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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose and Scope: The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LADPW), Bureau of Engineering, Environmental Management Division retained SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) to conduct cultural resources studies including a cultural resource records search and literature review; and preparation of a cultural resources technical report in support of the proposed Alameda Street Widening Between Harry Bridges Boulevard and Anaheim Street located in the Port of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California. This study is compliant with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1, Section 15064.5 of the Guidelines, and Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 of the Statutes of CEQA (Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 1998). PRC Section 5024.1 requires the identification and evaluation of historical resources that may be affected by a proposed project.

Dates of Investigation: SWCA requested a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search on April 25, 2014. The search was conducted by staff at the South Central Coastal Information System (SCCIC) located at California State University, Fullerton, who provided results to SWCA on April 29, 2014. SWCA contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on March 25, 2014, to request a search of the Sacred Lands File for traditional cultural resources. SWCA mailed letters on May 13, 2014, to 10 Native American groups or individuals who may have knowledge of cultural resources near the project area.

Summary of Findings: The SCCIC records search identified 20 previously conducted cultural resources studies within a 0.25 mile radius of the project area. Five of these previous studies occurred within at least a portion of the project area. An additional 14 unmapped overview studies were conducted within the Long Beach and Torrance, CA quadrangles. The SCCIC records search identified one previously recorded cultural resource within a 0.25-mile radius of the project area. Resource 19-004325 is an historic lumber yard site containing: railroad ties, brick paving, wooden conduits, bottles and bottle fragments, along with other domestic and industrial items.

Investigation Constraints: An intensive-level cultural resources survey was outside of the scope of this study.

Recommendations: No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified within the project area as a result of the records search and background research; however, the records search and responses from a local Native American group indicates that the project area is sensitive for subsurface archaeological resources. While the project area has been largely disturbed by urban development, the close proximity of the nearby village locations and marshland prior to historic fill episodes provides a reasonable likelihood that undisturbed subsurface deposits exist within the project area. The nearby historic archaeological resource recorded within the study area may indicate that undisturbed subsurface historic archaeological deposits may also exist within the project area. For these reasons, the project area should be treated as sensitive for archaeological resources. Measures to reduce potential effects/impacts to unanticipated archaeological resources are provided below.

Due to the high archaeological sensitivity of the project area and known cultural resources in the vicinity and possibly within the project area, it is recommended that a Monitoring Discovery Plan be prepared and approved prior to construction. This Monitoring Discovery Plan should include provisions for the identification and CRHR evaluation of any cultural resources that are encountered during ground disturbance, including the mitigation of adverse effects/impacts to any potentially significant resources through project redesign, data recovery, or other means.
Monitoring shall be conducted during all ground disturbing activities including, but not limited to: pavement removal, trenching, auguring, boring, and grading. In the event archaeological resources are encountered, work in the vicinity of the discovery shall halt until appropriate treatment of the resource is determined by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with the LADPW Bureau of Engineering.

SWCA further recommends that, before ground-disturbing activities begin, the archaeological monitor conduct a brief awareness training session for the benefit of all construction workers and supervisory personnel. The training, which could be held in conjunction with the project’s initial on-site safety meeting, would explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. Each worker would also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event that cultural resources or human remains/burials are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection and the immediate contact of the site supervisor and the archaeological monitor. It is recommended that this worker education session include visual images of artifacts that might be found in the project vicinity, and that the session take place on-site immediately before ground-disturbing activities begin.

**Disposition of Data:** The final cultural resources survey report and any subsequent related reports will be filed with LADPW; the SCCIC at California State University, Fullerton; and with SWCA’s Pasadena, California office. All field notes, photographs, and records related to the current study are on file at the SWCA Pasadena office.
# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location and Setting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project Work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory Setting</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Setting</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Setting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Setting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Overview</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Overview</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Overview</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site History</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Methods</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Research</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Search</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Lands File Search</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Historical Research</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results and Impact Considerations</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Resources</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References Cited</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURES

Figure 1. Project vicinity map .................................................................................................................. 3
Figure 2. Project location map ................................................................................................................. 4
Figure 3. Aerial photograph of the project area .................................................................................. 5

TABLES

Table 1. Prior Cultural Resources Investigations within 0.25 Mile of the Project Area ......................... 17
Table 2. Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources within 0.25 Mile of the Project Area
Identified by SCCIC .......................................................................................................................... 20
Table 3. Summary of Native American Coordination Efforts ................................................................. 21

APPENDICES

Appendix A. South Central Coastal Information Center Results Letter
Appendix B. Native American Contact Letters
INTRODUCTION

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) was retained by the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LADPW), Bureau of Engineering, to conduct desktop archaeological resources studies, including a records search and literature review, in support of the proposed Alameda Street Widening between Harry Bridges Boulevard and Anaheim Street (project). The project area is located along Alameda Street in the Port of Los Angeles in Los Angeles County, approximately 20 miles (32 kilometers) southwest of downtown Los Angeles.

This study was prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1, Section 15064.5 of the Guidelines, and Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 of the Statutes of CEQA (Governor’s Office of Planning and Research 1998). PRC Section 5024.1 requires the identification and evaluation of historical resources to determine their eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The CRHR is a listing of the state’s historical resources, and indicates which properties are to be protected from substantial adverse change, as defined by CEQA, to the extent that is prudent and feasible.

This study is an evaluation of known archaeological resources located within the project area, as well an assessment of the potential for additional resources that have not yet been recorded. Although information gained as part of the research effort indicates that historic resources may be present within the project area, no evaluation of historic resources or historic-age structures was conducted as part of this effort.

Project Personnel

SWCA Cultural Resources Senior Project Manager Sara Dietler, B.A., managed the project and contributed to the report. Brandi Shawn, B.A. conducted the Native American Contact program and contributed to the report. William Hayden, M.A., R.P.A prepared all of the figures for the report. This report was reviewed for quality assurance/quality control by Ms. Dietler and Cultural Resources Principal Investigator Heather Gibson, Ph.D., Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location and Setting

The proposed Alameda Street Widening between Harry Bridges Boulevard and Anaheim Street (project) encompasses an approximately 1.25 mile segment of Alameda Street between Harry Bridges Boulevard to the southwest, and Anaheim Street to the northeast in the City and Port of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California. The project area includes an existing five-lane segment of Alameda Street. Figure 1 shows the general vicinity of the project area. Figure 2 shows the location of the project area on the U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) Torrance and Long Beach, California 7.5-minute quadrangles. Figure 3 shows an aerial photograph of the project area.

Proposed Project Work

The Los Angeles Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering (LADPW BOE) proposes to upgrade Alameda Street and adjoining streets with improved infrastructure to accept increased traffic from existing and proposed projects located primarily within the Port of Los Angeles and the Wilmington Industrial Park and to adequately dispose of storm flows during rain storms. Alameda Street is under
capacity and is in a deteriorated state. The project will add additional travel and turn lanes, traffic signals and upgraded intersections and railway crossings. In addition, the project will add storm drain infrastructure to address flooding issues.
Figure 1. Project vicinity map.
Figure 2. Project location map.
Figure 3. Aerial photograph of the project area
REGULATORY SETTING

This section identifies state legislation, and local statues, ordinances, and guidelines that govern the identification and treatment of cultural resources and analysis of project-related effects to cultural resources. The lead agency must consider these requirements when making decisions about projects that may affect cultural resources.

