

### **3.4.1 Introduction**

This section describes the geographic and regulatory setting for cultural resources, discusses impacts on cultural resources that could result from the *2020 LA River Master Plan* and its elements, and determines the significance of impacts. Where needed, this section identifies mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid any significant impacts, when feasible. For a discussion of the Project's effects on Tribal Cultural Resources, see Section 3.17, *Tribal Cultural Resources*.

The analysis in this section includes impact determinations under CEQA for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* that are applicable to all 18 jurisdictions in the study area, including the County and non-County jurisdictions (17 cities). Except for significant and unavoidable impacts, all identified significant environmental effects of the proposed *2020 LA River Master Plan* can be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level if the mitigation measures identified in this PEIR are implemented. These mitigation measures will be implemented for subsequent projects that are carried out by the County. Because some later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would not be carried out by the County, the County cannot enforce or guarantee that the mitigation measures would be incorporated. Therefore, where this PEIR concludes a less-than-significant impact for later activities carried out by the County, the impact would be significant and unavoidable when these activities are not carried out by the County.

### **3.4.2 Setting**

This section describes the existing geographic, cultural, ethnographic, and regulatory setting sections with respect to cultural resources within the *2020 LA River Master Plan* study area.

#### **3.4.2.1 Geographic**

##### **Regional Setting**

The LA River within Los Angeles County is the alignment for the project study area and includes 51 miles of the LA River from Canoga Park to the northwest to its mouth at Long Beach. The LA River is located within the Los Angeles Basin. The present-day Los Angeles Basin is a northwest-trending alluvial lowland plain, sometimes called the *Los Angeles coastal plain*, about 50 miles long and 20 miles wide on the coast of Southern California, bounded on the north by the Santa Monica Mountains, on the east by the Elysian, Repetto, and Puente hills, and on the southeast by the Santa Ana Mountains and San Joaquin Hills. The low land surface slopes gently south or seaward, but is interrupted by the Coyote Hills near the northeast margin, a line of elongated low hills and mesas to the south and west that extends from Newport Bay northwest to Beverly Hills, and the Palos Verdes peninsula at the southwest extremity.

The Los Angeles Plain is a broad, level expanse of land comprising more than 800 square miles that extend from Cahuenga Peak south to the Pacific coast and from Topanga Canyon southeast to the

vicinity of Aliso Creek. Prior to historical settlement of the area, extensive inland prairies, and a lengthy coastal strand with elevations approximately 500 feet or less above mean sea level characterized the plain. Several large watercourses, most notably the Los Angeles, San Gabriel, and Santa Ana rivers, traverse the Los Angeles Plain. Fresh or salt-water-fed marshlands also once covered many portions of the area. To the west, the coastal region encompasses approximately 375 square miles of varied terrain. West of Topanga Canyon, the terrain is rugged; the steep westward slopes of the Santa Monica Mountains reach 1,000 feet or higher, except where stream-cut ravines and canyons drain onto narrow beaches at the water's edge. From Topanga Canyon southward for roughly 22 miles to the Palos Verdes Peninsula, the coast is relatively flat and level. Extensive marshlands once existed near the mouth of Ballona Creek in the area now known as Playa del Rey. The terrain becomes rugged once again as the coast follows the Palos Verdes Peninsula for approximately 12 miles before reaching San Pedro Bay, which, in prehistoric times, contained extensive mud flats and sand bars (McCawley 1996:55–72).

The Mediterranean climate of this region experiences cool, moist winters and warm, dry summers. During the twentieth century, average annual precipitation was less than 15 inches, although 40 inches of precipitation annually is not unusual in the higher mountain regions. During prehistoric times, the land was likely well-watered by the three major river systems and numerous streams and tributaries, many of which probably ran throughout the year. Prior to livestock ranching and urbanization, there was likely much less runoff, resulting in a higher groundwater table and more groundwater.

Numerous biotic zones existed within the region prehistorically, including valley grassland, coastal sage scrub, chaparral, southern oak woodland, riparian woodland, freshwater marsh, saltwater marsh, and beach and coastal strip. The valley grassland and coastal sage-scrub zones covered much of the open prairie of the Los Angeles Plain and adjacent hillslopes.

## Prehistoric Setting

Portions of the Prehistoric and Ethnographic Settings were excerpted and adapted from regional transportation project contexts that share the same geography as the project study area (Authority 2017, 2019).

Two regional chronologies are widely cited in the archaeological literature for the prehistory of the coastal regions of Southern California (Wallace 1955, 1978; Warren 1968). These chronologies are generalized temporal schemes based on the presence or absence of certain artifact types. Both chronologies span the known prehistoric occupation of coastal Southern California. The units Wallace used are *horizons* or *periods*, which are extensive in space, but restricted in time. The units employed by Warren are *traditions*, which may be spatially restricted, but display temporal continuity. Koerper and Drover (1983) have provided a more recent chronological synthesis for coastal Southern California that employs Wallace's (1955) horizon terminology, but uses radiometric data to identify the sequence of stylistic change observed in the artifact assemblages, interpreted as temporal indications of cultural change. The following discussion is divided into five major cultural intervals, called *periods*: Early Cultures, Terminal Pleistocene/Early Holocene, Middle Holocene, Middle to Late Holocene, and Late Holocene.

Environmental conditions, resource availability, and coastal access made the Los Angeles Basin an attractive location for prehistoric inhabitants for more than 12,000 years before the present (BP). The remains of long-term habitation, resource collection, food processing, and tool manufacture

sites, plus potential religious and ceremonial locations, have been found throughout the Los Angeles Basin; the subsequent projects proposed under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* have the potential to affect existing sites and those as yet unrecorded.

## Early Cultures

Although neither Wallace (1978) nor Warren (1968, 1980, 1984) begin their chronologies with an Early Man horizon or period, a few archaeologists and nonprofessionals working in Southern California have claimed that cultural remains of great antiquity can be found in the region. Most sites of purported great antiquity (i.e., in excess of 15,000 years old) are centered in the Mojave and Colorado Deserts of eastern California or in coastal Southern California. Few sites of great antiquity have been identified in the vicinity of Los Angeles County, however. Most archaeological research in the project study area has involved cultural periods after that time, as discussed below.

### Terminal Pleistocene/Early Holocene Period (pre-12,000 BP to 7500 BP)

Warren's (1968, 1980) earliest interval of Southern California prehistory is the *San Dieguito Tradition*, beginning about 10,000 BP, and is best defined in the coastal County of San Diego area (True 1958). Wallace (1978) calls this interval *Period I: Hunting* and considers it to begin about 12,000 BP. Farther to the east, the San Dieguito Tradition is relatively coeval to the Lake Mojave Period, an expression of the so-called Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition presumed to begin somewhat earlier than 9500 BP and lasting to perhaps 7000 BP in the southwestern Great Basin (Warren 1980, 1984). Wallace (1978:27) noted the close correspondence between the Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition and the San Dieguito Tradition and suggested that the two traditions likely represent regional variants of an early hunting tradition that prevailed over a wide geographical area.

Coastal and desert region designations for the early Holocene both refer to a long period of human adaptation to environmental changes brought about by the transition from the late Pleistocene to the early Holocene geologic periods. As climatic conditions became warmer and more arid, Pleistocene megafauna gradually disappeared. Human populations responded to these changing environmental conditions by focusing their subsistence efforts on the procurement of a wider variety of faunal and floral resources. Sites dating from this interval generally are found around early Holocene marshes, lakes, and streams, which dominated much of the landscape.

These early occupants of Southern California are believed to have been nomadic large-game hunters, whose tool assemblages included percussion-flaked scrapers and knives; large, well-made stemmed, fluted, or leaf-shaped projectile points (e.g., Lake Mojave, Silver Lake); crescentic points; heavy core cobble tools; hammerstones; bifacial cores; and choppers and scraper-planes. Warren (1968, 1980) suggests that the absence of milling tools commonly used for seed preparation indicates that an orientation toward hunting continued throughout this phase. Nonetheless, based on ethnographic models developed for hunting-gathering groups throughout the world, populations of this phase undoubtedly exploited plant resources, as well. Indeed, some Lake Mojave deposits investigated in the southwestern Great Basin have yielded milling equipment, usually handstones and large slabs with ephemeral wear, implying regular, albeit limited, use of vegetal resources (Warren 1984). Although intact stratified sites dating to this period are very scarce, the limited data do suggest that the prehistoric populations of this period moved about the region in small, highly mobile groups, using a wetland-focused subsistence strategy based on hunting and foraging. Perhaps the earliest evidence of human occupation in the City of Los Angeles region is represented at the tar pits of Rancho La Brea. In 1914, the partial skeleton of a young woman, dubbed the *Brea Maid*, was

discovered in association with a grinding stone, or *mano*. During the early 1970s, complex chemical methods were used to decontaminate the human bone of intrusive carbon, and a treated collagen sample was dated at 9000 ± 80 BP (Marcus and Berger 1984). Apart from the Brea Maid, no other human remains have been found at the tar pits.

Additional evidence of early occupation of the Los Angeles Basin has been documented at the Del Rey Bluffs, immediately south of Ballona Lagoon at the former mouth of the LA River (Lambert 1983). Projectile points similar to the Lake Mojave and San Dieguito types, as well as crescentic points, have been recovered. The presence of these point types along the region's coastal area suggests possible connections with the cultures of the southeastern California desert regions. At site CA-LAN-451 in Malibu, a fluted, Clovis-type projectile point was reportedly identified below a cultural stratum radiocarbon dated to 9000 BP.

### **The Middle Holocene Period (7500 BP to 5000 BP)**

In coastal Southern California, the early traditions gave way to the Middle Holocene period, what Warren refers to as the *Encinitas Tradition* and what Wallace (1978) terms *Period II: Food Collecting* by about 8000 BP to 7000 BP. Inland San Diego County sites dating to this period have been assigned to the La Jolla/Pauma Complex by True (1958). This interval has been frequently described as the *Milling Stone Horizon* because of the preponderance of milling tools in the archaeological assemblages of sites dated to this era (Kowta 1969; Wallace 1955). Paleoclimatic data for this period indicate a trend toward increasingly warm and desiccating conditions. This climatic interval has generally been referred to as the *Altithermal* (Antevs 1948, 1952), although more complex temporal and regional variabilities of this interval have been documented since (Moratto et al. 1978). In the coastal and inland regions of Southern California, this period of cultural development is marked by the technological advancements of seed grinding for flour and the first use of marine resources, such as shellfish and marine mammals. The artifact assemblage of this period is similar to that of the previous period and includes crude hammerstones, scraper planes, choppers, large drills, crescents, and large flake tools. This assemblage also includes large leaf-shaped points and knives, manos, and milling stones used for grinding hard seeds and, likely, nonutilitarian artifacts, such as beads, pendants, charmstones, discoidals, and cogged stones (Kowta 1969, True 1958; Warren et al. 1961).

Although sites assigned to this stage of cultural development are similar in many respects, their content, structure, and age vary, largely due to geographical differences between the coast and interior. The primary difference between the archaeological assemblages of coastal and inland sites appears to be related to subsistence. Coastal occupants gathered fish and plant resources, and hunting was generally less important (projectile points are rare). Inland occupants primarily collected hard seeds and hunted small mammals; projectile points are more common in inland assemblages. Overall, the general settlement-subsistence patterns of the Middle Holocene showed greater emphasis on seed gathering, regardless of location. Coastal and inland sites exhibit shallow midden accumulations, suggesting seasonal camping. Based on the distribution of sites assigned to this period, aboriginal groups likely followed a modified, centrally based wandering pattern with an inferred shift toward enhanced logistical settlement organization (cf. Binford 1980; Warren 1968). In this semi-sedentary pattern, larger groups occupied a base camp during a portion of the year, whereas smaller groups of people used satellite camps to exploit seasonally available floral resources, such as grass seeds, berries, tubers, and nuts.

