlements in southern California during the late nineteenth century.

The Tataviam population at the time of European contact was probably no more than 1,000 people. By 1834, nearly all the Tataviam had been baptized at the San Fernando Mission and had married members of other indigenous groups. By 1910, the last native speaker of Tataviam had died. Today, the FTBMI and San Fernando Band of Mission Indians include some of the groups who maintain their ancestral ties to the Tataviam and recognize the San Fernando Valley as part of their traditional territory.

*(c) Native American Settlements in the Spanish and Mexican Periods*

In general, it has proven difficult to establish the precise location of Native American settlements occupied immediately preceding and following Spanish arrival in California approximately 250 years ago. Many of the settlements and so-called villages had long since been abandoned by the time ethnographers, anthropologists, and historians attempted to document any of their locations, at which point Native American lifeways had been irrevocably changed. McCawley quotes Kroeber in his remarks on the subject, writing that “the opportunity to prepare a true map of village locations ‘passed away 50 years ago’”.

Several factors have confounded efforts at relocating former Native American settlements. Firstly, many settlements were recorded with alternative names and spellings. Second, there have been conflicting reports on the meaning and locational reference of the placenames. In addition to differences in the interpretation of a given word, some of the placenames refer to a site using relatively vague terms that could fit several possible locations, or the word may reference a natural feature that no longer exists, such as a type of plant that once grew in an area now fully urbanized.

Third and perhaps most importantly, Native American placenames recorded in historic records and reported in oral histories did not necessarily represent a continually occupied settlement within a discrete location, which is how the term ‘village’ is commonly understood today. Instead, in at least some cases, the settlements were represented by several smaller camps scattered throughout an approximate geography, shaped by natural features that were subject to change over generations. Furthermore, the criteria for what constitutes a village site has been especially lacking in consistency and specificity, even

within a strictly academic context. Much of the debate in this regard concerns whether sites were occupied on a permanent or temporary basis, and archaeological data do not always provide unequivocal evidence to make a reliable classification for a given site.

Within the range of terms put forth to characterize different types of Native American settlements, there are conventions and core insights shared among scholars. Prehistoric sites in coastal California, for example, are commonly referenced in archaeological sources as residential sites, habitation sites, and seasonal camps, whereas the term village is more often used to reference Mission period settlements such as the Chumash site of Humaliwo, Helo', and Muwu, or Luiseño sites such as Topomai. These Spanish and Mexican period sites are also known as rancherías—a term with connotations for a more permanent settlement, which is often used synonymously with village.

*(i) Ranchos and Rancherías*

The term “ranchería” was retained in the early American period. Historical references to a ranchería site could be describing a Native American settlement that became established in and around non-Native American developments, such as ranchos, pueblos, agricultural properties, townsites, etc. Some of these rancherías were formed more as a matter of necessity, becoming a de facto place of residence in otherwise unused territories outside of the non-Native American settlements. Some rancherías were intentionally created spaces within a rancho to house Native American workers. Beginning in 1906, the federal government began to establish rancherías as a term of legal title in the same manner as an Indian reservation. The ranchería as “federally recognized sovereign Indigenous spaces,” was unique to California. The strictly legal context of a ranchería should not be confused with more generalized references to Native American settlements, which is to say, not all places referenced as rancherías were designated as such in the federal and state legal systems.

The relationship of Native American rancherías and their inhabitants to the non-Native American ranchos is profound, and the influence went in both directions. This link is evident even in a strictly geographic sense, as Kroeber writes:

*The Indians of this region, Serrano, Gabrielino, and Luiseño, have long had relations to the old ranchos or land grants, by which chiefly the country was known and designated until the Americans began to dot it with towns. The Indians kept in use... native names for these grants. Some were the designations of the principal village on the grant, others of the particular spot on which the ranch headquarters were erected, still others of camp sites, or hills, or various natural features. (Kroeber 1925:616)*

In fact, several ranchos took their names from the Native American settlements and are the basis for contemporary neighborhoods and cities, such as Kaweenga, Tujunga, Topanga, and Cucamonga.

Beneath the more superficial history of placenames lies more significant economic, social, and cultural relationships that existed between Native American and non-Native American populations. The effect of colonization on Native Americans is a major field of academic discourse, and a detailed account is beyond the scope of this study; however, it is important to recognize some of the more recent scholarship that seeks to recognize the resiliency of Native Americans and the critical role Indian labor played in California history, in the midst of tragedy and loss, the effects of which are still felt among descendent communities. As historian George Phillips states in his book on the subject, “The missions radically altered Indian culture, but they did not destroy Indian people”. Phillips continues:

*By examining how Indians adjusted to the new work regime and by describing how many became efficient workers, the focus remains on the Indians themselves. Recognizing adaptation and efficiency, however, is far different from approving the system in which they were achieved. (Phillips 2010:21)*

Indeed, most of the surviving Native Americans found work in the Spanish- and Mexican-era ranchos, and it was Indian labor that constituted the majority of what would be considered the working class, which was especially true for the ranchos. As mentioned above, new settlements—rancherías—were often established as a direct result of the work being provided on ranchos, and at the same time other so-called village sites or rancherías that had been traditionally occupied became abandoned as Native American populations adapted to the new circumstances. Some of the placenames for these newly established rancherías were essentially synonymous with that of the rancho and were often referenced as “Indian Camps” in texts and various maps. Given the association between the rancho and Native American settlements, plat maps drawn in the middle to late nineteenth century are especially important in giving more precision to potential settlement locations. This is because maps drawn from this era were drawn using more modern surveying techniques that can be fit to contemporary geographic coordinate systems, which allows for greater accuracy and precision in identifying the current location of historically mapped features.

In other cases, the ranchería was established as a means of forced relocation and instituted as an action on the part of the local government. Compared with rancherías whose development was more integral and interwoven with that of the ranchos with which they were associated, rancherías created as a means of forced relocation were often abrupt and were ultimately short-lived. Such was the case for Rancho de los Pipimares, Ranchería de Poblanos, Pueblito, and unnamed rancherías located in the downtown Los Angeles area in the 1820s and 1840s. One unintended consequence of the forced relocations is that the locations of the settlements were often described in more specific

detail (e.g., between specific streets), which is more readily identifiable on the contemporary street grid.

*(d) Los Angeles Basin and San Fernando Valley Settlements*

Six former Native American settlements identified in the region include: Passenga and Kaweenga in the northern portion of the Project Area; Yaanga and two rancheria sites in the downtown Los Angeles Project Area; and Guaspeta in the Ballona area, a subregion in the western part of the Los Angeles Basin and the southern Project Area. The Site Locations are within the following seven Spanish and Mexican period ranchos: Ballona, Las Cienegas, Los Felis, Ex-Mission de San Fernando, Rincon de los Bueyes, San Rafael, and Sausal Redondo.

When assessing the mapped locations of these settlements relative to Project components, it is important to consider the classifications of settlement types discussed in the preceding section, specifically between archaeological sites, villages, and rancherias. Generally, archaeological sites are relatively small, and because they are based on recovered material remains, their locations are well known and mapped to very discrete areas. However, the material remains recorded as an archaeological site may only be a representative sample of what was once present and may still be preserved outside the mapped boundary. Villages and rancheria sites tend to imply a larger area whose location is known only more generally, which may be associated with one or more archaeological sites or geographic localities.

To summarize, different types of Native American settlements vary in how well their former locations are known and in the size of their footprints—the area in which any associated physical remains might be distributed. These variations correspond to differences in the tribal cultural resources sensitivity for a given project locality. While the sensitivity analysis conducted here is explicitly geographic in nature and focuses on the likelihood for material remains, it is important to remember that these settlements were once communities of indigenous people. Many of these places still have meaning and value to California Native American tribes, whether or not the specific boundary of a given settlement can be determined and regardless of there being any physical remains preserved.