State

CEQA

CEQA requires a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a *significant effect* on historical resources (California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 21084.1). 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 (Section 21083.2[a], [b], and [c]).

Section 21083.2(g) defines a *unique archaeological resource* as an archaeological artifact, object, or site that meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions (and there is 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.

A *historical resource* is a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the CRHR (Section 21084.1); a resource included in a local register of historical resources (CCR Section 15064.5[a][2]); or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (CCR Section 15064.5[a][3]).

PRC Section 5024.1, CCR Section 15064.5, and PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 were used as the basic guidelines for this cultural resources study. PRC Section 5024.1 requires an evaluation of historical resources to determine their eligibility for listing in the CRHR. The purpose of the CRHR is to maintain listings of the state’s historical resources and to indicate which properties are to be protected from substantial adverse change. The eligibility criteria for the CRHR were expressly developed to mirror the established criteria for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

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 installation, 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.

Impacts to significant cultural resources that affect the characteristics of any resource that qualify it for the NRHP or adversely alter the significance of a resource listed on or eligible for the CRHR are considered significant effects on the environment. These impacts could result from “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” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[b][1], 2000). Material impairment is defined as demolition or alteration “in an adverse manner [of] those characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[b][2][A]).

The disposition of burials falls first under the general prohibition on disturbing or removing human remains under California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. More specifically, remains suspected to be Native American are treated under CEQA at CCR Section 15064.5 and cite language found at PRC Section 5097.98 that illustrates the process to be followed in the event that remains are discovered. Further, if human remains are discovered during the construction of the proposed project, no further disturbance to the site shall occur, and the Los Angeles County Coroner must be notified (PRC 15064.5 and 5097.98). If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 48 hours. The NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendant (MLD) of the deceased, and the MLD may then make recommendations as to the disposition of the remains.

Local

City of Los Angeles

LOS ANGELES HISTORIC-CULTURAL MONUMENTS

Local landmarks in the City of Los Angeles are known as historic cultural monuments (HCMs) and are managed under the aegis of the Planning Department, Office of Historic Resources. An HCM, monument, or local landmark is defined in the Cultural Heritage Ordinance as follows:

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 (Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 22.171.7 Added by Ordinance No. 178,402, Effective 4-2-07).
PROJECT SETTING

Environmental Setting

The project area is located within the Port of Los Angeles Community Plan area in the City of Los Angeles, which is adjacent to the communities of San Pedro and Wilmington, and approximately 20 miles south of downtown Los Angeles. Access to and from the project site is provided by a network of freeways and arterial routes. The freeway network consists of the Harbor Freeway (I-110), the Long Beach Freeway (I-710), the San Diego Freeway (I-405), and the Terminal Island Freeway (SR-103/SR-47).

According to a geological map of the Long Beach Quadrangle (Saucedo et. al. 2003), the vicinity of the project area is characterized by artificial fill. To the north of the project area, old alluvial flood plain deposits are mapped. Prior to the early twentieth century, the site was located within the Wilmington Lagoon, an area described historically as mudflats that experienced periodic inundation. Substantial dredging and filling were conducted to create the modern inner harbor. The surface of the site consists of asphalt paving. Near Anaheim Street there are seven (7) palms (street trees). Between Eubanks Street and E Street there are a number of volunteer palms growing along the property’s south right-of-way.

Cultural Setting

Prehistoric Overview

Numerous chronological sequences have been devised to aid in understanding cultural changes in southern California. Building on early studies and focusing on data synthesis, Wallace (1955, 1978) developed a prehistoric chronology for the southern California coastal region that is still widely used today and is applicable to near-coastal and many inland areas. Four horizons are presented in Wallace’s prehistoric sequence: Early Man, Milling Stone, Intermediate, and Late Prehistoric. Although Wallace’s 1955 synthesis initially lacked chronological precision due to a paucity of absolute dates (Moratto 1984:159), this situation has been alleviated by the availability of thousands of radiocarbon dates that have been obtained by southern California researchers in the last three decades (Byrd and Raab 2007:217). Several revisions have been made to Wallace’s 1955 synthesis using radiocarbon dates and projectile point assemblages (e.g., Koerper and Drover 1983; Koerper et al. 2002; Mason and Peterson 1994). The summary of prehistoric chronological sequences for southern California coastal and near-coastal areas presented below is a composite of information in Wallace (1955) and Warren (1968) as well as more recent studies, including Koerper and Drover (1983).

HORIZON I–EARLY MAN (CA. 10,000–6000 B.C.)

The earliest accepted dates for archaeological sites on the southern California coast are from two of the northern Channel Islands, located off the coast of Santa Barbara. On San Miguel Island, Daisy Cave clearly establishes the presence of people in this area approximately 10,000 years ago (Erlandson 1991:105). On Santa Rosa Island, human remains have been dated from the Arlington Springs site to approximately 13,000 years ago (Johnson et al. 2002). Present-day Orange and San Diego Counties contain several sites dating to 9,000–10,000 years ago (Byrd and Raab 2007:219; Macko 1998:41; Mason and Peterson 1994:55–57; Sawyer and Koerper 2006). Although the dating of these finds remains controversial, several sets of human remains from the Los Angeles Basin (e.g., “Los Angeles Man,” “La Brea Woman,” and the Haverty skeletons) apparently date to the middle Holocene, if not earlier (Brooks et al. 1990; Erlandson et al. 2007:54).
Recent data from Horizon I sites indicate that the economy was a diverse mixture of hunting and gathering, with a major emphasis on aquatic resources in many coastal areas (e.g., Jones et al. 2002), and a greater emphasis on large-game hunting inland.

**HORIZON II–MILLING STONE (6000–3000 B.C.)**

Set during a drier climatic regime than the previous horizon, the Milling Stone horizon is characterized by subsistence strategies centered on collecting plant foods and small animals. The importance of the seed processing is apparent in the dominance of stone grinding implements in contemporary archaeological assemblages; namely, milling stones (metates) and handstones (manos). Recent research indicates that Milling Stone horizon food procurement strategies varied in both time and space, reflecting divergent responses to variable coastal and inland environmental conditions (Byrd and Raab 2007:220).

**HORIZON III–INTERMEDIATE (3000 B.C.–A.D. 500)**

The Intermediate horizon is characterized by a shift toward a hunting and maritime subsistence strategy, along with a wider use of plant foods. An increasing variety and abundance of fish, land mammal, and sea mammal remains are found in sites from this horizon along the California coast. Related chipped stone tools suitable for hunting are more abundant and diversified, and shell fishhooks became part of the toolkit during this period. Mortars and pestles became more common during this period, gradually replacing manos and metates as the dominant milling equipment, signaling a shift away from the processing and consuming of hard seed resources to the increasing importance of the acorn (e.g., Glassow et al. 1988; True 1993).

