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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering is proposing Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project (Task Order Solicitation 40) in the San Fernando Valley region of the City of Los Angeles, which involves the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. This Project is specifically located in the community of Northridge in an area surrounding the confluence of the concrete-lined channels of Aliso Creek and Limekiln Creek. This area is south of Nordhoff Street between Tampa Avenue and Wilbur Avenue and borders a Union Pacific/Metrolink rail line on the south end. Wilbur Canyon Debris Basin and a portion of Vanalden Park are also within the Project area. ArchaeoPaleo Resource Management, Inc. (APRMI) was contracted to perform an Archaeological Phase 1 Assessment of the Project.

Regarding archaeological resources, only one historic resource, and no prehistoric resources, have been recorded within the Project area. The historic resource within the Project, the UPRR track, runs along its south edge and has not retained its historic integrity. The concrete-lined Aliso and Limekiln canyon washes, though not recorded, are also historic and may even be significant based on their association with the concrete channelization of major waterways in Los Angeles. Two other archaeological resources, both historic structures, and five historic properties have been recorded within a mile of the Project area, although with the exception of the Faith Bible Church at 18531 Gresham Street and possibly Rancho Cordillera del Norte at the corner of Wilbur Avenue and Nordhoff Street, none of them are considered historically significant. Three additional resources are located just outside the mile radius, which include two prehistoric isolated artifacts as well as a pair of historic buildings on the California State University Northridge campus. These additional resources are also not considered historically significant.

The Native American Heritage Commission’s search of the Sacred Lands Inventory did not locate any previously recorded Native American traditional sites or places, but such searches do not preclude the possibility of the presence of subsurface sites or unrecorded Native American sites.

While few prehistoric resources have been recorded within the Project vicinity and only consist of isolated artifacts, the paths of two ephemeral stream courses are located within the Project making the area an ideal location for prehistoric visitation or occupation. Therefore there is a potential for prehistoric archaeological resources to be present beneath the surface and could be encountered during Project excavations. Therefore, full-time archaeological monitoring is recommended for all excavations within native soil within the Project area until the project archaeologist determines that monitoring is no longer required. Any Project-related activities that will damage the concrete-lined channels also need to be monitored due to the channels’ historic nature and possible significance. A Native American monitor will be required if prehistoric/Native American resources are uncovered.
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INTRODUCTION

Project Description and Location

The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LADPW) Bureau of Engineering (BOE) is designing the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project (the Project), which is in the community of Northridge in the San Fernando Valley region (the Valley) of the City of Los Angeles (Figure 1). The Project address is 8956 Vanalden Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 91324, which is the address for the Robert M. Wilkinson Multipurpose Senior Center located at the north end of Vanalden Park. The Project is located in an unsectioned portion of Township 2N Range 16W on the 7.5-minute Canoga Park United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic quad in the San Bernardino Base and Meridian. The Project encompasses an area of 11.8 acres surrounding the confluence of the concrete-lined channels of Aliso Creek (Aliso Canyon Wash) and Limekiln Creek (Limekiln Canyon Wash), which is south of Nordhoff Street between Tampa Avenue and Wilbur Avenue and borders a Union Pacific/Metrolink rail line on the south end (Figure 2) (LADPW BOE 2014).
Figure 2. Location map of Project (from TOPO! 2006)
The Project area also includes the Wilbur Canyon Debris Basin, which is owned and maintained by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, and a portion of Vanalden Park, which is owned and operated by the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) (LADPW BOE 2014). The Project’s elevation ranges from 801 to 823 feet above mean sea level (amsl).

The restoration of the Aliso/Limekiln creek area is one of the projects funded by the City of Los Angeles’s Proposition O Clean Water Bond designed to “provide water quality benefit and assist the City in meeting water quality goals” (LADPW BOE 2014:1). The Project involves the development of storm water Best Management Practices that are designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. These practices include low flow channel diversions, storm water pump stations, storm water pre-screening devices, bio swales, a vegetated detention/retention basin, restoration of upland riparian habitats, and educational signage in addition to the already present Wilbur Canyon Debris Basin, which traps waste and debris present in Aliso Creek before it merges with Limekiln Creek (LADPW BOE 2014).

**Natural Setting**

The general climate of southern California is often described as a Mediterranean-type climate. It is characterized by hot dry summers and moderate winters that include intermittent precipitation, with rain in the lower elevations and snow in the upper elevations. In the fall, the Santa Ana winds keep the region warm as hot dry winds blow westerly from the Mojave Desert toward the Pacific Ocean. Spring is characterized by fog along the coast and cool sunny days inland (Schoenherr 1992). The Project area is specifically located in the San Fernando Valley at the confluence of the Aliso Canyon and Limekiln Canyon washes, also known as Aliso Creek and Limekiln Creek. Both of these creeks appear to originate in the Santa Susana Mountains to the northwest just south of the Santa Clarita Valley. Downstream of where the two washes merge, Aliso Creek joins the Los Angeles River in Reseda to the south of the Project (Rand McNally 2008).

The San Fernando Valley is one of the larger valleys of cismontane southern California (the coastal sides of the Transverse and Peninsular Ranges). Such valleys, along with large valleys of the Coast Ranges and the Great Central Valley (elongate depression between the Coast Ranges and the Sierra Nevada Range), were once covered by Valley Grassland. Pristine Valley Grassland is characterized by perennial bunchgrasses such as needlegrass, triple-awned grass, bluegrass, and rye grass. There are also annual grasses and herbaceous species such as lilies, lupines, California poppies, Purple Owl Clovers, and several types of sunflowers, thistles, and tarweeds. Regarding native animal life, many of the same species that inhabit the deserts and scrub communities also inhabit the valleys. Predatory birds in the Valley Grassland community include the turkey vulture, golden eagle, red-tailed hawk, red-shouldered hawk, white-tailed Kite, American Kestrel, burrowing owl, common barn owl, American Crow, and Yellow-billed Magpie. Grouse and quail were once abundant but their numbers have diminished due to hunting and competition from introduced species such as the Chukar and the Ring-necked Pheasant. Burrowing mammals include rabbits, hares, ground squirrels, gophers, mice, and kangaroo rats. Several large grazing herbivores and carnivores were also once present in Southern California valleys but have since mostly or entirely disappeared. They included the mule deer, pronghorn, and Tule Elk as well as the grizzly bear, gray wolf, and San Joaquin Valley Kit Fox. The only large mammals still present in sufficient numbers are coyotes and mountain lions (Schoenherr 1992).

Much of the Valley Grassland environs within southern California are now overrun with invasive species. Introduced grasses and herbs include sow thistles, artichoke thistles, geraniums, mustard, wheat, hay, and alfalfa. Urbanization in the form of buildings, roads, and concrete-lined creek channels has diminished...
native plant communities even further. While pristine Valley Grassland is rare, in its disturbed form, it is one of California’s most common plant communities (Schoenherr 1992).

While much of the Project area was prehistorically characterized by Valley Grassland, it also once supported riparian woodlands, as did many major river courses in southern California. In the San Fernando Valley, large oak trees once lined the Los Angeles River and many of its tributaries (Gumprecht 1999). While the Los Angeles River is at some distance from the Project (about 3 miles to the south), as previously mentioned, there are two ephemeral washes that traverse the Project and, after their confluence, eventually join the Los Angeles River: Aliso Creek (Aliso Canyon Wash) and Limekiln Creek (Limekiln Canyon Wash). There is a third ephemeral waterway, Wilbur Creek (Wilbur Wash) north of the Project where it converges with Aliso Creek. Riparian woodlands within the Transverse and Peninsular Ranges are dominated by willows and poplars (cottonwoods and aspens) such as red willow, Pacific willow, sandbar willow, arroyo willow, Fremont cottonwood, and black cottonwood. At lower elevations, such as where the Project is located, the most common trees are Western sycamore and black willow. Other trees and shrubs that are present at lower elevations include birches, alders, ashes, Pepperwood, the Western Sycamore, the California Box Elder, the Pacific Dogwood, and the Western Azalea. Other riparian vegetation includes California laurel and Pacific madrone (Schoenherr 1992). The California riparian woodland supports a large diversity of animals including several species of butterflies and birds. The birds include flycatchers, vireos, goldfinches, warblers, blackbirds, and sparrows. The house wren, American dipper, and belted kingfisher are also present, while hawks hunt along river courses. Reptiles include garter snakes and the Western pond turtle. While mammals from the surrounding scrub and native grass communities can be present in the riparian woodlands of southern California, they tend to not linger. These mammals can include deer, mountain lions, coyotes, bobcats, gray foxes, ringtails, gophers, badgers, shrews, and moles. The riparian woodland is a threatened community in southern California due to habitat destruction, drying and diversion of water, and invasive and introduced species. Invasive birds include starlings and the brown-headed cowbird, which is one of the most destructive invasive species due to being a nest parasite (Schoenherr 1992; Gumprecht 1999).

With the arrival of agriculture and domesticated animals (mainly cattle and sheep) during the establishment of the Spanish settlements and ranches in the 1790s, the natural environment of California began to change radically. Agriculture during the Mexican and Spanish periods and the first part of the American period was limited to small vineyards and orchards as cattle ranching slowed the development of farming. The introduction of livestock, including cattle and sheep, resulted in overgrazing, which caused soil compaction, gully formation, and wind erosion. This overgrazing also restricted the soil’s ability to retain rainwater. However, a drought in 1862 to 1863 hurt the cattle industry, and, soon after, the Valley became the new base for California’s wine industry. Sheep herding mostly ended after another drought in 1874 to 1875, but Lankershim and Van Nuys introduced dry wheat farming onto their properties in 1874, thus greatly amplifying the environmental destruction (Mayers 1976). Crop cultivation resulted in more soil erosion, salt buildup, and polluted groundwater due to agricultural runoff (pesticides and fertilizer that contained heavy metals and other chemicals). In the Los Angeles Basin, water was diverted from rivers and later pumped from the ground for irrigation and consumption, thus depleting the water supply and lowering the water table. The native cottonwoods and willows were harvested for their wood while much of the rest of the native vegetation was replaced by weeds. All of these effects caused a desertification of plant communities within the Valley (Schoenherr 1992; Gumprecht 1999).

On-site observations found that much of the Project area is heavily disturbed with little native vegetation remaining. Several introduced floral species were present including palm trees, conifers, and cacti. There does appear to be native vegetation present in the Wilbur Canyon Debris Basin portion of Aliso Creek, which includes willows and sedges/rushes. In this basin, several faunaal species were also present including small to miniscule lizards as well as rabbits, ducks, and insects such as butterflies, beetles, bees,
and brine flies. The basin was also full of rabbit and rodent burrows. Rabbits, lizards, and burrows were also observed on other portions of the Project along with songbirds.

**Project Personnel**

Denise Ruzicka holds a Master of Arts in Anthropology from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (2010) and a Master of Science degree in Astronomy from the Swinburne University of Technology (2009). She is a Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) with over ten years of experience in Cultural Resource Management (CRM) including archaeological and paleontological survey, excavation, site recordation, construction monitoring, laboratory processing and analysis, and technical report writing. She meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology. She also served as a volunteer for the George C. Page Museum of La Brea Studies for three years and is a qualified paleontological resources monitor per the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology’s guidelines. Ms. Ruzicka conducted the cultural resources records search, the archival research, the field reconnaissance (archaeological and paleontological survey), and was the primary author of this report.

Robin Turner is the Principal Investigator and President for APRMI. She holds a Masters of Arts degree in Anthropology, with an emphasis on Public Archaeology, from California State University, Northridge. Ms. Turner has over 30 years of experience in the CRM and the paleontologic fields, and has conducted major field and technical investigations throughout southern California. She meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology and is a qualified professional paleontologist per the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology’s guidelines. Ms. Turner is also a Research Associate at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and at the George C. Page Museum of La Brea Discoveries, as well as a Scientific Advisor to the Buena Vista Museum of Natural History and Sciences in Bakersfield. She is a past Planning Commissioner for a local southern California city as well. Ms. Turner served as the principal investigator and project manager for this project as well as the final editor for this report.

Michael Kirby holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Geology from the University of California, Davis (1999). Dr. Kirby has over 20 years of experience in paleontological resource management and environmental compliance and has performed paleontological fieldwork and excavation throughout the western United States. His experience includes supervising paleontological field crews and conducting NEPA and CEQA environmental impact studies, stratigraphic analysis, paleoenvironmental interpretation, and fossil microvertebrate analysis. He has also authored several peer-reviewed paleontological articles. He is certified as a professional paleontologist throughout southern California and is a qualified professional paleontologist per SVP guidelines. Mr. Kirby edited the geologic and paleontologic sections of this report.

**REGULATORY SETTING**

*Federal Laws*

**Antiquities Act of 1906**
The Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 USC § 431 *et seq*.), provides for the establishment and preservation of national monuments, historic landmarks, and historic or prehistoric structures, or other items of interest on federally owned lands. Additionally, Section 433 of this act prohibits the purposeful taking, excavation, damage, and destruction of historic or prehistoric ruins, monuments, or other objects of antiquity on federally owned lands. Other “objects of antiquity” are interpreted to include paleontologic remains.
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, specifically P.L. 91-190, 83 Stat. 852, 42 USC §§ 4321-4327, mandates the preservation of “important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage” (§101.b4). In addition, NEPA is interpreted as providing for the protection and preservation of paleontologic remains.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) mandates the following:

“The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking in any State and the head of any Federal department or independent agency having authority to license any undertaking shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license, as the case may be, take into account the effect of the undertaking an any district, site, building, structure or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register [of Historic Places (NRHP)]. The head of any such Federal agency shall afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation [The Council], established under Title II of this Act, reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to such an undertaking.” [16 U.S.C. § 470f]

An effect, or “adverse effect,” as defined by 36 CFR § 800.5 (a)(1), occurs

“when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register [NRHP] in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.”

To further clarify the meaning of what constitutes an adverse effect, 36 CFR § 800.5 (a)(2) identifies the following: physical destruction, alteration that is not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties per 36 CFR §68, removal, change of use, alteration of property setting, relocation, application of intrusive elements, neglect, and change of ownership (federal to non-federal).

The NHPA (16 U.S.C. § et seq.) defines a historic resource as significant if eligible for inclusion in the NRHP as defined by one of four eligibility criteria set forth in 36 CFR § 60.4A. Determination of historic resource significance is carried out via implementation of the Section 106 process of the NHPA, as set forth by the Council per 36 CFR § 800 “Protection of Historic Properties.” Such significant historic resources can include archaeological sites of pre-historic or historic context, historic buildings, structures, or objects of state, local, or federal importance that retain integrity of location, design, setting, feeling, association, material, and/or workmanship and

(A) Are associated with events which have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history, or
(B) Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past, or
(C) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic value, or are representative of significant and distinguishable entity of which the component may lack individual distinction, or
(D) Yield, or are likely to yield, data important to our understanding of prehistory and/or history.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC Section 3001 et seq.)
The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during construction-related disturbances. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, or NAGPRA, was enacted November 16, 1990. It states that the “ownership or control of Native American cultural items,” which include human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony, that are “excavated or discovered on Federal or tribal lands” after the law went into effect is held by the lineal descendants of the Native American (or Hawaiian) to whom the objects originally belonged. If the lineal descendants cannot be found then their ownership is conferred to the “Indian” tribe or Native Hawaiian organization on whose land the objects or remains were discovered or that has the closest cultural affiliation.

**State Laws**

**California Register of Historical Resources (PRC §5024.1)**

The California State Historical Resources Commission enacted Public Resources Code §5024.1, which established the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The statute encourages public recognition and protection of resources of architectural, historical, archaeological, and cultural significance. The register itself is a listing of all properties considered to be significant historical resources in the state. Resources are considered significant (and thus eligible for the register) if they retain integrity and meet one of the following criteria:

1) Associated with events which have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and historical heritage
2) Associated with the lives of persons significant in California’s past
3) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic value, or
4) Yield, or are likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The California Register specifically provides that historical resources listed, determined eligible for listing on the California Register by the State Historical Resources Commission, or resources that meet the California Register criteria are resources, which must be given consideration under CEQA (see below). Other resources, such as resources listed on local registers or in local surveys, may be listed if they are determined by the State Historic Resources Commission to be significant in accordance with criteria and procedures to be adopted by the Commission and are nominated; their listing in the California Register is not automatic.

According to the federal laws to which the State of California defers when its own laws do not apply to a situation, historical resources are evaluated if they are 50 years or older, unless they are exceptional according to a set of criteria considerations. The Instructions for Recording Historical Resources (California Office of Historic Preservation [OHP] 1995:2) states that “[a]ny physical evidence of human activities over 45 years old may be recorded for purposes of inclusion in the OHP’s filing system.” This five-year difference is to compensate for the amount of time that usually occurs between a resource’s discovery and its official documentation as well as the implementation of any mitigation procedures.