Moratto (1984) suggests that increasing use of coastal resources enabled semipermanent occupations near resource-rich bays and estuaries. A more mobile subsistence round was likely

necessary for inland inhabitants. It is possible, too, that inland and coastal sites of this period represent seasonal movement by the same groups.

Over time, populations gradually grew and became more sedentary. Associated with this increase in sedentism and population size was an intensification of local resource utilization. Adaptation to various ecological niches and further population growth typify the subsequent periods of cultural history in Southern California. This subsistence orientation, characterized by a heavy dependence on both hunting and plant gathering, continued into the historic period. Jones (2008) reviewed these inconsistencies in content, structure, and age of sites assignable to the Milling Stone Horizon. In his discussion, he compares research that posits cultural unity and adaptation in place to theories regarding population incursions that replaced existing cultural adaptations. Although Jones states that the Milling Stone Horizon must be recognized as both adaptation and culture, decades of research have documented significant variability in subsistence emphasis, mortuary practices, and nonutilitarian artifacts (e.g., cogged stones, discoidals, beads), notwithstanding great similarities in one element of the tool kit—the milling stone and the mano.

The Topanga Complex is perhaps the best-known component of the so-called Milling Stone Horizon in the vicinity of the City of Los Angeles. In the 1940s and 1950s, Treganza and Bierman (1958) identified two phases of the Topanga Complex during excavations at CA-LAN-1 (the Tank Site) and CA-LAN-2, both located in Topanga Canyon. Scraper-planes, scrapers, choppers, core/cobble tools, an extensive ground-stone tool assemblage, few projectile points, and secondary burials characterize Phase I. Small projectile points, incised and cogged stones, and fewer core/cobble tools distinguish Phase II, in addition to an extensive ground-stone tool inventory; reburial continues along with the introduction of extended burials. A third phase of the Topanga Complex was identified at CA-LAN-2 in 1957 (Johnson 1966). The hallmarks of Phase III are large rock-lined ovens, mortars and pestles, pressure-flaked points, core tools, and plentiful milling stones. Radiometric assays, coupled with temporally diagnostic artifacts, chronologically place the Topanga Phase I earlier than 5000 BP, Phase II at ca. 5000 BP to 3000 BP, and Phase III at ca. 3000 BP to 2000 BP (Johnson 1966:15, 20). Aside from the sites in Topanga Canyon, the only evidence of prehistoric occupation of the Los Angeles Basin dating to this interval is an occasional discoidal or cogged stone recovered from sites dating to more recent periods of prehistory.

### **The Middle to Late Holocene Period (5000 to 1500 BP)**

For the Middle to Late Holocene period, after about 5000 BP, Warren (1968) and Wallace (1978) diverge in their chronological sequences for the coastal regions of Southern California. Warren's Encinitas Tradition includes all areas outside the Chumash territory of the Santa Barbara County coastal zone and continues until approximately 1300 BP. Wallace, on the other hand, identifies a transition beginning approximately 5000 BP, marking the onset of Period III: Diversified Subsistence. In his original 1955 sequence, Wallace based this period, generally referred to as the *Intermediate Horizon*, largely on changes in the archaeological assemblages of sites from the Santa Barbara County coastal region. This horizon is characterized by a greater variety of artifacts that suggest more diverse food resources. Although this interval of human occupation in Southern California is poorly defined and dated because of the paucity of representative sites, many researchers have retained Wallace's original Intermediate Horizon as a classification for sites dating between 5000 BP and 1500 BP.

During the Middle to Late Holocene Period, the subsistence base broadened. The technological advancement of the mortar and pestle indicates the use of acorns, an important storable subsistence

resource. During the Middle to Late Holocene, hunting also presumably increased in importance. An abundance of broad, leaf-shaped blades and heavy, often stemmed or notched projectile points have been found in association with large numbers of terrestrial and aquatic mammal bones. Other characteristic features of this period include the appearance of bone and antler implements and the occasional use of asphaltum and steatite. Most chronological sequences for Southern California recognize the introduction of the bow and arrow by 1500 BP, marked by the appearance of small arrow points and arrow shaft straighteners.

Some archaeologists have suggested that the changes in the coastal artifact assemblages dating to this period were the result of an influx or incursion of Shoshonean people from interior desert areas to the coastal regions (Wallace 1978). However, there is virtually no agreement among researchers as to the timing of the initial Shoshonean incursion into the study region; nonetheless, few researchers acknowledge or question the assumption that Shoshoneans arrived in the study region and replaced some other cultural group. Other archaeologists suggest that cultural transition from the earlier Milling Stone Horizon to the succeeding Intermediate Horizon coastal and inland assemblages reflects progressive economic changes (e.g., trade), rather than population replacement (King 1990; Moratto 1984:164).

In general, cultural patterns remained similar in character to those of the preceding horizon. However, the material culture at many coastal sites became more elaborate, reflecting an increase in sociopolitical complexity and increased efficiency in subsistence strategies (e.g., the introduction of the bow and arrow for hunting). The settlement-subsistence patterns and cultural development during this period are not well understood because of a lack of data, although some researchers have proposed that sedentism increased with the exploitation of storable food resources, such as acorns. The limited data do suggest that the duration and intensity of occupation at the base camps increased, especially toward the latter part of this period.

Within the Los Angeles Basin, only a few identified sites can be placed within this interval of prehistory. As discussed previously, the Phase II and Phase III components at CA-LAN 2 in Topanga Canyon are dated to this period; in addition, several sites south of Ballona Lagoon on the Del Rey bluffs confirm a rather well-developed Intermediate Horizon presence (Altschul et al. 2005). Projectile points from the Ballona Bluffs sites are, in some cases, similar to those found at sites in the southeastern California deserts, specifically in the Pinto Basin and at Gypsum Cave, suggesting that the coastal occupants of this period were in close contact with cultures occupying the eastern deserts.

### **The Late Holocene (Post-1500 BP)**

Reliance on the bow and arrow for hunting, along with the use of bedrock mortars and milling slicks, marks the beginning of the Late Holocene period, which Wallace (1955) denotes as the *Late Prehistoric Horizon* and Warren (1968) the *Shoshonean Tradition* in Southern California coastal regions, dating from about 1500 BP to the time of Spanish contact (approximately A.D. 1769). Late Prehistoric coastal sites are numerous. Diagnostic artifacts include small, triangular projectile points, mortars and pestles, steatite ornaments and containers, perforated stones, circular shell fishhooks, and numerous and varied bone tools as well as bone and shell ornamentation. Elaborate mortuary customs, along with generous use of asphaltum and the development of extensive trade networks, are also characteristic of this period.

The Late Prehistoric Horizon appears to represent increases in population size and economic and social complexity, as well as the appearance of social ranking. King (1990) posits that the mortuary

practices of the Intermediate and Late Horizons throughout Chumash territories evince social ranking, with beads used to confer status. Similarly, craft specialization on the northern Channel Islands has been linked to expanding economic capacities and emerging social ranking during the Late Period (Arnold 1987). Although the motivating forces for such trends have yet to be identified with certainty, some researchers have suggested that economies controlled by social elites spurred increasing economic productivity and resultant population growth (King 1990). More recently, archaeologists have linked past changes in subsistence, population, exchange, health, and violence to periods of drought that occurred during the late Holocene (Arnold 1992a, 1992b; Arnold et al. 1997). During the Medieval Climatic Anomaly (ca. 1200 BP to 650 BP)—particularly during the late Medieval Period (ca. 850 BP to 650 BP)—environmental dynamics may have played a role in deterioration of health and long-distance exchange relationships, increased subsistence stress and interpersonal violence, and even regional abandonments (Jones et al. 1999).

Kroeber (1925) and others have described a dispersion of Shoshonean peoples from eastern California desert areas and the Great Basin into southern and western California. This migration may have been linked to an unfavorable climatic change that prompted populations to seek richer distributions of plant and animal species and more reliable water sources. On the basis of linguistic evidence, Kroeber (1925:580) suggests that this intrusion occurred ca. 1500 BP. Warren (1968:9–10) identifies a Shoshonean Tradition in the San Bernardino County area at this time (i.e., Post-1250 BP). This movement of populations speaking Uto-Aztecan languages purportedly divided and displaced coastal Hokan speakers to the north and south, creating a wedge that subsequently defined ethnographically known territories. Warren (1968) indicates that small, triangular-shaped projectile points are the hallmark of this intrusion. Langenwaller and Brock (1985:3–8) note that various other researchers (e.g., Hopkins 1965; Kowta 1969; Rogers 1966; Rozaire 1967; Wallace 1962) have suggested a variety of dates for the initial Shoshonean influence in Southern California, some as early as the Milling Stone Horizon. It is worth noting here that Wallace (1978) discusses an increase in interregional trade during later prehistory that merely built upon the basic diversified-subsistence economy and social structure. In his sequence, the Shoshonean permeation caused little or no cultural discontinuity.

All chronological sequences for the region recognize the introduction of the bow and arrow at about 1450 BP by the appearance of small arrow points and arrow shaft straighteners. For neither Wallace (1955, 1978) nor Warren (1968), however, is this technological development a marker of a cultural traditional horizon/period change, even though this date marks the estimated terminus of Kroeber's (1925) Shoshonean incursion.

Based on work in the San Luis Rey River Basin in northern San Diego County, Meighan (1954) and True (1970) defined two late-prehistoric complexes. The San Luis Rey I Complex existed from approximately 600 BP to 250 BP and is typified by grinding implements, small, triangular projectile points with concave bases, stone pendants, Olivella shell beads, quartz crystals, and bone tools. The San Luis Rey II Complex, lasting from about 250 BP to 150 BP, is very similar, but also includes ceramic vessels, red and black pictographs, glass beads, metal knives, and steatite arrow straighteners. True, Meighan, and Crew (1974) believe that the San Luis Rey complexes developed out of the earlier La Jolla/Pauma cultural substratum and are the prehistoric antecedents to the historically known Luiseño.

Pottery, ceramic pipes, cremation urns, rock paintings, and some European trade goods were added to the previous cultural assemblage during the latter half of the late prehistoric occupation of the Southern California coastal region (Meighan 1954). Increased hunting efficiency through use of the

bow and arrow and widespread exploitation of acorns and holly-leaf cherry, indicated by the abundance of mortars and pestles, provided reliable and storable food resources. This, in turn, promoted greater sedentism. Related to this increase in resource utilization and sedentism are sites with deeper middens that suggest centrally based wandering or permanent habitation. These would have been the villages, or *rancherías*, noted by the early European explorers (True 1966, 1970). By 500 BP, strong ethnic patterns developed among native populations in Southern California. This may reflect accelerated cultural change brought about by increased efficiency in cultural adaptation and diffusion of technology from the central coastal region of California and the southern Great Basin (Douglas et al. 1981:10).

## Ethnographic Setting

The study area mainly encompasses the ethnographic territory of the Gabrieleño. The Tataviam traditionally occupied the San Fernando Valley north of the Los Angeles Basin. More detailed information on these two tribal groups is presented below.

