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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Eyestone Environmental retained Dudek to assist in the identification and documentation of potential impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) that could occur as a result of activities proposed for the Paseo Marina Project (project). The City of Los Angeles is the lead agency responsible for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project proposes a comprehensive development of an integrated mix of residential, community-serving commercial, retail, and restaurant uses across an approximately 6-acre site. The project site is bounded by Glencoe Avenue to the northeast, Maxella Avenue to the northwest, and existing commercial developments to the southeast and southwest within the existing Marina Marketplace located in the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles. The project falls on public land survey system (PLSS) area Township 2 South; Range 15 West; Section 22; located on the Venice, CA 7.5-minute United States Geologic Survey (USGS) Quadrangle.

The present study documents the results of a South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) records search, a search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File, and tribal consultation completed by the City pursuant to California Assembly Bill (AB) 52. This report further includes a cultural context and in-depth review of archival, academic, and ethnographic information. No known Native American resources were identified within the project area through the SCCIC records search completed (November 22, 2017) or through a search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File (completed June 12, 2017).

SCCIC records indicate that a prehistoric/ethnohistoric site (P-19-000047) has been previously recorded approximately 750 feet outside the project site. This resource includes documented human burials, midden deposits, and presence of cultural material consistent with prehistoric Native American habitation activities. While this resource has been recorded in the surrounding area, government to government consultation initiated by the City, acting in good faith and after a reasonable effort, has not resulted in the identification of a TCR within the project site. Given that no known TCR has been identified, no resource-specific mitigation for TCRs appears to be necessary. However, in consideration of the known sensitivity of the surrounding area for cultural resources, it is recommended that periodic archaeological and Native American monitoring be conducted. A qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, should oversee and adjust monitoring efforts as needed (increase, decrease, or discontinue monitoring frequency) based on the observed potential for construction activities to encounter cultural deposits or material and as approved by the City.
1 INTRODUCTION

Eyestone Environmental retained Dudek to conduct a Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs) study for the Paseo Marina Project (project) for compliance with the CEQA. The present study documents the results of a SCCIC records search, a search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File, and tribal consultation completed by the lead agency (City) pursuant to California Assembly Bill (AB) 52. This report further includes a cultural context and in-depth review of archival, academic, and ethnographic information. This study closes with a summary of recommended mitigation.

1.1 Project Personnel

William Burns, MSc, RPA drafted a large portion of the present report. Elizabeth Denniston, MA, RPA, assisted with project management. Adam Giacinto, MA, RPA, acted as principal archaeological and ethnographic investigator and provided management recommendations for TCRs. Portions of this cultural context have been prepared by Samantha Murray, MA, RPA. Micah Hale, PhD, RPA reviewed recommendations for regulatory compliance and assisted with report preparation.

1.2 Project Location

The project site is located within the Venice Beach area of the City of Los Angeles, approximately 1.75 miles east of the Pacific Ocean (Figure 1). The approximately 6-acre project site is bounded by Glencoe Avenue to the northeast, Maxella Avenue to the northwest, and existing commercial developments of the Marina Marketplace to the southeast and southwest. The project falls on PLSS area within Section 22 of Township 2 South; Range 15 West; and on the Venice, CA 7.5-minute USGS Quadrangle (Figure 1).

1.3 Project Description

Sares-Regis Group, the Applicant, proposes a comprehensive development project on an approximately 6-acre site located at Glencoe Avenue and Maxella Avenue within the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles. The project includes an integrated mix of residential, community-serving commercial, retail, and restaurant uses dispersed across the site. Specifically, the project would provide 658 multi-family residential units in three seven-story buildings and 27,300 square feet of neighborhood serving commercial uses, including 13,650 square feet of retail space and 13,650 square feet of restaurant space. Overall, the project would remove approximately 100,781 square feet of existing commercial floor area and construct approximately 674,329 square feet of new residential and commercial floor area, resulting in a net increase of 573,548 square feet of net new floor area within the project site for a total area ration (FAR) of approximately 2.6 to 1. The project would also provide 1,217 parking spaces to accommodate the proposed uses. To provide for the new uses, the three existing shopping center-related buildings would be removed.
Construction of the project would commence with removal of the existing buildings and surface parking areas, followed by grading and excavation for the subterranean parking garage. Building foundations would then be laid, followed by building construction, paving/concrete installation, and landscape installation. The project is anticipated to be completed within an extended horizon year of 2023. The estimated depth of excavation is anticipated to range to up to approximately 28 feet below grade when accounting for mat footings. It is estimated that approximately 220,000 cubic yards of export would be hauled from the project Site during the demolition and excavation phase.
Figure 2. Project Area Map
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2 REGULATORY SETTING

This section includes a discussion of the applicable state laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards governing cultural resources, which must be adhered to before and during construction of the proposed project.

2.1 State

2.1.1 The California Register of Historical Resources

In California, the term “historical resource” includes, but is not limited to, “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California” (California Public Resources Code (PRC), Section 5020.1(j)). In 1992, the California legislature established the CRHR “to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (PRC Section 5024.1(a)). The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), enumerated below. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.

2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.

4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In order to understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than 50 years old may be considered for listing in the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance (see 14 CCR 4852(d)(2)).

The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP, and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR, as are the state landmarks and points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.
2.1.2 California Environmental Quality Act

As described further, the following CEQA statutes (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) are of relevance to the analysis of archaeological, historic, and tribal cultural resources:

- PRC Section 21083.2(g) defines “unique archaeological resource.”
- PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) defines “historical resources.” In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) defines the phrase “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource”; it also defines the circumstances when a project would materially impair the significance of a historical resource.
- PRC Section 21074(a) defines “tribal cultural resources.”
- PRC Section 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) set forth standards and steps to be employed following the accidental discovery of human remains in any location other than a dedicated ceremony.
- PRC Sections 21083.2(b) and 21083.2(c) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 provide information regarding the mitigation framework for archaeological and historic resources, including examples of preservation-in-place mitigation measures. Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to significant archaeological sites because it maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context, and may also help avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the archaeological site(s).

More specifically, under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause “a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5(b)). If a site is listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a historical resources survey (meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(q)), it is an “historical resource” and is presumed to be historically or culturally significant for purposes of CEQA (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5(a)). The lead agency is not precluded from determining that a resource is a historical resource even if it does not fall within this presumption (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5(a)).

A “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” reflecting a significant effect under CEQA means “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired” (14 CCR 15064.5(b)(1); PRC Section 5020.1(q)). In turn, the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project does any of the following:

1. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or
(2) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

(3) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA (14 CCR 15064.5(b)(2)).

Pursuant to these sections, the CEQA inquiry begins with evaluating whether a project site contains any “historical resources,” then evaluates whether that project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource such that the resource’s historical significance is materially impaired.

If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (PRC Sections 21083.2(a)–(c)).

Section 21083.2(g) defines a unique archaeological resource as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

(1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.

(2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.

(3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person (PRC Section 21083.2(g)).

Impacts on nonunique archaeological resources are generally not considered a significant environmental impact (PRC Section 21083.2(a); 14 CCR 15064.5(c)(4)). However, if a nonunique archaeological resource qualifies as a tribal cultural resource (PRC Sections 21074(c) and 21083.2(h)), further consideration of significant impacts is required.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. As described below, these procedures are detailed in PRC Section 5097.98.
California State Assembly Bill 52

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 of 2014 amended PRC Section 5097.94 and added PRC Sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3. AB 52 established that Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) must be considered under CEQA and also provided for additional Native American consultation requirements for the lead agency. Section 21074 describes a TCR as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object that is considered of cultural value to a California Native American Tribe. A TCR is either:

- On the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register; Eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register; or
- 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 Section 5024.1.

AB 52 formalizes the lead agency–tribal consultation process, requiring the lead agency to initiate consultation with California Native American groups that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project, including tribes that may not be federally recognized. Lead agencies are required to begin consultation prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report.

Section 1 (a)(9) of AB 52 establishes that “a substantial adverse change to a tribal cultural resource has a significant effect on the environment.” Effects on tribal cultural resources should be considered under CEQA. Section 6 of AB 52 adds Section 21080.3.2 to the PRC, which states that parties may propose mitigation measures “capable of avoiding or substantially lessening potential significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource or alternatives that would avoid significant impacts to a tribal cultural resource.” Further, if a California Native American tribe requests consultation regarding project alternatives, mitigation measures, or significant effects to tribal cultural resources, the consultation shall include those topics (PRC Section 21080.3.2[a]). The environmental document and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (where applicable) shall include any mitigation measures that are adopted (PRC Section 21082.3[a]).

2.1.3 California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5

California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods, regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area reasonably suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the county coroner has examined the remains (Section 7050.5(b)). PRC Section 5097.98 also outlines the process to be followed in the event that remains are discovered. If the coroner determines or has reason to believe the remains are those of a Native American, the coroner must contact NAHC within 24 hours (Section 7050.5(c)). NAHC will notify the “most likely descendant.” With the permission of the landowner, the most likely descendant may inspect the site of discovery. The inspection
must be completed within 48 hours of notification of the most likely descendant by NAHC. The most likely descendant may recommend means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native Americans.

2.2 Local Regulations

2.2.1 Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments

Local landmarks in the City of Los Angeles are known as Historic-Cultural Monument (HCMs) and are under the aegis of the Planning Department, Office of Historic Resources. They are defined in the Cultural Heritage Ordinance as follows (Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 22.171.7, added by Ordinance No. 178,402, effective April 2, 2007):

Historic-Cultural Monument (Monument) is any site (including significant trees or other plant life located on the site), building or structure of particular historic or cultural significance to the City of Los Angeles, including historic structures or sites in which the broad cultural, economic or social history of the nation, State or community is reflected or exemplified; or which is identified with historic personages or with important events in the main currents of national, State or local history; or which embodies the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type specimen, inherently valuable for a study of a period, style or method of construction; or a notable work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual genius influenced his or her age.

For the purposes of LA, this definition has been broken down into four HCM designation criteria that closely parallel the existing NRHP and CRHR criteria:

1. Is identified with important events in the main currents of national, State or local history, or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, political, economic or social history of the nation, state, city, or community; or
2. Is associated with the lives of Historic Personages important to national, state, city, or local history; or
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction; or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder or architect whose genius influenced his or her age; or possesses high artistic values; or
4. Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the pre-history or history of the nation, state, city or community.

2.2.2 Historic Preservation Overlay Zones

As described by the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources, the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) Ordinance was adopted in 1979 and amended in 2004 to identify and protect neighborhoods with
distinct architectural and cultural resources. HPOZs, commonly known as historic districts, provide for review of proposed exterior alterations and additions to historic properties within designated districts.

Regarding HPOZ eligibility, City of Los Angeles Ordinance Number 175891 states (Los Angeles Municipal Code, Section 12.20.3):

Features designated as contributing shall meet one or more of the following criteria:

(1) adds to the Historic architectural qualities or Historic associations for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses Historic integrity reflecting its character at that time; or

(2) owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established feature of the neighborhood, community or city; or

(3) retaining the building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature, would contribute to the preservation and protection of an Historic place or area of Historic interest in the City.

Regarding effects on federal and locally significant properties, Los Angeles Municipal Code states the following (Section 91.106.4.5, Permits for Historical and Cultural Buildings):

The department shall not issue a permit to demolish, alter or remove a building or structure of historical, archaeological or architectural consequence if such building or structure has been officially designated, or has been determined by state or federal action to be eligible for designation, on the National Register of Historic Places, or has been included on the City of Los Angeles list of historic cultural monuments, without the department having first determined whether the demolition, alteration or removal may result in the loss of or serious damage to a significant historical or cultural asset. If the department determines that such loss or damage may occur, the applicant shall file an application and pay all fees for the California Environmental Quality Act Initial Study and Check List, as specified in Section 19.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. If the Initial Study and Check List identifies the historical or cultural asset as significant, the permit shall not be issued without the department first finding that specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the preservation of the building or structure.
3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 Environmental Setting and Current Conditions

The project site is currently developed with three structures including a two story Barnes and Noble bookstore located along the northeast corner of the project area, a single-story building providing a variety of retail uses located generally within the southern portion of the project area, a two-story commercial and retail building located generally within the western portion of the project area, and surface parking and circulation areas. The project site is relatively flat with limited ornamental landscaping. The project vicinity is developed with a mix of commercial and residential uses. To the northwest, across Maxella Avenue is a movie theater and other retail stores. To the north and northeast across Glencoe Avenue are residential developments. To the southeast and southwest are additional areas of the Marina Marketplace. Historical topographic maps do not reveal any development within the Project Site prior to the construction of the shopping center. The project area is approximately 400 feet north of the Marina Expressway.