**California Environmental Quality Act**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is a statute that requires state and local agencies to identify significant environmental impacts of their actions, including damages to cultural or historical resources, in order to avoid or mitigate those adverse impacts or changes. §5020.1 of CEQA establishes “substantial adverse change” as the “demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of an historical resource would be impaired” (see below for the definition of historical resource). The “threshold of significance” is the level at which a lead agency finds the effects of a Project to be significant.
The destruction of unique, non-renewable cultural resources is a significant impact on the environment that requires mitigation of the impact. Construction excavation in archaeologically sensitive deposits that underlie a Project Area is a significant impact that could be prevented, minimized, or mitigated through the development of project alternatives (e.g., avoidance of the cultural resource) or mitigation measures for the purpose of recovering data that might otherwise be destroyed (e.g. archaeological excavation prior to construction excavation and archaeological monitoring of construction excavation of a known site; or archaeological monitoring of construction excavation of an archaeologically sensitive area). Even if a historical resource, archaeological site, or human remains cannot be identified within a project area before project implementation (i.e., if the resources are not visible on the surface during a Phase I survey, or if Extended Phase I testing does not reveal subsurface archaeological material), the area may still be archaeologically sensitive, based on the characteristics of the environmental background of the area or its current environmental setting, that said resources are predicted to exist within the project area/remains could be present within the project area. Mitigation measures to avoid project impacts to as-yet undiscovered historical resources or human remains may be employed by the Lead Agency, even if these resources have not been identified within or adjacent to the project area. A study must consider a project’s current baseline environmental setting and physical conditions so that the lead agency can determine whether project impacts would cause a significant change to that environment.

§ 15091(a) and (d) of the CEQA Guidelines require the Lead Agency to adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes—that it has either required for the project or has made a condition of approval—in order to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) provides for the monitoring of mitigation measures that may be required by a project’s Environmental Impact Report (EIR), if the EIR identifies potentially significant adverse impacts and mitigation measures to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level. An archaeological resources/built environment data recovery or monitoring plan may be part of an MMRP if archaeological resources/built environment will be affected.

A significant historical resource, as defined by CEQA, is referred to as a “Historical Resource.” Such Historical Resources have been determined eligible for inclusion in the CRHR per Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), §15064.5(a)(3), include historic properties eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) per PRC §5024.1, or are historically significant at a local level, such as a city, town, community, or county.

California Administrative Code
Title 14, Section 4307 of the California Administrative Code states that “no person shall remove, injure, deface, or destroy any object of paleontological, archaeological, or historical interest or value.”

Public Resources Code
Section 5097.5 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC) protects both cultural and paleontological resources. It states that

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

As used in this section, “public lands” means lands owned by, or under the jurisdiction of, the state, or...
any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof.

**Native American Heritage Act**

The Native American Heritage Act, passed by California in 1976, established the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the purpose of protecting Native American religious values on state property (PRC §5097.9). The NAHC not only protects the heritage of California Native Americans, but also ensures their participation in matters concerning heritage sites. The commission’s duty is to assist both federal and state agencies in protecting Native American sacred places and provide recommendations concerning Native American heritage in accordance with environmental law and policy. As required by Government Codes §65352.3 and §65562.5, for purposes of consultation with California Native American Tribes, the NAHC maintains a list of California Native American Tribes with whom local governments and public agencies must consult.

The act also protects burials from disturbance, vandalism, and accidental destruction. It stipulates what specific procedures, laid out in the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), must be implemented if a Native American burial is uncovered during project construction or archaeological data recovery.

**California Health and Safety Code**

Section 7050.5 of the HSC states that if human remains are found, construction and/or excavation must cease within the general vicinity, and the remains must be inspected by the county coroner. If the coroner determines that they are Native American in origin, then the coroner must contact the NAHC. The NAHC will then determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD must complete 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.

Sections 8010-8011 of the HSC establish a state repatriation policy that is consistent with and facilitates implementation of NAGPRA. NAGPRA was passed in 1990 and required that museums and federal agencies document all Native American human remains within their collections, or uncovered on projects, as well as their cultural ties. These agencies must then notify any tribe that may be affiliated with the remains and provide the opportunity for their repatriation along with any associated cultural items (grave goods). The California state version (Cal NAGPRA) mandates publicly funded agencies (state and local government agencies) and museums to repatriate human remains and associated cultural items to California Native American Tribes, not just federally recognized tribes within California, and establishes penalties for noncompliance.

**Senate Bill 18**

The California Senate Bill 18, passed in 2004, establishes a procedure to help California indigenous tribes and jurisdictions define tribal cultural resources and sacred areas more clearly as well as incorporate their protection into a General or Specific Plan prior to its adoption or amendment. The law also requires that California cities and counties contact and consult with California Native American tribes prior to designating land as open space. By involving tribes in local land use decisions, impacts to sites of cultural significance can be mitigated.

**Local Laws**

**County of Los Angeles General Plan**

Los Angeles County considers its “historic, cultural, and paleontological resources [as] non-renewable and irreplaceable” (County of Los Angeles 2014:155). In order to protect these resources, the County is guided by federal and state laws regarding such resources. The County’s goal (C/NR 14) is to “[m]itigate all impacts from new development on or adjacent to historic, cultural, and paleontological resources to the
greatest extent feasible” and to “[e]nsure proper notification and recovery processes are carried out for development on or near historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.” The County also has policies to “[s]upport the preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings” and to “[e]nsure proper notification procedures to Native American tribes in accordance with Senate Bill 18 (2004)” (County of Los Angeles 2014:159).

One method the County has employed to successfully preserve historic, cultural, and paleontological resources is maintaining a “local registry or landmarks commission” that identifies historic, cultural, and paleontological resources that are not identified by state and federal programs (County of Los Angeles 2014:158). This registry, known as the Los Angeles County Historical Landmarks and Records Commission “reviews and recommends cultural heritage resources in the unincorporated areas for inclusion in the State Historic Resources Inventory” (County of Los Angeles 2014:155).

City of Los Angeles General Plan
The policy of the City of Los Angeles is to “identify and protect significant archaeological and paleontological sites and/or resources known to exist or that are identified during land development, demolition or property modification activities” (City of Los Angeles 2001: II-5 to II-6). The City’s General Plan (City of Los Angeles 2001) protects endangered paleontological and archaeological resources by adhering to CEQA mandates. In regards to archaeological resources, a qualified archaeologist is to monitor excavations or other subsurface activities in a project area that has been determined to have archaeological significance and is to evaluate all potential impacts to archaeological materials. If significant paleontological or archaeological resources are uncovered during a project, excavations may be halted in order to assess, document, protect, and possibly remove the resources.

CULTURAL SETTING

Prehistoric Background

The generally accepted chronology of four distinct Horizons for the region has been devised by W.J. Wallace (1955). His initial classification reflected the qualitative nature of archaeological sites and lacked absolute dates. It was divided into Early Man (Horizon I), Millingstone Period (Horizon II), Intermediate Period (Horizon III), and Late Prehistoric (Horizon IV). Despite lacking dates, the generalized themes from Wallace provided the foundation for regional prehistory (Moratto 1984). Warren (1968) revised the chronology for the Southern Coast Region using the concepts of “cultural tradition and cultural ecology” (Moratto 1984:160), and divided the region into two subregions, the Santa Barbara subregion and the San Diego subregion. The Project is in the southern portion of the Santa Barbara subregion, near the northern boundary of the Los Angeles Basin and San Diego subregion. The Santa Barbara subregion includes Ventura County, Santa Barbara County, the southern ends of Kern County and San Luis Obispo County, and the northern and western portions of Los Angeles County. The San Diego subregion encompasses the southern portion of Los Angeles County, all of Orange County, a small portion of southwestern San Bernardino County, and the western ends of Riverside and San Diego counties. The Santa Barbara subregion was primarily inhabited by native Chumash groups, while the San Diego subregion was primarily occupied by native Gabrieleno (Tongva) and other Shoshonean groups. The phases or traditions put forth by Warren (1968) for the Santa Barbara subregion are the San Dieguito Tradition (>5,500 B.C.), which is mostly equivalent with Horizon I, the Encinitas Tradition (5,500 to 3,000 B.C.) that is equivalent with Horizon II, the Campbell Tradition (3,000 B.C to ~A.D. 500) that is approximately equivalent to Horizon III, and the Chumash Tradition (A.D. 500 to 1782) that is equivalent with Horizon IV. However, despite the site being within the Santa Barbara subregion, it is located within the historic Gabrieleno (Fernandeño) territory instead of the historic Chumash territory. Therefore the last phase in the Project
vicinity would be equivalent to that of the northern portion of the San Diego subregion, which is the Shoshonean Tradition (A.D. 1000 to 1769) (Moratto 1984).

**Paleo-Indian (>10,000 to 9,000 B.C.)**
The Paleo-Indian Period began with the arrival of the first inhabitants of the region more than 12,000 years ago during the Late Pleistocene and is characterized by large fluted projectile points and the butchered remains of megafauna suggesting an economy heavily reliant on large and medium-sized game. Few sites from this time frame exist in Southern California and thus little is known about the inhabitants at this time. During the Pleistocene-Holocene transition, when the climate considerably warmed, many of the megafauna became extinct and could no longer serve as a viable food source (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984; Moratto 1984). Two of the northern Channel Islands are home to some of the earliest accepted dates for occupation in southern California. The Arlington Springs site on Santa Rosa Island has been radiocarbon dated to circa 13,000 years ago, while Daisy Cave on San Miguel Island had an early occupation approximately 11,500 years ago. Several other sites from Santa Rosa and San Miguel islands date to around 11,500 to 12,000 years ago (Braje et al. 2010). One possible Paleo-Indian site in the Los Angeles area is “Los Angeles Man,” a partial skeleton found in 1936 along the Los Angeles River north of Baldwin Hills. Most of his remains were lost except for the skull fragments, which were tentatively radiocarbon-dated to 23,500 years ago. This date is not conclusive, and the small sample size suggests the date is likely not correct. La Brea Woman is a partial skeleton found at Rancho La Brea in Los Angeles that appears to be a secondary burial. Her remains have been radiocarbon-dated to approximately 9,000 years ago (Moratto 1984), and thus belong to the next cultural period.

**San Dieguito (9,000 to 5,500 B.C.)**
This period is characterized by the presence of small nomadic and semi-nomadic hunter-gatherer groups who exploited coastal and inland environments for food and shelter on seasonal rounds. Many sites were located on or near the shorelines of ancient lakes and marshes, as well as along stream channels and estuaries. During the San Dieguito, subsistence shifted to a more generalized hunting economy with a greater emphasis on small animals as well as plant foods. In coastal areas, the emphasis was on aquatic resources (Jones et al. 2002; Moratto 1984). Chaparral resources, in particular, were exploited such as mule deer, rabbits, and sage but hard seeds do not appear to have been collected until very late. Large, heavy stone tools from this time include knives, choppers, and scrapers, and towards the end of the period there were also bone awls and needles used for basketry (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984).

**Encinitas (5,500 to 3,000 B.C.)**
The hallmarks of the Encinitas Tradition are extensive use of millingstone implements, such as manos and metates, suggestive of hard seed processing, and the use of core tools. Wallace (1955, 1978) and Warren (1968) relied on several key coastal sites in Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles Counties to characterize this period, including the Oak Grove Complex in the Santa Barbara region, Little Sycamore in southwestern Ventura County, and Topanga Canyon in the Santa Monica Mountains. The time period is also characterized by crude chopping, scraping, and cutting tools. There are few projectile points and shell artifacts and little use of bone. There is some evidence of weaving and basketry, while burials in the Santa Barbara Region are primarily loosely flexed and extended with few grave goods. From 4,000 to 1,000 B.C., cobbled and discoidal stones are found at sites from southern Ventura County to Baja California. They are often found together and buried intentionally but seldom found with other artifacts (Moratto 1984). Discoidal stones are “round to ovoid ground stones with flat to slightly convex faces and edges” with little use wear, while cobbled stones (or cogstones) are similar but with “grooves or indentations along their edges giving them a gearlike appearance” and can be either perforated or not (Moratto 1984:149).
Settlements are larger and more stable as evidenced by deeper and more extensive middens. This difference in settlement may reflect increased sedentism with long-term habitation within an established area. Cultural adaptation toward the coastal perimeter and along lakes, streams, lagoons, and estuaries started to be prolific during this time (Wallace 1978). There is great diversification of subsistence strategies during the Encinitas Period between the inhabitants; some sites indicate a greater reliance upon shellfish, small mammals, and birds, as well as plant resources, and less emphasis upon hunting and fishing (Wallace 1955; Moratto 1984). This shift towards a more diversified economy may have been the result of changing climatic factors related to the start of the Altithermal Period, a warm and dry period that lasted for several thousand years and resulted in the development of California’s Mediterranean climate (Raab and Larson 1997). This shift in collecting strategies also resulted in the introduction of the mortar and pestle during this horizon (Wallace 1955, 1978; Warren 1968).

Campbell (3,000 B.C. to A.D. 500)
The Campbell Tradition started approximately 3,000 B.C. at the time of a shift to a wetter climate. This period is also marked by a more diversified subsistence with some regions characterized by the continued presence of millingstones, and others showing a renewed reliance on hunting as well as an increased exploitation of maritime resources (Wallace 1978). Mortars and pestles become prolific in certain places at this time suggesting increased reliance upon the acorn as a dietary staple and less reliance on the hard seed consumption of the previous period (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). The abundance of projectile points and faunal remains in other places indicate increased land and sea exploitation as well as seasonal hunting and gathering subsistence strategies. Additionally, this period is characterized by flake scrapers and various bone and shell artifacts including ornaments. Burials are flexed with heads pointing to the west or north and are frequently associated with red ochre or dishes made of abalone (Moratto 1984). Regional interaction, in particular trade, grows in importance during this period as evidenced by the exchange of steatite, shell, obsidian, and other natural resources (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). Evidence of the use of asphaltum and boats at this time confirms the increased utilization of the Channel Islands. The artifact assemblages of this period also include charmstones, broad leaf shaped blades, drills, and scrapers as well as antler and bone tools such as fishhooks, gorges, awls, pins, daggers, spatulas, bird-bone tubes, and fish-spear points (Wallace 1978). The bow and arrow started to be manufactured and exploited toward the latter part of the period (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984).

In the interior of the San Diego subregion between 1,000 B.C. and A.D. 500, there is a possible hiatus in occupation, or at least a reduced presence. After this hiatus or transition, several complexes arose forming different linguistic groups and include ones that may have originated from the intrusion of Shoshonean (Takic) groups into the coastal area between the Chumash of the Santa Barbara region and the Diegueño (Yuman) of the southern San Diego region (Moratto 1984).

Late Prehistoric (A.D. 500 to 1769)
Starting in the late Campbell, between the Santa Barbara and San Diego regions, there is linguistic evidence of what has been termed the Numic Spread, which involved the migration of “Shoshoneans” from the interior to the coast, as well as the presence of Shoshonean pottery, small triangular arrow points, and cremation. Once on the coast, the Shoshoneans adapted quickly by borrowing technology and subsistence practices, including a maritime economy, from their Hokan (Chumash) neighbors (Moratto 1984; Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). In regards to the Project area, one of the Shoshonean groups believed to have migrated to the Los Angeles area is the Gabrieleno or Tongva (Kroeber 1925; see below) who appear to have first arrived in the Los Angeles Basin around 500 B.C. By A.D. 500, they had established permanent villages as well as satellite communities and had undergone “dialectical diversification” (Bean and Smith 1978:540). There may have also been an increase in religious or ceremonial complexity and deity worship, such as the Chingichno(g)ish (or Chingichnish) religion. This
religion originated with the Tongva and likely influenced the social and cultural values of the Tongva and their neighbors (Bean and Smith 1978).

Further north and west in the Santa Barbara subregion, in Ventura County, there does not appear to be a Shoshonean intrusion, but instead continuity between the Campbell Tradition and the Canaliño Tradition. The Canaliño Tradition is the term often used for the first part of the Chumash period (Moratto 1984). The early Chumash are characterized by a “maritime economy, elaborate technology, and a profusion of beads, ornaments, and ceremonial and artistic items” (Moratto 1984:161). Specifically they relied on offshore fishing and sea-mammal hunting using their tomols (planked canoes) as well as the seasonal collection of acorns, hard seeds, and mollusks. Deer hunting also occurred inland from the coast. Commerce and exchange involving shell bead currency commenced as well (Moratto 1984; Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984).