The following section describes Native American settlements and placenames identified in the vicinity of the new Site Locations proposed by the Project. The sections are organized to reflect the geographic range of the Site Locations across the San Fernando Valley, downtown Los Angeles area, and the Ballona area in the western part of the Los Angeles Basin.

*(i) San Fernando Valley*

The San Fernando Valley included many settlements affiliated with Gabrielino, Tataviam, and Chumash groups, possibly Serrano as well. Many of these sites are also affiliated with extensive archaeological assemblages, although some of these clearly pre-date specific named settlements or are otherwise not associated with a named place. These include the sites of Achoicominga, Pakooynga, Siutcabit, Ceegenga, Tujubit, Vijabit, and Vijanga. Most of these sites were located almost exclusively in the toeslopes of foothills surrounding the San Fernando Valley, especially near springs and other water sources, including along the Los Angeles River to the south. The same pattern of settlements along the Los Angeles River appears in maps by Johnston and Gumprecht, all of whom used common sources in their depiction of Native American villages and archaeological site locations based on generalized associations relative to various landmarks depicted at a regional level. The sites nearest to any of the Site Locations include Passenga and Kaweenga.

Passenga

Passenga (alternatively spelled or referred to as Pasheekwnga, Pasenkngna, Paseknga, Pasheeknga, Passanga, Pachanga, Patzanga, Pasecg-na, Passecubit) is frequently referenced in baptism and marriage registers from the San Fernando and San Gabriel Missions. There are 14 entries dating from 1797 to 1804 in the San Fernando Mission baptismal register listing an individual from Passenga, or a variation of that spelling. Passenga has traditionally been regarded as inhabited by Fernandeano speakers; however, King associated Passenga as having a strictly Tataviam affiliation. Indeed, much of the information available on the site comes from Tataviam ethnographic research by Alfred L. Kroeber and John P. Harrington. Kroeber interviewed Juan José Fustero in 1912 as his sole source. Harrington also interviewed Fustero in 1913, as well as several of his Kitanemuk consultants from Tejon Ranch, but most notably his information on Fernandeano placenames came from information supplied by Setimo “Moraga” Lopez, who was born about 1854.

There is no consensus in these sources for the location of Passenga. Lopez defines the placename as having referred to “the whole place of the [San Fernando] Mission,” and said the “rancheria of San Fernando Mission was east of the mission—where the packing house is now”. Baptismal records include notes referencing the “site of Passenga a short distance from the mission”. Although the location of Passenga is noted as being close to the site of the mission, Hugo Reid unequivocally stated that “Pasecg-na” is not the native village at the mission and that the San Fernando baptismal record states the “mission was founded in the place called by the natives Achoiscomihabit.” King’s account endorses Reid’s perspective on this issue, and he recognizes two locations as possibilities for Passenga: the packing house east of the mission and the complex of archaeological sites designated as the Porter Ranch complex. Overview maps published by both King and

Johnson ultimately plot Passenga in a somewhat generalized way— Johnson’s location is directly north of Mission San Fernando, King’s more to the northeast. The FTBMI’s map of their traditional territory and settlements plots the site in a location similar to that of King. These two locations—north and northeast of the Mission San Fernando—are retained here and referenced as Passenga (1) and Passenga (2), respectively.

### Kaweenga

Among the many Native American settlements in the San Fernando, the site of Kaweenga was prominent. Alternative spellings for the site from mission registers and ethnographic accounts include Kawenga, Kawengna, Kawengnavit, Kawepet, Cabuenga, and Cabuepet. The Hispanicized version of Kaweenga is the modern placename of Cahuenga. Kaweenga means “Place of the Mountain,” most likely a reference to what is now known as Cahuenga Peak. The site is recorded as having a historical association with Rancho Cahuenga, which helps to approximate the settlement’s location. McCawley cited the village site as having been located in what is now Universal City, but others have noted that he “has probably confused the tract of land called Cahuenga, which is located in the center of Rancho Providencia in the modern city of Burbank, with the Campo de Cahuenga (Cahuenga House), which is located at the foot of Cahuenga Pass”.

Ciolek-Torrello and colleagues surmise that Kaweenga, like other Native American settlements, was likely a composite of many smaller settlements (or rancherias) located in a general area rather than being one settlement. They note the strategic location of the area along the south bank of the Los Angeles River and between the foothills to the south and basin to the north. The San Gabriel and San Fernando missions recorded hundreds of Native Americans who identified as having come from Kaweenga. Little else is known about Kaweenga, including where it was located location, although work at the Campo de Cahuenga has at least confirmed that no evidence for an eighteenth century or earlier Native American settlement in that locality. The adobe at Campo de Cahuenga was built between 1797 and 1833 and is depicted on several land grant maps produced in the mid-nineteenth century.

### *(ii) Downtown Los Angeles*

### Yaanga

Yaanga is among the major Native American communities encountered by the Portola party when they passed through the Los Angeles Basin in 1769. Yaanga is referenced in mission registers and ethnographic accounts that incorporate the following alternative spellings and names: Yang-na, Yangna, and Yabit. The location of Yaanga has long been considered synonymous with that of Los Angeles, first as the Spanish pueblo, then the town and city. Historians and archaeologists have presented multiple possible village locations in the general area of the plaza and church, around which Los Angeles

developed. However, like the pueblo itself, it is likely that the village was relocated from time to time due to major shifts of the Los Angeles River during years of intense flooding. Dillon presented an exhaustive review of the potential locations, most within several blocks of the pueblo plaza. Johnston concluded that “in all probability *Yangna* lay scattered in a fairly wide zone along the whole arc [from the base of Fort Moore Hill to Union Station], and its bailiwick included as well seed-gathering grounds and oak groves where seasonal camps were set up”.

Aside from the ethnographic evidence suggesting the location of these villages, little direct, indisputable archaeological evidence for the location of either village has been produced to date. Archaeological materials reportedly were unearthed during the construction of Union Station in 1939, and “considerably more” in 1970 during the rebuilding of the Bella Union Hotel on the 300 block of North Main Street, one mile northeast from the Project Area. The preponderance of available evidence indicates that there were one or more early historic period Native American communities west of the Los Angeles River near the original plaza site. This assumption is supported through several lines of ethnographic evidence, including the expedition journal of Fr. Juan Crespi and engineer Miguel Costansó, both of whom were associated with the 1769 Portolá expedition. The notes from these sources indicate the village was located between 2.0 and 2.4 km (1.3 and 1.5 miles) west southwest from the Los Angeles River on high-level ground. The Pueblo of Los Angeles was documented to have been founded directly adjacent to this village. The location of Yaanga was also referenced by long-time Los Angeles resident Narciso Botello and Gabrielino consultant José María Zalvidea, who indicated that Yaanga was originally located adjacent to the original site of the Los Angeles plaza.

A second village, known as Geveronga, has also been described in ethnographic accounts as immediately adjoining the Pueblo of Los Angeles, though much like Yaanga, its location can only be inferred from ethnographic information.

After the settlement of Los Angeles in 1781, Yaanga faced many new challenges because of its proximity to the new city. The last recorded birth at Yaanga is believed to have been in 1813, after which the village was forced to relocate south of the original site. This new village, known as *Ranchería de los Poblanos* by the Angelenos, is believed to have been located at the intersection of Los Angeles Street and 1st Street. *Ranchería de los Poblanos* proved to be the first of at least five forced relocations of Native Americans between 1836 and 1847. These sites were historically referred to as *rancherías*.

### Downtown Los Angeles Rancherías

The history of the Native American settlement during the Mexican period is one of forced relocation and adaptation. *Ranchería de Los Poblanos* persisted for approximately

10 years, between 1826 and 1836, after which the indigenous population was forced to relocate to a plot of land near Commercial and Alameda Streets. This rancharia existed for approximately another 10 years, between 1836 and 1845, during which nearby land owners attempted to forcibly relocate them to obtain more land for agricultural use. When they were finally successful, the Native American community was once again forced to relocate even further east, across the Los Angeles River to a site called Pueblito, which itself was razed in 1847, at which time legislation was passed to require the indigenous population to live in dispersed settlements or with their employers throughout the city.