The project site is situated in the Venice Beach area of Los Angeles, southwest of Culver City, and 1.75 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. Historical maps indicate the presence of the extensive Ballona Lagoon (currently in the location of Marina Del Rey) to the south of the project area. In addition, this area falls in the ancient floodplain of the Los Angeles River in a low-lying area between the Ballona Bluffs to the south and the Santa Monica plain to the north. An archaeological report prepared for the nearby Admiralty Project Place included a robust analysis of the prehistoric environment (Dillon et al 1968). Pertinent sections have been provided as follows:

This area falls in the ancient floodplain of the Los Angeles River in a low-lying area between the Ballona Bluffs to the south and the Santa Monica plain to the north. The dominant geographic feature in the area is the Ballona Gap, one of the two courses of the Los Angeles River, which flowed around the Baldwin hills along the edge of the Ballona Escarpment and met the sea at what is now Marina del Rey. The other course approximates the present, channelized course of the river which flows south to meet the sea near Long Beach.

In prehistoric and early historic times, the Los Angeles River, depending upon its load, the year's rainfall, and other natural factors, either flowed west or south, with the result that the western course periodically carried very little water that sometimes the flow could not overcome the force of longshore drift along what is now Venice Beach and an impounded lagoon formed. In addition to anthropogenic or human-induced changes, are those of nature itself. Only the final chapter of such changes in our study area is known, that relating to the end of the first quarter of the 19th century. A great flood in 1815 caused the Los Angeles River to flow down its western channel, but another flood in 1825 caused the stream to change its course back to the east, leaving the western channel a mere remnant presently called Ballena Creek. Geological borings indicate that the alluvial soils deposited by the Los Angeles River
are composed of clay, silt and sand to depths of 30 to 35 feet. Currently the water table is some 10 to 14 feet below the present, filled, ground surface. The site was located on the edge of the ancient lagoon, probably at an elevation just above the highest zone of high water, presumably so that its inhabitants could take advantage of the abundant shellfish, migratory waterfowl, and fish resident in the adjacent lagoon and its marshy margins. [Dillon et al 1968: 5-7]

Existing development is underlain by urban land, commercial complex, associated with discontinuous human-transported material over Holocene alluvium and marine deposits (NRCS 2017). Due the size and nature of past development associated with the surroundings structures and existing paved area, all native subsurface soils with potential to support the presence of cultural deposits have likely been disturbed. However, there is always some possibility that subsurface Native American resources could be present, as have been encountered in areas within and surrounding Union Station approximately one mile to the north.
4  CULTURAL SETTING

4.1  Prehistoric Overview

Evidence for continuous human occupation in Southern California spans the last 10,000 years. Various attempts to parse out variability in archaeological assemblages over this broad period have led to the development of several cultural chronologies; some of these are based on geologic time, most are based on temporal trends in archaeological assemblages, and others are interpretive reconstructions. To be more inclusive, this research employs a common set of generalized terms used to describe chronological trends in assemblage composition: Paleoindian (pre-5500 BC), Archaic (8000 BC–AD 500), Late Prehistoric (AD 500–1769), and Ethnohistoric (post-AD 1769).

4.1.1  Paleoindian Period (pre-5500 BC)

Evidence for Paleoindian occupation in the region is tenuous. Our knowledge of associated cultural pattern(s) is informed by a relatively sparse body of data that has been collected from within an area extending from coastal San Diego, through the Mojave Desert, and beyond. One of the earliest dated archaeological assemblages in the region is located in coastal Southern California (though contemporaneous sites are present in the Channel Islands) derives from SDI-4669/W-12 in La Jolla. A human burial from SDI-4669 was radiocarbon dated to 9,590–9,920 years before present (95.4% probability) (Hector 2006). The burial is part of a larger site complex that contained more than 29 human burials associated with an assemblage that fits the Archaic profile (i.e., large amounts of ground stone, battered cobbles, and expedient flake tools). In contrast, typical Paleoindian assemblages include large stemmed projectile points, high proportions of formal lithic tools, bifacial lithic reduction strategies, and relatively small proportions of ground stone tools. Prime examples of this pattern are sites that were studied by Emma Lou Davis (1978) on Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake near Ridgecrest, California. These sites contained fluted and unfluted stemmed points and large numbers of formal flake tools (e.g., shaped scrapers, blades). Other typical Paleoindian sites include the Komodo site (MNO-679)—a multi-component fluted point site, and MNO-680—a single component Great Basined Stemmed point site (see Basgall et al. 2002). At MNO-679 and -680, ground stone tools were rare while finely made projectile points were common.

Warren et al. (2004) claimed that a biface manufacturing tradition present at the Harris site complex (SDI-149) is representative of typical Paleoindian occupation in the San Diego region that possibly dates between 10,365 and 8200 BC (Warren et al. 2004). Termed San Dieguito (see also Rogers 1945), assemblages at the Harris site are qualitatively distinct from most others in region because the site has large numbers of finely made bifaces (including projectile points), formal flake tools, a biface reduction trajectory, and relatively small amounts of processing tools (see also Warren 1968). Despite the unique assemblage composition, the definition of San Dieguito as a separate cultural tradition is hotly debated. Gallegos (1987) suggested that the San Dieguito pattern is simply an inland manifestation of a broader economic pattern. Gallegos’s interpretation of San Dieguito has been widely accepted in recent years, in part because of the difficulty in distinguishing San Dieguito components...
from other assemblage constituents. In other words, it is easier to ignore San Dieguito as a distinct socioeconomic pattern than it is to draw it out of mixed assemblages.

The large number of finished bifaces (i.e., projectile points and non-projectile blades), along with large numbers of formal flake tools at the Harris site complex, is very different than nearly all other assemblages throughout the region, regardless of age. Warren et al. (2004) made this point, tabulating basic assemblage constituents for key early Holocene sites. Producing finely made bifaces and formal flake tools implies that relatively large amounts of time were spent for tool manufacture. Such a strategy contrasts with the expedient flake-based tools and cobble-core reduction strategy that typifies non-San Dieguito Archaic sites. It can be inferred from the uniquely high degree of San Dieguito assemblage formality that the Harris site complex represents a distinct economic strategy from non-San Dieguito assemblages.

San Dieguito sites are rare in the inland valleys, with one possible candidate, RIV-2798/H, located on the shore of Lake Elsinore. Excavations at Locus B at RIV-2798/H produced a toolkit consisting predominately of flaked stone tools, including crescents, points, and bifaces, and lesser amounts of groundstone tools, among other items (Grenda 1997). A calibrated and reservoir-corrected radiocarbon date from a shell produced a date of 6630 BC. Grenda (1997) suggested this site represents seasonal exploitation of lacustrine resources and small game and resembles coastal San Dieguito assemblages and spatial patterning.

If San Dieguito truly represents a distinct socioeconomic strategy from the non-San Dieguito Archaic processing regime, its rarity implies that it was not only short-lived, but that it was not as economically successful as the Archaic strategy. Such a conclusion would fit with other trends in Southern California deserts, where hunting-related tools were replaced by processing tools during the early Holocene (see Basgall and Hall 1990).

4.1.2 Archaic Period (8000 BC – AD 500)

The more than 2,500-year overlap between the presumed age of Paleoindian occupations and the Archaic period highlights the difficulty in defining a cultural chronology in Southern California. If San Dieguito is the only recognized Paleoindian component in the coastal Southern California, then the dominance of hunting tools implies that it derives from Great Basin adaptive strategies and is not necessarily a local adaptation. Warren et al. (2004) admitted as much, citing strong desert connections with San Dieguito. Thus, the Archaic pattern is the earliest local socioeconomic adaptation in the region (see Hale 2001, 2009).

The Archaic pattern, which has also been termed the Millingstone Horizon (among others), is relatively easy to define with assemblages that consist primarily of processing tools, such as millingstones, handstones, battered cobbles, heavy crude scrapers, incipient flake-based tools, and cobble-core reduction. These assemblages occur in all environments across the region with little variability in tool composition. Low assemblage variability over time and space among Archaic sites has been equated with cultural conservatism (see Basgall and Hall 1990; Byrd and Reddy 2002; Warren 1968; Warren et al. 2004). Despite enormous amounts of archaeological work at Archaic sites, little change in assemblage composition occurred until the
bow and arrow was adopted around AD 500, as well as ceramics at approximately the same time (Griset 1996; Hale 2009). Even then, assemblage formality remained low. After the bow was adopted, small arrow points appear in large quantities and already low amounts of formal flake tools are replaced by increasing amounts of expedient flake tools. Similarly, shaped millingstones and handstones decreased in proportion relative to expedient, unshaped ground stone tools (Hale 2009). Thus, the terminus of the Archaic period is equally as hard to define as its beginning because basic assemblage constituents and patterns of manufacturing investment remain stable, complemented only by the addition of the bow and ceramics.

4.1.3 Late Prehistoric Period (AD 500–1769)

The period of time following the Archaic and before Ethnohistoric times (AD 1769) is commonly referred to as the Late Prehistoric (Rogers 1945; Wallace 1955; Warren et al. 2004); however, several other subdivisions continue to be used to describe various shifts in assemblage composition. In general, this period is defined by the addition of arrow points and ceramics, as well as the widespread use of bedrock mortars. The fundamental Late Prehistoric assemblage is very similar to the Archaic pattern, but includes arrow points and large quantities of fine debitage from producing arrow points, ceramics, and cremations. The appearance of mortars and pestles is difficult to place in time because most mortars are on bedrock surfaces. Some argue that the Ethnohistoric intensive acorn economy extends as far back as AD 500 (Bean and Shipek 1978). However, there is no substantial evidence that reliance on acorns, and the accompanying use of mortars and pestles, occurred before AD 1400. Millingstones and handstones persisted in higher frequencies than mortars and pestles until the last 500 years (Basgall and Hall 1990); even then, weighing the economic significance of millstone-handstone versus mortar-pestle technology is tenuous due to incomplete information on archaeological assemblages.

4.2 Ethnographic Overview

The history of the Native American communities prior to the mid-1700s has largely been reconstructed through later mission-period and early ethnographic accounts. The first records of the Native American inhabitants of the region come predominantly from European merchants, missionaries, military personnel, and explorers. These brief, and generally peripheral, accounts were prepared with the intent of furthering respective colonial and economic aims and were combined with observations of the landscape. They were not intended to be unbiased accounts regarding the cultural structures and community practices of the newly encountered cultural groups. The establishment of the missions in the region brought more extensive documentation of Native American communities, though these groups did not become the focus of formal and in-depth ethnographic study until the early twentieth century (Bean and Shipek 1978; Boscana 1846; Geiger and Meighan 1976; Harrington 1934; Laylander 2000; Sparkman 1908; White 1963). The principal intent of these researchers was to record the precontact, culturally specific practices, ideologies, and languages that had survived the destabilizing effects of missionization and colonialism. This research, often understood as “salvage ethnography,” was driven by the understanding that traditional knowledge was being lost due to the impacts of modernization and cultural assimilation. Alfred Kroeber applied his “memory culture” approach (Lightfoot 2005: 32) by recording languages
and oral histories within the region. Ethnographic research by Dubois, Kroeber, Harrington, Spier, Merriam, and others during the early twentieth century seemed to indicate that traditional cultural practices and beliefs survived among local Native American communities.