In the mid-16th century, the Spanish arrived in Tongva/Gabrielino territory initiating European Contact with the Native Californians although colonization and missionization did not begin until the late-18th century. The chronological periods and temporal affiliation following the time of contact are considered to be of protohistoric and historic type and are discussed below.

**Ethnographic Background**

The Project is in part of the area once occupied by the Fernandeño, or San Fernandeño. Their name originated from their presence at San Fernando Mission, one of two Franciscan missions in Los Angeles County, the other being San Gabriel (see below). The San Fernando Mission was also home to speakers of Chumash, Tataviam, and Serrano (Kroeber 1925; Pitt and Pitt 1997). The children of the various groups intermarried, and most families were of mixed tribal ancestry by the end of the Mission Period (Johnson 1997). The Fernandeño bordered the Chumash on the west, and, in fact, the Project area is near the territorial boundary of the Chumash, who inhabited Ventura County. The Fernandeño also bordered the Aliklik (or Tataviam) to the north (Santa Clarita Basin and southwest Antelope Valley) and the Gabrieleno to the east and southeast (territory defined below). The Kitenamuk were located farther to the north in the southern San Joaquin Valley and the northwestern portion of the Antelope Valley, while the Serrano were located farther east in the eastern Antelope Valley and the San Bernardino Mountains. To the south was the Pacific Ocean. While the Fernandeño had a distinct territory, defined by language, they were considered part of the larger Gabrielino (Kroeber 1925). John P. Harrington identified Fernandeño as one of four Gabrielino dialects, which was spoken by Native Americans north of the Los Angeles Basin, primarily in the San Fernando Valley region (Bean and Smith 1978). The indigenous name of the Gabrieleno has been reported as Kij or Kizh (Swanton 1952), meaning “houses.” They have also been referred to as Tobikhar or “settlers.” They were designated as Tumangamalum (“northerners”) by the Luiseño, as Miyah-hik-tchal-lop (“long arms”) by the Hametwole Yokuts, as Ataplili’sh by the Ventura Chumash, as Pahpi-na-mo-nam by the Kitenamuk, and as Kisianos by the Cahuilla (Reid and Heizer 1968:105).

The Gabrieleno once occupied the coast and mountainous areas of present-day Los Angeles and Orange counties (Figure 5). Aside from their Chumash neighbors to the northwest, they were the “wealthiest, most populous, and most powerful ethnic minority in aboriginal southern California” (Bean and Smith 1978:538). At the time of European contact, Gabrieleno territory was centered on the watersheds of the Los Angeles Basin (Los Angeles, San Gabriel, and Santa Ana rivers) and extended from the coast in the Santa Monica Mountains (Topanga Creek), east through the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys to the San Bernardino-Riverside area, and south to the Santa Ana Mountains and Newport Bay (Aliso Creek). Their territory also included some of the offshore Channel Islands including San Clemente, Santa Catalina, and San Nicolas islands. They occupied various ecological habitats including
mountains/fothills, the prairie surrounding the interior mountains, dunes on San Nicolas Island, and coastal environments including bays (Bean and Smith 1978).

Ethnographic information on the early Gabrielino is incomplete since population reduction caused by missionization prevented much Gabrielino oral history from being recorded. However, some information was collected including that their society was based on clan or lineage groups (moiety system) and that they spoke one of the Cupan languages of the Takic family. Gabrielino villages were politically autonomous with at least three levels of social hierarchy, although several villages could be allied under a single leader. With the exception of the group on Santa Catalina Island, they typically cremated their dead (Bean and Smith 1978). Armed intervillage conflicts often transpired, in particular between inland and coastal groups, and commenced for various reasons including breaking the “economic reciprocity system,” abducting women, trespassing, and sorcery (Bean and Smith 1978:546).

The Gabrielino traded shell beads, dried fish, sea otter pelts, shells, steatite (obtained from Santa Catalina Island), and possibly salt to the inland Serrano (in the San Bernardino Mountains) for acorns, seeds, obsidian, and deerskins. Steatite was the primary export item of the Gabrielino as well as their most prominent technological item. Steatite was used to make animal carvings, pipes, ornaments, cooking utensils, palettes, and arrow straighteners. They traded it in rough or finished form (vessels and ornaments) to many groups such as the Chumash, Yokuts, and Luiseño. Most trade took the form of barter but could also involve currency, which took the form of strung olivella shell beads. Other Gabrielino tools and material items included food preparation items (mortars, metates, mullers, mealing brushes, wooden stirrers, paddles, shell spoons, bark platters, and wooden bowls), pottery, bone and shell tools (deer scapula saws, bone and shell needles, fishhooks, awls, flakers, and wedges), knives (made of flint or cane), flint drills and scrapers, baskets (mortar hoppers, plates, trays, winnowers, carrying/serving baskets, storage baskets, and ceremonial baskets), and weapons (clubs, bows, arrows, sabers, and slings) (Bean and Smith 1978).

Subsistence depended on large land mammals (i.e., deer) hunted by bow and arrow, smaller game caught through snares or traps, sea mammals hunted using harpoons or spearthrowers, deep-sea fish obtained by using boats of wooden planks lashed together and sealed with asphaltum (plank canoes or tomolos), and
river and shore fish caught using specialized fishing tackle such as line and hook, nets, basketry, traps, spears, bow and arrow, or poison. Other faunal resources exploited include rabbits, marsh resources such as rodents and birds, and marine resources such as shellfish. On the islands, there were few land mammals or floral resources so the inhabitants mostly consumed marine mammals (dolphins, seals, sea lions, and sea otters), sea birds, fish, and shellfish. Two types of settlement patterns were noted on both the mainland and the islands and included primary villages, which were occupied continuously and were typically positioned on the coast, and secondary camp sites, which were typically located inland, only occupied during part of the year, and were for the purpose of exploiting seasonal resources such as mainland floral resources like sage, acorns, yucca, cacti, and pine nuts. Their houses were domed and circular and thatched with tule (Bean and Smith 1978).

The Chingichgnish religion, as practiced by the Gabrielino, was centered on the deity Chingichgnish, who ruled the world after the death of Wiyot, another deity who produced the first race of men. Chingichgnish transformed these first people into plants and animals to serve as food for the new race of humans (the ones who exist today), who he created out of mud. To honor Chingichgnish, the Gabrielino erected sacred houses, performed ceremonies, and made offerings of food and goods. At the time of European contact, the Chingichgnish religion had spread to neighboring groups where it became incorporated with the Toalache cult. Toalache (jimson weed) is a hallucinogen, and its roots were used in a drink that was believed to provide young adults with long life, good health, strength, and prosperity. Despite Chingichgnish’s chiefly role, the religion was polytheistic with the Sun and Moon also being prominent deities (Kroeber 1925; Bean and Smith 1978; Miller 1991). According to Reid (1968:19), the main creator god Chingichgnish was also known as Quaoar, but his name was so sacred that he was often instead referred to using a substitute name, Y-yo-ha-riv-g-nain or the “Giver of Life.”

**Historic Background**

**Spanish Period (A.D. 1769 to 1821)**

The Spanish were the first known Europeans to explore and colonize the land area of what today is known as California, which included Alta and Baja California. Starting in 1542, explorations by the Spanish of the California coast began with the expedition of Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo, whose crew first came ashore at the present-day harbor of San Diego. Cabrillo’s expedition then sailed north to the Los Angeles area (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984), passing San Pedro Bay (Kielbasa 1997). Cabrillo visited Santa Catalina Island during this time and made peaceful contact with the island’s native inhabitants. In 1602, another Spanish expedition led by Sebastián Vizcaíno also had a peaceful encounter with the Gabrielino on Catalina (Bean and Smith 1978). While these early Spanish expeditions and others made initial contact with the local Native Californians and facilitated trade networks, Spanish colonization did not really commence until 1769 with the expeditions of the Franciscan administrator Junipero Serra and the Spanish military under the command of Gaspar de Portolá in San Diego (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984; Laylander 2000). Portolá’s expedition encountered natives when it crossed through the territory of the Gabrielino in the Los Angeles Basin on the way to Monterey Bay. The encounters continued to be peaceful, but conflicts would arise soon after (Bean and Smith 1978; Johnston 1962).

The Portolá expedition traveled from the Los Angeles Basin to the San Fernando Valley following an Indian Trail up the Sepulveda Canyon through a pass in the Santa Monica Mountains (Bearchell and Fried 1988). The San Fernando Valley was first observed from the Sepulveda Pass during the 1769 expedition. It was originally called El Valle de Santa Catalina de Bononia de los Encinos (Valley of St. Catherine of Bologna of the Oaks) by Father Juan Crespi (Pitt and Pitt 1997; State of California 2015c; Kielbasa 1997). The expedition crossed the Valley by heading north and coming close to what would become the San Fernando Mission, and then left the Valley via San Fernando Pass. On their return trip in 1770, the Portolá expedition entered the Valley again via the Santa Monica Mountains (Camarillo) and Calabasas.
Pass and ended up passing through Encino again. Looking for an easier route than their previous one, they ended up traveling south through the Cahuenga Pass (Kielbas 1997; Johnston 1962; McCawley 1996).

Another expedition in the late 1700s was that of Juan Bautista de Anza, Captain of the Royal Presidio at Tubac, Sonora (in modern-day southern Arizona). The purpose of the expedition was to find an overland route to the coast. De Anza’s Expedition camped in Russell Valley near Triunfo (or El Triunfo del Dulcisimo Nombre de Jesús at the junction of El Camino Real and the road to Lake Sherwood) west of Calabasas on April 10, 1774, after a stay at San Gabriel Mission, and then moved on to San Buenaventura. The party returned to the area ten days later, where they camped east of Camarillo at the foot of Conejo Grade. De Anza passed through the area one more time in 1776 during a colonizing expedition in which de Anza provided a military escort to over 200 people, primarily consisting of soldiers and their families, and 1,000 livestock heading to San Francisco from Tubac for the purpose of settlement (Hoover et al. 2002; Bureau of Land Management 2013; Bolton 1930). This expedition camped at El Puertecuelo (Puerto Suelo) near Burbank on February 21 after leaving San Gabriel, and the following night at Agua Escondida (Las Virgenes Creek) in the Simi Hills near Calabasas (National Park Service 2015; Hoover et al. 2002).

These expeditions preceded the Spanish Missionization efforts, which involved the establishment of twenty-one California Missions whose purpose was to “convert” the Native Californians to Catholicism within a ten year period and then return the mission lands to them (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984; Laylander 2000). The nearest mission to the Project is the San Fernando Mission, or Mission San Fernando Rey de España, which is located over 5.5 miles away to the northeast. It was founded in 1797 by Padre Fermín Francisco de Lasuén, along with Juan Lupe Cortés and Francisco Dumetz, near the Gabrieleno village of Pasheeknga, or Paseknga, in the northeast portion of the San Fernando Valley. Achoicomingna, or Achois Comihabit, on the other hand, was supposedly the name of the place where the Mission was actually built (McCawley 1996:36; Johnston 1962; Nunis 1997), although, according to Jorgensen (1982:32), Achois Comihabit was actually the Indian name for the entire Valley and meant “our place” or “our home.” Despite its name, the mission is not currently located within the City of San Fernando, but instead just outside within the community of Mission Hills in the City of Los Angeles (Pitt and Pitt 1997). Two ranchos were established in the Valley, Rancho San Rafael in 1784 and Rancho Encino in 1795. The Project is located on lands once belonging to the San Fernando Mission, and later incorporated into Rancho Ex Mission de San Fernando (Rand McNally 2008). In order to support the Spanish settlements, missions used Native Californians to work on the farms and ranches located on mission grounds. The majority of the Indians living on the coastal plains and valleys of southern California were forced to move to and provide labor for the San Fernando and San Gabriel missions (Bean and Smith 1978). The San Gabriel Mission, or La Misión del Santo Arcángel San Gabriel de los Temblores, was originally established in 1771 in the Whittier Narrows area between the San Gabriel River and Rio Hondo by the City of Montebello. This site is known as Misión Vieja or “Old Mission.” The mission was moved to its current location in the City of San Gabriel in 1774 or 1775 due to flooding of the San Gabriel River (Johnston 1962; Mision Vieja 2012; Pitt and Pitt 1997). The presence of the Indians at the San Gabriel Mission resulted in their Spanish name Gabrielino or Gabrieleño (Bean and Smith 1978).

At the time of the Spanish arrival, population estimates of California Indians were placed at about 310,000 individuals (Castillo 1998; OHP 1988). Population estimates for the Gabrieleno specifically are difficult to make but early Spanish reports indicate that village populations ranged between 50 and 200, and that there were possibly 50 to 100 mainland villages occupied at one time (Bean and Smith 1978). Jorgensen (1982) states that the San Fernando Valley was one of the more densely populated areas in California in 1769 and estimates the Indian population in the Valley at the time as being between 3,500 and 5,000, while Kroeber (1925) estimates the entire Gabrieleno population (including Fernandeño and
San Nicoleño) to be about 5,000 in 1770. Mass conversions of the Gabrielino people began in 1778 when certain village chiefs turned to Catholicism in order to procure food from the missions for their people. These Gabrielino assisted the Spanish, even though many other Gabrielino resisted the colonization and started revolts. By 1800, the original Gabrielino villages were empty as the Gabrielino and other Native Americans provided much of the labor for the European ranches, farms, and communities. This forced interaction with the Spanish, along with diseases introduced by earlier explorers, marked the beginning of the decline of the Gabrielino as the principal inhabitants of the Los Angeles area (Bean and Smith 1978). In 1819, the Indian population at the San Fernando Mission was only 1,080 (Pitt and Pitt 1997), and by the end of the Spanish reign, due to unhygienic Spanish population centers (essentially labor camps), European diseases, incarceration of Indians, excessive manual labor demands, and poor nutrition, the population declined significantly, by nearly one-third (Castillo 1998).

**Mexican Period (A.D. 1821 to 1848)**

The year 1821 marks the beginning of the Mexican Period (1821 to 1848) and is synonymous with Mexico’s independence from Spain. Mexico became California’s new ruling government, and at first, little changed for the California Indians. The Franciscan missions continued to enjoy the free unpaid labor the natives provided, despite the Mexican Republic’s 1824 Constitution that declared the Indians to be Mexican citizens. This monopoly of Indian labor by a system which accounted for nearly 1/6 of the land in the state angered the newly land-granted colonial citizens (Castillo 1998).

During this period, extensive land grants were established in the interior regions to spread the population inland from the more settled coastal areas where the Spanish had first concentrated their colonization efforts. 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 non-native inhabitants increased during this period because of the influx of explorers, trappers, and ranchers associated with the land grants (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984; Castillo 1998).

At the same time, the influence of the California missions waned in the late 1820s through the early 1830s. This decline resulted from a combination of outside events and pressures including increasing hostility between missionaries and local civilians who demanded mission lands, decimation of the Native American population by introduced diseases and hunger, and the influence of private traders in the hide and tallow industry. These events led to the eventual secularization and collapse of the mission system starting in 1834. Although return of the land was mandated by the government, little land was distributed back to the California Indians, but instead confiscated by Mexican authorities (Castillo 1998; Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984) and parceled out to individual owners by the 1840s. The largest tracts of lands ceded to natives, though, were ranchos present in the San Fernando Valley including Rancho El Encino, Rancho El Escorpion, Rancho Cahuenga, and Rancho Tuhunga. However, most of these lands were sold within a few years, and by the 1860s, little land was left in Indian hands (Johnston 1962). By the end of the period as a result of disease, homicide, and the loss of native environment and food sources, the Native California population had been reduced to approximately 100,000 (OHP 1988).

American military forces were stationed within California during the summer of 1846 as a result of the Mexican-American War (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). Mexican resistance rapidly deteriorated and on January 13, 1847, General Andrés Pico capitulated to Lieutenant Colonel John C. Frémont in an adobe known as Campo de Cahuenga, a site on the National Register located on Lankershim Boulevard near Universal City. They signed an agreement, known as the Articles of Capitulation or the Treaty of Cahuenga, which ended hostilities in California between Mexico and the United States and gave Californians equal rights as citizens of the United States (Pitt and Pitt 1997; Gazzar 2014). The United States occupied Mexico City in 1848, thus marking the end of the war and the beginning of the American
Period (1848 to Present).

American Period (A.D. 1848 to Present)

In February 1848, California officially became a U.S. holding with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. This treaty ended the Mexican-American War and ceded much of the southwest (California, Nevada, Utah, and portions of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming) to the United States. A month earlier, on January 24, 1848, gold was discovered along the American River, near Sacramento. The following year resulted in over 150,000 miners, known as “49-ers”, descending upon California. That same year, 1849, California petitioned Congress for admission to the Union as a “free state.” As a result of the Compromise of 1850, California was admitted to the Union as the 31st state on September 9, 1850 and was slave-free (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984; State of California 2015b). In 1862, the Homestead Act was passed, allowing individuals to claim up to 160 acres of undeveloped federal land for freehold title, provided that the claimant filed an application, improved the land, and then filed for title within five years (U.S. Congress 1863).