**HORIZON IV–LATE PREHISTORIC (A.D. 500–HISTORIC CONTACT)**

The Late Prehistoric period, spanning from approximately 1500 years B.P. to the Spanish mission era, is the period associated with the florescence of contemporary Native American groups. Gabrieliño villages were reported to have been most abundant near the Los Angeles River, in the area north of downtown Los Angeles, known as the Glendale Narrows and those areas along the river’s various outlets into the sea including San Pedro Bay (Gumprecht 1999). Early explorers such as the Cabrillo Expedition, visited the bay in 1542, and described the peninsula as “Baia de los Fumos” due to the large volume of smoke they saw there. Information currently available indicates that a greater concentration of Gabrieliño placenames existed on the Palos Verdes Peninsula than any other similar areas in the Gabrieliño region (McCawley 1996:63). Nine placenames are recorded in approximately 40 square miles of territory including: Haraasnga, Toveemonga, Kiinkenga, Chaawvenga, Xuuxonga, ʿAataveanga, Swaanga, Ahwaanga, and Tevaaxaʿanga. Among those recorded adjacent the San Pedro Bay are Swaanga, Ahwaanga, and Tevaaxaʿanga all of which were located to the north of the peninsula along the Los Angeles River. Chaawvenga, Xuuxonga, ʿAataveanga lie on the eastern side of the peninsula, in close proximity to the project area. Toveemonga, Chaawvenga, Xuuxonga, ʿAataveanga, and Swaanga were known to have been occupied as late as the early 1800s based on information contained in the baptismal registers from the Mission San Gabriel.

Archaeological evidence suggests that human occupation of the Palos Verdes Peninsula began possibly as early as 8,000 years ago and indicates a very long, continued habitation as evidenced by the Malaga Cove archaeological site (McCawley 1996, Walker 1952, Wallace 1985). The deeply stratified site documents one of the longest continual occupation episodes recorded on the south coast. The site stratigraphy and material cultural assemblage provided a framework of early cultural chronological sequences for the region and Malaga Cove is generally recognized as a type site for the south coast area (Frazier 2000). Although the site is approximately seven miles northwest of the current project area, it is likely indicative of the type and depth of habitation remains that may have existed in the San Pedro Bay vicinity.
San Pedro Bay was heavily occupied during the prehistoric period. The estuarine environments of this area provided inhabitants with abundant subsistence resources and appear to have supported semi-permanent or permanent villages. Other nearby archeological sites include but are not limited to the following: CA-LAN-145, a small campsite possibly associated with the village of ‘Aataveanga, CA-LAN-147, a refuse deposit possibly associated with the village of Xuuxonga, and CA-LAN-283, the San Pedro Harbor Site, a large village site overlooking Wilmington Lagoon. Early and large scale development in the San Pedro Bay area likely precluded formal observation and recordation of many archaeological sites in the Wilmington Lagoon. It is likely that prehistoric sites were destroyed or buried under fill and port development before any information could be gleaned from them regarding the cultural traditions, chronological implications and settlement patterns in the Wilmington Lagoon and the project vicinity.

**Ethnographic Overview**

The project is in an area historically occupied by the Gabrielino/Tongva (Bean and Smith 1978:538; Kroeber 1925:Plate 57). Surrounding native groups included the Chumash and Tatataviam/Alliklik to the north, the Serrano to the East, and the Luiseño/Juaneño to the south. There is well-documented interaction between the Gabrielino and many of their neighbors in the form of intermarriage and trade.

The name Gabrielino (sometimes spelled Gabrieleno or Gabrieleño) denotes those people who were administered by the Spanish from Mission San Gabriel. By the same token, Native Americans in the sphere of influence of Mission San Fernando were historically referred to as Fernandeño (Kroeber 1925:Plate 57). This group is now considered to be a regional dialect of the Gabrielino language, along with the Santa Catalina Island and San Nicolas Island dialects (Bean and Smith 1978:538). In the post-Contact period, Mission San Gabriel included natives of the greater Los Angeles area, as well as members of surrounding groups such as Kitanemuk, Serrano, and Cahuilla. There is little evidence that the people we call Gabrielino had a broad term for their group (Dakin 1978:222); rather, they identified themselves as an inhabitant of a specific community through the use of locational suffixes (e.g., a resident of Yaanga was called a Yabit, much the same way that a resident of New York is called a New Yorker; Johnston 1962:10).

Native words that have been suggested as labels for the broader group of Native Americans in the Los Angeles region include Tongva (or Tong-v; Merriam 1955:7–86) and Kizh (Kij or Kichereno; Heizer 1968:105), although there is evidence that these terms originally referred to local places or smaller groups of people within the larger group that we now call Gabrielino. Nevertheless, many present-day descendants of these people have taken on Tongva as a preferred group name because it has a native rather than Spanish origin (King 1994:12). Consequently, the term Gabrielino/Tongva is used in the remainder of this report to designate native people of the Los Angeles Basin and their descendants.

Gabrielino/Tongva lands encompassed the greater Los Angeles Basin and three Channel Islands: San Clemente, San Nicolas, and Santa Catalina. Their mainland territory was bounded on the north by the Chumash at Topanga Creek, the Serrano at the San Gabriel Mountains in the east, and the Juaneño on the south at Aliso Creek (Bean and Smith 1978:538; Kroeber 1925:636).

The Gabrielino/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 variety of flora (e.g., islay, cactus, yucca, sages, and agave). Freshwater and saltwater fish, shellfish, birds, reptiles, and insects, as well as large and small mammals, were also consumed (Bean and Smith 1978:546; Kroeber 1925:631–632; McCawley 1996:119–123, 128–131).
The Gabriño/Tongva used a variety of tools and implements to gather and collect food resources. These included the bow and arrow, traps, nets, blinds, throwing sticks and slings, spears, harpoons, and hooks. Groups residing near the ocean used oceangoing plank canoes and tule balsa canoes for fishing, travel, and trade between the mainland and the Channel Islands (McCawley 1996:7).

Gabriño/Tongva people processed food with a variety of tools, including hammer stones and anvils, mortars and pestles, manos and metates, strainers, leaching baskets and bowls, knives, bone saws, and wooden drying racks. Food was consumed from a variety of vessels. Catalina Island steatite was used to make ollas and cooking vessels (Blackburn 1963; Kroeber 1925:629; McCawley 1996:129–138).

At the time of Spanish contact, the basis of Gabriño/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 1925:637–638). 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 1996:143–144).

Deceased Gabriño/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 1996:157). Cremation ashes have been found in archaeological contexts buried within stone bowls and in shell dishes (Ashby and Winterbourne 1966:27), 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 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 1962:52–54; McCawley 1996:155–165; Reid 1926:24–25).