It is important to note that even though there were many informants for these early ethnographies who were able to provide information from personal experiences about Native American life before the Europeans, a significantly large proportion of these informants were born after 1850 (Heizer and Nissen 1973); therefore, the documentation of pre-contact, aboriginal culture was being increasingly supplied by individuals born in California after considerable contact with Europeans. As Robert F. Heizer (1978) stated, this is an important issue to note when examining these ethnographies, since considerable culture change had undoubtedly occurred by 1850 among the Native American survivors of California. This is also a particularly important consideration for studies focused on TCRs; where concepts of “cultural resource” and the importance of traditional cultural places are intended to be interpreted based on the values expressed by present-day Native American representatives and may vary from archaeological values (Giacinto 2012).

Based on ethnographic information, it is believed that at least 88 different languages were spoken from Baja California Sur to the southern Oregon state border at the time of Spanish contact (Johnson and Lorenz 2006: 34). The distribution of recorded Native American languages has been dispersed as a geographic mosaic across California through six primary language families (Golla 2007).

Victor Golla has contended that one can interpret the amount of variability within specific language groups as being associated with the relative “time depth” of the speaking populations (Golla 2007: 80). A large amount of variation within the language of a group represents a greater time depth then a group’s language with less internal diversity. One method that he has employed is by drawing comparisons with historically documented changes in Germanic and Romantic language groups. Golla has observed that the “absolute chronology of the internal diversification within a language family” can be correlated with archaeological dates (2007, p. 71). This type of interpretation is modeled on concepts of genetic drift and gene flows that are associated with migration and population isolation in the biological sciences.

The tribes of this area have traditionally spoken Takic languages that may be assigned to the larger Uto–Aztecan family (Golla 2007: 74). These groups include the Gabrieleño, Cahuilla, and Serrano. Golla has interpreted the amount of internal diversity within these language-speaking communities to reflect a time depth of approximately 2,000 years. Other researchers have contended that Takic may have diverged from Uto–Aztecan ca. 2600 BC–AD 1, which was later followed by the diversification within the Takic speaking tribes, occurring approximately 1500 BC–AD 1000 (Laylander 2010).

4.2.1 Gabrieleño/Tongva

The archaeological record indicates that the Gabrieleño arrived in the Los Angeles Basin around 500 B.C. Surrounding cultural groups included the Chumash and Tataviam to the northwest, the Serrano and Cahuilla to the northeast, and the Juaneño and Luiseño to the southeast.
The name “Gabrieliño” or “Gabrieleño” denotes those people who were administered by the Spanish from the San Gabriel Mission, which included people from the Gabrieliño area proper as well as other social groups (Bean and Smith 1978; Kroeber 1925). Therefore, in the post-Contact period, the name does not necessarily identify a specific ethnic or tribal group. The names by which Native Americans in southern California identified themselves have, for the most part, been lost. Many modern Gabrieliño identify themselves as descendants of the indigenous people living across the plains of the Los Angeles Basin and refer to themselves as the Tongva (King 1994), within which there are a number of regional bands. The term Tongva is used in the remainder of this section to refer to the pre-Contact inhabitants of the Los Angeles Basin and their descendants.

Tongva lands encompassed the greater Los Angeles Basin and three Channel Islands, San Clemente, San Nicolas, and Santa Catalina. The Tongva established large, permanent villages in the fertile lowlands along rivers and streams, and in sheltered areas along the coast, stretching from the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. A total tribal population has been estimated of at least 5,000 (Bean and Smith 1978), but recent ethnohistoric work suggests a number approaching 10,000 (O’Neil 2002). Houses constructed by the Tongva were large, circular, domed structures made of willow poles thatched with tule that could hold up to 50 people (Bean and Smith 1978). Other structures served as sweat houses, menstrual huts, ceremonial enclosures, and probably communal granaries. Cleared fields for races and games, such as lacrosse and pole throwing, were created adjacent to Tongva villages (McCawley 1996). Archaeological sites composed of villages with various sized structures have been identified.

The largest ethnographic Tongva village in the region was that of Yanga (also known as Yaangna, Janga, Yangna, and Yabit), which was in the vicinity of the Pueblo of Los Angeles (McCawley 1996:56-57; NEA and King 2004). This village was reportedly first encountered by the Portola expedition in 1769. In 1771, Mission San Gabriel was established. Yanga provided a large number of the recruitments to this mission; however, the following the founding of the Pueblo of Los Angeles in 1781, opportunities for local paid became increasingly common, which had the result of reducing the number of Native American neophytes from the immediately surrounding area (NEA and King 2004). Mission records indicate that 179 Gabrieliño inhabitants of Yanga were recruited to San Gabriel Mission (King 2000:65; NEA and King 2004: 104). Based on this information, Yanga may have been the most populated village in the Western Gabrieliño territory.

Father Juan Crespi passed through the area near Yanga on August 2-3, 1769. The pertinent sections from his translated diary are provided here:

Sage for refreshment is very plentiful at all three rivers and very good here at the Porciúncula [the Los Angeles River]. At once on our reaching here, eight heathens came over from a good sized village encamped at this pleasing spot among some trees. They came bringing two or three large bowls or baskets half-full of very good sage with other sorts of grass seeds that they consume; all brought their bows and arrows but with the strings removed from the bows. In his hands the chief bore strings of shell beads of the sort that they use, and on reaching the
camp they threw the handfuls of these beads at each of us. Some of the heathens came up smoking on pipes made of baked clay, and they blew three mouthfuls of smoke into the air toward each one of us. The Captain and myself gave them tobacco, and he gave them our own kind of beads, and accepted the sage from them and gave us a share of it for refreshment; and very delicious sage it is for that purpose.

We set out at a half past six in the morning from this pleasing, lush river and valley of Our Lady of Angeles of La Porciúncula. We crossed the river here where it is carrying a good deal of water almost at ground level, and on crossing it, came into a great vineyard of grapevines and countless rose bushes having a great many open blossoms, all of it very dark friable soil. Keeping upon a westerly course over very grass-grown, entirely level soils with grand grasses, on going about half a league we came upon the village belonging to this place, where they came out to meet and see us, and men, women, and children in good numbers, on approaching they commenced howling at us though they had been wolves, just as before back at the spot called San Francisco Solano. We greeted them and they wished to give us seeds. As we had nothing at hand to carry them in, we refused [Brown 2002:339-341, 343].

The Portola party passed westward through the La Brea Tar Pits area (CA-LAN-159) the following day. This was a known area of Native American use for hunting and the gathering of tar and other area-specific resources (Westec 1983). A pertinent excerpt from Father Juan Crespi’s August 3, 1769 diary entry is provided here:

The Captain told me that when they scouted here, in a ravine about half a league to the westward they came upon about forty springs of pitch, or tar, boiling in great surges up out of the ground, and saw very large swamps of this tar, enough to have caulked many ships. [Brown 2002:341]

Upon leaving the La Brea Tar Pits, the Portola expedition continued westward, camping on August 4, 1769 near what is now the route Interstate 405 before heading northward into the mountains. Details of the day’s travels are provided below:

At a quarter past six in the morning we set out from this copious spring at the San Esteban Sycamores …. We pursued our way northwestward and on going about a quarter-league [0.85 mile], we came into a little flat hollow between small knolls, and then onward across level tablelands of dark friable soil….we turned west-northwestward and on going two hours, all over level soil, came to the watering place: two springs rising at the foot of a high tableland, their origin being higher up on the large plain here….At this spot we came upon a village at the aforesaid tableland and as soon as we arrived and set up camp, six very friendly, compliant tractable heathens came over, who had their little houses roofed with grass, the first we have been seeing of this sort. They brought four or six bowls of the usual seeds and good sage
which they presented to our Captain. On me they bestowed a good-sized string of the sort of beads they all have, made of white seashells and red ones, though not very bright-colored, that look to be coral. [Brown 2002:345-349]

The name of this village referenced to be near the August 4, 1769 Portola camp is unknown, and would have been located approximately 3 miles from the named village near Santa Monica (Kurwungo) and 5 miles from Sa’anga near the mouth of Ballona Creek. Sa’anga, likely within a mile of the present project site, has also been commonly referred to as Guaspet or Guashna, (NEA and King 2004), Saan (Kroeber 1925), or Sa’anga or Waaabunga (McCawley 1996). Ethnographic research completed by John Johnson (1988) pertaining to the inhabitants of San Clemente Island and Santa Catalina Island has indicated that there were many marriage ties between these islands and this village in the vicinity of the Ballona wetlands. Mission records indicate that a total of 95 neophytes came from this village; 87 of these individuals at Mission San Gabriel and the remaining eight at Mission San Fernando (NEA and King 2004). These records further suggest that marriage was common with the surrounding outside villages, but perhaps most often occurring with members of the large village of Yanga.

The Tongva 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 that of most native Californians, acorns were the staple food (an established industry by the time of the early Intermediate Period). Acorns were supplemented by the roots, leaves, seeds, and fruits of a wide variety of flora (e.g., islay, cactus, yucca, sages, and agave). Fresh water and saltwater fish, shellfish, birds, reptiles, and insects, as well as large and small mammals, were also consumed (Bean and Smith 1978:546; Kroeber 1925; McCawley 1996).

A wide variety of tools and implements were used by the Tongva 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 (McCawley 1996).

Tongva people processed food with a variety of tools, including hammerstones 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 (Blackburn 1963; Kroeber 1925; McCawley 1996).

At the time of Spanish contact, the basis of Tongva religious life was the Chinigchinich cult, 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 (Kroeber 1925). 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 (McCawley 1996).

Deceased Tongva 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 (Harrington 1942; McCawley 1996). Cremation ashes have been found in archaeological contexts buried within stone bowls and in shell dishes (Ashby and Winterbourne 1966), as well as scattered among broken ground stone implements (Cleland et al. 2007). Archaeological data such as these correspond with ethnographic descriptions of an elaborate mourning ceremony that included a wide variety of offerings, including 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 (Johnston 1962; McCawley 1996; Reid 1926). At the behest of the Spanish missionaries, cremation essentially ceased during the post-Contact period (McCawley 1996).

4.3 Historic-Period Overview

Post-Contact history for the State of California is generally divided into three periods: the Spanish Period (1769–1821), Mexican Period (1821–1848), and American Period (1846–present). Although Spanish, Russian, and British explorers visited the area for brief periods between 1529 and 1769, the Spanish 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.

4.3.1 Spanish Period (1769–1821)

Spanish explorers made sailing expeditions along the coast of southern California between the mid-1500s and mid-1700s. In search of the legendary Northwest Passage, Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo stopped in 1542 at present-day San Diego Bay. With his crew, Cabrillo explored the shorelines of present Catalina Island as well as San Pedro and Santa Monica Bays. Much of the present California and Oregon coastline was mapped and recorded in the next half-century by Spanish naval officer Sebastián Vizcaíno. Vizcaíno’s crew also landed on Santa Catalina Island and at San Pedro and Santa Monica Bays, giving each location its long-standing name. The Spanish crown laid claim to California based on the surveys conducted by Cabrillo and Vizcaíno (Bancroft 1885; Gumprecht 1999).

More than 200 years passed before Spain began the colonization and inland exploration of Alta California. The 1769 overland expedition by Captain Gaspar de Portola marks the beginning of California’s Historic period, occurring just after the King of Spain installed the Franciscan Order to direct religious and colonization matters in assigned territories of the Americas. With a band of 64 soldiers, missionaries, Baja (lower) California Native Americans, and Mexican civilians, Portola established the Presidio of San Diego, a fortified military outpost, as the first Spanish settlement in Alta California. In July of 1769, while Portola was exploring southern California,
Franciscan Fr. Junípero Serra founded Mission San Diego de Alcalá at Presidio Hill, the first of the 21 missions that would be established in Alta California by the Spanish and the Franciscan Order between 1769 and 1823.

The Portola expedition first reached the present-day boundaries of Los Angeles in August 1769, thereby becoming the first Europeans to visit the area. Father Crespi named “the campsite by the river Nuestra Señora la Reina de los Angeles de la Porciúncula” or “Our Lady the Queen of the Angeles of the Porciúncula.” Two years later, Friar Junípero Serra returned to the valley to establish a Catholic mission, the Mission San Gabriel Arcángel, on September 8, 1771 (Kyle 2002). Mission San Fernando Rey de España was established nearly 30 years later on September 8, 1797.