While the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo required the United States to grant citizenship to the Indians of former Mexican territories, the Constitution of California did not offer Indians protection under the law, considering them non-persons (Cook 1971). At the first State Constitutional Convention, California Indians’ right to vote was denied, and in 1850, the Act for the Government and Protection of Indians was passed by the State Legislature that greatly reduced the rights of Indians and enacted harsh punishments for any crimes committed by Indians. The Act practically legalized Indian slavery by allowing city officials to arrest Indians for vagrancy (drunkenness) and then sell them to ranchers and other people to serve as a private “labor force.” The law was not repealed until 1866 in order to comply with the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. However, Native Californians did not gain citizenship until 1917 when the California Supreme Court declared them citizens. Subsequently, the Indian Citizenship Act was passed in 1924 granting Indians the right to vote, but it would be more than 50 years before Indians were guaranteed their “constitutional right of religion” (OHP 1988).

In 1851, the United States Congress authorized a commission to create treaties with California Indians with the goal of extinguishing all Indian land titles and instead establishing reservation land, as had been done in many other states. However, the State Senate objected to the treaties as the land that was to be used for reservations was good for agriculture and rich in minerals. As a result, the U.S. senators from California convinced the U.S. Senate to not ratify the treaties that were drawn. They were then filed with an injunction of secrecy that was not removed until 1905. The signed treaties became known as the “Lost 18 Treaties of 1852” (Castillo 1978; Johnston 1962; OHP 1988). Reservation land was still set up in California, under the leadership of Edward F. Beale and Benjamin D. Wilson superintendent and sub-agent of Indian Affairs for California, but no new treaties were negotiated. After the treaties were “rediscovered,” legislation was passed to purchase small tracts of lands, later known as rancherías, in central and north central California for “landless Indians” in those areas. Therefore, some California Indians did manage to obtain reservation land by agreeing to move to specific locations. The quality of life on reservations, though, was sometimes poor because of limited resources. There was often a lack of water, and squatters were sometimes allowed to graze their cattle on reservation land, thereby destroying crops that were supposed to feed and support the Indians (OHP 1988).

The General Allotment Act of 1887, or the Dawes Act, was meant to provide California Indian families or individuals with lands. These lands were held in trust by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for 25 years, and if, after 25 years, the Indians had cultivated the land and become self-sufficient, they would gain title to the land. While the act appeared to benefit the Indians, it was designed to weaken the power of tribal governments. Many California Indians recognized the Act’s ultimate goal and instead chose to either purchase land or fight for the lands they believed to be theirs in the courts. Most court cases eventually
sided with American settlers, though, and most Indians were evicted (OHP 1988). As for the lands of which Indians did manage to gain ownership, most of them were taken away by laws enacted since 1900 (Chartkoff and Chartkoff 1984). The California Indian Jurisdictional Acts, or Lea Act, was passed in 1928 that allowed California Indians to either lay claim to certain lands in court or gain recompense, however Indians gained few victories and were often left homeless (OHP 1988).

One of the reasons that it was difficult for California Indians to obtain land was due to the arrival of the railroads in the late 1800s and early 1900s, which brought in a new influx of immigrants. The rail lines initially only connected the Los Angeles area to the Pacific Ocean, but California would be connected to the rest of the country when Central Pacific and other major railroad companies started working on a southern transcontinental route across the United States known as the Sunset Route. This route was completed in 1883 and connected San Francisco to New Orleans (Jones & Stokes 1999). The portion of the route built through the Los Angeles area was constructed by the Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) in the 1870s (Ashkar et al. 1999), and, in 1874, the SPPR started offering service from Los Angeles to San Fernando (Pitt and Pitt 1997). The Southern Pacific enjoyed a railroad monopoly in California until 1885 when the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe (AT&SF) completed a line into southern California.

Native Americans faced dangers beyond what they had experienced through missionization and loss of territory. Vigilante groups and militias were established to kill Indians and to kidnap their children. As a result, close to 100,000 Californian Indians perished and much of the tribal continuity throughout the state was extinguished (Castillo 1978). The last comprehensive survey of the Gabrielino took place in 1852. It found that most of the traditional communities had disappeared, the use of the indigenous language had declined, and many traditional ceremonies and practices had been abandoned (McCawley 1996). By 1900, they had “ceased to exist as a culturally identifiable group” (Bean and Smith 1978:540).

**History of Project Vicinity**

**San Fernando Valley**

The San Fernando Valley would get its name from the Mission established there (County of Los Angeles Public Library 2015b). The Valley was first surveyed by Padre Vicente de Santa María in 1795 in order to search for a prospective site for a new mission that was midway between the missions at San Buenaventura and San Gabriel (Nunis 1997; Kielbasa 1997). His descriptions encouraged Lasuén to found his eighth California mission (and 17th in the state) (Nunis 1997). It was named for Ferdinand III, the 13th-century king of Castile and León (Pitt and Pitt 1997). The Mission consisted of an “extensive compound of buildings, including a large church made of adobe brick and tile” (County of Los Angeles Public Library 2015b). By 1804, the original church had been replaced twice by larger churches due to increasing attendance, Indian neophytes at the Mission were housed in modest adobe houses, and a *zanja* (ditch) was dug from a nearby spring in the northern slope of the foothills. The ditch, along with a rudimentary dam of brush, rocks, and earth, formed an early irrigation system for the Mission’s agricultural fields. In 1808, the simple dam was replaced by a more elaborate one constructed of stone masonry. A reservoir was created, and by 1811, a clay-pipe aqueduct was constructed. By 1819, there were 15,000 cattle, sheep, and horses along with a large number of buildings including a chapel, kitchen, 20-room residence building, workshop buildings, and a cemetery (County of Los Angeles Public Library 2015b; Nunis 1997). A *Convento* building (residence of parish priests or community of nuns) was completed by 1822.

During the intervening years from its founding to 1820, various friars came and went (most leaving as a result of illness or death), and there were times when there was no resident priest at the Mission. In 1820, though, Francisco Gonzáles de Ibarra came to the Mission and served there until 1835. During this time, the Mission had a period of stability, despite California’s transition from Spanish to Mexican rule (Nunis...
and became quite prosperous. By 1826, there were 56,000 heads of cattle and 1,500 horses occupying Mission lands that were being cared for and raised by the Indian residents. The Mission was known for the artistry of its silversmiths, its abundant olives, and its fine wine (Roderick 2003). It also produced dates, wheat, barley, corn, wool, and leather hides, much of which was used to provision the Pueblo de Los Angeles and the presidio at Santa Barbara (Pitt and Pitt 1997). The Mission’s livestock herds declined, though, as a result of the flourishing hide and tallow trade, and when California missions were secularized in May 29, 1835, Ibarra departed (Nunis 1997). California officials confiscated property and evicted most of the Native Americans at San Fernando. Various friars succeeded Ibarra, while the agricultural fields were placed under the control of mayordomo Pedro Lopez, during which time the Mission quickly declined. The Mission’s buildings “crumbled and became vermin-infested,” while its “bells, books, furniture, vestments, and stations of the cross were looted” (County of Los Angeles Public Library 2015b). The Stations of the Cross, or Via Crucis (Way of the Cross), were fourteen canvases painted by the San Fernando Indians and hung on the walls of the Mission church. These paintings ended up at the Plaza Church in Los Angeles afterwards and have been at various other locations since then including a State Fair, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Los Angeles County Museum, and the San Gabriel Mission where they are currently (Neuerburg 1997). By 1847, the San Fernando Mission was virtually abandoned. Blas Ordaz was the last resident Franciscan missionary at San Fernando, and after its abandonment, left to take over what was left of the San Gabriel Mission (Nunis 1997).

Indians freed from the Mission were encouraged to apply for land grants once they met the qualifications for Mexican citizenship. In 1843, several grants were distributed to former San Fernando Mission Indians, although not all of them would be recognized by the U.S. Government. In 1845, Governor Pío Pico proclaimed that mission lands could be either sold to the government or leased to individuals for commercial use. The San Fernando Mission lands were originally leased to Juan Manso and Pico’s brother Andrés. However, war with the United States required capital and so the lease was sold to Eulogio F. de Celis, a wealthy Spaniard, in 1846, with the condition that Indian rights were not to be violated (Johnston 1962; Robinson 1961; Johnson 1997). According to the Los Angeles Times (1903), De Celis loaned the Mexican government money for the war effort and took the Mission lands as collateral. The buildings belonging to the Mission, however, were set aside and sold to the Pueblo de Los Angeles in 1846. These buildings were returned to the Catholic Church in 1861, although in a dilapidated state (California Missions Online n.d.; Bearchell and Fried 1988). De Celis left for Spain in 1853 and died in 1869 (Bearchell and Fried 1988). In 1854, after the expiration of the lease, de Celis sold half of the interest of the remaining lands back to Andres Pico, who subsequently sold it to Pío Pico in 1862. Pio Pico mortgaged the property and then sold all but 2,000 acres to the San Fernando Farm Homestead Association in 1869 (Dumke 1944; Jorgensen 1982). This investment constituted the southern half of the Valley and encompassed the modern-day communities of North Hollywood, Van Nuys, Reseda, and Canoga Park as well as Sherman Oaks and Studio City. The title or patent to Rancho Ex-Mision de San Fernando, which was originally 116,771 acres in size and included all lands on Rancho San Fernando not directly associated with the Mission, was confirmed by the United States government in 1873 to the heirs of de Celis under the 1851 statute that confirmed original Spanish and Mexican land grants (Bureau of Land Management 2015). This statute (9 Stat. 631 or Chapter XLI of Statute II of the Thirty-first Congress), passed on March 3, 1851, involved “Land Claims in California.” It specifically appointed a commission to settle private land claims in the State of California. Claimants of land based on a right or title given by the Spanish or Mexican government had to present said title to the Commission along with documentary evidence and witness testimony that corroborated the claim. The statute did not apply to lands granted for the establishment of towns (U.S. Congress 1851).

The San Fernando Farm Homestead Association lasted until 1874 and was run by Isaac Lankershim, who would lend his name to a town in the east end of the Valley initially dubbed Toluca (now known as North Hollywood) where he had established Lankershim Ranch, Land and Water Company (Dumke 1944). His
son-in-law, Isaac Newton Van Nuys, managed the lands and introduced dryland farming to the area. As a result, much of the southern portion of the Valley was used to grow wheat in the late 1800s along with raising livestock. The property was not only cultivated by Lankershim and Van Nuys, but also Lankershim’s son John under their new company called the Los Angeles Farm and Milling Company and established in 1880. Several towns grew from land bought from the Los Angeles Farm and Milling Company, which included the Lankershim Ranch, Land and Water Company. Completion of the Los Angeles Aqueduct by the City of Los Angeles and William Mulholland (see below) brought Owens River water to the Valley in 1913, thus allowing the introduction of vineyards, citrus groves, and other fruit orchards (Pitt and Pitt 1997; Nadeau 1965; Jorgensen 1982; Bearchell and Fried 1988). However, until the railroad came into the Valley, the Lankershims had no adequate method of shipping their grain. They thus constructed the first real wagon road across the Sepulveda Pass in 1874 and 1875 with San Fernando serving as the stage headquarters. This road enabled them to negotiate for a reasonable freight rate with Southern Pacific when it arrived (Mayers 1976; Nadeau 1965).

Other stage routes in the Valley include the Old Santa Susana Stage Road, or Santa Susana Pass Wagon Road. This route was first traversed by a stagecoach in 1861, after workers carved a road through the mountainside from Chatsworth to Simi Valley (Lozano 1990). This portion of the route that follows an old Indian trail through the Santa Susana Pass, was also known as the “Devil’s Slide” due to its very steep grade; thus the risk of losing control of the stagecoach was quite high (California State Parks 2010). The road, run by the Overland Stage Company, traveled between Los Angeles and San Francisco and was a stage trail for carrying mail in addition to being the main commercial overland route between the two cities (Lozano 1990). This route was an alternate mail service route through the Valley. The original, being the Butterfield Overland Mail Route, was to the east and traveled through the San Fernando Pass. The first stagecoach traveled the Butterfield stage road in 1858, entering the Valley through Cahuenga Pass and traveling to the San Fernando Mission and Fort Tejón (Pitt and Pitt 1997; Los Encinos State Park 1942). The Butterfield was started as a result of the U.S. Congress passing the Post Office Appropriations Bill in 1857 in order to create a direct overland mail route from the east to the west side of the country. The government awarded the contract to John Butterfield of the John Butterfield Company (Underwood 2000). The Lopez Station on the Butterfield route was established in the northern hills near the San Fernando Mission and the Van Norman Lake in the 1860s by Geronimo Lopez and was the first formal stagecoach stop in the Valley. Geronimo and his wife Catalina had moved to this tract in the early 1860s and built a large adobe home there that would serve as a stopping station for mule teams operating between the Pueblo of Los Angeles and the Cerro Gordo mines in Inyo County. They also established the first post office in the Valley in 1869. The stage line traveled between the Valley and Los Angeles via the Cahuenga Pass and operated until 1874 when the railroad arrived. Other major transportation routes (oxcart and wagon trails) in the Valley included El Camino Real (modern-day Ventura Boulevard) and the Old Sepulveda Trail (modern-day Sepulveda Boulevard), which followed the Sepulveda Canyon through the Santa Monica Mountains (Bearchell and Fried 1988).

In the 1870s, the Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) constructed a line between Los Angeles and Bakersfield that passed through the San Fernando Valley. In 1872, de Celis’s heirs granted the SPRR a strip of land through the Valley that was about 100 feet wide along with a 30-acre parcel at the north end of the Valley for a depot (Jorgensen 1982). Rail service between Los Angeles and San Fernando commenced on January 21, 1874. The line to Bakersfield was completed in 1876 when the northern and southern ends of the line were connected via a tunnel through Fremont Pass (San Fernando Pass), which is currently known as Newhall Pass and which separates the Santa Susana Mountains from the San Gabriel Mountains and links the San Fernando and Santa Clarita valleys. The establishment of this line started the development of the San Fernando Valley as Northern California investors bought land on “Ex Mission San Fernando” lands and started sub-dividing property next to the railroad’s path (County of Los Angeles Public Library 2015). However, this development was mostly confined to the north end of the
Valley and did not become widespread until the Valley gained access to the City of Los Angeles’s water supply after annexation in 1915 (see below). The SPRR later constructed another line through the Valley in 1893, an east-west line known as the Chatsworth Park Branch, which was part of the coastal route that ran through Simi Valley and Ventura before heading north. However, this line was beset by sharp curves and slow speeds, causing another, straighter rail line to be constructed between Chatsworth and Burbank (Foster 2002). This later track was eventually incorporated into the Montalvo Cut-off and is the line that runs along the southern perimeter of the Project.

C.P. Huntington of the Southern Pacific Coast Line directed the construction of the Montalvo Cut-off, which was completed in 1904 and served as the short route between Santa Barbara and Los Angeles. It was built to “cut operating costs into Los Angeles and provide commercial transportation from San Francisco to Los Angeles” (Foster 2002:11). The original route from Los Angeles to Santa Barbara (Santa Clara Valley line), completed in 1887, traveled through the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles, Saugus in Santa Clarita, and the Santa Clara River Valley in Ventura County with depots at Burbank, San Fernando, Saugus, Santa Paula, and Montalvo. The connection to San Francisco was completed in 1901. This route had problems, though, including light track, numerous curves that slowed the speed of the train, and washouts caused by heavy rain. The Montalvo Cut-off, on the other hand, branched off the main Coast Line in Burbank, traveling through the San Fernando Valley to Chatsworth, and tunneling through the Santa Susana Mountains north of Chatsworth into Simi Valley. It then headed west towards the coast through Moorpark and Camarillo, traveled north through Oxnard, and finally joined the old Coast Line at the Montalvo junction in Ventura, after which it headed northwest along the coast to Santa Barbara and San Francisco. While the cut-off only shortened the travel distance between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara by seven miles, it had reduced grades and curvature that significantly reduced running times. The Montalvo Cut-off was the first connection between Burbank and Oxnard that, after completion, became part of the main passenger line between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara (Foster 2002; Stewart 2009).