### Gabrieleño

The project study area is entirely within the ethnographic territory of the Gabrieleño, the Native American population that has long inhabited the area in the Los Angeles Basin. Following the Spanish custom of naming local tribes after nearby missions, missionaries dubbed the native peoples the Gabrieleño, Gabrieliño, or San Gabrieleño in reference to Mission San Gabriel Arcángel, located northeast of the project study area.

The Gabrieleño consist of a number of smaller bands, some of whom refer to themselves as *Tongva* and others who refer to themselves as *Kizh*. Gabrieleño speaker Mrs. James Vinyard Rosemeyer told anthropologist C. Hart Merriam that Gabrieleño speakers referred to themselves as *Tongva*, and Merriam recorded the name (King 2011:5). McCawley (1996:9) states that the Gabrieleño living near Tejon used *Tongva*; however, the term also referred to a *ranchería* in the San Gabriel area. Today, some Gabrieleño have chosen to be known as *Tongva* (McCawley 1996:10). Another name that the Gabrieleño have been reported to use is *Kizh* or *Kij*, perhaps derived from the word *kītç*, meaning *houses* (McCawley 1996:10; Stickel 2016). The latter term may refer specifically to Gabrieleño living in the Whittier Narrows (McCawley 1996:10).

The Gabrieleño spoke a language that falls within the Cupan group of the Takic subfamily of the Uto-Aztecan language family. This language family is extremely large and includes the Shoshonean groups of the Great Basin. Given the geographic proximity of Gabrieleño and Serrano bands living in the area and their linguistic similarities, ethnographers have suggested that the bands shared the same ethnic origins (Kroeber 1925).

The Gabrieleño are considered one of the most distinctive tribes in all of California. They occupied a large area bordered on the west by the community of Topanga and the City of Malibu, the San Fernando Valley, the greater Los Angeles Basin, and the coastal strip south of Aliso Creek, south of San Juan Capistrano. Gabrieleño territory extended from the San Bernardino Mountains to the islands of Catalina, San Clemente, and San Nicolas and occupied most of modern-day Los Angeles and Orange Counties (Bean and Smith 1978:538–549). By 1500 B.P., permanent villages were built in the lowlands along rivers and streams. Over 50 villages may have been occupied simultaneously with populations of between 50 and 200 people per village (Bean and Smith 1978).



Very little has been written about early Gabrieleño social organization because the band was not studied until the 1920s and had already been greatly influenced by missionaries and settlers by that time (Kroeber 1925). Kroeber's (1925) work indicates that the Gabrieleño were a hierarchically ordered society with a chief who oversaw social and political interactions both within the Gabrieleño culture and with other groups. The Gabrieleño had multiple villages, ranging from seasonal satellite villages to larger, more permanent settlements. Resource exploitation was focused on village-centered territories, and hunting ranged from deer, rabbits, birds, and other small game to sea mammals. Fishing for freshwater fish, saltwater mollusks, and crustaceans and gathering acorns and various grass seeds were also important (Bean and Smith 1978:538–549). Fishing technology included basket fish traps, nets, bonefish hooks, harpoons, and vegetable poisons, and ocean fishing was conducted from wooden plank canoes lashed and asphalted together. Gabrieleño houses were large, circular, thatched, and domed structures of tule, fern, or carrizo that were large enough to house several families. Smaller ceremonial structures were also present in the villages and used in a variety of ways. These structures were earth covered and used as sweathouses, meeting places for adult males, menstrual huts, and ceremonial enclosures (*yuva'r*) (Heizer 1962:289–293).

The coastal Gabrieleño are among the few indigenous peoples who regularly navigated the ocean. They built seaworthy canoes, called *ti'at*, with wood planks that were sewn together, edge to edge, and then caulked and coated with either pine pitch or, more commonly, the tar available from the La Brea Tar Pits or asphaltum washed ashore from offshore oil seeps. The *ti'at* could hold as many as 12 people, all of their gear, and all of the goods carried to trade with other people, either along the coast or on one of the Channel Islands. The Gabrieleño paddled out to greet Spanish explorer Juan Cabrillo when he arrived off the shores of San Pedro in 1542. Modern place names with Gabrieleño origins include Pacoima, Tujunga, Topanga, Rancho Cucamonga, Azusa, and Cahuenga Pass.

The name of their creation deity, Quaoar, has been used to name a large object in the Kuiper belt (a disc-shaped region of icy objects beyond the orbit of Neptune). A 2,656-foot summit in the Verdugo Mountains, in the City of Glendale, has been named Tongva Peak. The Gabrieleño Trail is a 32-mile-long path through the Angeles National Forest.

Recorded ethnographic and archaeological sites associated with Gabrieleño settlements are not common. This is directly attributable to the extensive and prolonged urban development of the City of Los Angeles region over the last one and a half centuries (DPR 2005:16). In the 1990s, Kuruvungna Springs, a natural spring located on the site of a former Gabrieleño village on the campus of University High School in West Los Angeles, was revitalized due to the efforts of the Gabrieleño Tongva Springs Foundation. The spring, which produces 22,000 gallons (83,279 liters) of water each day, is considered by the Gabrieleño to be one of their last remaining sacred sites and is regularly used for ceremonial events.

## Tataviam

This group was also at one time referred to as the Alliklik (Bright 1975). Tataviam territory included the mountainous canyons and valleys just north of the San Fernando Valley (Hudson 1982, Johnson and Earle 1990). The traditional Tataviam territory lies primarily between 1,500 feet and 3,000 feet above sea level. Their territory included the upper reaches of the Santa Clara River drainage system east of Piru Creek. Their territory extended to the east to include what is now the Vasquez Rocks Natural Area Park in Agua Dulce (W&S Consultants 2001). Their territory also may have extended west to the Sawmill Mountains to the north it included at least the southwestern fringes of the

Antelope Valley, which they apparently shared with the Kitanemuk, who occupied the greater portion of the Antelope Valley.

The name “Tataviam” means “People who Face the Sun.” The Tataviam may be among the larger “Shoshonean” migration into Southern California that occurred 2,000 to 3,000 years ago (Higgins 1996, Ventura County Resource Conservation District 2005). The Tataviam belong to the family of Serrano people who migrated into the Antelope, Santa Clarita, and San Fernando Valleys some time before 450 A.D. They also settled into the upper Santa Clara River drainage.

Tataviam settlements include *Nuhubit* (Newhall), *Piru-U-Bit* (Piru), *Tochonanga* (which is believed to have been located at the confluence of Wiley and Towsley Canyons), and the very large village of *Chaguibit*, the center of which is buried under the Rye Canyon exit off Interstate 5. The Tataviam also lived where Saugus, Agua Dulce, and Lake Elizabeth are located today. Although the Tataviam people lived primarily on the upper reaches of the Santa Clara River drainage system, they also inhabited the upper San Fernando Valley, including the present-day City of San Fernando and neighborhood of Sylmar (which they shared with their inland Gabrieleño neighbors).

The Tataviam were hunters and gatherers. Larger game was generally hunted with the bow and arrow, while snares, traps, and pits were used for capturing smaller game. At certain times of the year, communal hunting and gathering expeditions were held. Faunal resources available to the Tataviam included deer, mountain sheep, antelope, rabbit, small rodents, and several species of birds. Meat was generally prepared by cooking in earthen ovens, boiling, or sun-drying. Cooking and food preparation utensils consisted primarily of lithic (stone) knives and scrapers, mortars and metates, pottery, and bone or horn utensils. Vegetal resources available to the Tataviam included honey mesquite, piñon nuts, yucca roots, mesquite, and cacti fruits (Solis 2008). These resources were supplemented with roots, bulbs, shoots, and seeds that, if not available locally, were obtained in trade with other groups.

The Tataviam people lived in small villages and were semi-nomadic when food was scarce. There is little available data regarding Tataviam social organization, although information shows similarities among Tataviam, Chumash, and Gabrieleño ritual practices. Like their Chumash neighbors, the Tataviam practiced an annual mourning ceremony in late summer or early fall, which would have been conducted in a circular structure made of reeds or branches.

At first contact with the Spanish in the late 18th century, the population of this group was estimated at less than 1,000 persons. By 1810 nearly all of the Tataviam population had been baptized at San Fernando Mission (King and Blackburn 1978).

Access to the rivers and creeks was of great importance to the Tataviam, as these environments provided resources necessary for subsistence. Particular care was allotted to familiarity with flooding or drainage patterns (River Project 2006). It was along these waterways that access to fresh water, food, and other materials necessary for the construction of traditional house structures, or *Ki’j*, such as willow or tule reeds, was possible (FTBMI 2012). *Datura* (or jimsonweed), native tobacco, and other plants found along the local rivers and streams provided raw materials for baskets, cordage, and netting.

## Relevant Historical Trends in the Project Study Area

The following historic trends are relevant to understanding the archaeological and historical environment within the project study area. Rather than present a complete history of the area, the

goal of this historic context is to focus on those historical facts that are most important to understanding the types of cultural resources that could be located in the project study area. Overall trends are described first followed by a discussion focused on each of the 18 jurisdictions in the project study area.

### **The Spanish and Mexican Periods: 1781–1849**

The first Europeans in the region were led by Spanish explorer Gaspar de Portolà, who was sent from Mexico in 1769 to establish settlements in the Spanish territory known as Alta California. When they arrived in the Los Angeles area, they discovered a lush area surrounding the confluence of the LA River and Arroyo Seco and determined that it had “all the requisites for a large settlement” (Historic Resources Group et al. 2012:7–8).

The Pueblo de Los Angeles was founded within the project area vicinity near this junction of the two rivers in 1781. As the town developed, San Fernando Road (part of the El Camino Real, or “The King’s Highway) emerged as a crucial transportation route between El Pueblo and the missions, presidios, and ranchos to the north and east (Historic Resources Group et al. 2012:8). The Zanja Madre, or “Mother Ditch,” was also established to serve the growing settlement. The Zanja Madre was an open-air earthen canal that diverted water to the Pueblo from a dammed portion of the nearby LA River, providing irrigation that was crucial for the Pueblo’s growth and success (Taniguchi 2008).

In the late 1700s, the Spanish government began creating large land grants called ranchos (Figure 5.3-1). The Spanish crown would retain the title to the rancho while allowing—or granting—settlement and cattle grazing rights on the land. Three major ranchos were established within the project vicinity: Rancho San Rafael, Rancho Los Feliz, and Rancho Providencia. Rancho San Rafael was granted to Corporal José Maria Verdugo in 1798. The approximately 36,000 acres of the rancho made up portions of present-day Glendale, Eagle Rock, and Highland Park (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:10). Rancho Los Feliz, which comprised areas of present-day Los Feliz and Griffith Park, was granted to Corporal Jose Vicente Feliz in 1795 (Historic Resources Group et al. 2012:8). Rancho Providencia, the smallest of the three ranchos, was located in portions of present-day Burbank and Griffith Park; however, this area was not immediately granted to anyone until after Mexico declared its independence from Spain. It was then granted to Comandante Jose Castro, Luis Arenas and Vincente de la Ossa in the 1820s (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:15; Schonauer et al. 2014:7). Most of the ranchos were used for raising livestock, namely sheep and cattle, which helped to establish the local agricultural economy (Historic Resources Group et al. 2012:8).