4.3.2 Mexican Period (1821–1846)

A major emphasis during the Spanish Period in California was the construction of missions and associated presidios to integrate the Native American population into Christianity and communal enterprise. Incentives were also provided to bring settlers to pueblos or towns, but just three pueblos were established during the Spanish Period, only two of which were successful and remain as California cities (San José and Los Angeles). Several factors kept growth within Alta California to a minimum, including the threat of foreign invasion, political dissatisfaction, and unrest among the indigenous population. After more than a decade of intermittent rebellion and warfare, New Spain (Mexico and the California territory) won independence from Spain in 1821. In 1822, the Mexican legislative body in California ended isolationist policies designed to protect the Spanish monopoly on trade, and decreed California ports open to foreign merchants (Dallas 1955).

Extensive land grants were established in the interior during the Mexican Period, in part to increase the population inland from the more settled coastal areas where the Spanish had first concentrated their colonization efforts. Nine ranchos were granted between 1837 and 1846 in the future Orange County (Middlebrook 2005). Among the first ranchos deeded within the future Orange County were Manuel Nieto’s Rancho Las Bolsas (partially in future Los Angeles County), granted by Spanish Governor Pedro Fages in 1784, and the Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana, granted by Governor José Joaquín Arrillaga to José Antonio Yorba and Juan Pablo Peralta in 1810 (Hallan-Gibson 1986). The secularization of the missions (enacted 1833) following Mexico’s independence from Spain resulted in the subdivision of former mission lands and establishment of many additional ranchos. The project area fell within a 13,920 acre Rancho La Ballona granted to Agustín and Ignacio Machado and Felipe and Tomas Talamantes in 1839 (McCawley 1996).

During the supremacy of the ranchos (1834–1848), landowners largely focused on the cattle industry and devoted large tracts to grazing. Cattle hides became a primary southern California export, providing a commodity to trade for goods from the east and other areas in the United States and Mexico. The number of nonnative inhabitants increased during this period because of the influx of explorers, trappers, and ranchers associated with the land grants. The rising California population contributed to the introduction and rise of diseases foreign to the Native American population, who had no associated immunities.
4.3.3 American Period (1846–Present)

War in 1846 between Mexico and the United States precipitated the Battle of Chino, a clash between resident Californios and Americans in the San Bernardino area. The Mexican-American War ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, ushering California into its American Period.

California officially became a state with the Compromise of 1850, which also designated Utah and New Mexico (with present-day Arizona) as U.S. Territories (Waugh 2003). Horticulture and livestock, based primarily on cattle as the currency and staple of the rancho system, continued to dominate the southern California economy through 1850s. The Gold Rush began in 1848, and with the influx of people seeking gold, cattle were no longer desired mainly for their hides but also as a source of meat and other goods. During the 1850s cattle boom, rancho vaqueros drove large herds from southern to northern California to feed that region’s burgeoning mining and commercial boom. Cattle were at first driven along major trails or roads such as the Gila Trail or Southern Overland Trail, then were transported by trains when available. The cattle boom ended for southern California as neighbor states and territories drove herds to northern California at reduced prices. Operation of the huge ranchos became increasingly difficult, and droughts severely reduced their productivity (Cleland 2005).

4.4 Project Site Historic Context

4.4.1 City of Los Angeles

In 1781, a group of 11 Mexican families traveled from Mission San Gabriel Arcángel to establish a new pueblo called El Pueblo de la Reyna de Los Angeles (the Pueblo of the Queen of the Angels). This settlement consisted of a small group of adobe-brick houses and streets and would eventually be known as the Ciudad de Los Angeles (City of Angels), which incorporated on April 4, 1850, only two years after the Mexican-American War and five months prior to California achieving statehood. Settlement of the Los Angeles region continued in the early American Period. The County of Los Angeles was established on February 18, 1850, one of 27 counties established in the months prior to California acquiring official statehood in the United States. Many of the ranchos in the area now known as Los Angeles County remained intact after the United States took possession of California; however, a severe drought in the 1860s resulted in many of the ranchos being sold or otherwise acquired by Americans. Most of these ranchos were subdivided into agricultural parcels or towns (Dumke 1944). Nonetheless, ranching retained its importance, and by the late 1860s, Los Angeles was one of the top dairy production centers in the country (Rolle 2003). By 1876, Los Angeles County reportedly had a population of 30,000 persons (Dumke 1944).

Los Angeles maintained its role as a regional business center and the development of citriculture in the late 1800s and early 1900s further strengthened this status (Caughey and Caughey 1977). These factors, combined with the expansion of port facilities and railroads throughout the region, contributed to the impact of the real estate boom of the 1880s on Los Angeles (Caughey and Caughey 1977; Dumke 1944).
By the late 1800s, government leaders recognized the need for water to sustain the growing population in the Los Angeles area. Irish immigrant William Mulholland personified the city’s efforts for a stable water supply (Dumke 1944; Nadeau 1997). By 1913, the City of Los Angeles had purchased large tracts of land in the Owens Valley and Mulholland planned and completed the construction of the 240-mile aqueduct that brought the valley’s water to the city (Nadeau 1997).

Los Angeles continued to grow in the twentieth century, in part due to the discovery of oil in the area and its strategic location as a wartime port. The county’s mild climate and successful economy continued to draw new residents in the late 1900s, with much of the county transformed from ranches and farms into residential subdivisions surrounding commercial and industrial centers. Hollywood’s development into the entertainment capital of the world and southern California’s booming aerospace industry were key factors in the county’s growth in the twentieth century.
5 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

5.1 SCCIC Records Search

As part of the cultural resources study prepared for the proposed project, SCCIC staff conducted a CHRIS records search on November 22, 2017 for the proposed project site and surrounding half-mile. This search included their collections of mapped prehistoric, historic, and built environment resources, Department of Parks and Recreation Site Records, technical reports, and ethnographic references. Additional consulted sources included historical maps of the project area, the NRHP, the CRHR, the California Historic Property Data File, and the lists of California State Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility. The results of the records search are presented in Confidential Appendix A. No previous cultural resources technical studies have included any portion of the proposed project location. No prehistoric archaeological sites, or other resources documented to be related to past Native American activity, have been previously identified within the project area. One prehistoric site, P-19-000047, was recorded within one half-mile of the project area.

5.1.1 Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Studies

Results of the cultural resources records search indicated that 30 previous cultural resource studies have been conducted within 0.5-mile (800 meters) of the project area between 1969 and 2015 (Table 1). None of these have intersected the current project area. Four studies (LA-00253, LA-02558, LA-02673, and LA-03495) directly address the prehistoric site P-19-00047, recorded approximately 750 feet outside the project area. The exact location of this resource will not be disclosed in order to ensure its location remains confidential. The following paragraphs provide a brief summary of these studies.

Table 1. Previous Technical Studies Within a Half-Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCCIC Report No.</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Proximity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA-00069</td>
<td>Rosen, Martin D.</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Archaeological Resources in Playa Del Rey Area, Leighton and Associates</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-00253</td>
<td>Dillon, Brian D.</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Report on Preliminary Archaeological Investigations at CA-LAN-47, the Admiralty Site, Marina Del Rey, California.</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-00462</td>
<td>Hector, Susan M.</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>An Archaeological Resource Survey an Impact Assessment of Tract No. 25635, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-01975</td>
<td>Neuenschwander, Neal J.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Survey and Clearance Report for the Proposed American Telephone and Telegraph Los Angeles Airport Central Office to the Santa Monica Central Office Fiber optic Communication Route</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-02372</td>
<td>Homburg, Jeffrey A.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Late Prehistoric Change in the Ballona Wetland.</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-02558</td>
<td>Altschul, Jeffery</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Gateway Project</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCCIC Report No.</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Proximity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA-02673</td>
<td>Altschul, Jeffery H., Jeffery A. Homburg, and Richard S. Ciolek-Torrello</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Life in Ballona: Archaeological Investigations at the Admiralty Site (CA-lan 47) and the Channel Gateway Site (CA-LAN-1596Ih)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-03495</td>
<td>Levine, Harvey S.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>A Review of Indian Burial Findings at Marina Del Rey</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-03592</td>
<td>Wlodarski, Robert J.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Study for the Marina View Apartments 3300 and 3324 Thatcher Ave. Marina Del Rey, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-03665</td>
<td>Dillon, Brian D.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Archaeological Impact Assessment of the Price-costco Plaza Project 18.4 Acres in Culver City, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-03898</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal for Archaeological Investigations in the Area of Hammock Street and Port Drive (vi-i.a.-90,405; Lincoln Blvd. to Slauson Avenue)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-03929</td>
<td>Wlodarski, Robert J.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring Report, Marina View Apartment Project, 3300 and 3324 Thatcher Avenue, Marina Del Rey, City of Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-04664</td>
<td>Hale, Alice E.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring the Costco Plaza Project Culver City, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-04866</td>
<td>Wallock, Nicole</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment Cingular Wireless Facility No. Sm 054-01, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-06239</td>
<td>Wesson, Alex, Bryon Bass, and Brian Hatoff</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project Cultural Resources (archaeological Resources) Appendix J of Application for Certification</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-06240</td>
<td>Bunse, Meta and Mikesell, Stephen D.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>El Segundo Power Redevelopment Project Historic Resources (built Environment) Appendix K of Application for Certification</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-06244</td>
<td>Duke, Curt</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment at &amp; T Wireless Services Facility No. D092.2 Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Previous Technical Studies Within a Half-Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCCIC Report No.</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Proximity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA-07725</td>
<td>Altschul, Jeffrey H.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Playa Vista: Archaeological Treatment Plan for CA-LAN-54</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-07939</td>
<td>Kane, Diane</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Historic Property Survey Report for the Route 1 Widening Project Between Culver Boulevard and Jefferson Boulevard in Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-08157</td>
<td>Foster, John M.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Archaeological Investigation for Thatcher Yard Demolition Project (work Order E1905949) 3233 and 3311 South Thatcher Avenue, City of Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-10880</td>
<td>Trinh, Phoung</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Tahiti Marina application for Department of the Army authorization</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-11819</td>
<td>Hirsch, Jennifer</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Historical resources Evaluation Report for the SR 90 Realignment and Admiralty Way Improvements Projects Marina Del Rey, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LA-00253**

LA-00253 describes an archaeological investigation for proposed Admiralty Place Development completed by Brian D. Dillon, PhD in 1988. The investigation included a surface collection of site P-19-000047 which produced shells, debitage, cores, handstones, choppers, and bowl fragments. In addition, subsurface testing revealed midden soils as shallow as 30 cm below the disturbed overburden surface. Dillon reported that intact portions of the site remain.

**LA-02558**

LA-02558 was completed by Statistical Research in 1989 for the Channel Gateway Project within the boundaries of site P-19-00047. Trenching excavations revealed intact midden soils on the site. Four fragments...
of human remains were positively identified. The report concluded with the observation that intact portions of the site appeared to remain and recommended additional testing to be conducted.

**LA-02673**

LA-02673 was completed by Statistical Research in 1992 as the continuation of LA-02558. The report documents a more rigorous investigation of site P-19-000047 at the request of the Southern California Gabrielino Indian Band. A combination of hand excavation and monitored machine excavation yielded similar artifacts to previous investigations as well as revealed the midden layer. This study succeeded in establishing clear boundaries to P-19-000047.

**LA-03495**

LA-03495 provides a brief article by Harvey S. Levine written in 1969. Levine reported two burials found that year, both of which were excavated by UCLA. The article also summarized artifacts that were been found in the vicinity in the past, which include additional burials, large stone bowls, mortars, pestles, projectile points, fish bones, and shells.

### 5.1.2 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

A total of five previously recorded cultural resources have been documented within a half-mile of the project site, none of which intersect the project site. Of these, three are historic-era buildings or structures (P-19-186163, P-19-186164, and P-19-186165), one is a historic era trash midden (P-19-001596), and one is a prehistoric site (P-19-000047; Table 2). P-19-000047 is discussed in greater detail below.