(iii) *Ballona Region*

Guaspet

Guaspet (alternately referred to in Spanish Mission registers as Guaspet, Guasna, Guashna, Guachpet, Guashpet) has been identified through historical and ethnographic sources and was likely located within the vicinity of the Ballona wetlands. Guaspet and the archaeological complex in the Ballona region were studied in detail by SRI beginning in 1989, the results of which are summarized in a volume by Douglass et al. Their work carefully distinguishes the extensive prehistoric archaeological sites, which consist of various types of settlements occupied over thousands of years, and the Native American community in the Ballona area that was referenced in Spanish-period mission records. While some debate may still exist, all accounts of Guaspet point to an area either on the bluffs to the south of Ballona Creek or in the lowlands near the creek.

The Ballona area, composed of the wetland, creek, bluffs, and beach, was clearly important to Native American lifeways as demonstrated through archaeological and ethnographic evidence. Maps attempting to plot significant settlements or places in the Ballona region have typically included one or more locational markers along the east side of Ballona Creek and wetlands. Kroeber included the placename *Sa'an* in this location—on the north side of Ballona Creek at its confluence with the bay—and apparently intended the name as a region. No historical documents, including baptism or marriage records, have been found that refer to a place by this name. Later, W.W. Robinson posited the name *Guacho* or *Huacho*—meaning “high place” or abandoned—as referring to the Westchester Bluffs, which he determined after consultation with Cristóbal Machado. Cristóbal, one of the descendants of Augustin Machado and heir to his Ballona Rancho, is reported to have said that local Indians working as laborers for Augustin in the 1830s had placed their huts not far from the Machado ranch house, located near the Jefferson and Sepulveda Boulevards, and a second group placed them against the hills near Loyola Marymount University.

In her map of Gabrielino settlements, Bernice Johnston reinstated Kroeber’s regional term but added the Gabrielino locational suffix “-nga,” making *Sa'angna* a specific village, despite her having found no mention of the term in baptismal records. Attempts to

identify the location of the village in the archaeological record failed to produce reliable candidates. The archaeological site CA-LAN-47 was identified as a potential location of *Sa'angna* at one point but was demonstrated through dating of its materials to have been abandoned more than 550 years before Spanish arrival.<sup>7</sup>

### (3) Records Search

#### (a) *California Historical Resources Information System*

A records search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) was conducted by SWCA staff at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University Fullerton on August 18, 2022, for the Site Locations and a surrounding 0.25-mile radius. In addition to the CHRIS search conducted by the SCCIC, SWCA also reviewed archival CHRIS data already on file for several of the Project locations. This review included data for areas outside a 0.25-mile radius of the Site Locations and was incorporated based on professional judgement and the availability of data needed to characterize the existing conditions and inform the analysis of the potential for buried resources within a given Project Location.

The SCCIC maintains records of previously documented archaeological resources (including those that meet the definition of a tribal cultural resource) and technical cultural resource studies. The SCCIC also maintains copies of the California Office of Historic Preservation's (OHP's) portion of the Historic Resources Inventory. SWCA requested a confidential search of the CHRIS for each of the Site Locations plus a 0.25-mile radius. Confidential CHRIS results include specific information on the nature and location of sensitive archaeological sites, which should not be disclosed to the public or unauthorized persons and are exempt from the Freedom of Information Act. The information included in a confidential CHRIS records search is needed to assess the sensitivity for undocumented tribal cultural resources and inform the impact analysis. SWCA's CHRIS search excluded information on non-archaeological resources or any previous studies. Rather, only information on previously recorded archaeological sites within the 0.25-mile radius were requested.

The results of the SCCIC's search were received on August 18, 2022, and identified 68 previously recorded archaeological resources within the search radius (Table IV.L-2 on page IV.L-22). Of these six were identified as having components affiliated with Native Americans, and one of these was mapped to an area in which a Site Location is proposed: FF-1 is located within the southern portion of the boundary for Site CA-LAN-1575/H. The SCCIC search results identified a second site (LAN-4660H) mapped directly within the

---

<sup>7</sup> For all references to archaeological sites, the prefix CA- will be omitted.

**Table IV.L-2**  
**Previously Recorded Resources with Native American Components Identified within a 0.25-Mile Radius of Site Locations**

Primary Number	Trinomial Number	Type	Resource Description	Project Region	Relationship to Project Structure
P-19-000007	CA-LAN-7/H	Prehistoric and Historic Site	Granite metate and mano considered as possible Native American artifacts otherwise contained in historic period refuse deposit associated with 1860s–1870s Chinatown.	Downtown Los Angeles	Outside: northwest of NFF-8; west-northwest of FF-1
P-19-000054	CA-LAN-54/H	Prehistoric and Historic Site	Multicomponent site with prehistoric component (late Millingstone and early to middle Intermediate periods) and late-historic period materials.	South: Ballona	Outside: south of FF-29 and south of FF-30
P-19-001575	CA-LAN-1575/H	Prehistoric and Historic Site	Native American burials and artifact scatter identified during construction of the Metropolitan Water District Headquarters building.	Downtown Los Angeles	Within: FF-1 located in the south-central portion of the mapped site boundary
P-19-004662	CA-LAN-4662	Prehistoric Site	Femur dated to 3640–3560 years cal B.P., identified 19 feet below grade in stream gravel deposits of the Los Angeles River	Downtown Los Angeles	Outside: north of NFF-13
P-19-100281	—	Prehistoric Artifact	Sandstone bowl identified 3 m (approximately 10 feet) below the surface in stream deposited sand	North	Outside: southeast of NFF-3
P-19-100515	—	Prehistoric and Historic	Three shell fragments of species commonly associated with Native American sites (two <i>Haliotis</i> sp. and one <i>Tivela stultorum</i> ) identified with historic period materials	Downtown Los Angeles	Outside: northwest of NFF-8; west-northwest of FF-1

Source: SWCA Environmental Consultants, 2022.

Project Area for TCN Structure NFF-13; however, LAN-4660H lacks any Native American components and the archaeological features were all identified outside the Project Area. The remaining 61 archaeological sites identified in the CHRIS results are all located outside of the Project Area (within a 0.25-mile radius) and consist exclusively of historic period materials that are not affiliated with Native Americans or otherwise considered to be a tribal cultural resource. Notable prehistoric archaeological sites located outside a 0.25-mile radius of Site Locations and Historic Period Archaeological Sites are shown in Table IV.L-3 on page IV.L-24.

In addition to site LAN-4660H, which is mapped directly within the project area for TCN Structure NFF-13, SWCA's supplemental background research identified 12 additional archaeological sites in the vicinity of proposed Site Locations. These results include some sites dated to the historic period that lack any Native American component. Collectively, these resources help inform the general setting and potential for additional resources to be located in a given location. The results are summarized in Table IV.L-3, which calls out the geographic portion of the Project Area in proximity to the resource. The section that follows summarizes more detailed information regarding sites near Site Locations that have particular relevance to the assessment of the potential for buried tribal cultural resources within the areas subject to ground disturbance during Project implementation.

*(i) Native American Sites in San Fernando Valley: San Fernando (North)*

P-19-100281

P-19-100281 is a prehistoric isolated find consisting of a whole sandstone bowl documented in 1998 by Alice Hale of Greenwood and Associates. The sandstone bowl was discovered during the excavation of the South Fire Protection Vault for the construction of the Red Line Subway Project, North Hollywood Station. The isolated find was identified at a depth of ten ft below the surface in stream-deposited sand, on the west side of Lankershim Boulevard between Chandler Boulevard and Weddington Street, and southeast of NFF-3. The bowl was "globular" in shape and measured 9.8 inches (in) in diameter, 4.7 in in height, and 3.7 in in depth with possible asphaltum staining around the rim. No other cultural remains were observed in association with the bowl.