**Historic Overview**

As a consequence of increasing tensions between the Spanish crown and Mexican independence in the late eighteenth century, the king of Spain initiated land grants of Alta California to Spanish soldiers and officials. Rancho San Pedro, later known as Dominguez Ranch, was one of the first of California’s land grants. Granted in 1784 to Juan Jose Dominguez, a former soldier of the Spanish army serving at the Presidio of San Diego, this rancho encompassed 75,000 acres including Rattlesnake [Terminal] Island and land along the historic shoreline adjacent to the present project area (Kielbasa 1998; Livingstone et al. 2006:23; Weinman and Stickel 1978:26). Rancho San Pedro grew to prominence as the premier producer of cattle and sheep in the region (Livingstone et al. 2006:23). Rancho San Pedro extended over 12 square miles in the area extending from the Palos Verdes Peninsula to the east end of Terminal Island and extended north toward the South Bay and east to the Los Angeles River. The territory included the present-day towns of Carson, Compton, Gardena, Lomita, Palos Verde Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Torrance, the western portions of Long Beach and Paramount, Harbor City, Harbor Gateway, San Pedro, Terminal Island, and Wilmington (Kielbasa 1998). When Juan Jose Dominguez died in 1809, having no children, he left half of his holdings to his nephew Cristobal Dominguez and the other half was divided between Manuel Gutierrez and Mateo Rubio, who worked on and managed his rancho. Gutierrez assumed control of the rancho and gave permission to a friend, Jose Dolores Sepulveda, to graze a thousand head of cattle on the southwestern portion of the property at Palos Verdes. Sepulveda built an adobe here and made improvements to the land. This use of Rancho San Pedro land by Sepulveda eventually became the subject of litigation between Sepulveda and the Dominguez heirs in the 1820s to 1840s; the original Rancho San Pedro land was eventually divided between the two families in 1846.
San Pedro served as the busiest port in the region from the 1770s to the 1830s, throughout most of the Spanish and Mexican Periods. The restrictive nature of Spanish mercantilist policy meant that Spain enjoyed a virtual monopoly on trade with its subjects in California. However, Spanish ships visited the area on average only once per year, bringing necessities that were not produced locally by the missions. Illegal trade with American and other foreign ships grew to fill this gap, especially in the early part of the 19th century (Livingstone et al. 2006: 24).

Following Mexican independence, these restrictions on foreign trade were lifted and activity at the port increased. Early exports included hides and tallow. An early merchant in the hide trade, the McCulloch and Hartnell Company established agreements with the missions in Mexican California and built an adobe warehouse at San Pedro (Livingstone et al. 2006: 26). Goods were brought overland to San Pedro from the missions, particularly San Gabriel which produced more hides than any other mission. The contracts that McCulloch and Hartnell set up with the missions led to an English monopoly on the mission trade for a period of three years. Once these initial contracts expired, however, other English and American traders took advantage of the opportunity to enter into trade with the California missions.

In the 1830s, the secularization of the mission system, the rise of private ranching, the increase in the local population, and the growth of local retail businesses caused more changes to the economic landscape. Los Angeles gradually grew from a relatively small pueblo to a town and then a city. Together, these factors led to growth in consumer demand (Livingstone et al. 2006: 30).

As the possibility of a takeover of California by the United States loomed large in the 1840s, the Mexican government increased the number of land grants in an effort to keep the land in Mexican hands, and more than 600 ranchos were created between 1833 and 1846. In 1846, U.S. naval forces took Monterey and American forces captured Los Angeles shortly thereafter. Los Angeles soon slipped from American control, and needed to be retaken in 1847. Approximately 600 U.S. sailors, marines, Army dragoons, and mountain men converged under the leadership of Colonel Stephen W. Kearney and Commodore Robert F. Stockton in early January of that year to challenge the California resistance, which was led by General Jose Maria Flores. The American party scored a decisive victory over the Californians, who formally surrendered a year later in Los Angeles, opening the door for increased American immigration (Takahashi 1980).

The end of the war with the U.S. in 1848 marked the beginning of the American Period. By this time, the hide and tallow trade had virtually disappeared and the rancho lifestyle was in decline. The beginning of the American Period in Southern California was marked by the arrival of industrial capitalism, and the freight and transportation industry that had gradually grown between San Pedro and Los Angeles grew in importance even further. The discovery of gold in northern California led to an enormous influx of American citizens in the 1850s and 1860s, and these settlers rapidly displaced the old rancho families.

Shipping activity in San Pedro increased exponentially beginning in the late 1840s. Wagon and stagecoach lines were developed to connect Los Angeles with San Pedro via the Alameda corridor. In 1852, Phinneas Banning, who has been referred to as “the father of the Port of Los Angeles,” took John Temple’s place in Temple and Alexander shipping firm (Marquez and Turenne 2007). There, he built passenger and freight services that included 500 mules, 40 horses, 15 stagecoaches, and at last 30 freight wagons (Livingstone et al. 2006: 33). Banning would expand their business over the coming years and came to play an influential role in the growing transportation industry of California. Changing their name to Alexander and Banning, they added a San Pedro to San Francisco service in 1853, catering to the booming gold fields.

In 1856, Banning and his partners purchased land from the Dominguez estate: a portion of Rancho San Pedro approximately 4 miles northeast of the town of San Pedro. When a powerful storm destroyed Banning’s San Pedro wharf the following year, he moved his operation to this location and named it New
San Pedro. This settlement later became known as Wilmington, after the city by the same name in Banning’s native Delaware. Banning built a wharf at Wilmington and ferried goods and passengers from ships anchored outside the bay (Marquez and Turenne 2007: 48).

In 1859, Banning built southern California’s first railroad, an 1800 long piece of rail constructed on top of a timber wharf. The horse-drawn cars moved freight between Banning’s wharf and his warehouse in the town of Wilmington (Figure 4) (Livingstone et al. 2006: 35).

Figure 4. Banning’s Wilmington Wharf, 1870 (Vickery 1979).

In 1862, Banning helped to attract the Union Army to San Pedro, selling 27 acres for the establishment of Camp Drum in Wilmington (Marquez and Turenne 2007: 50). The U.S. Army stationed 4,000 soldiers at this facility during the Civil War (Figure 5). Banning was elected to the California State Senate in the late 1860s and lobbied for the state’s first railroad bill which resulted in the construction of the Los Angeles and San Pedro (LASP) Railroad between Los Angeles and Wilmington in 1868-1869. Los Angeles was connected to the transcontinental railroad when the Southern Pacific (SP) connection was completed from San Francisco in 1876. As part of the agreement for the SP to pass through Los Angeles, the city transferred ownership of the LASP line (Figure 6) (Marquez and Turenne 2007: 57). The completion of the second transcontinental line, the Santa Fe, took place in 1886 causing a fare war which drove fares to an unprecedented low. More settlers continued to head west and the demand for real estate skyrocketed. The city’s population rose from 11,000 in 1880 to 50,000 by 1890 (Meyer 1981:45).
In the 1870s, the federal government undertook several improvements to San Pedro Bay. In 1871, a dredging project began in order to deepen and extend the Main Channel (Port of Los Angeles [POLA] 2012). This dredging allowed for larger ships to enter further into the bay and close to the docks along the shore (Livingstone et al. 2006: 38). Around the same time, the government built the first major breakwater in the area, protecting harbor establishments from seasonal storms and high tides (Livingstone et al. 2006: 38).

In 1892, Dominguez heirs sold Rattlesnake Island to Los Angeles Terminal Railway (Kielbas 1998; Weinman and Stickel 1978). The railway line was built down the east side of the Los Angeles River and across to Rattlesnake Island, which was then called Terminal Island. Terminal Railway built a wharf on the island and called it East San Pedro (Weinman and Stickel 1978: 30). In the same period, the Southern Pacific extended the Los Angeles-San Pedro line on pilings across the shallow water of the Wilmington...
Lagoon to the west side of the Main Channel. This move resulted in increased shipping activity from San Pedro, and drew business away from the Wilmington docks.