#### Table 2. Previous Recorded Resources Within a Half-Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Recording Events</th>
<th>Proximity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-LAN-000047</td>
<td>P-19-000047</td>
<td>Sa’ anga</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>1961 (K. Johnson); 1965 (Burnham and Romoli); 1988 (Marcus Lopez, Alliance of Native Americans); 1988 (Vera Rocha, Gabrielino Indian People)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-LAN-001596H</td>
<td>P-19-001596</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1989 (Steven Troncone, SRI)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4601 Lincoln Blvd</td>
<td>P-19-186163</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006 (J. Hirsch, EDAW, Inc)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Previous Recorded Resources Within a Half-Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Recording Events</th>
<th>Proximity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-19-186165</td>
<td>4560 Admiralty Way</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>2006 (J. Hirsch, EDAW, Inc)</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-19-000047

P-19-000047 was recorded as a large shell midden in 1961 approximately 750 feet away from the Project site. The direction will remain unspecified here to maintain locational confidentiality, however details are provided within Confidential Appendix A if required. The site reportedly yielded numerous artifacts associated with food preparation and tool manufacture including stone bowls, projectile points, debitage, bone tools, beads, antler harpoons, choppers, hammerstones, scrapers, and pestles. Two burial were reported at the site within site forms on file with the SCCIC. The Southern California Gabrieleño People tribe identified the site as sacred village site Sa’anga (LA-00253). Portions of the site have undoubtedly been destroyed due to development. However, the possibility of intact portions of the site exists (see summary of reports above).

P-19-000047 is a listed Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM-490), which is a database maintained by the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources. The resource is considered to meet the criteria for HCM designation, having yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. The inventory notes that the site has yielded “upwards of a dozen human burials and unique harpoon heads” (Los Angeles Historic Resources Inventory 2018).

Dudek reviewed historical aerials (available since 1952) and topographic maps (available since 1896) (NETR 2017). Aerials indicate that as far back as 1952 the parcel was used for agriculture. By 1972, the parcel appears to be unused and undeveloped. By 1980, the present layout of buildings had been constructed. Historic topographic maps do not reveal any development in the project area before the construction of the shopping plaza.

5.2 Native American Correspondence

5.2.1 NAHC Sacred Lands File Search

As part of the process of identifying cultural resources within or near the project, Eyestone Environmental contacted the NAHC to request a review of the Sacred Lands File (SLF). The NAHC emailed a response on June 12, 2017, which indicated that the SLF search was completed with negative results. Because the SLF search does not include an exhaustive list of Native American cultural resources, the NAHC suggested contacting Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have direct knowledge of cultural resources in or near the project. The NAHC provided the contact information of the ten persons and
entities with whom to contact along with the SLF search results. Documents related to the NAHC SLF search are included in Appendix B.

5.2.2 Record of Assembly Bill 52 Consultation

The proposed project is subject to compliance with AB 52 (PRC 21074) which requires consideration of impacts to “tribal cultural resources” as part of the CEQA process, and requires the lead agency to notify any groups (who have requested notification) of the proposed project who are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project. Pursuant to AB 52, the City Department of City Planning sent project notification letters on April 19, 2017 to all NAHC-listed Native American tribal representatives on their AB 52 Contact List. One response was received by the City on May 2, 2017 from Mr. Andrew Salas, Chairman of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation, who asserted the following:

*Your project lies within our ancestral tribal territory, meaning descending from, or a higher degree of kinship than traditional or cultural affiliation. Your project is located within a sensitive area and may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of our tribal cultural resources.*

On July 26, 2017, consultation occurred between the City and the representatives from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation by phone conference. Department of City Planning staff and representatives from the tribe participated in the phone conference to discuss the tribe’s concerns regarding tribal cultural resources as they relate to the Project Site. During the phone conference, the tribal representatives provided traditional information relating to the areas near the Project Site, including the following:

- The Playa Vista area is a highly sensitive area.
- There is a traditional trading route that went through the area – the Gaucha trading route (as shown in the 1938 LA County Map).
- The burial site at Lincoln Boulevard is named after the Saangna village.
- There were 360 burials in this one location (a quick Google search for ‘Playa Vista human remains cultural resources’ would yield information on this large burial site).
- Ballona creek, the wetlands, marshes, and the coastal area were a highly used area. Villages had a presence at the bluffs.
- The area is known for its oil resources, including the tar pits at Baldwin Hills.

No additional responses or requests for Native American tribal consultation regarding the present project have been provided to the City to date.
5.3 Ethnographic Research and Review of Academic Literature

Dudek cultural resources specialists reviewed academic and ethnographic literature for information pertaining to past Native American use of the project area. This review included consideration of sources identified by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation during past consultations with the City. Figure 3 shows the general project location (in blue) relative to features identified on the 1938 Kirkman-Harriman historical map that is often referenced in consultation. Based on this map, the project area is south of an old road that skirted around what is now Marina Del Rey, along the general route of today’s Washington Blvd. As noted during AB 52 consultation, this was a likely route of Native American travel prior to, and after, contact with Europeans. Heading northeast along the side of Ballona Creek, through houses associated with Rancho Ballona (now in Culver City), the route would have intersected the historic location of El Pueblo de Los Angeles approximately 13 miles to the northeast. The mouth of the Ballona Creek was historically a marshy environment, and is labeled on this map as Guacha. This may be in reference to the Gabrieleño name for this place, Waachnga (also referred to as Guasna, Guashna, Guaschpet, Guaspet, and other names; McCawley 1996). This area, and the surrounding region, would have provided an ecosystem supporting numerous and diverse flora and fauna, as well as natural resources such as tar seeps, that were considered important to Native American subsistence and commerce.

At the time of Portola’s and Crespi’s travels, and through the subsequent mission period, the area surrounding the project site would have been occupied by Western Gabrieleño/Tongva inhabitants (Figure 4 and Figure 5). Use of Gabrieliño as a language has not been documented since the 1930s (Golla 2011). One study made an effort to map the traditional Gabrieleño/Tongva cultural use area through documented family kinships and Native American recruitment numbers documented in mission records (NEA and King 2004). Working under the assumption that missionization affected the region’s population relatively evenly, this process allowed the researchers to identify the relative size of tribal villages (settlements) based on the number of individuals reported in these records (Figure 7). Traditional cultural use area boundaries, as informed by other ethnographic and archaeological evidence, were also drawn around these clusters of villages. This study indicates that nearest large village site to the project was Guaspet, located in a portion of today’s Culver City that fell within what was once the eastern portion of Rancho Ballona. McCawley suggests that this was actually the village of Saa’anga (also referred to as Sa’anga, Saan or Saa’an), as indicated by Harrington’s ethnographic accounts reporting this village to be at the “old Machado Ranch” (Figure 8; McCawley 1996: 61). He further suggested that there was another village in the vicinity of what is now Marina Del Rey by the name of Waachnga. This is the location where Kroeber has mapped the village he labeled Saan (as shown on Figure 5). Regardless of these discrepancies, it is likely that there were at least two named Gabrieleño communities between present day Culver City and the mouth of Ballona Creek during the Spanish and Mexican eras. It should be further note that these villages have also been represented on the 1938 Kirkman-Harriman map discussed above, which was prepared independently of these academic studies (see Figure 3). The most common name for the village in the Marina Del Rey area is Sa’anga (also the name used by the Gabrieleño Kizh in previous consultation). The 1938 map represents this village to the south of the mouth of Ballona Creek. This village location is consistent with information presented in a Los Angeles Times article reporting the identification.
of significant cultural deposits indicative of habitation activities and high numbers of Native American burials that were encountered a mile south of the present project site during construction of the Playa Vista housing community (LA Times 2008).

Regardless of the exact location of Sa’anga, which would likely have been subject to change over many hundreds of years in response to variable environmental conditions, it is clear from the archaeological record that area around the project site was subject to past Native American use. This is indicated by the presence of a previously recorded prehistoric habitation site (P-19-000047) identified within approximately 750 feet of the proposed project location. The exact location of this site has not been disclosed with the intent of keeping its location confidential.

Based on review of pertinent academic and ethnographic information, the project falls within the boundaries of the Gabrieleño/Tongva traditional use area. While sensitive cultural resources have been previously recorded in the surrounding vicinity, none have been identified within the project site. As such, no Native American TCRs have been previously documented in areas that may be impacted by the project.
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Figure 6. Kroeber (1925) Map of Gabrielino Traditional Use Areas
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Figure 7. Native American Settlements and Mission Recruitment
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6 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources

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 (Pub. Resources Code, § 21084.2.). AB 52 requires a TCR to have tangible, geographically defined properties that can be impacted by an undertaking. A search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File for the project site and a surrounding half-mile area did not identify the presence of Native American resources. No previously recorded Native American resources have been identified within the project site based on records held at the SCCIC. However, SCCIC records did indicate that a prehistoric/ethnohistoric site (P-19-000047) has been previously recorded approximately 750 feet outside the project site. This resource, identified as the village of Sa’anga during consultation with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation, reportedly included human burials and had a rich subsurface deposit with cultural material indicative of habitation and tool manufacture. This tribe further expressed concern that the project could impact TCRs. The present management approach included in project environmental documents for treatment of unanticipated TCRs will provide for appropriate consideration of TCRs should they be encountered during construction. No known TCRs have been identified within the project site through tribal consultation that would be impacted. Based on current information, impacts to TCRs would be less than significant.

6.2 Recommendations

An appropriate approach to potential impacts to TCRs is developed in response to the identified presence of a TCR by California Native American Tribes through the process of consultation. Government to government consultation initiated by the City, acting in good faith and after a reasonable effort, has not resulted in the identification of a TCR within the project site. Given that no TCR has been identified, no resource-specific mitigation measures pertaining to known TCRs appear to be obligated. However, in consideration of the known sensitivity of the surrounding area for cultural resources, it is recommended that periodic archaeological and Native American monitoring be conducted. A qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, should oversee and adjust monitoring efforts as needed (increase, decrease, or discontinue monitoring frequency) based on the observed potential for construction activities to encounter cultural deposits or material and as approved by the City. Following completion of construction, the qualified archaeologist should provide an archaeological monitoring report to the City and SCCIC with the results of the cultural monitoring program.

While no TCRs are anticipated to be affected by the project, the City has established a standard condition of approval to address the inadvertent discovery of tribal cultural resources. Should a potential tribal cultural resource be inadvertently encountered, this condition of approval provides for temporarily halting construction activities near the encounter and notifying the City and Native American tribes that have informed the City they are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed
project. If the City determines that a potential resource appears to be a tribal cultural resource (as defined by PRC Section 21074), the City would provide any affected tribe a reasonable period of time to conduct a site visit and make recommendations regarding the monitoring of future ground disturbance activities, as well as the treatment and disposition of any discovered tribal cultural resources. The Applicant would then implement the tribe’s recommendations if a qualified archaeologist reasonably concludes that the tribe’s recommendations are reasonable and feasible. The recommendations would then be incorporated into a tribal cultural resource monitoring plan and once the plan is approved by the City, ground disturbance activities could recommence. In accordance with the condition of approval, all activities would be conducted in accordance with regulatory requirements. As a result, potential impacts to TCRs would continue to be less than significant.

6.3 Mitigation

The above recommendations are incorporated within the following mitigation measure:

Mitigation Measure: Prior to commencing any initial ground disturbance activities including excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing asphalt, clearing, pounding posts, augering blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity at the project site, the Applicant, or its successor, shall retain and pay for archeological monitors, determined by the City’s Office of Historic Resources to be qualified to identify subsurface tribal cultural resources. A qualified archaeological principal investigator (qualified archaeologist), meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, should oversee and adjust archaeological and Native American monitoring efforts as needed (increase, decrease, or discontinue monitoring frequency) based on the observed potential for construction activities to encounter cultural deposits or material and as approved by the City. The archeological monitors shall observe all initial ground disturbing activities with potential to encounter significant cultural resources on the project site which shall be defined as ground-disturbing activities beneath existing asphalt parking areas and landscaping to depths of 10 feet. Monitoring of depths deeper than 10 feet or within areas presently occupied by existing buildings may occur based on the recommendation of the archaeological principal investigator and observed potential to encounter cultural resources. If initial ground disturbance activities are simultaneously occurring at multiple locations on the project site, an archeological monitor shall be assigned to each location where the ground disturbance activities are occurring.