In the early 1800s, Spain began to lose its foothold in Mexico and Alta California due to political unrest, a lack of economic independence, and physical isolation. These factors, coupled with Napoleon’s invasion of Spain, hindered Spain’s ability to manage its far-flung colonies, thereby allowing Mexico to gain and declare its independence in 1821. The period of Mexican rule that followed was somewhat tumultuous as the Spanish missions were secularized and a clear and organized form of government failed to take hold. Between 1822 and 1848, there were 12 different governors and 15 different administrators (Prosser 2016:15). By the early 1840s, the number of Anglo-American settlers in the area had increased considerably, creating pressure for the annexation of Alta California to the U.S. (Prosser 2016:28).

The instability of this time period culminated in the Mexican War, which broke out in 1846. Annexing California, a strategic asset, became one of President James Polk’s primary goals during

the war. Los Angeles came under American occupation during the 1847 Battle of La Mesa, which would be the last battle of the war. A series of treaties, ending with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, officially brought the war to a close. The 1848 treaty formally ended Mexican rule of the territory and transferred authority to the U.S. For a year, California was a U.S. military-governed territory. In November 1849, voters chose to make California a state, and it was admitted to the Union in 1850 (Prosser 2016:29–30).

### **California Statehood and Los Angeles County**

Mexico ceded California to the United States on February 2, 1848 with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and California became a state on September 9, 1850. In principle, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo protected the rights of the Californios who owned property during the Mexican period. In practice, however, the legal process for vetting land claims that was set into motion by the Land Commission established in 1851, combined with the mounting debts of many rancho owners, allowed American and other newcomers eventually to take possession of nearly all of the rancho lands originally granted to Californios. Los Angeles became one of California's original 27 counties, created by the State's first legislature on February 18, 1850. Los Angeles County was named for the territory's largest city, Los Angeles, which was designated the county seat on July 15 of that year. Los Angeles County comprised lands that encompassed 4,340 square miles and originally contained all of San Bernardino County, a large portion of Kern County, and all of Orange County. During the 1850s and 1860s, the County underwent several boundary changes: in 1853, California's Legislature extracted the eastern portion of the county to form the County of San Bernardino; in 1866 an act created Kern County from portions of Tulare and Los Angeles Counties; and in 1889, a similar act created the County of Orange from lands lying southeast of Coyote Creek (Bean and Rawls 2003:61, 63–64, 142–147; Coy 1923:2–3, 140–56).

### **River Channelization and Flood Control 1920–1960**

In heavy winter rains, the LA River would swell and flood, often changing course and sweeping increasingly larger debris—mud, rocks, trees, animals, even dwellings—into its path as it raced down the San Gabriel Mountains. When enough of this debris gathered, it would flood and swamp along the river, halting travel and causing millions of dollars in damage and repair costs to properties along the riverbank. The combination of an unpredictable river and an increase in development along the river created a perfect storm of flood danger: the less undeveloped land that was available along the river provided less surface area for runoff water to be absorbed in a heavy storm (Lee et al. 2000:7). The Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD) was formed in 1915 in response to a series of devastating floods and began developing a plan to manage flood management issues. Some of the earliest flood management efforts included sections of river channelization and the creation of reservoirs. The Arroyo Seco was determined to be one of the primary contributors to flooding in downtown Los Angeles; as such, the first LACFCD flood management project was the completion of the Devil's Gate Dam north of Pasadena in 1920 (EDAW 2003:6). Taxpayers funded some of the flood projects through bonds issued in 1917 and 1924, but they were unwilling to fund other more substantial infrastructure (Grumprecht 2001:178, 196).

In the 1930s, another series of destructive floods prompted officials to request federal assistance. After a flood in 1934, the City of Pasadena began channelizing sections of the Arroyo Seco that were less than 80 feet wide. With the help of Works Progress Administration labor, much of the Arroyo Seco through Pasadena and Los Angeles was channelized by 1940, just before the first phase of the Arroyo Seco Parkway was dedicated. The final section was completed between 1946 and 1947.

In the City of Glendale, the Verdugo Wash, an 8-mile tributary to the LA River, was channelized beginning in 1935. The LACFCD appealed for federal aid in the undertaking, which was provided by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Verdugo Wash Project was completed in 1939 (Environmental Science Associates 2012). The City of Los Angeles also received assistance from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to channelize the LA River. The undertaking began in 1938 and would not be completed until 1960. In all, 51 miles of the LA River was channelized (McCool 2012: 223). Only three portions of the river remain unlined: a portion near Griffith Park and the Elysian Valley, another within the Sepulveda Flood Control Basin in the San Fernando Valley, and a third in Long Beach where the river empties into the Pacific Ocean (Los Angeles County Department of Public Works 2009). Channelization of the LA River was successful in providing effective and predictable flood management and helped protect the continued development in river-adjacent areas during and after World War II.

### **Long Beach (Frames 1 and 2)**

"In 1783, Pedro Fages, Governor of California, issued the first grants of land to private individuals. Manuel Nieto, a former soldier who had requested land upon which to graze cattle, received a grant that was bounded by the ocean on the south, El Camino Real "highway" on the north, the Santa Ana River on the east, and the San Gabriel River on the west. Because, at that time, the San Gabriel River flowed into San Pedro Bay, this grant included all of the land upon which Long Beach currently stands.

In 1833, 29 years after Nieto's death, his lands were divided among his heirs. In this way, the Ranchos Santa Gertrudis, Los Bolsas, Los Cerritos, Los Alamitos, and Los Coyotes were created. Most of modern Long Beach stands on land that was included in the Los Alamitos and Los Cerritos Ranchos. Alamitos Avenue in downtown Long Beach follows the old boundary line between the two estates.

The Rancho Los Alamitos was acquired in 1842 by Abel Stearns, a New Englander who had migrated to California in 1829 and who had subsequently been successful in the hide and tallow trade. The purchase price of the Rancho was \$5,954. In 1843, another transplanted New Englander named John Temple acquired the neighboring Rancho Los Cerritos. Both men became Mexican citizens as a condition of their land title, and for the following two decades their hide and tallow businesses flourished. The early 1860's, however, were characterized by a succession of floods and periods of drought that eventually ruined the ranchos. Stearns mortgaged his Rancho to San Francisco businessman Michael Reese in 1864, and when he defaulted on his payments, the property passed to Reese. The Rancho Los Cerritos was likewise sold in 1866 by Temple to Flint, Bixby, and Company, also of San Francisco.

The management of the Rancho Los Cerritos was turned over by Flint, Bixby, and Company to Jotham Bixby who formed a subsidiary named J. Bixby & Company for that purpose. The primary activity of J. Bixby & Company in the Long Beach area was the raising of sheep. Meanwhile, Reese and his estate retained possession of the old Rancho Los Alamitos until 1881 when it was sold for \$125,000 to a group of investors consisting of John Bixby (Jotham's cousin), J. Bixby & Company, and a Los Angeles banker named I. W. Hellman. John Bixby managed this parcel of land in much the same way that his cousin Jotham managed the neighboring Los Cerritos ranch.

In 1880 the first plan for the establishment of a community in the Long Beach area was announced. It called for the subdivision of 10,000 acres of land on the Cerritos Ranch to form an "American Colony Tract". In 1882 the California Immigrant Union (CIU), which had been the main financial

backer of the American Colony, backed out and the program was reorganized under the leadership of William Willmore, a former employee of the CIU. During the next 2 years, land was surveyed and a map of Willmore City prepared. The modest success the city enjoyed in attracting residents during its first year was ruined by torrential rains in the fall and winter of 1883. Consequently, Willmore was unable to make payment to J. Bixby & Company from whom he had arranged to buy the property and the colony failed.

Shortly thereafter, however, land values began to rise, and the rights to the town were purchased by a new syndicate called the Long Beach Land and Water Company. In 1884 the name of the town was changed from Willmore City to Long Beach. In 1887 the town was sold to a San Francisco syndicate, the Long Beach Development Company, that was closely associated with the Southern Pacific Railroad. Urban development during these years was not confined solely to the Cerritos Ranch area. As Long Beach was beginning to develop, John Bixby in 1886 laid plans for another: community that he called Alamitos Beach. This new town adjoined Long Beach at its east boundary, Alamitos Avenue. The two towns coexisted until, by a series of annexations beginning in 1905, Long Beach absorbed Alamitos Beach.

In 1890 Long Beach had a population of 564; by 1907 that number exceeded 20,000. Much of this growth has been attributed to the city's reputation as a year-round pleasure resort and to the absence of saloons. However, all of Southern California's population grew rapidly in those years, and railroad transportation played the vital role in bringing people west. In 1887, when the Long Beach Development Company bought the town, the company laid out plans to bring people to Long Beach and to make the area an important resort community. A large pier was constructed at Magnolia Street in 1888, the Pine Avenue Municipal Pier was constructed in 1893, and the Pacific Electric Railroad came to Long Beach in 1902. The heyday of the Long Beach era followed. The pike, the beach, and the pleasure piers were crowded on Sundays. R. L. Bisby, Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, managed to have articles about the vacation mecca published all over the country. People came to bathe in the surf, rent a cottage, or stay in the elegant Virginia Hotel.

### **City of Los Angeles (Frame 1 and 5-9)**

Within the boundaries of the City of Los Angeles, the LA River runs through the downtown area, northeast neighborhoods like Cypress Park and Atwater Village, and communities in the San Fernando Valley. Although much of the river was channelized in the 1940s, the general alignment of the river through these communities has largely remained unchanged since their initial development.

#### **Downtown Los Angeles**

Spanish settlement in the Los Angeles area began in 1771, when Fathers Josef Angel Fernandez de La Somera and Pedro Benito Cábmon founded Mission San Gabriel Arcángel near the location where the Portolá Expedition had camped the previous year. In 1781, Spanish Governor Felipe de Neve sent 11 families of Native American, African, and Spanish descent to establish the new pueblo of Los Angeles at the banks of the LA River, close to a Gabrieleño village near what is now downtown Los Angeles (Engelhardt, Zephyrin 1927). The settlers would lay out streets, construct modest adobe houses around a central plaza, and plant crops adjacent to the settlement (ICF 2011:11–13; Los Angeles County n.d.; Bean and Rawls 2003:44–45). While the area directly adjacent to the LA River in present day downtown Los Angeles developed first as vineyards and orchards, the introduction of the Southern Pacific Railroad along the river ushered in more industrial development to the area. By

the turn of the 20th century, industrial manufacturing enterprises and railroad-related warehouses lined the area near the river (Davis 1999:99; Los Angeles Conservancy 2013:2)

### **Northeastern Communities (Cypress Park, Glassell Park, and Atwater Village)**

After the initial development of the downtown, LA River adjacent communities began to grow starting in the 1880s. Just north of downtown, Cypress Park was first subdivided in 1882 and grew rapidly with the introduction of the Pacific Electric Railway line in 1904. By the 1920s, the area came to reflect its current built environment with modest, single-family, Craftsman residences and small businesses (Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan Area, 9-10). Further to the north, the neighborhood of Glassell Park, named after local developer Andrew Glassell, was annexed by the City of Los Angeles in 1912 and began to grow in population soon after. Like Cypress Park, the built environment came to be dominated by modest, single-family Craftsman homes along with commercial businesses located on major automobile corridors (Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan Area, 16-17). Even further north, the neighborhood of Atwater Village consisted of ranchland in the 1870s and was not fully developed as a residential community until the 1910s and 1920s due to frequent flooding from the nearby LA River. Period Revival and Craftsman styles dominate the residential landscape which was once served by a streetcar line along Glendale Boulevard. Industrial development spans the area of the neighborhood closest to river and rail lines (Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan Area, 7-9).