*(ii) Historic Period Resources in San Fernando Valley: Universal City (North)*

Campo de Cahuenga Memorial Park (LAN-1945H) and Adjacent Sites

Campo de Cahuenga Memorial Park (LAN-1945H) consists of the remains of a historic-era adobe structure, an associated refuse-filled trench, a refuse scatter. There is also an associated brick-lined well designated separately as LAN-2394H. The original

**Table IV.L-3  
Notable Prehistoric Archaeological Sites Located Outside a 0.25-Mile Radius of Site Locations and Historic Period Archaeological Sites  
Resources Included in the CHRIS Search**

Primary Number	Trinomial Number	Type	Resource Description	Project Region	Relationship to Project Structure
P-19-000034	CA-LAN-34	Prehistoric Site	"San Fernando Metate Site" with "piles of metates" and a few other milling stones	North: San Fernando	Outside: greater than 0.25 mile east-southeast of FF-22 and FF-24
P-19-000255	CA-LAN-255	Prehistoric Site	Possible cemetery and or habitation site that has been destroyed by an aqueduct system	North: San Fernando	Outside: greater than 0.25 mile north of FF-22 and FF-24
P-19-000629	CA-LAN-629	Prehistoric Site	Isolated burial eroding out of an arroyo, about six feet below the surface dated to 600 ± 50 years B.P. The site consisted of one burial, a young adult male estimated to be about 18 years old, and associated with 3500+ shell and steatite beads, 4 concave base projectile points, 2 bone awls, 2 deer rib fleshers, carved antler object, split deer metapodials and raccoon or coyote tibia.	North: San Fernando	Outside: greater than 0.25 mile south of FF-22 and FF-24
P-19-000644	CA-LAN-644	Prehistoric Site	Scatter of manos, metates, lithic detritus, and cores	North: San Fernando	Outside: greater than 0.25 mile south of FF-22 and FF-24
P-19-004226	CA-LAN-4226	Prehistoric Site	Group of nine artifacts identified during monitoring: two pestles (one granitic and the other a sedimentary material), large granitic bowl fragment, granitic hammerstone, chalcedony core, quartzite metate basin, jasper tested cobble, chalcedony angular waste, and granitic ground stone palette with ochre residue	North: San Fernando	Outside: greater than 0.25 mile south of FF-22 and FF-24
P-19-001945	CA-LAN-1945H	Historic Site	Campo de Cahuenga: the remains of a historic-era adobe structure, an associated refuse-filled trench, a refuse scatter, and a brick-lined well (LAN-2394H). No Native American components identified.	North: Universal City	Outside: north of NFF-4 and north of NFF-5

**Table IV.L3 (Continued)**  
**Notable Prehistoric Archaeological Sites Located Outside a 0.25-Mile Radius of Site Locations and Historic Period Archaeological Sites Resources Included in the CHRIS Search**

Primary Number	Trinomial Number	Type	Resource Description	Project Region	Relationship to Project Structure
P-19-002394	CA-LAN-2394H	Historic Site	Historic-era trash filled trench and a truncated round, red brick-lined well identified under approximately 21 feet 7 inches of fill soil associated with site LAN-1945H). No Native American components identified.	North: Universal City	Outside: southwest of NFF-4 and southwest of NFF-5
P-19-002804	CA-LAN-2804H	Historic Site	Three historic-era artifact concentrations with ceramics, glass bottles, cutlery, dishes, bowls, cups, wash basins, pots, pans, horseshoes, etc. No Native American components identified.	North: Universal City	Outside: north of NFF-4 and north of NFF-5
P-19-003303	CA-LAN-3303H	Historic Site	Large domestic trash dump site identified 25 feet below the surface and most likely buried by flooding of the Los Angeles River in 1938. No Native American components identified.	North: Universal City	Outside: west of NFF-4 and west of NFF-5
P-19-003304	CA-LAN-3304H	Historic Site	Large trash pit composed of automobile parts and newspapers. No Native American components identified.	North: Universal City	Outside: north of NFF-4 and north of NFF-5
P-19-003305	CA-LAN-3305H	Historic Site	Domestic trash dump site associated with multi-family condominiums consisting of glass bottles, ceramics, Melmac, metal, bones, shell, and other domestic refuse. No Native American components identified.	North: Universal City	Outside: northwest of NFF-4 and northwest of NFF-5
P-19-004660	CA-LAN-4660H	Historic Site	Paving stones, streetcar tracks (ca. 1897–1963), and railroad spike.	Downtown Los Angeles	Within: NFF-13 located in the south-central portion of the mapped site boundary and outside archaeological components recorded within the site boundary

**Table IV.L3 (Continued)**  
**Notable Prehistoric Archaeological Sites Located Outside a 0.25-Mile Radius of Site Locations and Historic Period Archaeological Sites Resources Included in the CHRIS Search**

Primary Number	Trinomial Number	Type	Resource Description	Project Region	Relationship to Project Structure
<p><i>Source: SWCA Environmental Consultants, 2022.</i></p>					

ranch house was the location where the Treaty of Cahuenga was signed on January 13, 1847. By 1900, that adobe structure was no longer present and a Spanish Colonial adobe style building was later erected and dedicated by the City of Los Angeles on November 2, 1950. The City of Los Angeles purchased the property of the site for a park that was dedicated as the Fremont-Pico Memorial Park before it was later named Campo de Cahuenga. The resource was listed as Los Angeles Cultural-Historic Monument No. 29 on November 13, 1964, and California State Historical Landmark No. 151 on January 11, 1935. The earliest excavations at this site were conducted by Marshall Miller in the early 1930s, and the majority of archaeological investigations were conducted by WESTEC Services, Inc., in the early 1980s. During monitoring of construction for Metro, Greenwood and Associates observed part of the adobe structure and conducted preliminary excavations. The most recent study of the site was done in 2000 by Greenwood and Associates, who recommended the whole park as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Greenwood and Associates also conducted an excavation north of Campo de Cahuenga at LAN-2804H for Metro in 2000. This site appears to have been a short-order restaurant dating from the early twentieth century and consisted of a continuous scatter of ceramic and glass fragments, building materials, and animal remains in an area measuring approximately 197 ft in length and 164 ft in width. No artifacts affiliated with Native Americans have been identified at these sites.

*(iii) Native American Sites in Downtown Los Angeles*

LAN-7/H

LAN-7/H is an archaeological site that primarily contained historic period deposits but also contained two pieces of ground stone and a brown mission ware (Tezon) ceramic sherd, which are typically associated with Native American activities. The site was initially recorded by Meighan in 1951 and updated by Huey and Romani in 1980. The historic component includes artifacts dating from 1860 to 1880s that are associated with Los Angeles's earliest Chinatown. The site is located west of Union Station and across Alameda Street and was discovered when the area was bulldozed for construction of the Santa Ana Freeway. The only mention of depth in the site records states that the depth of midden is approximately 23.6 in below the surface.

LAN-1575/H

Site LAN-1575/H is a multi-component resource with prehistoric and historic components identified at the present-day location of Union Station. The site included extensive historical features of ca. 1860 to 1930s Chinatown including privies, wells, and architectural remains, as well as a prehistoric Native American cemetery with several primary and secondary internments and numerous prehistoric artifacts. The prehistoric component along with several other prehistoric sites nearby are considered potential remnants of the Gabrielino village of Yaanga. Native American deposits were identified

below, but also partially intermixed with, a stratum of historic period sediments, both of which were underneath a surface stratum of construction fill. The resource was initially identified in 1989 during monitoring of the construction for the Metro-Rail Subway and was then updated twice during Phase I and monitoring projects, with the most recent site update in 2015. Cultural material was observed down to 12 ft below the surface.