In the late 19th century, the need for a deepwater port to serve the City of Los Angeles came to a head with competing proposals for further development of San Pedro, and for new ports in present-day Santa Monica, Marina del Rey, and Redondo Beach. The legal battle over the location of the deepwater port was known as the “Free Harbor fight.” Following review by a board of engineers, San Pedro was recommended as the site of the deepwater port and federal funds were authorized for the construction of a breakwater for San Pedro. The city subsequently established the free harbor, separate from the interests of the railroad companies. In 1906, the City annexed a half-mile wide strip of land connecting Los Angeles with the harbor area and in 1909, Wilmington and San Pedro became part of the City of Los Angeles (Marquez and Turenne 2007; POLA 2012). In 1907, the Los Angeles Harbor Commission was created and over the next decade the city invested 10 million dollars in building the Port of Los Angeles (POLA) (Livingstone et al. 2006: 38). Extensive commercial development ensued, with ship building, lumber yards, fish canneries, warehouses, and oil production facilities dominating the landscape.

Over the course of the 20th century, POLA grew into one of the busiest ports in the world. With the opening of the Panama Canal in 1914, POLA was poised to take on a larger role in international trade (Marquez and Turenne 2007: 73). During World War I, commercial activities were reduced as the Port served as training ground and anchorage for the U.S. Navy. After the war, Los Angeles Harbor surpassed San Francisco as the principal terminus for trade through the Panama Canal (Weinman and Stickel 1978: 57). The southern California oil industry grew during this era and POLA played an important role in supporting this industry. Fish canneries were also increasingly active at the Port in this period. Through the 1920s and 1930s, industries associated with the Port were important employers in the region. During World War II, the port played an essential role in shipbuilding. At the peak of this activity, the Port employed more than 90,000 workers (Livingstone et al. 2006: 41). The post-war years were a period of unprecedented growth, development, and construction in southern California, with POLA playing a vital role in the movement of raw materials and manufactured goods.

**Site History**

Prior to the development of the harbor at San Pedro, the land in the vicinity of the project area was located within the Wilmington Lagoon. Before dredging was carried out to deepen the channels in the harbor for larger vessels, this portion of the inner harbor was mostly shallow water and mudflats. In the 1850s, Captain Amos Fries of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers described the unimproved harbor, “Wilmington Lagoon begins near Deadman’s Island, a sand, clay and rock promontory some fifty feet high and less than two acres in extent, located about three-quarters of a mile nearly due east of the Government Reservation. The Lagoon is generally low land, overflowed at high tide, but largely mudflats at low tide, extending northward and eastward distances of three to four miles from Deadman’s Island. In all there are some 1,360 acres in the Lagoon” (quoted in Weinman and Stickel 1978: 29).

The nearby areas of San Pedro and Wilmington were used as ports in the nineteenth century, with increased development after the 1870s. The federal government undertook improvements to the harbor in the 1870s, which included dredging to make the main channel accessible. Prior to this point, vessels anchored outside the harbor and used smaller boats to move cargo to shore. With the dredging of the main channel, vessels could navigate directly to the wharves. Also in the 1870s, the harbor was connected by rail to Los Angeles and points north and east by the Southern Pacific.

The next major period of improvements spanned the 1890s and early 1900s. The population of Los Angeles had boomed during the latter part of the 19th century and development of a deepwater port to serve the growing economy and local population became a high priority. When POLA was officially
established and Wilmington and San Pedro were annexed to the City of Los Angeles, a second period of substantial investment in the development of the Port was undertaken. The federal government authorized funds to construct a breakwater for San Pedro in 1896 (Weinman and Stickel 1978: 39). The new developments included dredging of channels and turn basins, construction of a new inner harbor, and improvements to the outer harbor (Weinman and Stickel 1978: 42). The Harbor Commission also challenged Southern Pacific and Pacific Electric’s claims to substantial portions of the waterfront. When the improvements to the inner harbor area were begun, residents of Wilmington voted to pay for street improvements which included raising the street level by as much as 8 feet by introducing fill dredged from the harbor (Weinman and Stickel 1978: 44). Figure 9 shows Canal (now Avalon) Boulevard in Wilmington prior to these improvements.

![Figure 9. Canal Boulevard, Wilmington, 1910 (Vickery 1979).](image)

By the late nineteenth century, the project area segment of Alameda Street was not yet a formal road, rather the tracks of the Southern Pacific Rail Road’s San Pedro Branch Line loosely trace where the street would later exist, which indicates it is down what is now the middle of Alameda Street. According to an 1896 topographic map, the tracks follow the path of a small road that runs alongside the SPRR tracks to the northwest. At that time, adjacent to the southeast of the project area was undeveloped marshland (USGS 1896; Historic Aerials 2014). Later topographic maps indicate the steady development of the port and show that large areas of reclamation and dredging have taken place over time. The current configuration of Alameda Street appears to have varied little from its earliest stages as an SPRR spur line (historicaerials.com, 2014). By 1966, historic topographs indicate the line was the Harbor Belt Line, and is the Pacific Harbor Line running north/west alongside Alameda Street today.

The project area is depicted in a 1921 Sanborn map labeled “S. Alameda.” The map shows that Alameda Street was located in the same area that it is currently. It is indicated on the map that the center lane of Alameda was occupied by SPRR tracks, while a second spur is also shown to come from the south to turn and run along the outermost lane of Alameda Street, possibly now what is known as the Pacific Harbor Line.
RESEARCH METHODS

Archival Research

Records Search

On April 25, 2014, SWCA requested a search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the SCCIC, located on the campus of California State University, Fullerton. SWCA received the results on April 29, 2013. The search included any previously recorded cultural resources and investigations within a 0.25-mile radius of the project area. The CHRIS search also included a review of the NRHP, the CRHR, the California Points of Historical Interest list, the California Historical Landmarks list, the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility list, the City of Los Angeles HCM list, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory. A letter from the SCCIC summarizing the results of the records search along with a bibliography of prior cultural resources investigations are provided in Appendix B.

An archaeological survey was not conducted as part of this study.

PRIOR CULTURAL RESOURCE INVESTIGATIONS

Twenty cultural resource investigations have been previously conducted within 0.25 mile of the project area (Table 1). Of these, five were conducted within at least a portion of the project area (LA-01082, LA-02399, LA-04130, LA-10527, and LA-11807). Brief summaries of these five investigations are provided below. An additional 14 unmapped investigations were also conducted within the Long Beach and Torrance quadrangles, several of which are overview reports encompassing very large areas, and all appear to be outside the project area. Appendix B provides a complete bibliography from the SCCIC, including the unmapped investigations that are not included in Table 1.