Prior to the commencement of any ground disturbance activities at the project site, the Applicant, or its successor, shall notify any California Native American tribes that have informed the City they are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project that ground disturbance activities are about to commence and invite the tribes to observe the ground disturbance activities, if the tribes wish to monitor.
In the event that any subsurface objects or artifacts that may be tribal cultural resources are encountered during the course of any ground disturbance activities, all such activities shall temporarily cease within the area of discovery, the radius of which shall be determined by the qualified archeologist, until the potential tribal cultural resources are properly assessed and addressed pursuant to the process set forth below:

1. Upon a discovery of a potential tribal cultural resource, the Applicant, or its successor, shall immediately stop all ground disturbance activities and contact the following: (1) all California Native American tribes that have informed the City they are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project; (2) and the Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources.

2. If the City determines, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a)(2), that the object or artifact appears to be a tribal cultural resource in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, the City shall provide any affected tribe a reasonable period of time, not less than 14 days, to conduct a site visit and make recommendations to the Applicant, or its successor, and the City regarding the monitoring of future ground disturbance activities, as well as the treatment and disposition of any discovered tribal cultural resources.

3. The Applicant, or its successor, shall implement the tribe’s recommendations if a qualified archaeologist, retained by the City and paid for by the Applicant, or its successor, reasonably concludes that the tribe’s recommendations are reasonable and feasible.

4. In addition to any recommendations from the applicable tribe(s), a qualified archeologist shall develop a list of actions that shall be taken to avoid or minimize impacts to the identified tribal cultural resources substantially consistent with best practices identified by the Native American Heritage Commission and in compliance with any applicable federal, state or local law, rule or regulation.

5. If the Applicant, or its successor, does not accept a particular recommendation determined to be reasonable and feasible by the qualified archaeologist, the Applicant, or its successor, may request mediation by a mediator agreed to by the Applicant, or its successor, and the City. The mediator must have the requisite professional qualifications and experience to mediate such a dispute. The City shall make the determination as to whether the mediator is at least minimally qualified to mediate the dispute. After making a reasonable effort to mediate this particular dispute, the City may:

   (1) require the recommendation be implemented as originally proposed by the archaeologist;

   (2) require the recommendation, as modified by the City, be implemented as it is at least as equally effective to mitigate a potentially significant impact; (3) require a substitute recommendation be implemented that is at least as equally effective to mitigate a
potentially significant impact to a tribal cultural resource; or (4) not require the recommendation be implemented because it is not necessary to mitigate any significant impacts to tribal cultural resources. The Applicant, or its successor, shall pay all costs and fees associated with the mediation.

6. The Applicant, or its successor, may recommence ground disturbance activities outside of a specified radius of the discovery site, so long as this radius has been reviewed by a qualified archaeologist and determined to be reasonable and appropriate.

7. The Applicant, or its successor, may recommence ground disturbance activities inside of the specified radius of the discovery site only after it has complied with all of the recommendations developed and approved pursuant to the process set forth in paragraphs 2 through 5 above.

8. Copies of any subsequent prehistoric archaeological study, tribal cultural resources study or report, detailing the nature of any significant tribal cultural resources, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any significant tribal cultural resources shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton and to the Native American Heritage Commission for inclusion in its Sacred Lands File.

9. Notwithstanding paragraph 8 above, any information determined to be confidential in nature, by the City Attorney’s office, shall be excluded from submission to the SCCIC or the general public under the applicable provisions of the California Public Records Act, California Public Resources Code, section 6254(r), and shall comply with the City’s AB 52 Confidentiality Protocols.
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APPENDIX A
CONFIDENTIAL SCCIC Records Search
Re: Record Search Results for the Paseo Marino Project (10716)

The South Central Coastal Information Center received your records search request for the project area referenced above, located on the Venice, CA USGS 7.5’ quadrangle. The following reflects the results of the records search for the project area and a ½-mile radius:

As indicated on the data request form, the locations of resources and reports are provided in the following format: ☒ custom GIS maps ☐ shape files ☐ hand-drawn maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources within project area: 0</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources within ½-mile radius: 5</td>
<td>SEE ATTACHED MAP or LIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources listed in the OHP Historic Properties Directory within project area: 0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources listed in the OHP Historic Properties Directory within ½-mile radius: 1</td>
<td>SEE ATTACHED LIST FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY STATUS CODES – resource locations from the OHP HPD may or may not be plotted on the custom GIS map or provided as a shape file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports within project area: 0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports within ½-mile radius: 30</td>
<td>SEE ATTACHED MAP or LIST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource Database Printout (list): ☒ enclosed ☐ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Resource Database Printout (details): ☒ enclosed ☐ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Resource Digital Database (spreadsheet): ☒ enclosed ☐ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Report Database Printout (list): ☒ enclosed ☐ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Report Database Printout (details): ☒ enclosed ☐ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Report Digital Database (spreadsheet): ☒ enclosed ☐ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Resource Record Copies: ☒ enclosed ☐ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Report Copies: ☒ enclosed ☐ not requested ☐ nothing listed
OHP Historic Properties Directory: ☒ enclosed ☐ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility: ☒ nothing listed
Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments: ☒ enclosed ☒ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Historical Maps: ☒ enclosed ☒ not requested ☐ nothing listed
Ethnographic Information: ☒ not available at SCCIC
Historical Literature: ☒ not available at SCCIC
GLO and/or Rancho Plat Maps: ☒ not available at SCCIC
Caltrans Bridge Survey: ☒ not available at SCCIC; please go to http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/structur/strmaint/historic.htm
Shipwreck Inventory: ☒ not available at SCCIC; please go to http://shipwrecks.slc.ca.gov/ShipwrecksDatabase/Shipwrecks_Database.asp
Soil Survey Maps: (see below) ☒ not available at SCCIC; please go to http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx

Please forward a copy of any resulting reports from this project to the office as soon as possible. Due to the sensitive nature of archaeological site location data, we ask that you do not include resource location maps and resource location descriptions in your report if the report is for public distribution. If you have any questions regarding the results presented herein, please contact the office at the phone number listed above.

The provision of CHRIS Data via this records search response does not in any way constitute public disclosure of records otherwise exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act or any other law, including, but not limited to, records related to archeological site information maintained by or on behalf of, or in the possession of, the State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic Preservation, or the State Historical Resources Commission.

Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area. Additionally, Native American tribes have historical resource information not in the CHRIS Inventory, and you should contact the California Native American Heritage Commission for information on local/regional tribal contacts.

Should you require any additional information for the above referenced project, reference the record search number listed above when making inquiries. Requests made after initial invoicing will result in the preparation of a separate invoice.

Thank you for using the California Historical Resources Information System,

Isabela Kott
GIS Technician/Staff Researcher
Enclosures:

(X) Custom Maps – 3 pages
(X) Resource Database Printout (list) – 1 page
(X) Resource Digital Database (spreadsheet) – 5 lines
(X) Report Database Printout (list) – 3 pages
(X) Report Digital Database (spreadsheet) – 30 lines
(X) Resource Record Copies – (all) 22 pages
(X) Report Copies – (all) 1858 pages
(X) OHP Historic Properties Directory – 1 page
(X) National Register Status Codes – 1 page
(X) Invoice #18283.
APPENDIX B

Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File Search
June 12, 2017

Laura Rodriguez  
Eyestone Environmental  

Sent by E-mail: l.rodriguez@eyestoneeir.com  

RE: Proposed Paseo Marina Project, City of Marina del Rey; Venice USGS Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California  

Dear Ms. Rodriguez:  

Attached is a consultation list of tribes with traditional lands or cultural places located within the boundaries of the above referenced counties. Please note that the intent of the reference codes below is to avoid or mitigate impacts to tribal cultural resources, as defined, for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) projects under AB-52.  

As of July 1, 2015, Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 require public agencies to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purpose mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources:  

Within 14 days of determining that an application for a project is complete or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency shall provide formal notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, which shall be accomplished by means of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section. (Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(d))  

The law does not preclude agencies from initiating consultation with the tribes that are culturally and traditionally affiliated with their jurisdictions. The NAHC believes that in fact that this is the best practice to ensure that tribes are consulted commensurate with the intent of the law.  

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(d), formal notification must include a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. The NAHC believes that agencies should also include their notification letters information regarding any cultural resources assessment that has been completed on the APE, such as:

1. The results of any record search that may have been conducted at an Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), including, but not limited to:

   ▪ A listing of any and all known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE;  
   ▪ Copies of any and all cultural resource records and study reports that may have been provided by the Information Center as part of the records search response;  
   ▪ If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.  
   ▪ Whether the records search indicates a low, moderate or high probability that unrecorded cultural resources are located in the potential APE; and  
   ▪ If a survey is recommended by the Information Center to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
2. The results of any archaeological inventory survey that was conducted, including:
   - Any report that may contain site forms, site significance, and suggested mitigation measurers.
     
     All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure in accordance with Government Code Section 6254.10.

3. The results of any Sacred Lands File (SFL) check conducted through Native American Heritage Commission. A search of the SFL was completed for the project with negative results.

4. Any ethnographic studies conducted for any area including all or part of the potential APE; and

5. Any geotechnical reports regarding all or part of the potential APE.

Lead agencies should be aware that records maintained by the NAHC and CHRIS is not exhaustive, and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of a cultural place. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of a tribal cultural resource.

This information will aid tribes in determining whether to request formal consultation. In the case that they do, having the information beforehand will help to facilitate the consultation process.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our consultation list contains current information.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gayle Totton, M.A., PhD.
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Beverly Folkes, Elders Council
1019 Second St. Suite 1
San Fernando, CA, 91340

Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Kimia Fatehi, Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer
1019 Second Street, Suite 1
San Fernando, CA, 91340
Phone: (818) 837 - 0794
Fax: (818) 837-0796
kfatehi@tataviam-nsn.us

Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Alan Salazar, Chairman Elders Council
229 Ute Lane
Ventura, CA, 93001
Phone: (805) 423 - 0091

Gabrieleno /Tongva Nation
Sandonne Goad, Chairperson
106 1/2 Judge John Aiso St., #231
Los Angeles, CA, 90012
Phone: (951)807-0479
goat@gabrieleno-tongva.com

Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert Darame, Chairperson
P.O. Box 490
Bellflower, CA, 90707
Phone: (562) 761 - 6417
Fax: (562) 781-6417
gbtongva@gmail.com

Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe
Charles Alvarez,
23454 Vanowen Street
West Hills, CA, 91307
Phone: (310) 403 - 6048
roadkingcharles@aol.com

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA, 91322
Phone: (760) 885 - 0955
tsen2u@hotmail.com

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

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
P.O. Box 693
San Gabriel, CA, 91778
Phone: (626) 483 - 3564
Fax: (626)286-1262
GTTrtacouncil@aol.com
April 19, 2017

CASE No.: ENV-2016-3343-EIR
Project Address: 13450 W Maxella Ave.
Community Plan: Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey

Dear Tribal Representative:

This letter is to inform you that the Los Angeles Department of City Planning is reviewing the following proposed project:

The Project would demolish three existing shopping center-related buildings within the Project Site and construct a new mixed-use development consisting of 658 residential units and approximately 27,300 square feet of commercial uses (retail and restaurant). Project would include three mid-rise, seven-story buildings with a maximum height of approximately 77 feet and provide two pedestrian paseos.