### **San Fernando Valley**

Starting with Glendale to the southeast, the LA River stretches through communities like Burbank, Studio City, and Sherman Oaks in the southern San Fernando Valley. The City of Glendale began as a rural townsite in the 1880s with the completion of the Southern Pacific Railroad and incorporated as a city in 1906. The modern city emerged in the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century when financier Leslie C. Brand bought and developed 1,000 acres in the Verdugo Mountains. To the northwest, the City of Burbank was founded in 1887 as part of the Southern California land boom of the 1880s. The town would develop around Lockheed Aircraft and later the entertainment industry. Further to the west along the LA River are the neighborhoods of Studio City and Sherman Oaks, which have a similar development history. Both developed first as single-family residential communities in the 1920s; they were both served by a commercial corridor along Ventura Boulevard that expanded rapidly in the 1930s. Both communities retain their suburban character along both have experienced some multi-family residential infill since the 1950s (Pitt 1997: 66, 174-175, 465, 488). After passing the Sepulveda Basin, a narrower band of the river travels northwest through the neighborhoods of Reseda, Winnetka, and West Hills, suburban areas largely developed in the post-World War II era.

### **Carson (Frame 2)**

Carson was incorporated in 1968 and includes an area of 19.2 square miles. Originally part of Rancho San Pedro, Carson is named for George Henry Carson, who was married into the Rancho's land grantee, the Dominguez family in the mid-nineteenth century, or his son, John M. Carson, for whom a Pacific Electric Railroad stop was named in the 1930s. The elder Mr. Carson supervised the Dominguez family land holdings and ranching operations. As with many of its neighbors, the community that would become Carson began as portions of Rancho San Pedro was sold off or leased to farmers and real estate investors. The land remained relatively undeveloped and in agricultural

use. However, due to its location, the area was subject to repeated flooding and residential development was sparse.

Oil was discovered in this location in the 1920s, which brought the first significant industry to the community in the form of refineries, tank farms, and oil derricks. As a result, this made the community attractive for additional related industries in the years leading up to, and following, World War II. The need for people to work in these rapidly developing industries led to increased need for housing, and Carson was one of many communities in southeast Los Angeles County that accommodated that need. Local calls for incorporation began as early as the 1950s, and in 1960 a committee of residents petitioned Los Angeles County for incorporation as “Dominguez.” (<https://lacountylibrary.org/carson-local-history/>, accessed 4/7/2020). It took eighteen more years, but the city finally incorporated in 1968.

### **Compton (Frame 2)**

Compton was settled in the 1860s by thirty families led by Griffith Dickenson Compton, for whom it was eventually named. These settlers purchased 4,600 acres of land that had been part of Rancho San Pedro. When Compton donated his land for incorporating the city, he stipulated that a certain amount was to be set aside strictly for agricultural use. This 10-block section of the city is Richland Farms, and it is the largest urban agricultural zone in the Los Angeles basin. (<https://www.npr.org/2011/04/03/134981907/straight-outta-compton-on-horseback>, accessed 04/07/2020).

The city was incorporated in 1888 with 500 people and is one of the oldest incorporated cities in Los Angeles County. The Los Angeles and San Pedro railroad was constructed through the city, so the early farmers of the area were able to access the railroad hub in the City of Los Angeles, 10 miles to the north, or the growing ports of Long Beach and San Pedro to the south.

As with its neighbors, the community remained primarily agricultural, especially in the Richland Farms area which maintains its farming nature today, through the first decades of the twentieth century. By the 1920s, the city had an airport, and a junior college, and two major oil fields. In addition, the Samson Tire and Rubber Factory (Uniroyal) was founded in 1918 in Compton, and in 1929 the company constructed the largest tire manufacturing facility on the west coast (23 acres), designed in an Assyrian style with a Samson and Delilah motif, by the acclaimed Los Angeles architects Morgan, Walls, and Clements.

### **Cudahy (Frame 3)**

Cudahy was incorporated in 1960 and measures 1.2 square miles. Located in southeast Los Angeles County, it was named for a meat-packing baron, Michael Cudahy, who had purchased the land that would become the new city, in 1908. The land Cudahy purchased was known as the Nadeau Ranch, and was originally part of Rancho San Antonio.

### **Downey (Frame 3)**

The City of Downey was established on October 13, 1873, by the Downey Land Association (Land Association) and was named in honor of John Gately Downey, the governor of California during the Civil War and president of the Land Association (Los Angeles Directory Company 1950).



The original plot of the town site consisted of 125 acres of land that was originally part of the Los Nietos Township, the largest Spanish land grant given to Manuel Nieto in 1784 by Governor Pedro Fages (Los Angeles Directory Company 1950). In 1834, the land was divided among the Nieto heirs, in which a portion became the Rancho Santa Gertrudes. In 1873, 96 acres of the Rancho was used to found Downey City (City of Downey 2021), after word spread that a railroad stop was to be constructed at the future town site. On April 15, 1874, the Southern Pacific Railroad established a stop in Downey, while building a branch line between Los Angeles and San Diego (Los Angeles Directory Company 1950). The railroad created a rise in population after the residents of the two small nearby communities of Gallatin and College Settlement moved to the newly founded Downey City (Quinn 1973).

The railroad provided the footings for the town to flourish as an agricultural and stock raising community. In the early 1870s, oranges were first grown in the area, in which the seed came from the original stalk brought by the padres. Navel and Valencia oranges were grown and citrus production began to thrive. Ball & Tweedy, acquired by Sunkist in the early 1900s, began packing oranges in 1895 and took advantage of the Southern Pacific depot, which was just south of the central downtown center (Los Angeles Directory Company 1950). At the end of the 1800s, other agricultural products that proved prosperous were the castor bean, walnuts, and various fruit trees. In 1884, a winery was established just south of the railroad off what was called Crawford Street (now Downey Avenue); however, a cold winter killed the vines and the industry a few years later. In 1899, the dairy farmers organized the Downey Cooperative Creamery, with a plant off Downey Avenue by the railroad (Quinn 1973).

In the early twentieth century, Downey flourished with the citrus and dairy industries, and in the late 1920's, an emerging aircraft company, EMSCO, built industrial buildings on existing farmland southeast of the town center. The company grew through the mid-century, developing the surrounding land and became established with aeronautics and aerospace industries (Christopher A. Joseph & Associates 2008). As the population rose following World War II, there was a movement from the city to be incorporated. The desire for incorporation failed by the Los Angeles County Supervisors in 1954 but was successful on December 4, 1956 with a two-to-one margin (City of Downey 1981). By 1964, Downey had over 90,000 residents and was almost the seventh largest charter city in Los Angeles County (City of Downey 1981).

### **Lynwood (Frame 3)**

The City of Lynwood was incorporated in 1921, and was named for Lynn Wood Sessions, the wife of a local dairyman. C. H. Sessions had acquired 400 acres of the former Ranch San Antonio twenty years earlier, and established his dairy, which was named the Lynwood Dairy and Creamery. Located at Sanborn and Long Beach boulevards, a siding for the Southern Pacific Railway was eventually extended to the dairy, and it was named the Lynwood siding. A few years later, the Pacific Railroad ran through the area on the way from Los Angeles to Santa Ana, and a depot was constructed at Long Beach Boulevard and Fernwood Avenue. As with the Southern Pacific, the new Depot was also named Lynwood. In 1913, a group known as the Lynwood company began selling off lots for home sites, and the community began to develop.

### **Paramount (Frame 3)**

Paramount was founded in 1948, when the towns of Hynes and Clearwater unified. The name of this new community was taken directly from Paramount Boulevard, which runs north to south through

the middle of the city, which incorporated in 1957. Similar to those communities in Southeast Los Angeles County, Paramount remained generally rural and agricultural throughout the nineteenth century.

According to the city's profile:

In the first half of the 20th century, the villages of Hynes and Clearwater were the center of Southern California's dairy industry and were known as both "The Milk Shed of Los Angeles" and "The World's Largest Hay Market." Hynes-Clearwater had more cows per square mile than anywhere west of Chicago – a total of 25,000 at its peak. It was home to the Hay Tree, where the price of that commodity was set each morning for the rest of the world. The Hay Tree is a California Historical Landmark (<http://www.paramountcity.com/government/city-profile>, accessed 4/7/2020)

### **South Gate (Frame 3)**

The City of South Gate was incorporated in 1923 and owes its name to its historic location at the southern gate of Rancho San Antonio (<https://www.cityofsouthgate.org/259/History-of-South-Gate>, accessed 4/5/2020). As part of this historic Rancho, this community remained primarily agricultural throughout the nineteenth century, divided into large 40-acre tracts that were used as cattle grazing lands and for farming. The downtown area of South Gate was part of the Tweedy family property, who owned 2,000 acres of land in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, and the downtown business district is known as the Tweedy Mile for this family.

In the fall of 1917, 0.5 acre lots in "South Gate Gardens" were advertised for sale by Charles B. Hooper, a local realtor. As with its neighboring cities, this community was part of the former Cudahy Ranch Company, which was concerned with selling of the thousands of acres of land purchased by Michael Cudahy in 1893. Despite the lack of paved streets, as well as water and sewer service, and the aforementioned gardens, more than 250 lots were sold. A year later, 125 houses were constructed, streets were being named, street trees planted, and a large lot had been set aside for a school, which was built in 1919. The City incorporated in 1923.

South Gate, like many of its neighbors, remained somewhat rural and unpopulated through the 1920s and 1930s, but saw great expansion of both residential and industrial properties as part of the manufacturing build up to WWII and the post-war population increases. In one example, General Motors built an automobile assembly plant in South Gate in 1935. Known as the South Gate Plant, and located on Tweedy Boulevard, this was first GM plant to build multiple car lines: Buick, Oldsmobile, and Pontiac cars were assembled at this factory; Chevrolet and Cadillac lines were added by 1949 (<https://www.southgatecc.org/economic-development/south-gates-business-history/>, accessed 4/7/2020). Other companies that made South Gate their home included the Bell Foundry (1923), a Firestone Tire and Rubber Company factory for west coast distribution, U.S. Gypsum (formerly Star Roofing), and American Concrete and Steel Pipe Company. Firestone built their factory on a 40-acre former bean field in 1928, and by the 1950s the plant covered almost a million square feet. The main boulevard through South Gate was named after Harvey Firestone, the founder of the company.

Many of the workers who had moved here to take jobs in those factories remained after the war ended, even when those companies left; according to the Chamber of Commerce, in 1976 there were over 400 industries in South Gate (LA County Library 2020).

### **Bell (Frame 4)**

The City of Bell is located 10 miles to the southeast of downtown Los Angeles, and measures just 2.81 square miles. Incorporated in 1927, the city was originally part of the James Bell ranch, which dated to the late 1800s. Between 1870 and 1890, settlers began to arrive in the area that is now Bell. Among these first settlers was James George Bell, who would later become the city's founder. He acquired nearly 360 acres of land in the area, which he used to develop a small farming and cattle community. After a dispute with the Santa Fe Railroad over use of his land, Bell allowed the railroad access to his land in exchange for naming the station "Bell," where the community would later take its name (City of Bell 2010).