Goldberg et al. summarized the results of archaeological data recovery conducted in 1996 by Applied Earthworks for the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) Headquarters Facility Project. The report describes Native American deposits identified below, but also partially intermixed with, a stratum of historic period sediments, of which both were identified underneath a surface stratum of construction fill. The data obtained from LAN-1575/H clearly demonstrate the potential for significant prehistoric archaeological resources to be preserved beneath historic period deposits, which, in turn, can be preserved underneath asphalt and modern construction debris in a fully urbanized setting. The report documents archaeological remains preserved as far below the modern grade as 9.8 feet. The material was discovered within lenses of alluvial sediments deposited during floods within the Los Angeles River floodplain.

In 2019 during construction of Metro's Patsaouras Bus Plaza Station, 13 archaeological features were identified, including Native American human remains and artifacts, as well as historic period deposits (i.e., not affiliated with Native Americans). This new component included materials consistent with the types and ages identified in LAN-1575/H. Some of these new discoveries were identified within the boundary designated for LAN-1575/H, but the majority extend east along Highway 101 and Interstate 10. The new component was identified during mechanical excavation of areas understood to have been extensively disturbed by the Southern California Gas Company's Manufactured Gas Plant, Highway 101, El Monte Busway Bridge, the Metro Red Line, and Patsaouras Plaza, among other developments. Full details and archaeological reporting for this discovery were not available at the time of this study, and the information regarding the contents and location of the discovery were based on publicly available information included in Metro's 2019 board reports (File #2019-0195).

#### LAN-4662

LAN-4662 consists of a single prehistoric Native American bone identified east of Union Station and below the southbound lane of the 900 block of Vignes Street. The resource was identified by AECOM in 2013. The bone is the shaft of a right femur with both epiphyses broken off and is highly permineralized. The femur was encountered during construction activities at a depth of 19 ft below the present street surface, within poorly sorted alluvial deposits, and the surrounding matrix is described as "concretized." The site form postulates that the bone was deposited by the Los Angeles River, and radiocarbon dating yielded a calibrated date of 3640 to 3560 years cal B.P., which places it

within the middle Holocene period. Archaeological testing did not reveal any further remains.

#### P-19-100515

P-19-100515 was originally recorded in 2005 by D. Slawson for Greenwood and Associates as a historic isolated find that consisted of dark brown loam mixed with coal ash and cinders, as well as a range of additional cultural material dating from the 1840s through ca. 1900. The majority of the diagnostic artifacts date from 1830 to 1900. The cultural remains were discovered during the course of City sewer pipe repair within Republic Street, an alley, immediately southwest of Plaza de Los Angeles in the City's central district. Cultural material was observed down to nine ft below the surface and included red brick fragments, large mammal bone, rusted metal, bottle glass, and a variety of domestic ceramic ware.

The resource was later categorized as a multi-component site in 2005 by A. Hale during emergency sewer repairs. Historic-era ceramics and glass artifacts embedded in the sewer line backfill soils at two different locations, and the cultural materials dated from 1813 through 1947. Three shell fragments were documented that are commonly associated with Native American sites: two *Haliotis* sp. fragments and a *Tivela stultorum*.

#### *(iv) Historic Period Sites in Downtown Los Angeles*

#### LAN-4660/H

LAN-4660/H is a historic period archaeological site that consists of paving stone, two sets of narrow-gauge streetcar tracks, and a railroad spike that were recovered during utility excavation along Macy Street. The tracks were preserved directly beneath the surface asphalt and in the center of the street. The paving stones were recovered from different locations between 8 and 10 feet below the existing grade and had been dislocated from their original location as part of a former street surface. Several railways have been constructed along Macy Street, the first of which was built in 1897 as part of the Los Angeles Railway Company, which was eventually absorbed into the Pacific Electric (Red Car) network. Versions of the streetcar system remained in use until 1963.

#### *(v) Native American Sites in the Ballona Region (South)*

#### LAN-54/H

LAN-54/H is a multi-component site with both historic-era and prehistoric components that was originally recorded in 1949 by J. and H. Eberhart of the University of California. The resource was originally recorded as a probable prehistoric village site located approximately 0.25 mile north of Ballona Creek. The site record states that the

UCLA Anthropology Department was in possession of a human bone from the site and that the cultural materials included a chopper, a possible lithic knife, two core scrapers, a possible “scraper plane,” and shell.

The site record was updated in 2002 by S. Kremkau of Statistical Research, Inc. as a multi-component resource during data recovery excavations. The resource contained primarily prehistoric deposits, but features associated with the early twentieth century were also present. A total of 32 features were recorded during the data recovery in LAN-54/H, including artifact concentrations, possible hearth clean out deposits with abundant fire-affected rock fragments, lithic/ground stone concentrations, mortuary/ritual features that included three primary inhumations, and historic-era/modern features near or beneath the former Blue Goose Packing House. The depth of cultural deposits was up to 6.6 ft below the surface.

#### (4) Sensitivity Assessment

The CHRIS records search identified one known tribal cultural resource mapped directly within the Project Area: LAN-1575/H, located in downtown Los Angeles and directly within the Project Area for Site Location FF-1. A second historic-period archaeological site, LAN-4660H, was identified directly within the Project Area for TCN Structure NFF-13; however, the site lacks any Native American components and the TCN Structure avoids the archaeological components within the mapped site boundary. The CHRIS search and supplemental background research also identified several additional previously recorded archaeological sites and former Native American settlements in close proximity to 12 Site Locations which are summarized in Table IV.L-4 on page IV.L-31. Maps showing the spatial relationships of the archaeological sites and the Site Locations are included in Confidential Attachment B of the Tribal Cultural Resources Report.

##### *(a) San Fernando Valley: San Fernando and Universal City (North)*

The northern region of the Project Area is within the San Fernando Valley. Within this region, SWCA identified two former Native American settlements—Passenga and Kaweenga—and several archaeological resources that are outside but in proximity to six Site Locations: FF-5, FF-22, FF-24, NFF-4, and NFF-5.

Passenga is reported to have been situated somewhere north or east of the San Fernando Mission, which is in the northernmost portions of the Project Area near Site Locations FF-22 and FF-24. Several archaeological sites have been recorded between 0.25 mile and one mile of the Site Locations FF-22 and FF-24. These include several that have been designated as part of an archaeological complex surrounding the Van Norman Reservoir in the foothills to the south. Within the north region of the Project Area and in the central part of the San Fernando Valley, an isolated Native American artifact was identified

**Table IV.L-4  
Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity of Site Locations**

<b>Tribal Cultural Resources Sensitivity</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Geographic Region</b>	<b>Site Location(s)</b>
High	Site Location within LAN-1575/H and in the approximate location of Yaanga and Indian rancherias occupied from ca. 1836 to 1845.	Downtown Los Angeles	FF-1
High	Site Location near LAN-1575/H and in the approximate location of Yaanga; likely to encounter sediments similar to those in which Native American human remains were identified in river cobbles (LAN-4662)	Downtown Los Angeles	FF-2, FF-3
High	Site Location near LAN-1575/H and in the approximate location of Yaanga and Indian rancherias occupied from ca. 1836 to 1845.	Downtown Los Angeles	NFF-8
High	Site Location near LAN-1575/H and near Yaanga; likely to encounter sediments similar to those in which Native American human remains were identified in river cobbles (LAN-4662)	Downtown Los Angeles	NFF-13
High	Site Location near archaeological site with buried Native American components (LAN-54/H)	South (Ballona Area)	FF-29, FF-30
Moderate	Site Location in the vicinity of P19100281, an isolated Native American artifact.	North	NFF-3
Moderate	Site Location in the vicinity of Passenga and several Native American archaeological sites, including several recorded as the Van Norman Reservoir Archaeological District	North (San Fernando)	FF-22, FF-24
Moderate	Site Location in the vicinity of Kaweenga and is adjacent to the Campo de Cahuenga site (LAN-1945H) as well as other historic period archaeological sites	North (San Fernando)	FF-5, NFF-4, NFF-5
Low to Moderate	Baseline sensitivity	Downtown Los Angeles	FF-4, FF-6, FF-7, FF-8, FF-9, FF-10, FF-11, FF-12, NFF-2, NFF-6, NFF-16, NFF-21, NFF-22
Low to Moderate	Baseline sensitivity	North	NFF-22, FF-13, FF-14, FF-15, FF-16, FF-17, FF-18, FF-19, FF-20, FF-25, NFF-1, NFF-9, NFF-10
Low to Moderate	Baseline sensitivity	South	NFF-10, FF-21, FF-23, FF-26, FF-27, FF-28, FF-31, FF-32, FF-33, FF-34, NFF-7, NFF-11, NFF-12, NFF-14, NFF-15, NFF-17, NFF-18, NFF-19, NFF-20
<p><i>Source: SWCA Environmental Consultants, 2022.</i></p>			

near Site Location NFF-3. The object was a stone bowl identified approximately 10 ft below the surface during excavation of a vault. Given the proximity of the archaeological sites to Site Locations FF-22, FF-24, and NFF-3, SWCA considers the Project Area for these locations to have moderate sensitivity for tribal cultural resources.