Prior to its acquisition by Union Pacific, Southern Pacific Railroad Company was the major railroad in southern California as it had absorbed most of the smaller rail lines by the early 1900s. It was created as a subsidiary of the Central Pacific Railroad in the 1860s in order to build rail lines from San Francisco to Los Angeles, as well as eastward to the Colorado River (Pitt and Pitt 1997). It was officially incorporated as the Southern Pacific Company of Kentucky in 1884, which leased all Central Pacific property including the holdings of the Big Four, the principal organizers of the Central Pacific Railroad (Mark Hopkins, Collis P. Huntington, Leland Stanford, and Charles Crocker). When the route of the southern transcontinental line (Sunset Route) was being decided in the 1870s, Los Angeles had to agree to subsidize its construction in order to get the SPRR to build the route through the county and city, which was completed in 1876. In 1901, Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) acquired control of SPRR and operated both the Southern Pacific’s and Central Pacific’s routes. However, in 1912, the United States Government sued the UPRR under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, and the United States Supreme Court forced Union Pacific to sell all of its Southern Pacific interests. However, by the 1990s, the Union Pacific had once again acquired the holdings of the Southern Pacific Company (Ashkar et al. 1999; Bailey 1908; Jorgensen 1982; A&E Television Networks 2015).

In 1909, the Los Angeles Suburban Homes Company, which included such founding members as Harry Chandler, Harrison Gray Otis, and Hobart Johnstone Whitley, purchased the Lankershim Ranch, which was 47,500 acres in size and did not include the 12,000 acres retained by Lankershim in the east end of the Valley north of Cahuenga Pass that would eventually become North Hollywood as well as Toluca Lake and portions of Studio City and Sun Valley (Robinson 1961; Jones 1887; Rand McNally 2008). The purchase included the western portion of the Ex-Mission lands and was bought in anticipation of the future aqueduct that would bring water from the Owens Valley (see below). Three of the major townsites
laid out on this land included Van Nuys, Marian (now Reseda), and Owensmouth (Chatsworth). Van Nuys (originally Kester Ranch), named in honor of Isaac Newton Van Nuys, was founded in 1911 and became the first community to be annexed to Los Angeles in 1915. The community of Reseda was subdivided in 1913 and first named Marian after the daughter of Harrison Otis (also the wife of Harry Chandler). However, the United States Postal Service disapproved of the name due to California having a similarly named town elsewhere, Mariana (Bearchell and Fried 1988; Pitt and Pitt 1997). The property owners then selected the name Reseda, which is the botanical (genus) name of the mignonette flower (*Reseda odorata*) (Gudde 1949). It also means “gives comfort” in Latin (Pitt and Pitt 1997:431). Moses H. Sherman, also on the board of directors, reserved some property near the crossing of Sepulveda and Ventura Boulevards and named it Sherman Oaks in 1911 (Bearchell and Fried 1988). An east-west road known as Sherman Way (south of the Project) was constructed through the Valley in 1911 that was accessible to cars, horses, wagons, and eventually the electric trolley (Pacific Electric) that ran down the middle of the road (Mayers 1976).

The Pacific Electric (PE) formed in 1902 and would eventually connect 42 incorporated cities within 35 miles of Los Angeles. SPRR bought the Pacific Electric in 1910 and in 1911 created the Pacific Electric Railway. The Pacific Electric Railway Company, or the Red Car, became the operator of one of the largest electric interurban rail systems (trolley cars) in the state after merging with Southern Pacific along with many small electric railway companies (Walker 2006). PE initially entered the Valley in 1911 when the Los Angeles Pacific Railway began building a rail line from Hollywood through Cahuenga Pass. Midway through construction, Los Angeles Pacific was absorbed by Pacific Electric (PE), which was owned by the SPRR. The newly incorporated Los Angeles & San Fernando Valley Electric Railway Company, on the other hand, obtained a right-of-way for an electric railway from Van Nuys to San Fernando. However, this company was bought by PE in 1912, who then obtained the right-of-way and thus completed construction of that line. Both the Van Nuys-Owensmouth Extension and the Van Nuys-San Fernando Extension were completed in 1913. The first PE line in the Valley would travel from Hollywood, pass Universal City, and stop at Lankershim (North Hollywood). It would then travel to Kester Junction on a track paralleling the steam line of the SPRR’s North Hollywood Branch (or Chatsworth Park line). Severe floods in 1938 washed out the PE bridge on this line, after which PE had to share SPRR’s rails. (PE leased SPRR’s track and electrified it.) From Kester Junction, the line traveled to Van Nuys on its own right-of-way, through Marion (Reseda), and terminated at Owensmouth. The other line constructed branched off in Van Nuys at Sherman Way, heading north, and traveled to the San Fernando Mission and the City of San Fernando (Jorgensen 1982; ERHA n.d.).

For 41 years, Pacific Electric was the sole commuter line from the Valley to the City of Los Angeles and also linked isolated Valley communities. Coupled with the newly available water, PE enabled residential development to occur. However, in the 1930s, ridership declined due to the rising prominence of the automobile (Walker 2006). In 1938, all tracks linking Van Nuys with San Fernando and Owensmouth were removed and replaced by buses, although in 1940, PE built a track into the Valley through Cahuenga Pass in the middle of the Hollywood Freeway (Bearchell and Fried 1988; Foster 2002), which was dieselized in 1943. This line ended at Van Nuys Boulevard and North Sherman Way (ERHA n.d.). By the early 1940s, PE’s business was once again on the rise due to World War II, which resulted in gasoline rationing and the need to transport defense materials. However, by the late 1940s, after the cessation of the war, freeways and automobiles once again gained in popularity. PE discontinued passenger service on some of its lines and shut down other lines completely. Rail operations in many other areas were also converted to buses (Walker 2006). In 1952, buses replaced rail service on the Hollywood Freeway line as well. The last regular car traveled the track in 1952, after which power to the line was cut. All of the tracks were pulled except for two blocks on Highland Avenue and the tracks in North Hollywood, which were used for freight use. The portion of the line between San Fernando to Nordhoff also continued to be used in order to move citrus products (ERHA n.d.). In 1953, PE sold all of its rail and bus passenger
services to state-owned Metropolitan Coach Lines (MCL), and by 1956, all freight operations had been turned over to diesel locomotives (Walker 2006). In 1957, the former right-of-way through the Cahuenga Pass was paved over when two lanes were added to the Hollywood Freeway (ERHA n.d.). In 1958, MCL sold out to the first “MTA” (Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority) (Walker 2006), and by 1961, the Transit Authority had discontinued all rail services (Ashkar et al. 1999). In 1965, PE “disappeared entirely as an operating entity” (Tobar n.d.) when it formally merged with Southern Pacific (Signor 2003).

Los Angeles River
The Los Angeles River (the River) drains the watershed of the San Fernando Valley and its surrounding mountains and carries the water to the Pacific Ocean via Long Beach (San Pedro Bay). In the past, heavy rainfall could cause the Los Angeles River, as well as other rivers such as the San Gabriel River, to overflow its banks and flood nearby farms and houses (City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks 2015). During the initial Spanish colonization/occupation of Los Angeles, at the Pueblo in Downtown Los Angeles, settlers realized they needed proper irrigation in order to engage in agriculture necessary to sustain them. The first main irrigation ditch to the Pueblo de Los Angeles was completed in 1781 and called Zanja Madre, or mother ditch. Eventually, due to the labor of local Indians, Los Angeles started producing grain and, by the early 1800s, became one of the most important agricultural settlements on the Pacific Coast with its surpluses of wheat, corn, barley, and beans. Later, Los Angeles would also grow grapes for wine, oranges, almonds, walnuts, and even hemp. Despite its agricultural success, by 1850, southern California had become “barren and desolate” as most of the willows and cottonwoods that grew along the river courses and in the marshes had been cut down to make room for farms and ranches, with the wood being used for lumber and firewood (Gumprecht 1999:53). In addition, the marshlands and wetlands had mostly dried up due to the increasing use of surface water for agriculture and personal gardens (Gumprecht 1999).

After California became a state, more migrants settled in Los Angeles resulting in ever increasing demand for water. As a result, there was a “competition for the river’s supply” and the irrigation network (zanjas) was expanded (Gumprecht 1999:56). However, the River became an inadequate source of water as the population, and demand for water, continued to increase and residential and industrial development started displacing farmland. By 1876, when SPRR completed its line to Los Angeles, the Los Angeles River was a dry wash in the Los Angeles Basin through most of the year as its surface flow gradually disappeared (Gumprecht 1999).

The farmers of the San Fernando Valley were legally banned from using or diverting water from the Los Angeles River as the Valley was not yet part of the City of Los Angeles, which had exclusive rights to the River’s flow thanks to the original Spanish land grant (Gumprecht 1999; Jorgensen 1982). While the Valley had previously been part of the township of Los Angeles, in 1887, the county was divided into 13 different townships with much of the original Rancho San Fernando lands being separated into their own township, the San Fernando Township (Jorgensen 1982). As a result of this separation, the Valley was forced to engage in dryland farming until the early 1900s when water was imported from the eastern slopes of the Sierra Nevada. Early irrigation was not widespread as its only source was mountain springs and underground aquifers, thus wheat was the primary crop of the Valley at that time. In 1909, San Fernando farmers were also banned from using water from the underground basin that supplies the River. However, certain places in the Valley could farm using water from artesian wells not connected to the River, thus increasing the number of crops that could be cultivated in those specific areas. For example, grapes, figs, olives, and garden crops were planted at Mission San Fernando, while in Burbank, melons, fruits, and vegetables were grown along with vineyards. Irrigation was finally extensively developed in the Valley after 1913 when the Los Angeles-Owens River Aqueduct was constructed to obtain runoff from the eastern Sierras in order to offset the dwindling water supply in Los Angeles (Gumprecht 1999). The communities of Chatsworth and Canoga Park in the Valley were once known as “Owensmouth,”
because that was where the Aqueduct entered Los Angeles County from the north (County of Los Angeles Public Library 2015). The Los Angeles River still supplied one-fifth of the City’s water prior to the 1940s, though, when a second major aqueduct was built to deliver water from the Colorado River. In order to gain access to the City’s water and receive fixed water rates, many outlying communities voted to become part of Los Angeles. In 1915, the City started annexing a significant portion of the Valley. Today, the City of Los Angeles still has exclusive right to the water beneath the San Fernando Valley (Gumprecht 1999).

Despite the “draining” of the Los Angeles River, it still overflowed often destroying farmland, homes, and businesses as well as hurting transportation (highway bridges and railroad lines), communication and infrastructure (public utility wires and pipe lines), and even occasionally washing away entire towns. Due to increasing construction on the floodplain as well as irrigation diversion, the construction of levees that constricted water flow, and the building of railroads that interrupted natural drainage patterns, flooding became a growing hazard. The state of affairs was further exacerbated because of the removal of vegetation that had previously hindered erosion. The River also changed its course repeatedly. As a result of the floods, many proposals were put forth to control flooding that included constructing diversions, reservoirs, check dams, and more levees as well as deepening and realigning major drainage channels. The Flood Control Act of 1936 authorized and provided funds for fifty flood control projects on major waterways in the United States, including the Los Angeles River. Flood control was achieved on the Los Angeles River through channelization, which involved encasing some portions in a concrete rectangular channel and confining other portions with sloped concrete banks. By the end of the 1960s, practically all the rivers and creeks in the Los Angeles area were encased in concrete channels (Gumprecht 1999), including Aliso and Limekiln creeks within the Project area.

Northridge

Northridge is located in the northwest portion of the San Fernando Valley and is part of the land purchased by former California Senators Charles Maclay and George K. Porter, who would establish the City of San Fernando. Maclay and Porter, with the financial assistance of Porter’s cousin Benjamin F. Porter, bought the northern half of the Valley from the heirs of Eulogio de Celis in 1874 (Bearchell and Fried 1988; Jorgensen 1982). They divided the land three-ways with Maclay receiving the eastern portion, which included the land from the proposed SPRR tracks to the San Gabriel Mountains, and Benjamin Porter receiving the western portion, which encompassed the land from the Mission to the Santa Susana Mountains including the Porter Ranch community north of the Project. George Porter obtained the land in between, including a portion of the City of San Fernando, and created the Porter Land and Water Company subdivision (Jorgensen 1982; Wright 1898; Rand McNally 2008). In 1887, Henry C. Hubbard and Francis Marion Wright purchased a portion (1,100 acres) of the land managed by Benjamin Porter known as Hawk Ranch. They then used their ranch to produce wheat. Wright was initially a ranch hand for George Porter, but later became a co-developer of the ranch. Hawk Ranch was sold to Valley Farms Company in 1908 and subsequently subdivided. Wright’s wife, Emily Vose Wright, named the early housing tract Zelzah Acres, or Zelzah, which is the Biblical term for oasis (Bearchell and Fried 1988; Water and Power Associates n.d.a). It specifically means “watering place in the desert” (Pitt and Pitt 1997:361). It was given that name due to an underground stream or spring that flowed beneath Reseda Boulevard and Parthenia Street that served as a water source. This spring is not far from the current above-ground flow of Aliso Creek. The SPRR laid tracks to the newly developed town Zelzah in 1908 and established a stop (shipping point) there along with a well (Bearchell and Fried 1988). In 1915, the citizens of Zelzah formally voted for annexation to the City of Los Angeles.

According to Pitt and Pitt (1997) and Gudde (1949), the town’s name was changed to North Los Angeles in 1933, but Bearchell and Fried (1988) and Water and Power Associates (n.d.a) state that the name change actually occurred in 1929 when the signs over the Southern Pacific train depot and post office...
were changed. The name of the town would change once again, this time to Northridge, in 1938 according to Bearchell and Fried (1988) and Water and Associates (n.d.a). The name change was proposed by Carl S. Dentzel of the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles due to the town being located at the base of the San Fernando Valley’s northern ridge (Pitt and Pitt 1997; Gudde 1949). He initially proposed the name Northridge Village, but it was shortened to just Northridge soon after (Water and Associates n.d.a).

GEOLOGIC AND PALEONTOLOGIC SETTING

The Project is located in the City of Los Angeles’s San Fernando Valley. The San Fernando Valley is one of the broad, enclosed (interior) valleys that border the Transverse Ranges (DeCourten 2010). The Transverse Ranges of southern California are located south of the Coast Ranges and north of the Peninsular Ranges, and have an east-west trend that is different from the northwest-southeast trend of the other two geomorphic provinces. They extend from the most western part of the southern California coast at the Santa Ynez Mountains to the eastern end of the Little San Bernardino Mountains in central Riverside County. They include the Santa Monica Mountains, San Gabriel Mountains, San Bernardino Mountains, Santa Ynez Mountains, Tehachapi Mountains, San Emigdio Mountains, Sierra Pelona Mountains, San Rafael Mountains, Santa Susana Mountains, and the Topatopa Mountains. The Transverse Ranges also include the northern Channel Islands (Santa Rosa, Santa Cruz, San Miguel, and Anacapa), which are essentially an extension of the Santa Monica Mountains into the Pacific Ocean (Bailey and Jahns 1954).

The Transverse mountain ranges came into existence about 20 million years ago during the Miocene Epoch (23 to 5.3 million years ago) when the tectonic blocks on which they are present rotated up to 90 degrees clockwise in response to a shear along the San Andreas Fault called the Big Bend (Luyendyk et al. 1985; Fritsche 1998; DeCourten 2010). The Pacific Plate, separated from the North American Plate by the San Andreas Fault, is moving northwest in relation to the North American Plate. In the area of the bend, this movement causes the land on the Pacific Plate to converge with the North American Plate. The plate specifically converges with the Central Valley and Sierra Nevada to the north, resulting in the compression that created the mountain ranges and causes them to continue to gain in elevation (DeCourten 2010).

During the Miocene, the Los Angeles area was part of a deep, rapidly subsiding submarine trough that was separated from the open ocean by a submarine ridge. This basin quickly (geologically speaking) divided into the Ventura Basin, the San Gabriel Basin (Valley), the San Fernando Basin (Valley), and the Los Angeles Basin due to the bend in the San Andreas fault line (Luyendyk et al. 1985). Starting in the early Pliocene, which began about 5.3 million years ago (mya), these basins were subsequently filled with sediment until they became overlain with shallow-marine deposits and finally with terrestrial (alluvial stream) deposits during the Pleistocene (2.6 mya to 11,700 years ago) and Holocene (11,700 years ago to present) epochs (Woodford et al. 1954; USGS Geologic Names Committee 2010).