Per AB 52, you have the right to consult on a proposed public or private project prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. You have 30 calendar days from receipt of this letter to notify us in writing that you wish to consult on this project. Please provide your contact information and mail your request to:

Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Attn: Jon Chang
200 N. Spring Street, Room 750
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Email: Jonathan.Chang@lacity.org
Phone No.: (213) 978-1914

Sincerely,

Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP
Director of Planning

Jon Chang
Major Projects & Environmental Analysis Section
Appendix N.2
AB 52 Notification Letter and Delivery Confirmations
April 19, 2017

CASE No.: ENV-2016-3343-EIR
Project Address: 13450 W Maxella Ave.
Community Plan: Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey

Dear Tribal Representative:

This letter is to inform you that the Los Angeles Department of City Planning is reviewing the following proposed project:

The Project would demolish three existing shopping center-related buildings within the Project Site and construct a new mixed-use development consisting of 658 residential units and approximately 27,300 square feet of commercial uses (retail and restaurant). Project would include three mid-rise, seven-story buildings with a maximum height of approximately 77 feet and provide two pedestrian paseos.

Per AB 52, you have the right to consult on a proposed public or private project prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. You have 30 calendar days from receipt of this letter to notify us in writing that you wish to consult on this project. Please provide your contact information and mail your request to:

Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Attn: Jon Chang
200 N. Spring Street, Room 750
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Email: Jonathan.Chang@lacity.org
Phone No.: (213) 978-1914

Sincerely,

Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP
Director of Planning

Jon Chang
Major Projects & Environmental Analysis Section
Project Location Map

Source: Google Earth, 2016.
July 7, 2017

Dear Customer:

The following is the proof-of-delivery for tracking number 778935238071.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Information:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>Delivery date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed for by:</td>
<td>M. ORTEGA</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017 12:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service type:</td>
<td>FedEx Standard Overnight</td>
<td>Delivery location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Handling:</td>
<td>Deliver Weekday</td>
<td>Receptionist/Front Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Fernando, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature image is available. In order to view image and detailed information, the shipper or payor account number of the shipment must be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shipping Information:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracking number:</td>
<td>778935238071</td>
<td>Ship date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight:</td>
<td>0.5 lbs/0.2 kg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recipient: San Fernando, CA US

Shipper: Los Angeles, CA US

Reference: Paseo Marina-AB 52 Tribal Ltr

Thank you for choosing FedEx.
July 7, 2017

Dear Customer:

The following is the proof-of-delivery for tracking number 778935241940.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Information:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status: Delivered</td>
<td>Delivered to: Apartment Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed for by: E.GOMEZ</td>
<td>Delivery location: Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service type: FedEx Standard Overnight</td>
<td>Delivery date: Apr 20, 2017 10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Handling: Deliver Weekday Residential Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature image is available. In order to view image and detailed information, the shipper or payor account number of the shipment must be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shipping Information:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracking number: 778935241940</td>
<td>Ship date: Apr 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight: 0.5 lbs/0.2 kg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recipient: Los Angeles, CA US  
Shipper: Los Angeles, CA US  
Reference: Paseo Marina-AB 52 Tribal Ltr

Thank you for choosing FedEx.
July 7, 2017

Dear Customer:

The following is the proof-of-delivery for tracking number 778935244294.

**Delivery Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status:</th>
<th>Delivered</th>
<th>Signed for by:</th>
<th>C.CRISTINE</th>
<th>Receptionist/Front Desk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service type:</td>
<td>FedEx Standard Overnight</td>
<td>Delivery location:</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Handling:</td>
<td>Deliver Weekday</td>
<td>Delivery date:</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017 16:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature image is available. In order to view image and detailed information, the shipper or payor account number of the shipment must be provided.

**Shipping Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracking number:</th>
<th>778935244294</th>
<th>Ship date:</th>
<th>Apr 19, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight:</td>
<td>0.5 lbs/0.2 kg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recipient: Los Angeles, CA US

Shipper: Los Angeles, CA US

Reference: Paseo Marina-AB 52 Tribal Ltr

Thank you for choosing FedEx.
**USPS Tracking® Results**

**Tracking Number:** 70151520000134854880

**Delivered**

**Product & Tracking Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE &amp; TIME</th>
<th>STATUS OF ITEM</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2017, 11:09 am</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>THERMAL, CA 92274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2017, 2:51 pm</td>
<td>Available for Pickup</td>
<td>THERMAL, CA 92274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2017, 2:49 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at Unit</td>
<td>THERMAL, CA 92274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 2017, 11:35 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 10:21 pm</td>
<td>Departed USPS Origin Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 8:19 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Origin Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>CULVER CITY, CA 90230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Available Actions**

- **Text Updates**
- **Email Updates**

**Can’t find what you’re looking for?**
# USPS Tracking® Results

## Track Another Package +

**Tracking Number:** 9590940225346306230688

In Transit, Delayed

## Product & Tracking Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postal Product:</th>
<th>Features:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Class Mail®</td>
<td>USPS Tracking®</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See tracking for related item: 70151520000134854880
(/go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=70151520000134854880)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE &amp; TIME</th>
<th>STATUS OF ITEM</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2017, 10:28 pm</td>
<td>Departed USPS Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2017, 9:38 am</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2017, 12:12 am</td>
<td>Departed USPS Facility</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2017, 6:38 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm</td>
<td>Return Receipt Associated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The package is delayed and will not be delivered by the expected delivery date. An updated delivery date will be provided when available. Your item departed our USPS facility in LOS ANGELES, CA 90052 on April 26, 2017 at 10:28 pm. The item is currently in transit to the destination.

## Available Actions

- Change Your Delivery Instructions
- Text Updates
- Email Updates
USPS Tracking® Results

Track Another Package +

Tracking Number: 7015173000030554773

Delivered

Expected Delivery Day: Friday, April 21, 2017

Product & Tracking Information

Postal Product: First-Class Mail®
Features: Certified Mail™, Return Receipt

See tracking for related item: 9590940225346306230749 / (http://tools.usps.com/go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=9590940225346306230749)

DATE & TIME

STATUS OF ITEM

LOCATION

April 21, 2017, 9:15 am
Delivered, PO Box
COVINA, CA 91723

Your item has been delivered and is available at a PO Box at 9:15 am on April 21, 2017 in COVINA, CA 91723.

April 20, 2017, 11:50 pm
Departed USPS Facility
SANTA ANA, CA 92799

April 20, 2017, 5:00 am
Arrived at USPS Facility
SANTA ANA, CA 92799

April 19, 2017, 11:38 pm
Departed USPS Origin Facility
LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 19, 2017, 8:19 pm
Arrived at USPS Origin Facility
LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm
Acceptance
CULVER CITY, CA 90230

Available Actions

Text Updates

Email Updates

See Less ▲
USPS Tracking® Results

Track Another Package +

Tracking Number: 9590940225346306230749

Delivered

Product & Tracking Information

Postal Product: First-Class Mail®
Features: USPS Tracking®

See tracking for related item: 70151730000030554773
(/go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=70151730000030554773)

Date & Time | Status of Item | Location
---|---|---
April 24, 2017, 3:45 pm | Delivered, In/At Mailbox | LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

Your item was delivered in or at the mailbox at 3:45 pm on April 24, 2017 in LOS ANGELES, CA 90045.

April 24, 2017, 8:25 am | Arrived at Post Office | LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

April 23, 2017, 2:36 am | Departed USPS Facility | LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 22, 2017, 11:37 am | Arrived at USPS Facility | LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 21, 2017, 11:00 pm | Departed USPS Facility | SANTA ANA, CA 92799

April 21, 2017, 9:50 pm | Arrived at USPS Facility | SANTA ANA, CA 92799

April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm | Return Receipt Associated | 

Available Actions

Text Updates

Email Updates
USPS Tracking® Results

Track Another Package +

Tracking Number: 7015173000030554780

Delivered

Product & Tracking Information

Postal Product: First-Class Mail®
Features: Certified Mail™
Return Receipt

See tracking for related item: 9590940225346306230732
(/go/TrackConfirmAction?lTLabels=9590940225346306230732)

DATE & TIME STATUS OF ITEM LOCATION
May 1, 2017, 9:22 am Delivered, PO Box BELLFLOWER, CA 90706

Your item has been delivered and is available at a PO Box at 9:22 am on May 1, 2017 in BELLFLOWER, CA 90706.

April 20, 2017, 11:06 am Available for Pickup BELLFLOWER, CA 90707

April 19, 2017, 10:21 pm Departed USPS Facility LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 19, 2017, 8:19 pm Arrived at USPS Facility LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm Acceptance CULVER CITY, CA 90230

Available Actions

Text Updates

Email Updates

See Less ▲

Can't find what you're looking for?
**USPS Tracking® Results**

**Tracking Number:** 9590940225346306230732

In-Transit

**Product & Tracking Information**

Postal Product: First-Class Mail®

Features: USPS Tracking®

See tracking for related item: 70151730000030554780 (/go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=70151730000030554780)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE &amp; TIME</th>
<th>STATUS OF ITEM</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 9, 2017, 3:23 pm</td>
<td>In Transit to Destination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 2017, 3:23 pm</td>
<td>Departed USPS Facility</td>
<td>PASADENA, CA 91109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 2017, 8:56 am</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>PASADENA, CA 91109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 2017, 4:08 pm</td>
<td>Notice Left</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 2017, 5:26 pm</td>
<td>In Transit to Destination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2017, 5:26 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm</td>
<td>Return Receipt Associated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Available Actions**

- **Text Updates**
- **Email Updates**

See Available Actions
# USPS Tracking® Results

## Track Another Package

**Tracking Number:** 70151730000030554797

### Delivered

**Postal Product:**
- First-Class Mail®
- Certified Mail™
- Return Receipt

**See tracking for related item:** 9580940225346306230725

**DATE & TIME** | **STATUS OF ITEM** | **LOCATION**
---|---|---
April 22, 2017, 3:23 pm | Delivered, PO Box | LOS ANGELES, CA 90086

Your item has been delivered and is available at a PO Box at 3:23 pm on April 22, 2017 in LOS ANGELES, CA 90086.

April 21, 2017, 5:21 am | In Transit to Destination |

April 19, 2017, 10:21 pm | Departed USPS Facility | LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 19, 2017, 8:19 pm | Arrived at USPS Facility | LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm | Acceptance | CULVER CITY, CA 90230

## Available Actions

### Text Updates

### Email Updates

**See Less**

---

**Can't find what you're looking for?**
USPS Tracking® Results

Track Another Package +

Tracking Number: 9590940225346306230725

Pre-Shipmeent

Expected Delivery Day: Friday, April 21, 2017

Product & Tracking Information

Postal Product: First-Class Mail®
Features:
USPS Tracking®

See tracking for related item: 70151730000030554797
(/go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=70151730000030554797)

DATE & TIME STATUS OF ITEM LOCATION

April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm Return Receipt Associated

The U.S. Postal Service has received electronic notification on April 19, 2017 at 1:26 pm that you have associated a return receipt to your item.

See Less

Available Actions

Text Updates

Email Updates

See Less

Can’t find what you’re looking for?

Go to our FAQs section to find answers to your tracking questions.

FAQs (http://faq.usps.com/?articleId=220900)
Tracking Number: 7015173000030554803

Delivered

Product & Tracking Information

Postal Product: First-Class Mail®
Features: Certified Mail™
Return Receipt

See tracking for related item: 9590940225346306230718
(/go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=9590940225346306230718)

DATE & TIME   STATUS OF ITEM                           LOCATION

April 24, 2017, 11:38 am   Delivered, Individual Picked Up at Post Office   SAN GABRIEL, CA 91776

Your item was picked up at the post office at 11:38 am on April 24, 2017 in SAN GABRIEL, CA 91776.