Along the southern margin of the San Fernando Valley, the settlement known as Kaweenga is thought to have existed somewhere in the northern outlet of the Cahuenga Pass, including interior portions of the foothills near Universal City, and the north-facing slopes of the Santa Monica Mountains, south of the Los Angeles River floodplain. Site Locations FF-5, NFF-4, and NFF-5 are located near the Historic Period site known as Campo de Cahuenga and other nineteenth and twentieth century archaeological sites, which have been suggested as possible locations for Kaweenga. While no evidence of Native American occupation has been identified within any of the archaeological sites in the Universal City area, the possibility remains for buried tribal cultural resources to be preserved in the Project Area for these Site Locations, and SWCA considers the tribal cultural resources sensitivity to be moderate therein.

*(b) Downtown Los Angeles*

In the downtown Los Angeles area, Site Locations FF-2, FF-3, NFF-8, and NFF-13 are all considered as being in close enough proximity to known tribal cultural resources to warrant a finding of high sensitivity. FF-1 is plotted directly within the mapped boundary of LAN-1575/H. The resource is a multi-component archaeological site comprising a Prehistoric Period Native American cemetery with several primary and secondary internments and numerous artifacts, as well as a Historic-Period non-Native American artifacts and features. The site is in downtown Los Angeles and is mapped within an area that includes the present-day location of Union Station, MWD Headquarters Building, and some of the adjacent areas fit within the contemporary street grid and property lines. Site Location FF-1 is proposed to be located within the southern portions of the LAN-1575/H site boundary.

As discussed above, the site included a prehistoric Native American cemetery with several primary and secondary internments and numerous artifacts. The prehistoric component along with several other prehistoric sites nearby are considered as potential remnants of Yaanga—a prominent Gabrielino settlement inhabited at the time the Spanish arrived approximately 250 years ago. The data obtained from LAN-1575/H during the MWD Headquarters project and earlier work at Union Station clearly demonstrates the potential for significant prehistoric archaeological resources to be preserved beneath Historic-period deposits, which, in turn, can be preserved underneath asphalt and modern construction debris in a fully urbanized setting. These observations were further substantiated by recent discoveries during construction of Metro's Patsaouras Bus Plaza Station, in which 13 archaeological features were identified, including Native American

human remains and artifacts that were generally consistent with the types and ages identified in LAN-1575/H. Some of these new discoveries were identified within the boundary designated for LAN-1575/H, but the majority extend east along Highway 101 and Interstate 10. The setting for these discoveries is similar to the setting in which Site Location FF-1 is proposed.

The materials discovered at LAN-1575/H were identified within lenses of alluvial sediments deposited during floods within the Los Angeles River floodplain. Typically, these low-energy deposits result in favorable preservation conditions compared to high-energy settings that displace or damage artifacts and features on the ancient surfaces. However, a discovery of an approximately 3600-year-old human femur (LAN-4664) within 9 ft below the surface with larger river cobbles, demonstrates that some tribal cultural resources can occur within higher energy depositional settings in this area. Furthermore, multiple sources describe former Gabrielino rancheria sites occupied from ca. 1836 to 1845 as having once been in the same vicinity as LAN-1575/H and the former Yaanga community. Together, this Native American land-use history suggests high sensitivity for tribal cultural resources within the Project Area for Site Locations FF-2, FF-3, NFF-8, and NFF-13.

*(c) Ballona Region (South)*

The south region of the Project Area includes Site Locations proposed to be constructed in the Ballona area, situated along the northern periphery of a former wetland. The southeastern margin of the wetland is formed by foothills that compose the northern flank of the Baldwin Hills, and the Gabrielino settlement known as Guaspét is believed to have been located somewhere in this vicinity. Several Native American archaeological sites have been identified in the areas around the former Ballona wetland, especially in the margin along the bluffs of the foothills and along Ballona Creek, as well as some of the interior areas of the former wetland. These interior sites include LAN-54/H, which is located south of FF-30 and south of FF-29. The archaeological site was composed primarily of prehistoric artifact concentrations and features, as well as the remains of three Native American individuals. These materials were identified up to 6.6 ft below the surface. Because of the proximity of Site Locations FF-29 and FF-30 to LAN-54/H and the location of the Project Area in the Ballona region, there is high sensitivity for tribal cultural resources.

*(d) General Project Area*

For the remaining portions of the Project Area outside the 13 Site Locations discussed above, the sensitivity for tribal cultural resources sensitivity is considered to range from low to moderate. It has been demonstrated in multiple locations throughout the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles Basin that deeply buried archaeological deposits can exist within late Pleistocene and early Holocene-aged alluvium, including below, outside, and intermixed with sediments altered by intensive urban development. Where

these sediments occur, tribal cultural resources sensitivity is considered moderate. While some Site Locations are located outside of alluvium, the overwhelming majority are within these sedimentary units; therefore, the baseline conditions for the Project Area include moderate sensitivity for tribal cultural resources.

Alluvial deposits within the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles Basin can be massive, extending hundreds of feet below the surface and containing sediments deposited long before human presence in North America. Furthermore, most accumulations of alluvial sediments were formed by a combination of high- and low-energy events. While some individual Native American objects can be still occur within high-energy depositional settings (i.e., flood deposits), as in the case of the human femur (LAN-4662) found in Los Angeles River gravel deposits, generally these settings are considered as having poor preservation conditions for buried Native American objects and sites. Determining the location of high-energy alluvial deposits requires detailed analysis on subsurface conditions that was not available for this study. Therefore, the baseline conditions for the Project Area can be considered as including areas of moderate and low sensitivity for tribal cultural resources.

### 3. Project Impacts

#### a. Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, the Project would have a significant impact related to tribal cultural resources if it would:

***Threshold (a): Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:***

- i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or***
- ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.***

For this analysis, the Appendix G Thresholds listed above are relied upon.

## **b. Methodology**

As discussed above, for purposes of the tribal cultural resources analysis, SWCA defined the area of potential impact (Project Area) as the 10-foot by 10-foot area of each Site Location and any trenching required that extends beyond this footprint. The majority of ground disturbance within this area is expected to result from drilling the foundations support for the Site Location, which could reach a maximum depth of 50 ft below grade for freeway facing Site Locations and approximately 20 ft below grade for non-freeway facing Site Locations. The depth of excavation and location for utility trenches has not been identified. However, for purposes of assessing tribal cultural resources sensitivity and determining the potential for impacts, SWCA considered the findings made in their Tribal Cultural Resources Report to be consistent with what can reasonably be expected for small-scale utility trenching at any given Site Location.

A CHRIS records search was conducted for the Project Area plus a 0.25-mile radius, and the results were received on August 18, 2022. Additionally, a search of the SLF by the NAHC was completed and summarized in a letter dated June 21, 2022. The records search results are provided in Confidential Attachment C of the Tribal Cultural Resources Report, on file at the City for review by qualified individuals. SWCA also conducted supplemental background research in July and August 2022. In addition to the literature sources cited throughout the Tribal Cultural Resources Report, SWCA consulted the following publicly accessible data sources: David Rumsey Historical Map Collection; Huntington Library Digital Archives; Library of Congress; Los Angeles Public Library Map Collection; USGS historical topographic maps; and aerial photographs within the University of California, Santa Barbara, Digital Library.