Bell was an exclusively residential community when it incorporated in 1927 with the motto "Key to Industry." The bedroom community supplied a labor pool for neighboring industrial cities and expanded its residential development on a pay-as-you-go basis. Beginning during World War II, Bell began to develop more high-density apartment buildings and would continue this development pattern in the postwar period (Rasmussen 1997).

The City annexed 130 acres of land from the former Cheli Air Force Depot with hopes that the land would later be used for industrial development, which would provide a solid tax base. By 1978, the government released the property and allowed for the first industrial redevelopment project in Bell. At this same time, the city became increasingly desperate for sources of revenue and open the California Bell Card Club, which at its peak added more than \$3 million a year to City coffers. The casino closed in 1995, and small-scale business and industry are currently the major economic drivers for Bell (Rasmussen 1997).

### **Bell Gardens (Frame 4)**

Bell Gardens was also named for James George Bell, who also lent his name to the City of Bell, which is separated from it across the I-710 and the LA River to the west. Bell arrived in Los Angeles in 1875 and quickly bought up 360 acres from Ranch San Antonio. As with many real estate prospectors at that time, he subdivided the acreage into smaller land holdings, and sold them primarily for farming. Until the 1930s, the community remained largely agricultural.

The use of "gardens" in the city's name may have derived from the large number of farms and gardens that occupied the acreage even as other nearby communities were beginning to develop into small cities. In 1927, the Firestone Tire Company was one of the first large companies to open a plant in the community, and in 1930s, tracts continued to be subdivided and developed with affordable housing. As with its neighbors, Bell Gardens saw population growth before and after World War II as a result of the number of defense-related industries that came to the county. Incorporation did not occur until 1961. At only 2.5 square miles, it is one of the smallest cities in the United States. Bell Gardens is also home to the oldest house in Los Angeles County—the Casa de Rancho San Antonio, or Henry Gage Mansion—which was started in 1795 and completed in 1815. It is located at 7000 East Gage Avenue and is California Historical Site Number 984.

### **Commerce (Frame 4)**

Although the City of Commerce was not incorporated until 1960, industrial development has been present in the area since the early 1900s. The Simons Brick Company opened the first major industrial plant in the area in 1905. At its peak in the 1920s, the plant employed more than 3,000 people (including women and children) and the plant's bricks were used to build numerous

landmark buildings in Los Angeles, including City Hall and UCLA's Royce Hall. In 1919, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company opened its first Southern California plant in the area. This was followed by the construction of the Samson Tire and Rubber Company plant in 1929, which was a striking 240,000 square foot Assyrian style plant that employed 2,500 men. Automaker Chrysler opened a plant in the area in 1932, and Ford built a parts depot facility in 1951 (English and GuneWardena 1997).

In the late 1950s, Warren Bedell, an employee of the nearby Firestone plant, conceived of the idea to incorporate the neighbors of Rosewood Park and Bandini into what is now the City of Commerce. With corporate sponsorship and homeowner support, the City of Commerce was officially incorporated on January 28, 1960. During the 1960s, the city added civic amenities such as a library, an "aquatorium," and a new city hall. Commerce had 101 of the nation's 500 largest corporations operating within its city limits by May of 1976. While some of the older industries, such as Chrysler and Goodrich, began to leave the city in the 1970s, it added a number of distribution centers and warehousing facilities (English and GuneWardena 1997).

Commerce underwent major redevelopment in the decades following the 1970s, and new projects included new residential developments and a business park. When the Commerce Casino was open in 1990, it quickly became the City of Commerce's second largest employer. During the same year, the landmark Samson Tire Factory reopened as a specialty retail center, office space, and a 200-room hotel. The city continues to retain its manufacturing identity with nearly 64 percent of the city zoned for industrial use (English and GuneWardena 1997).

#### **Huntington Park (Frame 4)**

Huntington Park was originally part of Rancho San Antonio. The first tracts to be developed in the community were called Sunrise Tract, owned by two land developers, A.L. Burbank and E.V. Baker. The tract was subdivided and renamed La Park around 1901. The name was changed soon after to Huntington Park and a railroad right-of-way was set aside as a way to lure Henry Huntington to extend the Pacific Electric Railway to town. The first actual inhabitants of the new town began arriving and by 1906, the city was incorporated, with 526 residents.

#### **Maywood (Frame 4)**

Although it is one of the smaller cities in Los Angeles, the City of Maywood had a population of 1,000 when it incorporated in 1924. Originally part of Rancho San Antonio, the first housing tracts were put up for sale in 1919; the community was named after a real estate agent named May Wood agreed to lend it her name. As with the surrounding cities, it slowly developed both a residential and industrial nature through the early decades of the twentieth century before the population of people and factories exploded throughout the pre- and post- World War II era. Both the Chrysler Corporation and the Ford Motor Company built auto assembly plants in Maywood, and Bethlehem Steel had a plant in the community.

#### **Vernon (Frame 4)**

Rancher Thomas J. Furlong and merchant John B. Leonis founded and incorporated the City of Vernon in 1905 on land reclaimed from the floodplain of the LA River. The city took its name from Vernon Avenue, which crossed through the center of town. The city founders wanted to take advantage of three major railroads running through the area to create an "exclusively industrial" city. During the early 1900s, Vernon's limited taxation and promise of no political or industrial strife

attracted a handful of firms from downtown Los Angeles. Vernon also provided a respite from the blue laws that took hold in Los Angeles in the first quarter on the twentieth century, with entertainment such as baseball, boxing, nightclubs, and gambling taking hold within the city limits of Vernon (City of Vernon 2010).

The industrial movement to Vernon accelerated during World War I, when oil companies, metal works, lumber yards and building-material manufactures relocated from downtown. By the 1920s and 1930s, companies like U.S. and Bethlehem Steel, Alcoa (aluminum), Owens (glass), American Can, and automaker Studebaker all set up shop in town. Through a bond measure, John Leonis was able to authorize the construction of the city's own light and power plant in order to provide cheaper utility rates to industrial firms (Davis 2001).

Vernon continues to be a major manufacturing and shipping center in Southern California despite the evolution of industry over the last 100 years. The city has embraced smaller industrial establishments, like fashion design, garment making, film production, and waste recycling. The city has also maintained its exclusively industrial nature, which has resulted in one of the lowest tax burdens in the State of California (City of Vernon 2010).

### **Glendale (Frame 6)**

"The City of Glendale consists of approximately thirty square miles located about six miles north of downtown Los Angeles" (Historic Preservation Element of the City of Glendale General Plan, Planning Division, September 1997, p. 12). In 1798 Corporal Jose Maria Verdugo (later changed to Verdugo) established title to the Rancho San Rafael. The Rancho included most of present-day Glendale, Burbank, Eagle Rock and Highland Park. In 1831, Jose Maria Verdugo died and passed the Rancho San Rafael to his son and daughter (Julio and Catalina). It was not until 30 years later (1861) that Julio and Catalina divided the Rancho between them. A series of smaller divisions took place until a court decision known as the "Great Partition" was made in 1871 dissolving the Rancho San Rafael. As smaller parcels were created, many homes and businesses were developed. Six individuals contributed land to create the original 150-acre townsite which was named Glendale. This was platted, filed, and recorded with the County Recorder as the "Town of Glendale" in 1887. In 1906 the city was incorporated. It consisted of 1,486 acres. (City of Glendale 2020.)

### **Burbank (Frame 7)**

The City of Burbank occupies land within the Spanish land grant of Rancho San Rafael. Spanish Governor Pedro Fages awarded the 36,403-acre parcel to Corporal José Maria Verdugo on October 20, 1784 (City of Glendale 1997:10, Cowan 1977:87, 139). The Verdugo family sold 4,603 acres of the property to Jonathan R. Scott, who then sold his acreage in 1866 to Dr. David Burbank, a trained dentist who worked in the Pueblo of Los Angeles (McDaniel and Clark 2012). As an entrepreneur, Burbank continued to purchase adjacent land, using his property for sheep grazing. From 1872 to 1873, Burbank sold the right-of-way of San Fernando Road to the Southern Pacific Railway to construct a new rail line between the downtown area of the City of Los Angeles and the City of Burbank's property. The segment of rail was completed on April 15, 1874 (City of Burbank 2012). In 1886, Burbank sold his entire 9,200 acres to the Providencia Land, Water and Development Company, which plotted a business district and surrounding residential neighborhoods that were for sale by late 1887 (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:27, McDaniel and Clark 2012). Because of the new rail line, many communities in the San Fernando Valley, including the City of Burbank, attained a vital commercial link to the City of Los Angeles. Lots (50- by 150-foot) were

predominantly purchased by farmers who then grew peaches, melons, and alfalfa (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:39). By 1910, the town had a population of 12,225 people with only approximately 700 of them living in the downtown core (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:42).

The City of Burbank was incorporated on July 8, 1911 (Bills 2004). In 1918, the City of Burbank transformed Second Street between Orange Grove and Angeleno Avenues into the main commercial district and the subdivisions of Benmar Hills and Magnolia Park were established as the first large residential subdivisions in the City of Burbank (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:53, 71). New industrial buildings and factories began to replace orchards. Brothers Allan and Malcolm Loughhead, founders of the Lockheed Aircraft Company, established an aviation manufacturing plant in the City of Burbank in 1928. The plant produced 50 types of planes and employed a staff of 150 (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:60). Two years later, the United Airport (now the Hollywood Burbank Airport) opened as the largest commercial airport in Los Angeles County (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:90). By 1941, the Lockheed-Vega Aircraft Plant facility became the City of Burbank's biggest employer, employing 44,839 people. The facility's number of staff doubled by the end of the war so that in 1945, 80,800 people were employed producing America's first jet fighter, the Lockheed P-80 Shooting Star (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:106).

In addition to industrial development associated with the aerospace industry, the City of Burbank became a hub for the entertainment industry. First National Pictures constructed its studios on the 75-acre former David Burbank Ranch in 1926. Two years later, First National was bought by Warner Brothers Studio (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:61). Other movie studios followed. Walt Disney established a 51-acre studio 0.5 mile east of Warner Brothers studio, and Columbia Ranch established a 40-acre studio near Hollywood Way and Oak Street (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:91). During World War II, movie studios helped the war efforts by camouflaging the Lockheed-Vega Aircraft plant with faux streets and vegetation on chicken-wired trees covered with feathers, providing the surrounding landscape with a three-dimensional appearance to thwart Japanese attacks (Casey 2012). After the war, the City of Burbank's population increased from 62,348 in 1946 to 78,577 in 1950 (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:128). In 1952, the National Broadcasting Corporation (NBC) established its headquarters in the City of Burbank and developed television sound stages (Galvin Preservation Associates, Inc. 2009:132). NBC's complex was completed by 1962. The airport was purchased from Lockheed through a tri-city authority (Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena) and became known as such until 2003. The city's downtown area was subject to revitalization during the late 1980s; a number of restaurants and shops opened in the area, and the Golden Mall was re-opened, allowing traffic to once again flow down San Fernando Boulevard.

### 3.4.2.2 Regulatory

This section identified laws, regulations, and ordinances that are relevant to the impact analysis of cultural resources in this PEIR.

## Federal

### The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)

#### Certified Local Governments (CLG)

The Certified Local Government Program (CLG) was introduced in the 1980 amendment to the NHPA, to encourage and fiscally support local governments with the identification, evaluation, registration, and preservation of historic properties in communities. In addition, local government entities are encouraged to integrate their historic preservation programs with local planning and decision-making processes. The CLG program is administered through a partnership of the local municipality, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and NPS.