Table 1. Prior Cultural Resources Investigations within 0.25 Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCCIC Report Number</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA-10527</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Areas Regional Cultural History, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Weinman, Lois J. and E. Gary Stickel</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-04455</td>
<td>A Cultural Resource Study for the Los Angeles Harbor Deepening Project</td>
<td>Pierson, Larry J.</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-01082</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Evaluation of Two Development Areas Within the Port of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Weil, Edward B.</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-04130</td>
<td>Los Angeles-long Beach Harbors Landfill Development and Channel Improvement Studied Cultural Resources Appendix</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-02644</td>
<td>The Results of a Phase 1 Archaeological Study for the Proposed Alameda Transportation Corridor Project, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Wlodarski, Robert J.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Prior Cultural Resources Investigations within 0.25 Mile of the Project Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCCIC Report Number</th>
<th>Title of Study</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA-02758</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment for the Anaheim Street Viaduct Replacement Project</td>
<td>King, Chester</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Pedro, California.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-02789</td>
<td>Cultural/scientific Resource Assessment B Street Realignment</td>
<td>Govena, Fran and Beth</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Port of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County California</td>
<td>Padon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-04129</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Study-anahiem Street Viaduct Port of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-04879</td>
<td>Report of Findings, Class I and Iii Historic Architectural, Archaeological,</td>
<td>Lander, E. Bruce</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Paleontological Surveys, Terminal Island Treatment Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Wastewater Treatment Facility Phase I Distribution Pipeline, Los</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angeles Harbor Area, Los</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angeles, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-03936</td>
<td>Archaeological Assessment for Pacific Bell Mobile Services</td>
<td>McLean, Deobrah K.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telecommunications Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La 240-22, 846 Watson Avenue, City of Wilmington, County of Los Angeles,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-10524</td>
<td>Alameda Corridor Project Treatment Plan for Historic Properties</td>
<td>Home, Melinda C., M.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discovered During Project Implementation, second draft. Addendum to Finding</td>
<td>Colleen Hamilton, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Effect (February 21 1995; October 27, 1998)</td>
<td>Susan K. Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-06076</td>
<td>Highway Project to Construct an Elevated Expressway Between</td>
<td>Home, Melinda C. and</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Schuyler Heim Bridge and Alameda Street, Just South of Pacific</td>
<td>David Livingston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coast Highway (state Route Sr-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-06203</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment/evaluation for Nextel</td>
<td>McKenna, Jeanette A.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications Site CA-7801f, Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-07952</td>
<td>Trails to Rails: Transformation of a Landscape: History and Historical</td>
<td>Livingstone, David M.,</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology of the Alameda Corridor, Volume 1</td>
<td>et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-09183</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile</td>
<td>Bonner, Wayne H.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate LA13117D (XR7 Trucking), 426 East D Street,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmington, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-10858</td>
<td>Final SR-47 Flyover Considered part of the Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Robinson, Mark</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and SR-47 Expressway Project - Supplemental Historic Property Survey Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-11807</td>
<td>Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the ILWU Local 13 Dispatch Hall</td>
<td>Dietler, Sara</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-11811</td>
<td>Draft Phase I Archaeological Investigation WWL Vehicle Cargo Terminal at</td>
<td>Dietler, Sara and Heather</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berths 195-200A Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LA-01082

In 1981, Edward B. Weil prepared a cultural resource evaluation to identify any potential cultural resources in preparation of a planned development of two areas at the Port of Los Angeles. The report detailed the survey of proposed project sites, the “Condock’ area” and the “Classification Yard,” which included a walkover and examination of surface soils. The literature review for this project area identified three prehistoric sites with a 1.5 -mile radius: CA-LA-693, CA-LA-694 and CA-LA-695, none of which were located within the current project area. It was determined that the three previously listed sites were largely destroyed by residential and commercial development. Weil suggested that sites may still exist below the surface in areas that had not yet been disturbed, especially in the “Classification Yard” due to its relative lack of development. No additional cultural resources were identified as a result of the study;
however, because of potential for subsurface deposits, monitoring was recommended during ground-disturbing activities.

**LA-02399**

In 1978, Lois J. Weinman and E. Gary Stickel prepared Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Areas Cultural Resource Survey. The report is an overview of the project area’s 27,103 acres, of which 13,484 are sub-marine, and 13,619 are above sea level. The project boundary extends from Point Fermin to Seal Beach Boulevard, along Seal Beach to Pacific Coast Highway, northeast to Anaheim Street to the Harbor Freeway, South on the Harbor Freeway to Gaffey Street, South on Gaffey to Hamilton Avenue, west on Hamilton to Alma Street, and west to the ocean. Only resources relating to harbor history were investigated. Sixty-nine cultural resources were identified during the survey including 18 prehistoric sites, 21 shipwrecks, and 30 historical resources. The purpose of the study was to locate, identify, and where applicable, nominate historic resources for inclusion in the NRHP. The study recommended that further research be conducted and that more nominations be made.

**LA-04130**

The Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors Landfill Development and Channel Improvement Studies Cultural Resources Appendix was prepared in 1984. The study was undertaken by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach as part of the Landfill Development and Channel Improvement Project, which included the Ports and Los Angeles and Long Beach in Los Angeles County. The current project area is adjacent to the east and south of the study area. The literature review for this study area identified 64 previously recorded sites, four of which were listed in the NRHP, two were nominated, and seven others were deemed eligible for listing. No additional cultural resources were identified as part of the study, and no further recommendation was made.

**LA-10527**

In 1978, Lois J. Weinman prepared the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Areas Regional Cultural History. This report is a duplicate of LA-02399 with minor variations, as indicated by the SCCIC. The report is an overview of the project area’s 27,103 acres, of which 13,484 are sub-marine, and 13,619 are above sea level. The project boundary extends from Point Fermin to Seal Beach Boulevard, along Seal Beach to Pacific Coast Highway, northeast to Anaheim Street to the Harbor Freeway, South on the Harbor Freeway to Gaffey Street, South on Gaffey to Hamilton Avenue, west on Hamilton to Alma Street, and west to the ocean. Only resources relating to harbor history were investigated. A total of 69 cultural resources were identified during the survey including 18 prehistoric sites, 21 shipwrecks, and 30 historical resources. The latter resources comprise the focus of the report. The purpose of the study was to locate, identify, and where applicable, nominate historic resources for inclusion in the NRHP. The study recommended that further research be conducted and that more nominations be made.

**LA-11807**

Sara Dietler prepared Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the ILWU Local 13 Dispatch Hall Project in 2011. The study was undertaken for the Los Angeles Harbor Department as part of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union Local 13 Dispatch Hall Project, which proposed a new facility to be built on a paved, triangular 9.15-acre site at the corner of Alameda Street and E. Anaheim Street in Los Angeles County. The study area included a portion of the current project area. The literature review for this study area identified two historic sites: P-19-002850 and P-19-180784, neither of which is located within the current project area. No additional cultural resources were identified as part of the study, however monitoring during all ground disturbance activities was recommended.
RECORDED CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN 0.25 MILE OF THE PROJECT AREA

The SCCIC records search identified one previously recorded archaeological site within 0.25 mile of the project area (Table 2). This resource (19-004325) is adjacent to the project area and is described in further detail in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 2. Previously Recorded Archaeological Resources within 0.25 Mile of the Project Area Identified by SCCIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Resource Description</th>
<th>CRHR/NRHP Eligibility Status</th>
<th>Recorded By and Year</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-004325</td>
<td>CA-LAN-4325H</td>
<td>Historic: Consolidated Lumber Company Site</td>
<td>Unevaluated</td>
<td>Mallette, et al, 2013</td>
<td>Adjacent to east</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19-004325 (CA-LAN-4325H)

In 2013, Applied Earthworks recorded CA-LAN-4325H, an historic lumber yard site measuring 460 × 305 m (1500 × 1000 feet) situated south of Alameda Street at the corner of Anaheim Street and North Henry Ford Avenue. The site is described as a demolished lumberyard site dating to the early- to late-twentieth century. The site was exposed during pavement removal, soil remediation, and sediment removal. A mixture of both industrial and domestic artifacts were collected from the site and included: brick paving segments, industrial equipment related to the movement of lumber about the lumber yard, railroad ties, engine room machinery, various bottles dating to the late-nineteenth to early-twentieth century, as well as several wooden conduits. The site was described as being heavily disturbed, with multiple periods of use and re-use, multiple paving layers, demolition of all above-ground structures, and the installation of utility lines, pipes, etc. The site has not been evaluated for CRHR or NRHP eligibility.