April 21, 2017, 7:34 am   Available for Pickup   SAN GABRIEL, CA 91778

April 21, 2017, 6:44 am   Arrived at Unit   SAN GABRIEL, CA 91778

April 20, 2017, 6:05 pm   Departed USPS Facility   SANTA ANA, CA 92799

April 20, 2017, 10:27 am   Arrived at USPS Facility   SANTA ANA, CA 92799

April 19, 2017, 10:21 pm   Arrived at USPS Origin Facility   LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm   Acceptance   CULVER CITY, CA 90230

Available Actions

Text Updates

Email Updates

Can’t find what you’re looking for?
Go to our FAQs section to find answers to your tracking questions.
### USPS Tracking® Results

**Tracking Number:** 9590940225346306230718

**Updated Delivery Day:** Wednesday, April 26, 2017

**Postal Product:** First-Class Mail®

**Features:**
- USPS Tracking®

**See tracking for related item:** 701517300000300554803

### Product & Tracking Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE &amp; TIME</th>
<th>STATUS OF ITEM</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2017, 3:52 pm</td>
<td>Delivered, In/At Mailbox</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2017, 8:05 am</td>
<td>Arrived at Post Office</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2017, 12:34 am</td>
<td>Departed USPS Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2017, 4:13 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2017, 10:17 pm</td>
<td>Departed USPS Facility</td>
<td>SANTA ANA, CA 92799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2017, 9:55 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>SANTA ANA, CA 92799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm</td>
<td>Return Receipt Associated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Available Actions

**Text Updates**

**Email Updates**
USPS Tracking® Results

Track Another Package +

Tracking Number: 701517300000030554810

Delivered

Product & Tracking Information

Postal Product: First-Class Mail®
Features: Certified Mail™
Return Receipt

See tracking for related item: 9590940225346306230701 (/go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=9590940225346306230701)

DATE & TIME                STATUS OF ITEM          LOCATION

April 26, 2017, 12:47 pm   Delivered               NEWHALL, CA 91321

Your item was delivered at 12:47 pm on April 26, 2017 in NEWHALL, CA 91321.

April 22, 2017, 12:27 pm   Available for Pickup   CHATSWORTH, CA 91311

April 21, 2017, 4:37 pm    In Transit to Destination

April 20, 2017, 11:36 pm   Departed USPS Facility SANTA CLARITA, CA 91383

April 20, 2017, 8:30 am    Arrived at USPS Facility SANTA CLARITA, CA 91383

April 19, 2017, 10:21 pm   Departed USPS Origin Facility LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 19, 2017, 8:19 pm    Arrived at USPS Origin Facility LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm    Acceptance               CULVER CITY, CA 90230

See Less  

Available Actions

Text Updates  

Email Updates  

USPS Tracking® Results

Tracking Number: 9590940225346306230701

In Transit, Delayed

Product & Tracking Information

Postal Product: First-Class Mail®

Features:
USPS Tracking®

See tracking for related item: 701517300000030554810
(/go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=701517300000030554810)

DATE & TIME                  STATUS OF ITEM                                      LOCATION

April 27, 2017, 7:51 am      Arrived at USPS Facility                           LOS ANGELES, CA 90052

The package is delayed and will not be delivered by the expected delivery date. An updated delivery date will be provided when available. Your item arrived at our USPS facility in LOS ANGELES, CA 90052 on April 27, 2017 at 7:51 am. The item is currently in transit to the destination.

April 26, 2017, 11:39 pm     Departed USPS Facility                           SANTA CLARITA, CA 91383

April 26, 2017, 11:06 pm     Arrived at USPS Facility                           SANTA CLARITA, CA 91383

April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm      Return Receipt Associated

Available Actions

Change Your Delivery Instructions

Text Updates

Email Updates
# USPS Tracking® Results

## Tracking Number: 70151730000030554827

### Delivered

## Product & Tracking Information

**Postal Product:** First-Class Mail®  
**Features:** Certified Mail™  
Return Receipt

See tracking for related item: 9590940225346306230695
(go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=9590940225346306230695)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE &amp; TIME</th>
<th>STATUS OF ITEM</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2017, 10:07 am</td>
<td>Delivered, Individual Picked Up at Postal Facility</td>
<td>SAN JACINTO, CA 92583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 2017, 6:32 am</td>
<td>Available for Pickup</td>
<td>SAN JACINTO, CA 92581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 2017, 6:29 am</td>
<td>Arrived at Unit</td>
<td>SAN JACINTO, CA 92583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2017, 10:25 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>MORENO VALLEY, CA 92553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 2017, 11:35 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 10:21 pm</td>
<td>Departed USPS Origin Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 8:19 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Origin Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>CULVER CITY, CA 90230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Less ▼

## Available Actions

### Text Updates

### Email Updates
**USPS Tracking® Results**

**Tracking Number:** 9590940225346306230695

**Updated Delivery Day:** Wednesday, April 26, 2017

**Product & Tracking Information**

Postal Product: First-Class Mail®

Features:
- USPS Tracking®

See tracking for related item: 701517300000305554827 (/go/TrackConfirmAction?tLabels=701517300000305554827)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE &amp; TIME</th>
<th>STATUS OF ITEM</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2017, 3:52 pm</td>
<td>Delivered, In/At Mailbox</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your item was delivered in or at the mailbox at 3:52 pm on April 26, 2017 in LOS ANGELES, CA 90045.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE &amp; TIME</th>
<th>STATUS OF ITEM</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2017, 8:05 am</td>
<td>Arrived at Post Office</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2017, 1:25 am</td>
<td>Departed USPS Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2017, 5:10 am</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA 90052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2017, 11:07 pm</td>
<td>Departed USPS Facility</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2017, 5:34 pm</td>
<td>Arrived at USPS Facility</td>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2017, 1:26 pm</td>
<td>Return Receipt Associated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available Actions

Text Updates

Email Updates
Appendix N.3

Native American Heritage Commission
Sacred Lands File Search Results
June 12, 2017

Laura Rodriguez
Eyestone Environmental

Sent by E-mail: l.rodriguez@eyestoneeir.com

RE: Proposed Paseo Marina Project, City of Marina del Rey; Venice USGS Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California

Dear Ms. Rodriguez:

Attached is a consultation list of tribes with traditional lands or cultural places located within the boundaries of the above referenced counties. Please note that the intent of the reference codes below is to avoid or mitigate impacts to tribal cultural resources, as defined, for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) projects under AB-52.

As of July 1, 2015, Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 require public agencies to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purpose mitigating impacts to tribal cultural resources:

**Within 14 days** of determining that an application for a project is complete or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency shall provide formal notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, which shall be accomplished by means of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section. (Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(d))

The law does not preclude agencies from initiating consultation with the tribes that are culturally and traditionally affiliated with their jurisdictions. The NAHC believes that in fact that this is the best practice to ensure that tribes are consulted commensurate with the intent of the law.

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(d), formal notification must include a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. The NAHC believes that agencies should also include with their notification letters information regarding any cultural resources assessment that has been completed on the APE, such as:

1. The results of any record search that may have been conducted at an Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), including, but not limited to:
   - A listing of any and all known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE;
   - Copies of any and all cultural resource records and study reports that may have been provided by the Information Center as part of the records search response;
   - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   - Whether the records search indicates a low, moderate or high probability that unrecorded cultural resources are located in the potential APE; and
   - If a survey is recommended by the Information Center to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
2. The results of any archaeological inventory survey that was conducted, including:
   - Any report that may contain site forms, site significance, and suggested mitigation measurers.
     All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure in accordance with Government Code Section 6254.10.

3. The results of any Sacred Lands File (SFL) check conducted through Native American Heritage Commission. A search of the SFL was completed for the project with negative results.

4. Any ethnographic studies conducted for any area including all or part of the potential APE; and

5. Any geotechnical reports regarding all or part of the potential APE.

Lead agencies should be aware that records maintained by the NAHC and CHRIS is not exhaustive, and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of a cultural place. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of a tribal cultural resource.

This information will aid tribes in determining whether to request formal consultation. In the case that they do, having the information beforehand well help to facilitate the consultation process.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our consultation list contains current information.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: gayle.totton@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gayle Totton, M.A., PhD.
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Beverly Folkes, Elders Council
1019 Second St. Suite 1
San Fernando, CA, 91340

Gabrieleno/Tongva Nation
Sandonne Goad, Chairperson
106 1/2 Judge John Aiso St., #231
Los Angeles, CA, 90012
Phone: (951) 807-0479
sgoad@gabrieleno-tongva.com

Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Kmia Fatehi, Tribal Historic and Cultural Preservation Officer
1019 Second Street, Suite 1
San Fernando, CA, 91340
Phone: (818) 837 - 0794
Fax: (818) 837-0796
kfatehi@tataviam-nsn.us

Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert Dorame, Chairperson
P.O. Box 490
Bellflower, CA, 90707
Phone: (562) 761 - 6417
Fax: (562) 761-6417
gtongva@gmail.com

Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Alan Salazar, Chairman Elders Council
229 Ute Lane
Ventura, CA, 93001
Phone: (805) 423 - 0091

Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe
Charles Alvarez,
23454 Vanowen Street
West Hills, CA, 91307
Phone: (310) 403 - 6048
roadkingcharles@aol.com

Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Beverly Salazar, Councilmember
1931 Shady Brooks Drive
Thousand Oaks, CA, 91362
Phone: (805) 558 - 1154

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Newhall, CA, 91322
Phone: (760) 885 - 0955
tsen2u@hotmail.com

Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation
Andrew Salas, Chairperson
P.O. Box 393
Covina, CA, 91723
Phone: (626) 925 - 4131
gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
P.O. Box 693
San Gabriel, CA, 91778
Phone: (626) 483 - 3564
Fax: (626)286-1262
GTTrTribalcouncil@aol.com

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7053.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.84 of the Public Resource Section 5097.38 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources assessment for the proposed Paseo Marina Project, Los Angeles County.
Appendix N.4
Request for Consultation
May 2, 2017
Re: AB52 Consultation request for 13450 W Maxella Ave. Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey

Dear Jon Chang,

Please find this letter as a written request for consultation regarding the above-mentioned project pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subd. (d). Your project lies within our ancestral tribal territory, meaning descending from, or a higher degree of kinship than traditional or cultural affiliation. Your project is located within a sensitive area and may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of our tribal cultural resources. Most often, a records search for our tribal cultural resources will result in a “no records found” for the project area. The Native American Heritage Commission, ethnographers, historians, and professional archaeologists can only provide limited information that has been previously documented about California Native Tribes. This is the reason the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) will always refer the lead agency to the respective Native American Tribe of the area because the NAHC is only aware of general information and are not the experts on each California Tribe. Our Elder Committee & tribal historians are the experts for our Tribe and are able to provide a more complete history (both written and oral) regarding the location of historic villages, trade routes, cemeteries and sacred/religious sites in the project area. Therefore, to avoid adverse effects to our tribal cultural resources, we would like to consult with you and your staff to provide you with a more complete understanding of the prehistoric use(s) of the project area and the potential risks for causing a substantial adverse change to the significance of our tribal cultural resources.

Consultation appointments are available on Wednesdays and Thursdays at our offices at 901 N. Citrus Ave. Covina, CA 91722 or over the phone. Please call toll free 1-844-390-0787 or email gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com to schedule an appointment.

** Prior to the first consultation with our Tribe, we require all those individuals participating in the consultation to view a video produced and provided by CalEPA and the NAHC for sensitivity and understanding of AB52. You can view the video at: http://nahc.ca.gov/2015/12/ab-52-tribal-training/

With Respect,

Andrew Salas, Chairman

Andrew Salas, Chairman
Nadine Salas, Vice-Chairman
Christina Swindall Martinez, secretary
Albert Perez, treasurer I
Martha Gonzalez Lemos, treasurer II
Richard Graidas, Chairman of the Council of Elders
P.O. Box 393, Covina, CA 91723
www.gabrielenoindians.org
gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com
Appendix N.5
Record of AB 52 Consultation
The following information was provided to the City by the Tribe:

- The Playa Vista area is a highly sensitive area.
- There is a traditional trading route that went through the area – the Gaucha trading route (as shown in the 1938 LA County Map).
- The burial site at Lincoln Blvd is named after the Saangna village that was present here.
- There were 360 burials in this one location (a quick Google search for ‘Playa Vista human remains cultural resources’ would yield information on this large burial site).
- Ballona creek, the wetlands, marshes, and the coastal area here was a highly used area. Villages had a presence at the bluffs.
- The area is known for its oil resources, including the tar pits at Baldwin Hills