The primary requirements of the CLG program include:

- Enforcing appropriate state and local laws and regulations for the designation and protection of historic properties
- Establishing a historic preservation review commission by local ordinance
- Maintaining a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties
- Providing for public participation in the local preservation program
- Satisfactorily performing responsibilities delegated to it by the State

#### Secretary of the Interior Standards

The Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) Standards and Guidelines for the treatment of Historic Properties (Standards) were developed by the National Park Service (NPS) to provide guidance in historic preservation best practices. The Standards were introduced in 36 CFR Part 68, (1995) and while they are advisory and not regulatory practices, they are considered essential in carrying out historic preservation responsibilities at the local, state, and federal levels.

Each approach, be it preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction provide the accepted standards for repair, replacement, alteration and maintenance of historic properties and historic materials. Each of these terms (preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction) have very specific definition as they relate to historic preservation and historic properties. There are specific guidelines for the treatment of historic properties as well as cultural landscapes, sustainability, and rehabilitation.

#### ***Standards for Preservation:***

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically

and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection and properly documented for future research.

4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color, and texture.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

#### ***Standards for Rehabilitation***

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.



10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

***Standards for Restoration***

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that interprets the property and its restoration period.
2. Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection and properly documented for future research.
4. Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials.
7. Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.
8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
9. Archaeological resources affected by a project will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
10. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

***Standards for Reconstruction***

1. Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property.
2. Reconstruction of a landscape, building, structure, or object in its historic location will be preceded by a thorough archaeological investigation to identify and evaluate those features and artifacts that are essential to an accurate reconstruction. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
3. Reconstruction will include measures to preserve any remaining historic materials, features and spatial relationships.

4. Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.
5. A reconstruction will be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.
6. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

## State

### California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)

§ California Public Resource Code (PRC) Section 5024.1 establishes the CRHR. The register lists all California properties considered to be significant historical resources. The CRHR also automatically includes all properties listed or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, including properties evaluated under Section 106, and California Historical Landmarks No. 770 and higher.

The CRHR regulations govern the nomination of resources to the CRHR (California Code of Regulations [CCR], tit. 14 § 4850). The regulations set forth the criteria for eligibility as well as guidelines for assessing historical integrity and resources that have special considerations. The CRHR criteria closely parallel those of the NRHP. A resource must be determined to be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the four criteria (paraphrased below) in order to be eligible:

- **Criterion 1**—Resources associated with important events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history
- **Criterion 2**—Resources associated with the lives of persons important to our past
- **Criterion 3**—Resources that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master
- **Criterion 4**—Resources that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

The CRHR definition of integrity and its special considerations for certain properties are slightly different than those for the NRHP. Integrity is defined as “the authenticity of an historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance.” The CRHR further states that eligible resources must “retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance,” and lists the same seven aspects of integrity used for evaluating properties under the NRHP criteria.

### California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

PRC Section § 21084.1 defines historical resources as those listed, or eligible for listing, in the CRHR, or those listed in the historical register of a local jurisdiction (county or city) unless the preponderance of the evidence demonstrate that the resource is not historically or culturally significant. NRHP-listed “historic properties” located in California are considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA and are also listed in the CRHR. The CRHR criteria for listing such resources are based on, and are very similar to, the NRHP criteria.

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 provides specific guidance for determining the significance of impacts on historical resources (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(b)). According to CEQA, a project that causes a *substantial adverse change* in the significance of a *historical resource* or a *unique archaeological resource* has a significant effect on the environment (CCR Title 14 § 15064.5; PRC § 21083.2). CEQA defines a *substantial adverse change* as (CCR Title 14 § 15064.5(b)):

- Physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired; or
- Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
- Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by the lead agency.

Under CEQA these resources are called “historical resources” whether they are of historic or prehistoric age.

### **Historical Resources**

The term *historical resource* includes, but is not limited to any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of PRC § 5020.1(j). Historical resources may be designated as such through three different processes:

1. Official designation or recognition by a local government pursuant to local ordinance or resolution (PRC § 5020.1(k))
2. A local survey conducted pursuant to PRC § 5024.1(g)
3. The property is listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP (PRC § 5024.1(d)(1))

### **State Owned Historical Resources**

PRC § 5024(b) requires every state agency in California to inventory structures over 50 years of age which may be NRHP-eligible, or eligible for registration, or listed, as a California Historical Landmark (CHL) under their jurisdiction. These lists are submitted to the SHPO, whose office establishes the standards for these submittals, and the SHPO maintains a master list of these inventoried structures (PRC § 5024 (d)). The function of PRC § 5024 is to support the formulation of policies to preserve and maintain historical resources under each state agencies jurisdiction (PRC § 5024(a)). For the purposes of PRC § 5024 and 5024.5 (discussed below), “state agency” is defined as

any agency, department, division, commission, board, bureau, officer, or other authority of the State of California.

In line with the requirements to identify and preserve historical resources, PRC § 5024.5 prohibits state agencies from altering the original or significant historical features or fabric, or transfer, relocate, or demolish historical resources on the master list maintained pursuant to subdivision (d) of § 5024 without, early in the process, first giving notice and a summary of the proposed action to the SHPO who will have 30 days after receipt of the notice and summary for review and comment. Similar to both NHPA and CEQA, PRC § 5024.5, if the proposed action is found to have an adverse effect on a listed historical resource, the relevant state agency person in charge and the SHPO will implement prudent and feasible measures to eliminate or mitigate the anticipated adverse effects; the State Historical Building Safety Board will be consulted for advice when appropriate. PRC § 5024.5 also provides guidance for the process of documenting SHPO concurrence, mediation, and information dispersion.

### **Unique Archaeological Resources**

A *unique archaeological resource* is defined in Section 21083.2 of the California Public Resources Code as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria.

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and for which there is a demonstrable public interest
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person

In most situations, resources that meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource also meet the definition of *historical resource*. As a result, it is current professional practice to evaluate cultural resources for significance based on their eligibility for listing in the CRHR. For the purposes of this CEQA cultural resources study, a resource would be considered significant if it meets the CRHR eligibility (significance and integrity) criteria.

Even without a formal determination of significance and nomination for listing in the CRHR, the lead agency can determine that a resource is potentially eligible for such listing, to aid in determining whether a significant impact would occur. The fact that a resource is not listed in the CRHR, or has not been determined eligible for such listing, and is not included in a local register of historic resources, does not preclude an agency from determining that a resource may be a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

### **Health and Safety Code 7050.5 (HSC 7050.5)/Public Resources Code 5097.9**

Health and Safety Code 7050.5 addresses the protection of human remains discovered in any location other than a dedicated cemetery and makes it a misdemeanor for any person who knowingly mutilates or disinters, wantonly disturbs, or willfully removes any human remains in or from any location other than a dedicated cemetery without authority of law, except as provided in PRC Section 5097.99. It further states that in the event of discovery or recognition of any human

remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there will be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined that the remains are not subject to the provisions concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in PRC Section 5097.98. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she will contact the NAHC by telephone within 24 hours. Whenever the NAHC receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from the county coroner, it will immediately notify those people it believes to be the Most Likely Descendants of the deceased Native American. The descendants may inspect the site of the discovery and make recommendations on the removal or reburial of the remains.

### **California Government Code Section 6254 (r) and 6254.10**

California Government Code Sections 6254(r) and 6254.10 of the California Public Records Act were enacted to protect archaeological sites from unauthorized excavation, looting, or vandalism. Section 6254(r) explicitly authorizes public agencies to withhold information from the public relating to “Native American graves, cemeteries, and sacred places maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission.” Section 6254.10 specifically exempts from disclosure requests for “records that relate to archaeological site information and reports, maintained by, or in the possession of the Department of Parks and Recreation, the State Historical Resources Commission, the State Lands Commission, the Native American Heritage Commission, another state agency, or a local agency, including the records that the agency obtains through a consultation process between a Native American tribe and a state or local agency.”

## **Regional**

### **Los Angeles County**

In unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, the county’s Historic Preservation program establishes the criteria and procedures for the designation, preservation and maintenance of landmarks and historic districts. The Historic Preservation Ordinance (HPO) was adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in 2015; as of 2020, there are only three properties listed on the Los Angeles County Historical Landmarks Registry, none of which are designated historic districts. The resources included in Part A, 1-5 can include archaeological sites. Most often, archaeological resources are eligible under Criterion 4 for data potential if:

- A. A structure, site, object, tree, landscape, or natural land feature may be designated as a landmark if it is 50 years of age or older and satisfies one or more of the following criteria:
  - 1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the history of the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located;
  - 2. It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in the history of the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located;

3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, architectural style, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder whose work is of significance to the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located; or possesses artistic values of significance to the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located;
  4. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, significant and important information regarding the prehistory or history of the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located;
  5. It is listed, or has been formally determined eligible by the United States National Park Service for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places, or is listed, or has been formally determined eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing, on the California Register of Historical Resources;
  6. If it is a tree, it is one of the largest or oldest trees of the species located in the County; or
  7. If it is a tree, landscape, or other natural land feature, it has historical significance due to an association with a historic event, person, site, street, or structure, or because it is a defining or significant outstanding feature of a neighborhood.
- B. Property less than 50 years of age may be designated as a landmark if it meets one or more of the criteria set forth in Subsection A, above, and exhibits exceptional importance.
- C. The interior space of a property, or other space held open to the general public, including but not limited to a lobby, may be designated as a landmark or included in the landmark designation of a property if the space qualifies for designation as a landmark under Subsection A or B, above.
- D. Historic Districts. A geographic area, including a noncontiguous grouping of related properties, may be designated as a historic district if all of the following requirements are met:
1. More than 50 percent of owners in the proposed district consent to the designation;
  2. The proposed district satisfies one or more of the criteria set forth in Subsections A.1 through A.5, above; and
  3. The proposed district exhibits either a concentration of historic, scenic, or sites containing common character-defining features, which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan, physical development, or architectural quality; or significant geographical patterns, associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of parks or community planning.

The *Los Angeles County General Plan*, adopted on October 6, 2015, does not contain a stand-alone historic preservation element. However, Goal C/NR 14: Protected historic, cultural, and paleontological resources, provides six policies for the protection of these resources:

- **Policy C/NR 14.1:** Mitigate all impacts from new development on or adjacent to historic, cultural, and paleontological resources to the greatest extent feasible.
- **Policy C/NR 14.2:** Support an inter-jurisdictional collaborative system that protects and enhances historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.
- **Policy C/NR 14.3:** Support the preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings.
- **Policy C/NR 14.4:** Ensure proper notification procedures to Native American tribes in accordance with Senate Bill 18 (2004).

- **Policy C/NR 14.5:** Promote public awareness of historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.
- **Policy C/NR 14.6:** Ensure proper notification and recovery processes are carried out for development on or near historic, cultural, and paleontological resources.

## Local

### City of Long Beach (Frame 1 and Frame 2)

The City of Long Beach participates in the Certified Local Government (CLG) program. As a CLG, they have the responsibility of reviewing and commenting on development projects for compliance with state (and federal) environmental regulations. It has a Cultural Heritage Ordinance that allows for the designation of individual structures and district. There is a City of Long Beach Cultural Heritage Commission that advises the Planning Commission and City Council on historic preservation issues. The Commission may also administer design guidelines for designated buildings (City of Long Beach 2010).