The San Fernando Valley is a roughly triangular-shaped sub-basin measuring about 24 miles by 12 miles that separates the San Gabriel Mountains from the Santa Monica and Santa Susana mountains, with the Simi Hills bordering on the northwest and the Agoura Hills on the southwest. It is an overlapping, diagonal offshoot of the southeastern portion of the Ventura Basin and is separated from the Los Angeles Basin to the south by the Santa Monica Mountains (Schoenherr 1992; Bailey and Jahns 1954). The San Fernando Basin, or Valley, is filled by Miocene and Pliocene deposits that are structurally deepest toward the north side of the Valley. The accumulation of sediment occurs at the north end due to streams entering the Valley at that location. This alluvial plain, thus, tilts to the south and east from an elevation of 1500 feet to 500 feet amsl. Beneath the alluvium is a basement of Cenozoic (65.5 mya to present) and upper
Mesozoic/Cretaceous (145.5 to 65.5 mya) sedimentary rocks. The northern edge of the Valley is split by the Santa Susana thrust zone (Bailey and Jahns 1954; USGS Geologic Names Committee 2010). The sediment along the northern and eastern edges of the Valley mostly consists of sand and gravel contributed by the San Gabriel Mountains. Along the southern and western edges of the Valley, sediment consists of clay derived from the Santa Monica and Santa Susana mountains and silt left behind by receding waters (Jorgensen 1982).

The Los Angeles River is an important component of the Valley in that it originates from a large underground reservoir beneath the Valley that is then pushed to the surface at the base of the Santa Monica Mountains. This natural reservoir is created by porous deposits (such as sand and gravel) that have washed into the Valley from the surrounding mountain slopes by seasonal runoff. The streams that enter the Valley from the surrounding mountains are submerged quickly into the porous valley surface after exiting their narrow canyons, thus contributing to the underground reservoir instead of reaching the Los Angeles River directly. As a result, drainage of the Valley primarily occurs below the surface. Other streams that drain the Valley are the Big Tujunga Creek, the Little Tujunga Creek, and the Pacoima Creek as well as various tributaries that include a few year-round above-ground springs on the margins of the Basin. Prior to the drawdown and channelization of the Los Angeles River (see above), the overflow of this reservoir caused water to flow into the River even during the dry season (Gumprecht 1999). As the majority of its flow came from a subterranean source and not directly from mountain or surface runoff, the River had been dubbed the “upside-down river” (Gumprecht 1999:13).

The general geology of the Project vicinity (see Figure 4) consists of Quaternary alluvium (Qa) based on Dibblee (1992). The surficial Quaternary-age (Holocene) deposits are composed of unconsolidated, generally undissected alluvial gravel, sand, and clay. These deposits are common in valley and floodplain areas. To the north, at some distance from the Project, are Quaternary-age (Recent) sediments of gravel and sand deposited by major stream channels (Qg) as well as older Quaternary-age (upper Pleistocene) alluvium composed of angular pebble-size fragments of Miocene shale and sandstone incorporated into light gray to tan silty matrix (Qoa).

According to McLeod (2015), the younger Quaternary alluvium that characterizes the surficial sediment of the site consists primarily of alluvial fan deposits from the Santa Susana Mountains to the north. There are also fluvial deposits derived from the Aliso Canyon Wash drainage that flows through the middle of the Project. These younger deposits do not typically contain significant vertebrate fossils in the upper layers. However, older Quaternary alluvium exists at varying depths beneath the younger alluvium throughout the Valley. The older sediment does have the potential to contain significant fossil vertebrate remains. Deposits of older alluvium (Pleistocene-age) exist on the surface to the north along the Aliso Canyon Wash not far from the Project (Qao), and they probably occur beneath the surficial sediment of the Project at an unknown but possibly shallow depth.

**METHODOLOGY**

*Cultural Resources Records Search*

On August 20, 2015, Ms. Ruzicka conducted the cultural resource records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), the local repository for the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), which is located on the campus of California State University, Fullerton. To identify any cultural resources on or near the proposed Project sites, a one-mile search radius was utilized around the Project property. Ms. Ruzicka also examined current inventories of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), and the CRHR found at State of California (2015a), as well as the California...
State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) for Los Angeles County (OHP 2012) at the SCCIC, to determine any local resources that have been previously evaluated for historic significance. The Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) List: City Declared Monuments (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2014) was also examined along with the Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) Report for Northridge (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015).

For the purposes of this assessment, the OHP’s definition of historic resources was used in that any building or object that is fifty years of age or older is considered historic (OHP 1995).

**Archival Research**

United States Geologic Service (USGS) historic topographic maps were examined for indications of historic structures and historical development in and around the Project area including the 7.5’ Canoga Park quadrangle (USGS 1952, 1952 PR 1967) and the 15’ Calabasas quadrangle (USGS 1903, 1944). The Canoga Park quadrangle had previously been located on two separate quadrangles: Reseda (south half) and Zelzah (north half) with the Project area present on the Zelzah quadrangle (USGS 1928, 1932, 1941). In addition, on-line aerial photographs of the region from NETROnline (2011) were inspected that go back as far as 1947. NETROnline (2011) also has topographic maps of the area from the years 1903, 1908, 1909, 1912, 1913, 1924, 1925, 1929, 1937, 1944, 1947, 1954, 1959, 1966, 1968, 1979, and 1986. Four other historic maps were also examined, two of which are historic maps of Los Angeles County.
(Rowan 1888; Wright 1898), one of which is a title insurance map of the San Fernando Valley (Los Encinos State Historic Park 1942), and one of which is a street map of the San Fernando Valley (Borgnis 1924).

Three maps were examined to determine approximate locations of historic (ethnographic) Native American villages, Southwest Museum (1962) and the 1925 United States Bureau of Ethnology map (Kroeber 1925: Plates 48 and 57), as well as descriptions present in Swanton (1952). These maps are based on the work of Hugo Reid, married to a native from the Comicrabit (or Comicranga) rancheria near the San Gabriel Mission, who provided the names of 28 villages and their locations in 1852. There were probably forty more villages that he did not name or map (Reid and Heizer 1968; Mision Vieja 2012).

**Paleontologic Resources Records Search**

While paleontologic resources were not included in the scope of the Project, APRMI requested a paleontologic resources records search from the Vertebrate Paleontology department of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (LACM) on August 21, 2015. A vertebrate paleontological records check was conducted on September 10, 2015 and consisted of reviewing the museum’s paleontology collection records of recorded fossil sites on and/or near the project area.

**Field Reconnaissance**

Ms. Ruzicka conducted a field survey of the Project for archaeological resources on August 26, 2015. She walked approximately north-south and east-west transects, depending on the Project section, across the accessible, dry areas of the Project that were spaced about five meters apart. The sections surveyed included the area south of Vanalden Park (north of railroad tracks), the area east of the Wilbur Canyon Debris (Settlement) Basin, and the portions of the Basin that were not covered in concrete, water, or too dense foliage. She also surveyed the less well maintained/managed areas of Vanalden Park. Despite difficulty in access, full survey coverage of the Project area occurred. Ms. Ruzicka took photographs of the Project area, the railroad tracks, and the vegetation present. Her notes and photographs are on file at APRMI.

**RESULTS OF RECORDS SEARCHES**

**Cultural Resources Records Search**

The Cultural Resources Records Search revealed that only three cultural resources were located within a mile radius of the Project. However, three additional resources were located just outside the mile radius. Of these six resources, only two are prehistoric and both are only isolates located outside the mile radius. The first one, CA-LAn-1026, is located southwest of the Project at the northeast corner of Roscoe Boulevard and Oakdale Avenue and was recorded by P.V. Aiello and C.A. Singer. The resource consisted of a projectile point fragment made of fused shale and was uncovered in the backyard of a house during gardening activities. No other signs of occupational debris were observed in the yard. The other prehistoric resource, P19-200203, is only identified as a stone bowl and was recorded by Bonnie MacDougall of the SCCIC. No other documentation is available for the isolate except that it was generally located east of Zelzah Avenue, south of Plummer Street, and north of Nordhoff Street, at an elevation of 865 feet amsl.

The remaining resources are all historic structures. P19-190251 is located within a half mile of the Project at 8707 Shirley Avenue and was recorded by K.A. Crawford in 2012. It is a rectangular shaped, asymmetrical Modern-style public utility building located on a large urban lot. The building was
constructed circa 1963, has been altered with additions in the late 1990s and early 2000, and is in good condition. It was built by Pacific Bell in response to the increasing demand for telephone services in northern Los Angeles during the 1960s. It still operates as a telephone service provider, specifically “at&t’. The property is not eligible for the National Register and so is not significant.

P19-187333 is located within a mile of the Project at 18437 Roscoe Boulevard and was recorded by Kathleen A. Crawford in 2004. The property contains two buildings facing each other across a large parking lot. One building houses Gil’s Muffler Shop and is a rectangular-shaped, asymmetrical, Modern-style commercial building. The other building is an auto repair facility and is a long, rectangular, Modern-style, symmetrical commercial building. The buildings were designed and constructed in 1955 by the current owners Dale and Gilbert Schirmeister. While the integrity and condition of the buildings are good, they are not eligible for the National Register and so are not significant. P19-187334 is also located within a mile of the Project and was recorded by Nicole Pletka and Judith Marvin in 2004. It is listed on the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site record as located at 8100 Tampa Avenue, although it is actually located at 19323 Lanark Street. It is a single story Modern-style residence with a hipped roof constructed in 1952. It is in poor condition and is not eligible for the National Register and so is not significant.

The final historic resource, located just outside the mile radius, is P19-190016 at 18111 Nordhoff Street. It was recorded by Shannon L. Loftus in 2011 and K.A. Crawford in 2012 and is located on the central campus of the California State University, Northridge (CSUN) although it appears as if the two records actually record two different buildings on the campus. Jacaranda Hall, recorded by Loftus, is a multi-level building in Modern/Contemporary style with International overtones constructed circa 1965. It belongs to the College of Engineering and Computer Science and has undergone numerous renovations including an addition in 1994. The building is not eligible to the National Register. The building recorded by Crawford is identified as the Student Services Building, but according to Crawford was originally the Business and Economics Building. Based on pictures at California State University, Northridge (2015b), the building appears to be Bayramian Hall, which currently houses the Administration and Records offices as well as several student related departments including the Career Center and the Counseling office. This five-story building was built in 1964, although Crawford states that it is six stories and was built in 1961 based on university records. It is in good condition with no major exterior alterations noted. The building is not eligible to the California Register or the local University of California Northridge Register and thus is not historically significant.

The CSUN campus was first established in 1956 as the San Fernando Valley campus (satellite) of the Los Angeles State College. It became a separate college, the San Fernando Valley State College, in 1958 and is identified as such on USGS (1952 PR 1967). It officially became part of the California State University system in 1972 and was renamed California State University, Northridge (California State University, Northridge 2015a). The university campus as a whole has not been recorded as a historic resource nor evaluated for its significance. According to K.A. Crawford (see above) and Pitt and Pitt (1997), the land on which CSUN currently occupies was once covered in orange and walnut groves that were planted in the 1920s. The Halverson farm was also on land that is now part of the university (Water and Power Associates n.d.a), while CSUN’s North Campus is on land that was once known as Devonshire Downs where horse racing, rodeos, and the San Fernando Valley Fair took place (Bearchell and Fried 1988).

No historic resources were found within one mile of the Project on the NRHP, CHL, CPHI, or CRHR. Six resources are located within one mile on the Historic Property Data File (HPDF) of the HRI. Four of these properties include 8463 Tampa Avenue, 18531 Gresham Street (Faith Bible Church), 18445 Napa Street, and 18437 Roscoe Boulevard (Gil’s Muffler). The Faith Bible Church is also listed on the HCM as monument number LA-152 (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2014). Based on aerial
photographs from Google Earth (Google, Inc. 2015) and NETROnline (2011), all the properties are still present with the exception of 18445 Napa Street, which appears to have once been a residence constructed in 1922 (OHP 2012) but has since been demolished and replaced by an auto repair shop (Harry’s MBZ). Aside from the Faith Bible Church, none of the above properties is considered eligible to the National Register, and they have not been evaluated for the California Register. Two more structures are listed on the HPDF (18904 Nordhoff St/9051 Wilbur Avenue and 9015 Wilbur Avenue) and are associated with the Rancho Cordillera del Norte. They are also listed on the HCM Report for Northridge as ZI-2412 and ZI-2414 (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning 2015).

8463 Tampa Avenue was constructed in 1947 (OHP 2012) and is a single story residence with a hipped roof (Google, Inc. 2015). 18437 Roscoe Blvd, also known as Gil’s Muffler, has the primary number 19-187333 and is described above. Four other properties have associated primary numbers, but the DPR site records for those numbers were not present at the SCCIC. 18445 Napa Street is P19-175483. Faith Bible Church at 18531 Gresham Street is P19-167234. Rancho Cordillera del Norte at 18904 Nordhoff Street and 9051 Wilbur Avenue is P19-175486. Cordillera del Norte at 9015 Wilbur Avenue is P19-176249.

Faith Bible Church was constructed in 1916 (OHP 2012) and was the first church built in Northridge. It has been present on topographic maps, although not labeled, since at least 1928 (USGS 1928). It was originally known as the Norwegian Lutheran Church, because the six families that formed the congregation were of Norwegian descent (Bearchell and Fried 1988). It is in the Carpenter Gothic Victorian style. It has since been acquired by the Korean congregation and renamed the Northridge Free Methodist Church, although on the sign in front, it is identified as the Los Angeles Antioch Church (Water and Power Associates n.d.a). The church’s exterior appears to mostly be in its original state and in good condition. It is located about a half mile east of the Project. The Church appears eligible for the National Register as an individual property (OHP 2012).

Rancho Cordillera del Norte is located less than a quarter mile to the northeast of the Project. It was the original home of a Valley pioneer family. Its current resident, Elizabeth Waldo, is an entertainer and uses the property to host events. Her late husband, Carl Dentzel, was the one who named Northridge based on the English translation of Cordillera del Norte (Museum of the San Fernando Valley 2011). According to Getchell and Atwood (2008), the bells in the bell tower on the Rancho property were cast in Latin America during the Colonial Period. Based on historic maps, only four of the buildings currently located at the Rancho were present prior to 1952 as they are the only ones on USGS (1941). On USGS (1932) and USGS (1928), there are only three buildings on the property. Therefore some of the structures on the property are historic, although probably not the entire property. The Rancho is only open for private events, thus the property was not accessible, and no more information about it could be obtained.

Twenty-seven studies have been performed within one mile of the Project and are listed in Table 1 along with one study conducted just outside the mile radius that is relevant to the historic resource P19-190016. Most of the studies were negative for resources in the Project vicinity, and the few that did encounter resources provided little additional information regarding these resources that was not present in the DPR site records.

One study (Foster 2002), however, evaluated a railroad crossing in Chatsworth, west of the Project. In this study, Foster (2002) discusses the Southern Pacific Railroad alignment between the Montalvo and Burbank junctions known as the Montalvo Cut-off. This line is the railroad track that runs along the southern boundary of the Project. The construction of the Montalvo Cut-off was completed in 1904 and served as the short route between Santa Barbara and Los Angeles. The original route from Los Angeles to Santa Barbara was completed in 1887 and traveled through the San Fernando Valley, Saugus, and the Santa Clara River Valley in Ventura County. It had depots in the cities of Burbank and San Fernando.
This route had problems, though, including light track, numerous curves that slowed the speed of the train, and washouts caused by heavy rain. The Montalvo Cut-off, on the other hand, branched off the other line in Burbank, traveling through the San Fernando Valley to Chatsworth, and tunneling through the Santa Susanna Mountains north of Chatsworth into Simi Valley. It then headed west towards the coast and passed through Oxnard on its way to Santa Barbara. While the cut-off only shortened the travel distance between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara by seven miles, it had reduced grades and curvature that significantly reduced running times. The Montalvo Cut-off was the first connection between Burbank and Oxnard that, after completion, became part of the main passenger line between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara. However, a rail line connecting Burbank to Chatsworth, the Burbank branch line, was completed earlier in 1893 in order to ship wheat from farms in the western part of the Valley to Burbank and San Fernando (Foster 2002; Stewart 2009). This branch is identified as the “Chatsworth Park Branch” on USGS (1903), was projected as far back as 1888 (Rowan 1888), and is present on topographic maps up until 1986 (NETROnline 2011). However, due to its sharp curves and slow speed, a third track crossing the San Fernando Valley was built. This track still traveled between Chatsworth and Burbank but along a different, much straighter route (Foster 2002). Based on historic maps, it was built sometime between 1898 (Wright 1898) and 1903 (USGS 1903). Depots along this route included Raymer and Zelzah (modern-day Northridge). This track that runs on the southern perimeter of the Project was eventually incorporated into the Montalvo Cut-off. The original Burbank branch line, however, is no longer present (Rand McNally 2008) and is currently the right-of-way for the Metro Orange Line Busway instead (Google, Inc. 2015).