Sacred Lands File Search

Native American contact was initiated for this project on March 25, 2014. As part of the process of identifying cultural resources in or near the project area, SWCA contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a review of the Sacred Lands File. The NAHC faxed a response on March 28, 2014 (see Appendix B), and stated that Native American cultural resources were not identified within 0.5 mile of the project area but noted that there are Native American cultural resources further west and northeast of the project area. It was also noted that it is always possible for cultural resources to be unearthed during construction activities. The NAHC provided a contact list of 10 Native American individuals or tribal organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the project area. Letters were prepared and mailed to each of the NAHC-listed contacts on May 13, 2014, requesting information regarding any Native American cultural resources in or adjacent to the project area.

Mr. Andy Salas contacted SWCA by email on May 17, 2014 and stated that the proposed project is within a highly culturally sensitive area and requested that a Native American monitor associated with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians/Kizh Nation be on-site during all ground disturbances. Mr. Salas also included a map of major villages in the project vicinity and a photograph of a dedication for the Alameda Corridor reburial in Lynwood, California.

No additional responses have been received to date. Table 3 provides a complete record of Native American coordination to date.
Table 3. Summary of Native American Coordination Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Group/Government Contact</th>
<th>SWCA Coordination Efforts</th>
<th>Response to Coordination Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles City/County Native American Indian Commission</td>
<td>05/13/14: Letter sent by U.S. Mail</td>
<td>No response to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Andrade, Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieleno/Tongva Nation Sandonne Goad, Chairperson</td>
<td>05/13/14: Letter sent by U.S. Mail</td>
<td>No response to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>05/13/14: Letter sent by U.S. Mail</td>
<td>No response to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Morales, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe Sam Dunlap, Cultural Resources Director</td>
<td>05/13/14: Letter sent by U.S. Mail</td>
<td>No response to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F. Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians Andrew Salas, Chairperson</td>
<td>05/13/14: Letter sent by U.S. Mail</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Salas contacted SWCA by email and stated the proposed project is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within a very highly culturally sensitive area and requested a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians monitor be on-site during all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ground-disturbing activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe Conrad Acuna</td>
<td>05/13/14: Letter sent by U.S. Mail</td>
<td>No response to date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Historical Research

In addition to reviewing prior studies and previously recorded site records, SWCA examined historical maps and aerial photographs obtained through Historicaerials.com, the online Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL) photo database, and the online Sanborn Fire Insurance Map archive available through the LAPL. Historical maps (1906–1999) and photographs (1948–2005) viewed on Historicaerials.com document the development of the project area and its surroundings, from a remote undeveloped area in the early 1900s, to a dense residential and industrial neighborhood by the 1950s.

RESULTS AND IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS

Archaeological Resources

Archival research, as described in the previous sections of this report, has indicated that the project area is within a known area of historic occupation, including the SPRR spur line, which may have a portion or spur which remains intact under the pavement, likely in the center of the road. Historic archaeological sites associated with the railroad or nearby historic development may exist within Alameda Street itself or the shoulder of the road. Ethnohistoric data indicates that several Gabrieleno villages were once located in the general vicinity of the project area. Although portions of the project area consist of fill dredged from the harbor, this fill may cap archaeological sites associated with prehistoric exploitation of marshland.
resources. Although the project area has been subjected to and highly disturbed by urban development, it is located within an area of prehistoric occupation, as well as historic development and infrastructure, and should be considered sensitive for subsurface archaeological resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified within the project area as a result of the records search and background research; however, the records search and responses from a local Native American group indicates that the project area is sensitive for subsurface archaeological resources. While the project area has been largely disturbed by urban development, the close proximity of the nearby village locations and marshland prior to historic fill episodes provides a reasonable likelihood that undisturbed subsurface deposits exist within the project area. The nearby historic archaeological resource recorded within the study area may indicate that undisturbed subsurface historic archaeological deposits may also exist within the project area. For these reasons, the project area should be treated as sensitive for archaeological resources. Measures to reduce potential effects/impacts to unanticipated archaeological resources are provided below.

Due to the high archaeological sensitivity of the project area and known cultural resources in the vicinity and possibly within the project area, it is recommended that a Monitoring Discovery Plan be prepared and approved prior to construction. This Monitoring Discovery Plan should include provisions for the identification and CRHR evaluation of any cultural resources that are encountered during ground disturbance, including the mitigation of adverse effects/impacts to any potentially significant resources through project redesign, data recovery, or other means.

Monitoring shall be conducted during all ground disturbing activities including, but not limited to: pavement removal, trenching, auguring, boring, and grading. In the event archaeological resources are encountered, work in the vicinity of the discovery shall halt until appropriate treatment of the resource is determined by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with the LADPW Bureau of Engineering.

SWCA further recommends that, before ground-disturbing activities begin, the archaeological monitor conduct a brief awareness training session for the benefit of all construction workers and supervisory personnel. The training, which could be held in conjunction with the project’s initial on-site safety meeting, would explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. Each worker would also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event that cultural resources or human remains/burials are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection and the immediate contact of the site supervisor and the archaeological monitor. It is recommended that this worker education session include visual images of artifacts that might be found in the project vicinity, and that the session take place on-site immediately before ground-disturbing activities begin.

Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains

The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbances; State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Los Angeles County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The Los Angeles County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a MLD. The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.
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South Central Coastal Information Center
Results Letter
April 29, 2014

Ms. Sara Dietler
SWCA
150 S Arroyo Pkwy, 2nd Floor
Pasadena, CA 91105
(626) 240-0587

RE: LADPW Alameda Street Widening. Alameda Street between Harry Bridges Boulevard and Anaheim Street.

Dear Ms. Dietler,

As per your request received on April 28, 2014, an expedited records search was conducted for the above referenced project. The search includes a review of all recorded archaeological sites within a ¼-mile radius of the project site as well as a review of cultural resource reports on file. In addition, the California Points of Historical Interest (SPHI), the California Historical Landmarks (SHL), the California Register of Historical Resources (CAL REG), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), and the City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments (LAHCM) listings were reviewed for the above referenced project. The following is a discussion of the findings.

**Long Beach, CA and South Gate, CA USGS 7.5' Quadrangles**

**MAPPED ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES:**

One archaeological site (19-004325*) has been recorded on our maps within a ¼-mile radius of the project site. One archaeological site is recorded within the project site. No sites are listed on the Archaeological Determination of Eligibility (DOE) list. No isolates have been recorded within a ¼-mile radius of the project site. No isolates are recorded within the project site.

(* = Recorded within the project site)

**MAPPED HISTORIC BUILT-ENVIRONMENT RESOURCES:**

No above-ground historic resources have been recorded on our maps within a ¼-mile radius of the project site. No above-ground historic resources are recorded within the project site.
ADDITIONAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (all other listings)

The California Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) lists one property that has been evaluated for historical significance within a ¼-mile radius of the project site (see enclosed list of highlighted properties). These are additional resources that are listed in the Historic Property Data File and are located either within the project site or within the search radius.

The California Point of Historical Interest (SPHI) of the Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation, lists no properties within a ¼-mile radius of the project site.