The results of the NAHC's SLF search were included in a letter dated June 21, 2022, which indicated positive results. The following tribal organizations were identified as contacts associated specifically with the positive finding: Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation, the Gabrieleño/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, and the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council. A separate list of 20 tribal contacts from 16 tribal organizations, which constitute the NAHC Tribal Consultation List for Los Angeles County and include the four tribal organizations listed above, was returned and constitutes the parties with whom tribal consultation must be initiated pursuant to PRC Section 21080.3.1, as amended by AB 52. These tribal organizations include: Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians, Chumash Council of Bakersfield, Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation, Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation, Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe, Juaneno

Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation–Belardes, Northern Chumash Tribal Council, San Fernando Band of Mission Indians, San Luis Obispo County Chumash Council, Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians.

SWCA categorized each Site Location as low, moderate, or high sensitivity for the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources. Specifically, SWCA identified Site Locations as high to moderate sensitivity where the CHRIS records search and supplemental background review identified a known cultural resource within or in close proximity to the Project Area for each Site Location. Additionally, because it has been demonstrated in multiple locations throughout the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles Basin that deeply buried archaeological deposits can exist within late Pleistocene and early Holocene-aged alluvium, including below, outside, and intermixed with sediments altered by intensive urban development, SWCA categorized all other Site Locations as ranging from moderate to low sensitivity. Specifically, where there is evidence of intensive development or a high-energy erosional/depositional setting below the surface, the sensitivity for tribal cultural resources is considered low; the sensitivity is otherwise considered moderate.

### **c. Project Design Features**

No specific Project design features are proposed with regard to tribal cultural resources.

### **d. Analysis of Project Impacts**

***Threshold (a): Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:***

- i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or***
- ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?***

## (1) Impact Analysis

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, the depth of excavation associated with the Project would be up to approximately 50 ft below grade for freeway facing Site Locations and approximately 30 ft below grade for non-freeway facing Site Locations. Further, minor trenching would be required to install electrical conduit to connect to Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP). In Addition, it is estimated that a total of approximately 5,208 cubic yards of soil would be exported and hauled from the Site Locations during the excavation phase. Lastly, as part of TCN Program, a take-down component would be implemented including the removal of at least 110,000 square feet (2 to 1 square footage take-down ratio) of existing static displays. Existing static displays that include a support column would be cut at approximately two feet below grade and filled in with similar material to the surrounding landscape. As the ground would be previously disturbed surficial tribal cultural resources that may have existed at one time have likely been previously disturbed and impacts during removal of the static displays would be less than significant.

In compliance with the requirements of AB 52, Metro provided formal notification of the Project on May 20 and July 21, 2022, to the tribes listed above in Subsection 2.b. Metro's consultation with tribal parties has been initiated with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation and the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council. As of the date of this Draft EIR, an initial correspondence has occurred with the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, an initial and follow-up correspondence has occurred with the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, a meeting has occurred with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians–Kizh Nation, and responses to notification letters are still pending for the remaining 17 tribal contacts who were notified pursuant to PRC 21082.3.1. Tribal consultation is ongoing and could result in the identification of additional tribal cultural resource and requests for specific mitigation measures or treatment to address the potential for significant impacts to tribal cultural resources. Accordingly, the measures provided below may be subject to revisions based on the results of tribal consultation

As set forth in the Tribal Cultural Resources Report, a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. AB 52 requires a tribal cultural resource to have tangible, geographically defined properties that can be impacted by an undertaking. As discussed above, the CHRIS records search identified one known tribal cultural resource mapped directly within the Project Area: CA-LAN-1575/H, located in downtown Los Angeles and directly within the Project Area for Site Location FF-1. LAN-1575/H is a prehistoric and historic site consisting of Native American burials and artifact scatter identified during construction of the Metropolitan Water District Headquarters building in the Downtown Los Angeles region. Site Location FF-1 would be

located in the south-central portion of the mapped site boundary for this tribal cultural resource. As such, Site Location FF-1 is assessed as high sensitivity for tribal cultural resources. A second historic-period archaeological site, LAN-4660H, was identified directly within the Project Area for TCN Structure NFF-13; however, the site lacks any Native American components and the TCN Structure avoids the archaeological components within the mapped site boundary.

The CHRIS records search and supplemental background research also identified several previously recorded archaeological sites and former Native American settlements in close proximity to 12 Site Locations: FF-2, FF-3, FF-5, FF-22, FF-24, FF-29, FF-30, NFF-3, NFF-4, NFF-5, NFF-8, and NFF-13. These Site Locations are assessed as high to moderate sensitivity for the potential to encounter tribal cultural resources during construction. Of these 12 Site Locations, FF-29, FF-30, NFF-3, NFF-8, and NFF-13 are within 0.25 mile of an archaeological site. Site Location FF-2, FF-3, FF-5, FF-22, FF-24, NFF-4, and NFF-5 are located greater than 0.25 mile from an archaeological site.

The archaeological sites located within 0.25 mile of a Site Location include: LAN-7/H, LAN-54/H, LAN-4662, P-19-100281, and P-19-100515, all of which contain Native American components and consist of a prehistoric site, a prehistoric artifact, and combination prehistoric and historic sites. LAN-7/H includes granite metate and mano considered as possible Native American artifacts otherwise contained in historic period refuse deposit associated with 1860s–1870s Chinatown. LAN-54/H includes a multicomponent site with a prehistoric component (late Millingstone and early to middle Intermediate periods) and late-historic period materials. LAN-4662 includes a femur dated to 3,640–3,560 years B.P., identified 19 ft below grade in stream gravel deposits of the Los Angeles River. P-19-100281 includes a sandstone bowl identified approximately 10 ft below the surface in stream deposited sand. Lastly, P-19-100515 includes three shell fragments of species commonly associated with Native American sites identified with historic period materials.

The archaeological sites located outside the 0.25-mile radius which contain Native American components include: LAN-34, LAN-255, LAN-629, LAN-644, and LAN-4226. These sites are all prehistoric sites. LAN-34 is described as containing “piles of metates” and a few other milling stones. LAN-255 includes a possible cemetery and or habitation site that has been destroyed by an aqueduct system. LAN-629 includes an isolated burial eroding out of an arroyo, about six feet below the surface dated to  $600 \pm 50$  years B.P. which consisted of one burial: a young adult male estimated to be about 18 years old and associated 3500+ shell and steatite beads, four concave base projectile points, two bone awls, two deer rib fleshers, carved antler object, split deer metapodials and raccoon or coyote tibia. LAN-644 includes a scatter of manos, metates, lithic detritus, and cores. Lastly, LAN-4226 includes a group of nine artifacts identified during monitoring: two pestles (one granitic and the other a sedimentary material), large granitic bowl fragment,

granitic hammerstone, chalcedony core, quartzite metate basin, jasper tested cobble, chalcedony angular waste, and granitic ground stone palette with ochre residue.

The archaeological sites located outside the 0.25-mile radius which do not contain Native American components include: LAN-1945H, LAN-2394H, LAN-2804H, LAN-3303H, LAN-3304H, and LAN-3305H. All of these sites consist of historic sites. LAN-1945H includes Campo de Cahuenga: the remains of a historic-era adobe structure, an associated refuse-filled trench, a refuse scatter, and a brick-lined well. LAN-2394H includes a historic-era trash filled trench and a truncated round, red brick-lined well identified under approximately 22 ft of fill soil associated with site LAN-1945H. LAN-2394H includes three historic-era artifact concentrations with ceramics, glass bottles, cutlery, dishes, bowls, cups, wash basins, pots, pans, horseshoes, etc. LAN-3303H includes a large domestic trash dump site identified 25 ft below the surface and most likely buried by flooding of the Los Angeles River in 1938. LAN-3304H includes a large trash pit composed of automobile parts and newspapers. Lastly, LAN-3305H includes a domestic trash dump site associated with multi-family condominiums consisting of glass bottles, ceramics, Melmac, metal, bones, shell, and other domestic refuse. While no evidence of Native American occupation has been identified within any of these archaeological sites, they have been suggested as possible locations for Kaweenga. As such, the possibility remains for buried tribal cultural resources to be preserved in the Project Area for these Site Locations, and SWCA considers the tribal cultural resources sensitivity at the Site Locations near these resources to be moderate.