### Table 1. List of Reports within One-Mile Radius of Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report # LA-</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Author, Year</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Area</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Assessment of the Archaeological Impact by the Development of Four City Lots at the Northeast Corner of the Intersection of Nordhoff Street and Tampa Avenue, Northridge, California</td>
<td>Gerald R. Gates, 1973</td>
<td>Within a half mile</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 (also VN-572)</td>
<td>Phase 1 Cultural Resources: Survey Fiber Optic Cable Project, Burbank to Santa Barbara, California for US Sprint Communications Company</td>
<td>Dames &amp; Moore, 1988</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>No resources recorded within one mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2645 (also VN-1153)</td>
<td>Class 3 Cultural Resource Assessment of the Proposed Carpinteria and Southern Reroutes, Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles Counties, California</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates, 1991</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>No resources recorded within one mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2950 (also VN-1265)</td>
<td>Consolidated Report: Cultural Resources Studies for the Proposed Pacific Pipeline Project</td>
<td>Peak &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>No resources recorded within one mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3442</td>
<td>Report of Archaeological Survey for L.A. Cellular Site #763.3, 9045 Corbin Avenue, Northridge, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Carol R. Demcak, 1996</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4328</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment for the Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Company, Facility Number E872, Located at 8943 Tampa Avenue, Community of Northridge, City and County of Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>Curt Duke, 1998</td>
<td>Within a half mile</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4851</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment: Cingular Wireless Facility No. LA 185-06, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Curt Duke, 2001</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6143</td>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District: Expansion of Grover Cleveland High</td>
<td>McKenna et al., 2002</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report #</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
<td>Author, Year</td>
<td>Proximity to Project Area</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6599</td>
<td>Historic Resource Evaluation Report: Mason Avenue At-Grade Crossing and Safety Improvement Project, Los Angeles City, California</td>
<td>John M. Foster, 2002</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>Montalvo Cut-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6762</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment for Pacific Bell Mobile Services Facility LA 185-03, County of Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>Curt Duke, 2000</td>
<td>Within a mile</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6779</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment: Cingular Wireless Facility No. 185-06, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Curt Duke, 2001</td>
<td>Within a mile</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6878</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment: Cingular Wireless Facility No. VY 361-01, City and County of Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>Caprice D. (Kip) Harper, 2003</td>
<td>Within a mile</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7145</td>
<td>Request for SHPO Review of FCC Undertaking: Roesbin/CA-6870C, 19323 Lanark Street, Reseda, CA</td>
<td>Lorna Billat, 2004</td>
<td>Within a half mile</td>
<td>(19-187334: not described in report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7276</td>
<td>Records Search Results and Site Visit for Sprint Telecommunications Facility Candidate LA60XC514A (AT&amp;T/ Gil's Muffler) 18437-1/2 Roscoe Boulevard, Reseda, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Wayne H. Bonner and Christeen Taniguchi, 2004</td>
<td>Within a mile</td>
<td>19-187333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7279</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment for Cingular Wireless Facility VY194-01, City of Northridge, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Carolyn E. Kyle, 2002</td>
<td>Within a mile</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8192</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment: Cingular Wireless Facility No. VY 363-02, Reseda, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Nicole Pletka and Judith Marvin, 2004</td>
<td>Within a mile</td>
<td>19-187334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8200</td>
<td>Indirect APE Historic Architectural Assessment for Sprint Telecommunications Facility Candidate, LA60XC514A (AT&amp;T/ Gil's Muffler) 18437-1/2 Roscoe Boulevard, Reseda, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Wayne H. Bonner, 2004</td>
<td>Within a mile</td>
<td>19-187333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8255</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Final Report of Monitoring and Findings for the Qwest Network Construction Project, State of California</td>
<td>SWCA Environmental Consultants, 2006</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>No resources recorded within one mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8687</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for Royal Street Communications, LLC Candidate LA0030B (9345 Melvin Ave.), 9345 Melvin Avenue, Northridge, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Wayne H. Bonner, 2006</td>
<td>Within a mile</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9244</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile Candidate SV11581A (RL Boulevard Shops), 9701 Reseda Boulevard, Northridge, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>Wayne H. Bonner, 2007</td>
<td>Within a mile</td>
<td>No resources recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Archival Research

The Project is present in a “Settlement Basin” (USGS 1952; USGS 1952 PR 1967) in the community of Northridge. Northridge has seen the growth and development of several neighborhoods since the 1950s. Some of the neighborhoods surrounding the Project have been present since the 1960s. Several houses in the immediate vicinity of the Project along the northeastern and western boundaries appear to have been constructed in the early 1960s, and so would be considered historic (NETROnline 2011). There is one house at 18960 Nordhoff Street, just outside the Project area, which was built in 1922 (Zillow 2006-2015). It is unlikely that Project related activities will affect any of these houses; thus, at this time, it is unnecessary to record and evaluate them. Based on aerial photographs, a baseball diamond appears to have been present just east of the Project between 1964 and 1972. In addition, two structures were present...
within the immediate vicinity of the Project (on the east side) that were constructed prior to 1960. However, these two structures no longer exist and were replaced by houses in the early 1970s. In regards to the Project site itself, none of the buildings currently present are considered historic. The oldest building, the Senior Center, was built between 1977 and 1980, while the other buildings, including two Vanalden Park structures (probably park facilities) and a large warehouse-type building on the southeast border, were constructed later (NETRONline 2011).

The community’s original name, Zelzah, was located on topographic maps until 1944 (USGS) when it was replaced by Northridge. In fact, the previous name of the quad on which the Project is located is Zelzah. Zelzah was identified as “Zelzah / Northridge PO and Sta” on USGS (1941), “Zelzah / North Los Angeles PO and Sta” on USGS (1932), and as “Zelzah” only on USGS (1928) and USGS (1903). This name was placed southeast of the Project, north of Parthenia, and east of Reseda near where the train station used to be. Zelzah was also the original name of the train station/depot that was once present southeast of the Project on the north side of the railroad tracks east of Reseda Boulevard near Parthenia Street. This station was constructed in 1910, underwent the same name changes as the community (North Los Angeles and Northridge), and was demolished in 1961 (Museum of the San Fernando Valley 2010; Water and Power Associates n.d.a). The building in which the station was housed is present on USGS (1928), USGS (1932), and USGS (1941) but not USGS (1952). It is present on early aerial photographs but disappears between 1959 and 1964 when it was replaced by a different building (NETRONline 2011). A more recent rail station (Northridge Station) belonging to Metrolink is present closer to the Project and Vanalden Park on the south side of the tracks west of Wilbur Avenue. The name Zelzah has been preserved in an avenue to the east that runs along the east side of CSUN (Rand McNally 2008). Zelzah Avenue was once part of a 19th-century wagon route from San Fernando to Hawk Ranch (Water and Associates n.d.a), which was the name of the area before it became Zelzah (see History of Project Vicinity).

Two other nearby place names no longer present on maps include “Marion,” which was located between Zelzah and Reseda on USGS (1903) and is now considered a part of Reseda (Water and Power Associates n.d.a), and “Owensmouth,” which is present on USGS (1928) and Borgnis (1924), as well as on USGS (1903) along with Canoga. Marion was the name of a Pacific Electric station (Gudde 1949), which may have been named after Francis Wright, whose middle name was Marion (see History of Project Vicinity). It has often been confused with the original proposed name of the community of Reseda, Marian. Reseda, on the other hand, was the name originally applied to an SPRR station on the Burbank to Chatsworth line. Reseda eventually became the name of the community, and after 1920, the name Reseda was transferred to the Marion station (Gudde 1949). Owensmouth is currently the communities of Canoga Park and West Hills (Water and Power Associates n.d.a), and was replaced by Canoga Park on maps starting in 1932 (USGS 1932). A Pacific Electric (PE) line is present south of the Project, north of the original Burbank to Chatsworth branch, on USGS (1903), USGS (1928), USGS (1932), and USGS (1941). It traveled along Sherman Way from Owensmouth/Canoga Park east through Reseda/Marion. It is absent on USGS (1944) and USGS (1952).

Chatsworth Reservoir is located about 3.5 miles west of the Project and is present on USGS (1944), USGS (1952), and USGS (1952 PR 1967). While much smaller and not identified as a reservoir, it does appear on USGS (1903), likely a natural lake. Chatsworth Reservoir began to be utilized in 1919 after two earthen dams were used to fill it. Its initial function was to store water for irrigation for agriculture in the western San Fernando Valley. Eventually the area served by the reservoir was subdivided and developed, meaning the water stored was increasingly used to supply residential and domestic drinking water. However, the reservoir was decommissioned and drained in 1971 after the Sylmar Earthquake due to structural flaws, and is currently dry (Water and Power Associates n.d.b).
In regards to historic Native American (Fernandeño) villages in the area, aside from those already mentioned (see Historic Background), there are Pisek (or Pasek or Pasekngna) to the north near the San Fernando Mission and to the east Hahamonga (or Haahamonga or possibly Jajamonga) was near Glendale and probably located on Rancho de los Verdugos on the east bank of Arroyo Seco in South Pasadena (Johnston 1962; Johnson 1997). Kawe (Kawengna) and Mau were located by the Los Angeles River. Kawengna, near Cahuenga Pass, has preserved as Cahuenga today and was originally spelled Cahueg-na, with “nga” or “gna” meaning “the place of.” In this case, Kawengna means “Place of the Mountain” (Johnston 1962:9-10). In the northeast end of the Valley, there are Tuhungna and Muhungna. Tuhungna was a village located on the north bank of Big Tujunga Wash, just below Foothill Boulevard between Sunland and the City of San Fernando, while Muhungna was located on the mouth of Little Tujunga Wash (Johnston 1962; Johnson 1997). To the northwest in the Santa Susana Mountains and Simi Valley just within Chumash territory are the villages Kishiwe, Ta’apu, and Shimiyi (Kroeber 1925:590; Southwest Museum 1962). Two other nearby Chumash villages include Huwam in the low hills of Canoga Park and Totogna, or Totongna, at the western end of the San Fernando Valley near the upper reaches of the Los Angeles River (Johnston 1962; Jorgensen 1982). The inhabitants of Totongna, or “Place of the Stones,” supposedly died of smallpox (Johnston 1962:11).

Several villages are mentioned that are not present on the historic ethnographic maps. ‘Ashaawnga (“eagle mountain”) was supposedly located along the western edge of the Valley near Chatsworth along with an unnamed Indian community near Chatsworth Reservoir (McCawley 1996:38). ‘Ahikanga (“wind”) is located west of San Fernando, while Pakooynga (“entrance”) may be from where the City of Pacoima is derived (McCawley 1996:39). Johnson (1997) mentions Calabasas and Jucjauynga (Rancho El Escorpion), as being located in the west end of the Valley abutting the hills. Jucjauynga, however, appears to be in the same location as Totogna and so may be the same village. Other place names in the Valley include Atavsanga near Woodland Hills and Calabasas, which may be the Fernandeño name for Huwam, and Wiqanga (also possibly Vijabit or Vijanga) near the Verdugo Hills (McCawley 1996; Johnson 1997). There was also an important and large “rancheria” (Indian village) at Encino by a spring encountered by the Portolá expedition, but no record of its indigenous name is present in old mission records according to Johnston (1962), Kroeber (1925), and Kielbasa (1997). However, other sources identify this ancient village as Siutcanga (State of California 2015c; Gumprecht 1999; McCawley 1996; Johnson 1997). Despite the plethora of villages in the San Fernando Valley, none appear to be in close proximity to the Project. However, based on Southwest Museum (1962), there are two unnamed archaeological sites nearby, although their identification and exact location are not given. However, one of the sites could possibly be the Chatsworth Cairn Site mentioned by Jorgensen (1982), who places it at the foot of Santa Susana Pass.

Paleontologic Resources Records Search

The results of the paleontologic records search conducted on September 10, 2015 (Appendix A) indicated that while there are no known vertebrate fossil localities within the Project area, there are six nearby fossil localities present in similar, as well as older, sedimentary deposits. The older deposits may be present on the Project at an unknown but possibly shallow depth.

RESULTS OF FIELD RECONNAISSANCE

The field reconnaissance of the Project found the area to be considerably disturbed and urbanized. Much of the Project was covered in artificial fill, managed grass (Vanalden Park), and concrete (creek washes). Other disturbances include modern refuse dumping, tire tracks, modern pedestrian traffic, and homeless
encampments. The least disturbed area of the Project was the settlement/debris basin portion of Aliso Creek, which was covered in dense vegetation as well as a pool of water (Figure 5). Despite the modern trash present in this portion of the Project and the sides potentially being artificially built up, native wildlife and vegetation also appear to be present. Additional photographs of the Project area can be seen in Figures 6 and 7.

![Figure 5. Wilbur Canyon Debris Basin (“Settlement Basin”) portion of Aliso Creek: dense vegetation on left and pool of water with ducks on bank on right, facing east](image)

**Archaeological Survey**

No undocumented prehistoric resources or historic buildings were observed during field reconnaissance. Instead, the Project was covered in modern refuse, concrete, placed rock piles, and homeless encampments. The only resources (historic structures) present in the Project area include the railroad tracks on the south side of the Project and the concrete channels in which the creeks/washes are encased. The railroad tracks are part of the Burbank-Chatsworth replacement line built around the turn of the century and incorporated into the Montalvo Cut-off in 1904. While the line is historic, the tracks are not. The line is still utilized by Metrolink, Union Pacific, and Amtrak (Figure 8). While the railroad tracks were not recorded as a historic resource during the survey, if it is determined that Project excavations will disturb the tracks, then the line should be properly documented. The concrete channels in which the two creeks/washes are present (Figure 9) are historic, because they appear to have been constructed between 1952 and 1959 based on aerial photographs at NETRONline (2011).

The settlement (debris) basin may have been laid out earlier as it first appears on topographic maps in 1952 (USGS 1952), although it was not present in 1941 (USGS 1941). If it is determined that Project construction will damage the integrity of the channels, then they will need to be properly documented as they are within the Project area. They are also potentially significant due to their connection to a major event in the San Fernando Valley, the channelization of all major rivers in the Valley in the 1950s. While, Aliso Creek is not encased in concrete within the debris basin itself, concrete is present on either side, both before the creek enters the basin and after it leaves the basin.
Figure 6. Project area south of Vanalden Park, west of confluence, north of railroad tracks, facing southwest on left and southeast on right.

Figure 7. Overview of Vanalden Park, facing southwest.
NATIVE AMERICAN CONTACT

APRMI requested a Sacred Lands File Search and a Native American Contacts list for the proposed Project area from the NAHC on August 21, 2015. The NAHC’s search of the Sacred Lands Inventory, conducted on September 17, 2015, did not find any recorded Native American cultural resources within the immediate project area. The NAHC, though, states that the lack of recorded sites does not indicate that such sites are not present in the area. Additionally, the NAHC provided APRMI with a Native American Contacts list. From September 20 through September 22, 2015, Robin Turner of APRMI contacted all the names on the list by phone to let them know that they would soon be receiving in the mail a letter and Project description. APRMI then mailed a letter requesting input as well as a packet containing important information regarding the Project to all the tribes, individuals, and organizations listed on September 23, 2015. However, the NAHC sent another letter and list on September 29, 2015 (received on September 30). While there was some overlap between the two lists of Native American contacts, the new list had some new names while omitting many of the names on the previous list. A letter and Project information packet was sent to the new names on October 1, 2015. A typographical error was later discovered on all the letters, thus a follow-up letter was sent to all the contacts on October 15, 2015 correcting the error.

No written responses were received from any of the contacts at the time this report was submitted. However, three of the Native American contacts phoned APRMI. Beverly Folkes of Chumash, Tataviam, and Fernandeño descent called on September 28, 2015 and stated that she was concerned about the Project and would like to be involved in the consultation and monitoring of the Project. Richard Angulo of Chumash descent called on September 29, 2015 and stated that the NAHC’s records are not complete and that there are in fact Native American sites within the Project vicinity and that the area is sensitive to cultural resources. Caitlin Gulley of the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, under President Rudy Ortega Jr., phoned APRMI on October 13, 2015 to say that she was concerned about the area as well. The written responses from the NAHC along with the corrected letters sent to the Native American groups and individuals can be found in Appendix B.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Only one historic resource, and no prehistoric resources, have been recorded within the Project. The historic resource within the Project, the UPRR track, runs along its south edge and has not retained its historic integrity. Of the remaining historic resources within a mile of the Project, only one is considered significant, the Faith Bible Church at 18531 Gresham Street. The concrete channels that run through the Project appear to be historic as well, even though they have not been recorded, and may even be significant based on their association with the concrete channelization of major waterways in Los Angeles. No other significant archaeological resources are present on the surface of the Project site, but that is likely the result of modern surficial disturbances. While few prehistoric resources have been recorded within the Project vicinity and only consist of isolated artifacts, the paths of two ephemeral stream courses are located within the Project making the area an ideal location for prehistoric visitation or occupation. When construction first occurred within the Project area, environmental laws that protected cultural resources were not in place and thus any resources present would not have been documented and may have even been partially destroyed. Therefore there is a possibility that archaeological (in particular prehistoric) resources are present beneath the surface and could be encountered during Project excavations.