The California Historical Landmarks (SHL) of the Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation, lists no properties within a ¼-mile radius of the project site.

The California Register of Historical Resources (CAL REG) lists no properties within a ¼-mile radius of the project site. These are properties determined to have a National Register of Historic Places Status of 1 or 2, a California Historical Landmark numbering 770 and higher, or a Point of Historical Interest listed after 1/1/1998.

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) lists no properties within a ¼-mile radius of the project site.

The City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments (LAHCM) lists no properties within a ¼-mile radius of the project site.

HISTORIC MAPS:

Copies of our historic maps – Downey, CA (1896, 1942, & 1943) 15’ USGS - are enclosed for your review.

PREVIOUS CULTURAL RESOURCES INVESTIGATIONS:

Twenty studies (LA1082*, LA2399*, LA2644, LA2758, LA2789, LA3707, LA3936, LA4129, LA4130*, LA4455, LA4879, LA6076, LA6203, LA7952, LA9183, LA10524, LA10527*, LA10858, LA11807*, LA11811) have been recorded within a ¼-mile radius of the project site. Of these, five studies have been recorded that subsume or intersect the project site. There are fourteen additional investigations located on the Long Beach, CA and South Gate, CA 7.5’ USGS Quadrangles that are potentially within a ¼-mile radius of the project site. These reports are not mapped due to insufficient locational information. (* = Located within the project site)

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 657.278.5395 Monday through Thursday 9:00 am to 3:30 pm.

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

(X) Maps – Long Beach, CA and South Gate, CA 7.5’ USGS Quadrangles, Downey, CA (1896, 1942, 1943) 15’ USGS Quadrangle – 10 pages
(X) Bibliography – 34 pages and 2 excel spreadsheets
(X) HRI – 1 page
(X) National Register Status Codes – 1 page
(X) Site Records – (19-004325) – 12 pdf pages
(X) Survey Reports – (LA1082, LA2399, LA4130, LA10527, LA11807) – 403 pdf pages
(X) Invoice #13915.104
Appendix B

Native American Contact Letters
March 25, 2014

Mr. Dave Singleton  
Government Program Analyst  
Native American Heritage Commission  
1550 Harbor Boulevard, Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95691

RE: Archaeological Resource Surveys for Alameda Street Widening Between Harry Bridges Boulevard and Anaheim Street, Los Angeles, California (SWCA Project No. 20514.03).

Dear Mr. Singleton:

We are requesting on behalf of our client that a review of the Sacred Lands File be conducted for a cultural resources study in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County. The proposed project is located along Alameda Street between Harry Bridges Boulevard and Anaheim Street. Specifically, the project is situated on the Torrance and Long Beach, California topographic quadrangle maps, in an unsectioned portion of Township 4 and 5 South, Range 13 West (see attached map).

As indicated in Table 1, the project area is situated on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute Torrance and Long Beach, California topographic quadrangle maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrangles</th>
<th>Township and Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torrance</td>
<td>T 4 and 5 S/R 13 W/Unsectioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>T 4 and 5 S/R 13 W/Unsectioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project will involved the widening of Alameda Street between Harry Bridges Boulevard and Anaheim Street in the City of Los Angeles. The upgrade will provide improved infrastructure to accept increased traffic from existing and proposed projects located primarily within the Port of Los Angeles and the Wilmington Industrial Park and to adequately dispose of storm flows during rain storms. The project will add travel and turn lanes, traffic signals and upgraded intersections and railroad crossings. In addition, the project will add storm drain infrastructure to address flooding issues.
SWCA has done extensive work in the Port of Los Angeles area and understand that it is culturally sensitive. We are dedicated to the protection of Native American cultural resource and will incorporate any comments or concerns you may have into our findings and recommendations. Please email the results of this search, along with the contact information for any Native American tribes or individuals who may have additional knowledge of religious and/or culturally significant locations within or in the vicinity of the project area, to me at sdieter@swca.com. They can also be faxed to my attention at (626) 240-0607. For correspondence, please reference Project Number 20514.03. If you have any questions regarding this request, please do not hesitate to contact me via email or at (626) 240-0587. Thank you for your assistance with this project.

Sincerely,

Sara Dietler
Senior Project Manager, Cultural Resources

Enclosures: study area map
April 28, 2014

Ms. Sara Dietler, Senior Project Manager, Cultural Resources

SWCA ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS
150 South Arroyo Parkway
Pasadena, CA 91105

Sent by FAX to: 626-240-0607
No. of Pages: 4

RE: Sacred Lands File Search and Native American Contacts list for the "Alameda Street Widening Between Harry Bridges Boulevard and Anaheim Street (Storm Drain Infrastructure and other Street Improvements)" located within the Port of Los Angeles/Wilmington Industrial Park, in the City of Los Angeles; Los Angeles County, California

Dear Ms. Dietler:

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

In the 1985 Appellate Court decision (170 Cal App 3rd 604), the Court held that the NAHC has jurisdiction and special expertise, as a state agency, over affected Native American resources impacted by proposed projects, including archaeological places of religious significance to Native Americans, and to Native American burial sites.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachments
Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County California
April 28, 2014

LA City/County Native American Indian Comm
Ron Andrade, Director
3175 West 6th St, Rm. 403
Los Angeles, CA 90020
randrade@css.lacounty.gov
(213) 351-5324
(213) 386-3995 FAX

Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert F. Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 490
Bellflower, CA 90707
gtongva@verizon.net
562-761-6417 - voice
562-761-6417 - fax

Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
Private Address

tattniaw@gmail.com
310-570-6567

Gabrielino Tongva

Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe
Bernie Acuna, Co-Chairperson
P.O. Box 180
Bonsall, CA 92003
(619) 294-6660 - work
(310) 428-5690 - cell
(760) 636-0854 - FAX
bacuna1@gabrielintontribe.org

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
PO Box 693
San Gabriel, CA 91778
GT Tribal Council@aol.com
(626) 286-1232 - FAX
(626) 286-1758 - Home
(626) 286-1262 - FAX

Gabrielino Tongva

Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe
Linda Candelaria, Co-Chairperson
P.O. Box 180
Bonsall, CA 92003
palmssprings9@yahoo.com
626-676-1184 - cell
(760) 636-0854 - FAX

Gabrieleno /Tongva Nation
Sandonne Goad, Chairperson
P.O. Box 8908
Los Angeles, CA 90086
sgoad@gabrieleno-tongva.com
951-845-0443

Gabrielino Tongva

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

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7655.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 597.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 597.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local American Indians with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Alameda Street Widening Project; located within the Port of Los Angeles/Wilmington Industrial Park area; Los Angeles County, California of which a Sacred Lands file search and Native American Contacts list were requested.
Native American Contacts  
Los Angeles County California 
April 28, 2014

Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe  
Conrad Acuna,  
P.O. Box 180, Bonsall, CA 92003

760-636-0854 - FAX

Gabrielino/Tongva Nation  
Sam Dunlap, Cultural Resources Director  
P.O. Box 86908, Los Angeles, CA 90086

Samdunlap@earthlink.net  
909-262-9351

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

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7080.8 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.34 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.89 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Alameda Street Widening Project, located within the Port of Los Angeles/Wilmington Industrial Park area; Los Angeles County, California of which a Sacred Lands file search and Native American Contacts list were requested.