Lastly, because it has been demonstrated in multiple locations throughout the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles Basin that deeply buried archaeological deposits can exist within late Pleistocene and early Holocene-aged alluvium, including below, outside, and intermixed with sediments altered by intensive urban development, SWCA categorized all other Site Locations as ranging from moderate to low sensitivity. Specifically, where there is evidence of intensive development or a high-energy erosional/depositional setting below the surface, the sensitivity for tribal cultural resources is considered low; otherwise, the sensitivity is considered moderate.

**Based on this information, the Site Locations may contain known or reasonably foreseeable resources determined by Metro to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC Section 5024.1 (i.e., tribal cultural resources). As such, the Project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known tribal cultural resource with cultural value to a California Native American tribe or that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register or in a local register. Therefore, Project impacts related to tribal cultural resources would be potentially significant.**

## (2) Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be implemented with regard to tribal cultural resources:

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-1 (Retain a Tribal Consultant and Qualified Archaeologist):** Prior to any ground-disturbing activities on the Site Locations associated with the Project Area, a tribal consultant and qualified archaeologist shall be retained to monitor ground-disturbing activities and ensure proper implementation of the Tribal Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program (described in Mitigation Measure TCR-2, below).

Ground disturbing activities are defined as excavating, digging, trenching, drilling, tunneling, grading, leveling, removing asphalt, clearing, driving posts, augering, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity at a Site Location. A tribal consultant is defined as one who is on the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Tribal Contact list. The tribal consultant will provide the services of a representative, known as a tribal monitor.

A qualified archaeologist is defined as one who meets the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) for archaeology. The qualified archaeologist shall submit a letter of retention to Metro no fewer than 30 days before ground-disturbing activities commence. The letter shall include a resume for the qualified archaeologist that demonstrates fulfillment of the SOI PQS.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-2 (Develop a Tribal Cultural Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program):** Prior to any ground-disturbing activities within the Project Area, a Tribal Cultural Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program (TCR MMP) shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist. The TCR MMP shall incorporate the results of SWCA's *Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment for the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Transportation Communication Network Project* report, and reasonable and feasible recommendations from tribal parties resulting from consultation. The TCR MMP shall include provisions for avoidance of unanticipated discoveries and procedures for the preservation of unanticipated discoveries where possible.

The TCR MMP shall include, but not be limited to, provisions to conduct a worker training program, a monitoring protocol for ground-disturbing activities, discovery and processing protocol for inadvertent discoveries of tribal cultural resources, and identification of a curation facility should artifacts be collected. The TCR MMP shall require monitoring of ground-disturbing activities at all Site Locations and will provide a framework for assessing the geoarchaeological setting to

determine whether sediments capable of preserving tribal cultural resources are present, and include a protocol for identifying the conditions under which additional or reduced levels of monitoring (e.g., spot-checking) may be appropriate at any given Site Location. The duration and timing of the monitoring shall be determined based on the rate of excavation, geoarchaeological assessment, and, if present, the quantity, type, spatial distribution of the materials identified, and input of the tribal consultant or their designated monitor. During monitoring, daily logs shall be kept and reported to Metro on a monthly basis.

During ground-disturbing activities, the monitors shall have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities in soils that are likely to contain potentially tribal cultural resources, as determined by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with the tribal monitor. In the event that tribal cultural resources or potential tribal cultural resources are exposed during construction, work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall stop within a minimum of 25 ft or as determined by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with the tribal consultant based on the nature of the find and the potential for additional portions of the resource to remain buried in the unexcavated areas of the project site. The qualified archaeologist in consultation with the tribal consultant will evaluate the significance of the find and implement the protocol described in the TCR MMP before work can resume in the area surrounding the find that is determined to have sensitivity. Construction activities may continue in other areas in coordination with the qualified archaeologist and tribal consultant. Soils that are removed from the work site are considered culturally sensitive and will be subject to inspection on-site by the tribal and archaeological monitors. Provisions for inspection at an off-site location would be determined through consultation with the tribal and archaeological monitors, construction personnel, and Metro. Any tribal cultural resources that are not associated with a burial are subject to collection by the qualified archaeologist.

The TCR MMP shall also summarize the requirements for coordination with consulting tribal parties in the event of a tribal cultural resource or potential tribal cultural resource is inadvertently discovered, as well as the applicable regulatory compliance measures or conditions of approval for inadvertent discoveries, including the discovery of human remains, to be carried out in concert with actions described in the TCR MMP and treatment plan prepared in compliance with Mitigation Measure TCR-3. . The TCR MMP shall be prepared in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, and PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1. The TCR MMP shall be submitted to Metro at least 30 days prior to initiating ground-disturbing activities.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-3 (Treatment of Known Tribal Cultural Resources):** A treatment plan will be developed for any historical archaeological sites that may be adversely affected/significantly impacted by the Project, including but not limited to CA-LAN-1575/H. The treatment plan will be developed based on the known constituents to guide the post-discovery process and initial treatment requirements upon discovery. The treatment plan will outline data recovery procedures to be followed and shall require controlled archaeological excavation within the first eight feet (ft) at all Site Locations proposed to be located within known tribal cultural resources, specifically an excavation unit measuring 3.28 ft by 3.28 ft across extending to a depth of at least 4.92 ft below the unpaved surface, followed by the use of a 4 inch hollow stem hand-auger to a total depth of at least 9.84 ft below the unpaved surface. Subsequent mechanical drilling will be conducted in approximately 1.64-ft increments to a depth of approximately 20 ft below the surface. Sediments from each of the 1.64-ft mechanical excavation levels will be inspected for the presence of Native American objects or evidence of a tribal cultural resource, and relevant environmental information obtained from the sediments will be recorded. The treatment plan will include provisions to allow for standard mechanical excavation to resume at levels above these depths in the event that sufficient evidence is identified to demonstrate that the sediments are more than 20,000 years old.

The treatment plan may be modified and updated depending on the nature of the discovery and consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and consulting parties. The treatment plan would be developed so that treatment of historical resources meets the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines* (1983) for archaeological documentation, the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP)'s *Archaeological Resources Management Report, Recommended Contents and Formats* (1989), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's publication *Treatment of Archaeological Properties: A Handbook*, and the Department of the Interior's Guidelines for Federal Agency Responsibility under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Society for California Archaeology's *Guidelines for Determining the Significance of and Impacts to Cultural Resources and Fieldwork and Reporting Guidelines for Archaeological, Historic, and Tribal Cultural Resources*.

### (3) Level of Significance After Mitigation

With the implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-3, impacts related to tribal cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

---

## f. Cumulative Impacts

### (1) Impact Analysis

Although impacts to tribal cultural resources tend to be site-specific, cumulative impacts would occur if the Project, related projects, and other future development within the general area would affect the same tribal cultural resources and communities. In the event any tribal cultural resources are uncovered, each related project would be required to comply with the applicable regulatory requirements and any site-specific mitigation that would be identified for that project. In addition, related projects would be required to comply with the consultation requirements of AB 52 to determine and mitigate any potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. **Therefore, the Project and related projects would not result in significant cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources. As such, the Project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.**

### (2) Mitigation Measures

Cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

### (3) Level of Significance After Mitigation

Cumulative impacts related to tribal cultural resources were determined to be less than significant without mitigation. Therefore, no mitigation measures were required or included, and the impact level remains less than significant.