*Due to the potential for subsurface cultural materials, full-time archaeological monitoring of all subsurface earth-moving activities for the Project within native soils is to be conducted by a qualified...*
archaeologist until the Project Archaeologist deems that full-time monitoring is no longer needed. Such an assessment will be based on the observation of subsurface soil and the presence/absence of undisturbed/native soil. In addition, if any Project-related activities are to damage the integrity of the concrete-lined creek washes, then the channels need to be properly documented and their impacts monitored.

While there is the potential for prehistoric Native American resources, as voiced by some of the Native American contacts, the disturbed surface precludes the necessity for a full-time Native American monitor. It is recommended that a Native American monitor be retained to monitor the Project if prehistoric/Native American sites are encountered during earth-moving construction-related activities.

The Project’s scope does not account for paleontological resources. However, APRMI recommends that a full paleontological assessment and survey be conducted for the Project due to the potential for fossils at subsurface levels. The surficial geologic deposits (alluvial fan and fluvial deposits) on the Project site are of recent origin (Holocene-age alluvium) and are mostly disturbed. Therefore, it is unlikely that shallow Project excavations will encounter paleontologic resources. However, there is the possibility for fossil remains to be present below the surficial sediment at an unknown but possibly shallow depth based on the proximity of older Quaternary (Pleistocene-age) alluvium and the presence of resources in similar deposits in the region.

If an archaeological resource is encountered during construction when a monitor is not present on site, then all work should halt in the area and the Project Archaeologist must be notified. Work cannot resume in the area until the find is assessed by the archaeological professional and properly mitigated, and the professional indicates that construction can resume. If human remains are encountered at any point during Project construction, then the procedures dictated by law (see Regulatory Setting) must be implemented. If a paleontological resource is encountered at any point during the Project, then any construction work within the immediate vicinity of the find must cease and a qualified paleontologist must be notified. Only after the qualified paleontologist has assessed the find and instituted proper mitigation measures, such as documentation and removal of fossils, may work resume in the area.

If any resources are collected during mitigation monitoring of the Project, they must be properly processed, identified, analyzed, catalogued, and prepared for curation, along with any other laboratory tasks that may need to be undertaken. All significant archaeological and paleontological resources collected during mitigation monitoring are to be curated at an accredited and permanent scientific institution. A final Report of Findings document must also be prepared before the artifacts and/or fossils are curated at a legal repository. If no resources are collected or observed, then a Negative Findings document must be prepared instead.
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APPENDIX A

PALEONTOLOGIC RESOURCES RECORDS SEARCH
10 September 2015

ArchaeoPaleo Resource Management, Inc.
1531 Pontius Avenue, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Attn: Robin Turner, President

re: Paleontological resources for the proposed Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, APRM project # 2015-05, in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, project area

Dear Robin:

I have conducted a thorough search of our paleontology collection records for the locality and specimen data for the proposed Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, APRM project # 2015-05, in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, project area as outlined on the portion of the Canoga Park USGS topographic quadrangle map that you sent to me via e-mail on 21 August 2015. We do not have any vertebrate fossil localities that lie directly within the proposed project boundaries, but we do have localities nearby from the same sedimentary deposits that occur at depth in the proposed project area.

In the entire proposed project area the surface deposits consist of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived predominantly as alluvial fan deposits from the Santa Susana Mountains to the north, with fluvial deposits from the Aliso Canyon Wash drainage that flows through the middle of the proposed project area. These younger Quaternary deposits, found throughout the San Fernando Valley, typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils in the uppermost layers, but older Quaternary deposits found at depth may well contain significant fossil vertebrate remains.
Our closest vertebrate fossil locality from older Quaternary deposits is LACM 1406, situated in Santa Susana Pass northwest of the proposed project area, that produced a fossil specimen of mastodon, *Mammut*, from a stream bed. To the southeast of the proposed project area, east of the Sepulveda Dam Recreation Area and north of the Ventura Freeway (Highway 101), we have several vertebrate fossil localities from the older Quaternary deposits including LACM 3822, near Kester Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard north of Oxnard Street, that produced fossil specimens of extinct peccary, *Platygonus*, camel, *Camelops*, and bison, *Bison*, at depths between 75 and 100 feet below the surface, locality LACM 6208, further south along Kester Avenue near Burbank Boulevard, that produced fossil specimens of extinct bison, *Bison*, at a depth of 20 feet below the surface, and further south still locality LACM 3263, near the intersection of Kester Avenue and Otsego Street, that produced fossil specimens of extinct horse, *Equus*, at a depth of 14 feet below the surface. To the south-southwest of the proposed project area, off Mulholland Highway south of Woodland Hills, our vertebrate fossil locality LACM 1213 produced fossil specimens of horse, *Equus*, and ground sloth, *Paramylodon*. A little farther to the west-southwest of the proposed project area, off Long Valley Road in Hidden Hills, our locality LACM 5878 produced a skeleton of a fossil mastodon, *Mammut*.

Shallow excavations in the younger Quaternary Alluvium exposed throughout the proposed project areas are unlikely to produce significant fossil vertebrate remains. Deeper excavations in the proposed project area that extend down into older Quaternary deposits, however, may well encounter significant vertebrate fossils. Any substantial excavations in the proposed project area, therefore, should be monitored closely to quickly and professionally recover any fossil remains discovered while not impeding development. Also, sediment samples should be collected and processed to determine the small fossil potential in the proposed project area. Any fossils recovered during mitigation should be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations.

This records search covers only the vertebrate paleontology records of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. It is not intended to be a thorough paleontological survey of the proposed project area covering other institutional records, a literature survey, or any potential on-site survey.

Sincerely,

Samuel A. McLeod, Ph.D.
Vertebrate Paleontology

enclosure: invoice
APPENDIX B

NATIVE AMERICAN CORRESPONDENCE
Robin Turner  
Archaeo Paleo Resource Management  
1531 Pontius Ave, Suite 200  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  

Email to: rturner@archaeopaleo.com  

RE: Aliso Creek-Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Los Angeles County.  

Dear Ms. Turner,  

A record search of the sacred land file has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.  

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. The Commission makes no recommendation or preference of a single individual, or group over another. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe or group. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.  

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 373-3712.  

Sincerely,  

Katy Sanchez  
Associate Government Program Analyst
Native American Contact List
Los Angeles County
September 17, 2015

Beverly Salazar Folkes
1931 Shadybrook Drive
Thousand Oaks  CA 91362
folkes9@msn.com
(805) 492-7255
(805) 558-1154  Cell

Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
tattnlaw@gmail.com
(310) 570-6567

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

Barbareno/Venturenos Band of Mission Indians
Julie Lynn Tumamait-Stennsle, Chair
365 North Poli Ave
Ojai,  CA 93023
jtumamait@hotmail.com
(805) 646-6214

Patrick Tumamait
992 El Camino Corto
Ojai,  CA 93023
(805) 640-0481
(805) 216-1253 Cell

Randy Guzman - Folkes
4676 Walnut Avenue
Simi Valley,  CA 93063
ndnRandy@yahoo.com
(805) 905-1675 Cell
(805) 520-5915 Fax

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

Gabrieleno /Tongva Nation
Sandonne Goad, Chairperson
106 1/2 Judge Jothn Also
Los Angeles,  CA 90012
sgoad@gabrieleno-tongva.com
(951) 807-0479

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 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Aliso Creek-Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Los Angeles County.
Native American Contact List
Los Angeles County
September 17, 2015

Richard Angulo
P.O. Box 935
Salome, AZ 85348
Chumash

Frank Arredondo
P.O. Box 161
Santa Barbara, CA 93102
ksen_sku_mu@yahoo.com
Chumash

Gabrieliño Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert F. Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 490
Gabrieliño Tongva
Bellflower, CA 90707
gtongva@verizon.net
(562) 761-6417 Voice/Fax
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100
Gabrieliño Tongva Tribe
Bernie Acuna, Co-Chairperson
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 428-5690 Cell

Carol A. Pulido
165 Mountainview Street
Oak View, CA 93022
Chumash

Gabrieliño Tongva Tribe
Linda Candelaria, Co-Chairperson
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100
Gabrieliño Tongva Tribe
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(626) 676-1184 Cell

Melissa M. Parra-Hernandez
119 North Balsam Street
Oxnard, CA 93030
Chumash

Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation
Andrew Salas, Chairperson
P.O. Box 393
Covina, CA 91723
gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com
Gabrieleno
(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 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Aliso Creek-Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Los Angeles County.
Native American Contact List
Los Angeles County
September 17, 2015

Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
Kathleen Pappo
2762 Vista Mesa Drive CA 90275
(310) 831-5295

PeuYoKo Perez
5501 Stanford Street CA 93003
Ventura, CA 93003
grndowl4U@yahoo.com
(805) 231-0229 Cell

Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
Raudel Joe Banuelos, Jr.
331 Mira Flores Court Camarillo, CA 93012
(805) 987-5314

Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe
Conrad Acuna
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100 Los Angeles, CA 90067

Gabrielino /Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Cultural Resources Director
P.O. Box 86908 Los Angeles, CA 90086
sam Dawson@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 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 8097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed Aliso Creek-Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Los Angeles County.
September 29, 2015

Robin Turner
ArchaeoPaleo Resource Management, Inc.
1531 Pontius Ave., Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Sent by Fax: 424-248-3417
Number of Pages: 3

RE: Aliso Creek-Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Community of Northridge in San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms./Mr. Turner:

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 above reference codes is to mitigate impacts to tribal cultural resources, as defined, for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) projects.

As of July 1, 2015, Public Resources Code Sections 21080.1, 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 21080.1(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 21080.1(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
1. 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 SFL search was completed 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: rob.wood@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rob Wood
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Native American Heritage Commission
Tribal Consultation List
Los Angeles County
September 29, 2015

Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Rudy Ortega Jr., President
1019 2nd Street
San Fernando, CA 91340
(818) 837-0794 Office

Gabrieleno 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/Fax

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

Gabrieleno/Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Cultural Resources Director
P.O. Box 86908
Los Angeles, CA 90086
samdunlap@earthlink.net
(909) 262-9351

San Fernando Band of Mission Indians
John Valenzuela, Chairperson
P.O. Box 221838
Ethewall, CA 91322
johnv2u@hotmail.com
(61) 753-9833 Office
(60) 885-0955 Cell

San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
O. Box 693
San Gabriel, CA 91778
TribalCouncil@aol.com
26) 483-3564 Cell

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
Gabrieleno Tongva
San Gabriel, CA 91778

Gabrieleno Band of the Chumash Nation
S. Lopez, Chairperson
Chumash

3arbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
Julie Lynn Tumamait-Stenslie, Chair
365 North Poli Ave
Djai, CA 93023
Tumamait@hotmail.com
905) 646-6214

Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe
Linda Candefaria, Co-Chairperson
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Gabrieleno
(626) 676-1184 Cell

Gabrieleno/Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Cultural Resources Director
P.O. Box 86908
Los Angeles, CA 90086
samdunlap@earthlink.net
(909) 262-9351

Gabrieleno Band of the Chumash Nation
S. Lopez, Chairperson
Chumash
September 23, 2015

Ron Andrade, Director
Los Angeles City/County Native American Indian Commission
3175 West 6th Street, Room 403
Los Angeles, CA 90020

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Director Andrade,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal

1531 Pontius Ave., Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(424) 248-3316 ph
(424) 248-3417 fax
September 23, 2015

Richard Angulo
P.O. Box 935
Salome, AZ 85348

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Angulo,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Frank Arredondo
P.O. Box 161
Santa Barbara, CA 93102

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Arredondo,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Bernie Acuna, Co-Chairperson
Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Chairperson Acuna,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal

ArchaeoPaleo Resource Management, Inc.
A full service Archaeology and Paleontology company
SBE/WBE/DBE/UDBE/LBE/CBE/VSBE/MicroBE Certified
September 23, 2015

Raudel Joe Banuelos, Jr.
Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians
331 Mira Flores Court
Camarillo, CA 93012

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Banuelos,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal

1531 Pontius Ave., Suite 200 (424) 248-3316 ph
Los Angeles, CA 90025 (424) 248-3417 fax
September 23, 2015

Conrad Acuna  
Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe  
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Acuna,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner  
President/Principal

1531 Pontius Ave., Suite 200  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(424) 248-3316 ph  
(424) 248-3417 fax
September 23, 2015

Linda Candelaria, Co-Chairperson  
Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe  
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Chairperson Candelaria,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner  
President/Principal

1531 Pontius Ave., Suite 200  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(424) 248-3316 ph  
(424) 248-3417 fax
September 23, 2015

Robert F. Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources
Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
P.O. Box 490
Bellflower, CA 90707

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Chairperson Dorame,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

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

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Director Dunlap,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Sandonne Goad, Chairperson
Gabrielino/Tongva Nation
106 ½ Judge John Aiso Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Chairperson Goad,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Randy Guzman-Folkes  
4676 Walnut Avenue  
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Guzman-Folkes,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner  
President/Principal
October 9, 2015

Mia Lopez, Chairperson
Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation
cbcn.nahc.sb@gmail.com

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Chairperson Lopez,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Anthony Morales, Chairperson
Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
P.O. Box 693
San Gabriel, CA 91778

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Chairperson Morales,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal

1531 Pontius Ave., Suite 200 (424) 248-3316 ph
Los Angeles, CA 90025 (424) 248-3417 fax
October 1, 2015

Rudy Ortega Jr., President  
Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians  
1019 2nd Street  
San Fernando, CA 91340

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear President Ortega,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner  
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Kathleen Pappo  
Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians  
2762 Vista Mesa Drive  
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Pappo,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner  
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Melissa M. Parra-Hernandez
119 North Balsam Street
Oxnard, CA 93030

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Parra-Hernandez,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

PeuYoKo Perez  
5501 Stanford Street  
Ventura, CA 93003

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear PeuYoKo Perez,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner  
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Carol A. Pulido
165 Mountainview Street
Oak View, CA 93022

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Pulido,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Administrator  
Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation  
tattnlaw@gmail.com

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Administrator Rosas,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal

1531 Pontius Ave., Suite 200  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(424) 248-3316 ph  
(424) 248-3417 fax
September 23, 2015

Andrew Salas, Chairperson
Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
P.O. Box 393
Covina, CA 91723

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Chairperson Salas,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Beverly Salazar Folkes
1931 Shadybrook Drive
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Folkes,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal

1531 Pontius Ave., Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(424) 248-3316 ph
(424) 248-3417 fax
September 23, 2015

Patrick Tumamait
992 El Camino Corto
Ojai, CA 93023

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Mr. Tumamait,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner
President/Principal
September 23, 2015

Julie Lynn Tumamait-Stennslie, Chair  
Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians  
365 North Poli Ave.  
Ojai, CA 93023

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Chairperson Tumamait-Stennslie,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner  
President/Principal

1531 Pontius Ave., Suite 200  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(424) 248-3316 ph  
(424) 248-3417 fax
October 1, 2015

John Valenzuela, Chairperson  
San Fernando Band of Mission Indians  
P.O. Box 221838  
Newhall, CA 91322

Re: Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project, Northridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County

Dear Chairperson Valenzuela,

The City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, has approved the implementation of the Aliso Creek – Limekiln Creek Restoration Project through the use of Proposition “O” Clean Water Bond money. Attached to this letter are the project description, project maps, and additional information for you to look through. This Project will involve the excavation for and construction of several storm water structures and devices, including a retention basin, designed to treat on-site and off-site runoff as well as reduce contamination in Aliso Creek, Limekiln Creek, and the Los Angeles River. The depth of excavation is unknown at this time.

The Native American Heritage Commission conducted a record search of sacred sites within the area and determined that there are no known sacred sites within the project boundaries. APRMI’s research conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center housed at California State University at Fullerton, also found that there are known significant sites located within the project boundaries or within a mile of the project.

Your name was given to us by the Native American Heritage Commission as being an interested party and/or contact. Since your ancestral homeland is part of this general vicinity, the Bureau of Engineering and ArchaeoPaleo would like your input and views to see if you feel that there is ancestral significance on or close by this project site on which you and/or your family would like to comment. Please send your written responses to my attention at the address at the bottom of this letter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Robin Turner  
President/Principal