As a CLG, with a Cultural Heritage Ordinance in place, overseen by a Cultural Heritage Commission, this municipality will require coordination regarding historic resources when a plan is proposed within their borders.

The City of Long Beach has a Historic Preservation Ordinance, located in Chapter 2.63 of Volume 1, Administration and Personnel title of the Long Beach Municipal Code. The purpose of the City of Long Beach Historic Preservation Ordinance is the recognition, preservation, protection and use of cultural resources are necessary to the health, property, social and cultural enrichment, and general welfare of the people.

A resource may be recommended for designation as a landmark or landmark district if it manifests one or more of the following criteria:

- A. It possesses a significant character, interest, or value attributable to the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, the Southern California region, the State, or the nation; or
- B. It is the site of a historic event with a significant place in history; or
- C. It is associated with the life of a person or persons significant to the community, City, region, or nation; or
- D. It portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style; or
- E. It embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or engineering specimen; or
- F. It is the work of a person or persons whose work has significantly influenced the development of the City or the Southern California region; or
- G. It contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which represent a significant innovation; or
- H. It is a part of or related to a distinctive area and should be developed or preserved according to a specific historical, cultural, or architectural motif; or
- I. It represents an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood or community due to its unique location or specific distinguishing characteristic; or

- J. It is, or has been, a valuable information source important to the prehistory or history of the City, the Southern California region, or the State; or
- K. It is one of the few remaining examples in the City, region, State, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type; or
- L. In the case of the designation of a tree(s) based on historic significance, that the tree(s) is (are) associated with individuals, places and/or events that are deemed significant based on their importance to national, State and community history; or
- M. In the case of the designation of a tree(s) based on cultural contribution, that the tree(s) is (are) associated with a particular event or adds (add) significant aesthetic or cultural contribution to the community. (ORD-09-0003, § 1, 2009)

Archaeological resources are included in the list of potential resources which could be designated as a landmark or landmark district by the Cultural Heritage Commission and meeting criteria described in the *City of Long Beach General Plan Part 2.63.040*.

### **City of Los Angeles (Frames 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9)**

The City of Los Angeles has a historic preservation ordinance: Ordinance No. 185472 (passed in 1962), which amended the Los Angeles Administrative Code to clarify the criteria for designation of local historic resources, known as Historic-Cultural Monuments (HCMs). It established the Cultural Heritage Commission and related rules and qualifications, and provided the definition of an HCM:

“...any site (including significant trees or other plant life located on the site), building or structure of particular historic or cultural significance to the City of Los Angeles.”

HCMs may be designated by the City Council after a recommendation by the Cultural Heritage Commission if meets one or more of the following criteria: (Section 22.171.7, revised 2018)

1. Is identified with important events of national, state, or local history or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, economic, or social history of the nation, state, city, or community;
2. Is associated with the lives of historic personages important to national, state, city, or local history; or
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction; or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder, or architect whose individual genius influenced his or her age.

In addition to HCMs, the city has an ordinance that establishes local historic districts, known as Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs). The HPOZ program began in 1983, and to date more than 20 HPOZs have been designated throughout the city. The Los Angeles Municipal Code, Ordinance No. 184903, Section 12.20.3, established that each HPOZ would have a historic resources survey, which would identify contributing and non-contributing elements, included a context statement, and established the criteria for consideration as Contributing Element:

1. Adds to the Historic architectural qualities or Historic associations for which a property is significant because it was present during the period of significance, and possesses historic integrity reflecting its character at that time; or
2. Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established feature of the neighborhood, community, or city; or



3. Retaining the building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature, would contribute to the preservation and protection of an historic place or area of historic interest in the City (Section F[3][C]).

Section 3, *Archaeological and Paleontological*, of Chapter II, *Resource Conservation and Management*, in the *City of Los Angeles General Plan* states that the city has a primary responsibility in protecting significant archaeological resources. Under the Archaeological and Paleontological objective, policy, and program, the policy is to continue 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.

The Conservation Element of the *City of Los Angeles General Plan* (aka OurLA), adopted in September 2001, states the following on page II-7:

Under the city's CEQA guidelines, an environmental assessment must be prepared for any proposed demolition, destruction or significant modification of an Historic-Cultural Monument or resource listed on the national or state registers, or on the Community Redevelopment Agency list, or cited as a proposed historical resource by a community plan or historic preservation overlay zone survey, or which are over 50 years old and are substantially intact examples of an architectural style important in Los Angeles or are associated with an architect or other person of importance in Los Angeles history. Under the 1998 amendment, buildings less than 50 years old may also be considered.

This document identifies the City of Los Angeles's policy to continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources that may be potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition, or property modification activities, and provides a general list of mandated activities or processes to meet this policy's requirements:

Program 1: development permit processing, monitoring, enforcement and periodic revision of regulations and procedures (II-9).

Responsible City of Los Angeles departments include Building and Safety, City Planning, Cultural Affairs and Community Redevelopment Agency (which has been eliminated since 2001) and/or the lead agency responsible for the permit implementation.

In addition, there are 35 community plans in the City of Los Angeles, of which the following 14 apply to the project study area:

1. Wilmington – Harbor City [Frame 1]
2. Southeast Los Angeles [Frame 4, 5]
3. Central City [Frame 5]
4. Boyle Heights [Frame 5]
5. Central City North [Frame 5]
6. Northeast Los Angeles [Frame 5, 6]
7. Silver Lake -Echo Park – Elysian Valley [Frame 6]
8. Hollywood [Frame 6, 7]
9. North Hollywood – Valley Village [Frame 7, 8]
10. Sherman Oaks – Studio City – Toluca Lake – Cahuenga Pass [Frame 7, 8, 9]

11. Van Nuys – North Sherman Oaks [Frame 8]
12. Encino – Tarzana [Frame 8, 9]
13. Reseda – West Van Nuys [Frame 9]
14. Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills -West Hills [Frame 9]

### **City of Carson (Frame 2)**

The City of Carson does not include a historic preservation element in its general plan. It also does not have a historic preservation ordinance, a dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, an active landmark designation, or a citywide historic resources survey. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resource ordinances.

### **City of Compton (Frames 2 and 3)**

The City of Compton does not include a historic preservation element in its general plan. It also does not have a historic preservation ordinance, dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, active landmark designation, or citywide historic resources survey. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resource ordinances.

### **City of Cudahy (Frame 3)**

The City of Cudahy does not include a historic preservation element in its general plan. It also does not have a historic preservation ordinance, dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, or active landmark designation. A survey of “old” houses in the community was completed in 1984, but no updated or recent historic resources surveys have been completed since that time. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resources ordinances in Cudahy.

### **City of Downey (Frame 3)**

The City of Downey does not include a historic preservation element in its general plan. It also does not have a historic preservation ordinance, dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, active landmark designation, or citywide historic resources survey. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resources ordinances.

### **City of Lynwood (Frame 3)**

The City of Lynwood does not include a historic preservation element in its general plan. It also does not have a historic preservation ordinance, dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, active landmark designation, or citywide historic resources survey. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resources ordinances.

### **City of Paramount (Frame 3)**

The City of Paramount does not include a historic preservation element in its general plan. It also does not have a historic preservation ordinance, dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, active landmark designation, or citywide historic resources survey. However, the City of Paramount does have Resource Management Policies that pertain to historic preservation and cultural resources. The Resource Management Element focuses on four key issue areas: cultural resources (historic and archaeological), ecological resources (plant and animal life), natural

resources (air, water, and minerals), and open space resources used for recreation. The Resource Management Policy addresses the maintenance and preservation of important natural and cultural resources for the enjoyment and use of future generations.

- **Resource Management Element Policy 20** – The City of Paramount will identify and preserve those sites/buildings that are important to the community for the benefit of the future generations that will reside or work in the city.

### City of South Gate (Frame 3)

Chapter 7.68 of the South Gate Municipal Code, “Preservation of Cultural Heritage,” sets forth the method for the City of South Gate’s city council to designate culturally significant landmarks if a site or improvement meets one or more of the following criteria:

- A. It possesses a significant character, interest, or value attributable to the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city, the Southern California region, the state of California or the United States of America or if it is associated with a person whose life is historically significant; or
- B. It is the site of an historic event with a significant place in history; or
- C. It exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community; or
- D. It portrays the environment in an era of history characterized by a distinctive architectural style; or
- E. It embodies those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or engineering specimen; or
- F. It is the work of a person or persons whose work has significantly influenced the development of the city or the Southern California region; or
- G. It contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship which represent a significant innovation; or
- H. It is a part of or related to a distinctive area that is developed according to a specific historical, cultural, or architectural motif; or
- I. It represents an established and similar visual feature of a neighborhood or community due to its unique location or specific distinguishing characteristics; or
- J. It is, or has been, a valuable information source important to the prehistory or history of the City of South Gate, the Southern California region, the state of California or the United States of America.

However, as of 2020, the city does not have a designated historic preservation commission, preservation staff, ability to designate historic districts, or historic resource survey.

Adopted in 2009, *South Gate General Plan 2035* does not address cultural resources within the city’s jurisdiction. However, the general plan notes that 13.8 percent of its housing stock was built in 1939 or earlier, 48.2 percent was constructed between 1940 and 1959, and an additional 17.7 percent of these buildings date to between 1960 and 1969.

### City of Bell (Frame 4)

The City of Bell has included a Historic Preservation Element in the *City of Bell 2030 General Plan* (City of Bell 2018), and it has identified a list of identified significant sites. There are seventeen in total, all commercial structures and all located on Gage Avenue. The City of Bell does not have a

historic preservation ordinance, dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, active landmark designation, or citywide historic resources survey. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resources ordinances.

#### **City of Bell Gardens (Frame 4)**

The City of Bell Gardens has a historic preservation ordinance; however, it does not have dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, active landmark designation, or citywide historic resources survey. The *City of Bell Gardens General Plan 2010* does not include a historic preservation element. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resources ordinances.

#### **City of Commerce (Frame 4)**

The City of Commerce has a historic preservation ordinance; however, it does not have dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, active landmark designation, or citywide historic resources survey. The City of Commerce does not include a historic preservation element in its general plan. However, Section 1.6.2, *Cultural Resources*, in the *City of Commerce 2020 General Plan* lists four resource management policies related to cultural resources and historic preservation.

- **Resource Management Policy 2.1** – The City of Commerce will strive to preserve the history of the city and any historical places in the city, such as the railroad station and the rubber tree in the vicinity of Olympic and Goodrich Boulevards.
- **Resource Management Policy 2.2** – The City of Commerce will evaluate other potential significant sites in the community and will continue to recognize the city’s cultural and historical resources.
- **Resource Management Policy 2.3** – The City of Commerce will document local historic sites and promote the public’s awareness of these resources.
- **Resource Management Policy 2.4** – The City of Commerce will explore opportunities for the development of a city museum and cultural center.

#### **City of Huntington Park (Frame 4)**

The City of Huntington Park has a historic preservation ordinance, dedicated preservation staff, a designated historic preservation commission, and a historic resources survey from 2006 that has not been updated since that time. None of the resources surveyed in 2006 are in the project study area. The *City of Huntington Park 2030 General Plan* does not include a historic preservation element. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resource ordinances.

Title 9 (Zoning), Chapter 3, Article 18 (9-3.1806) of the Huntington Park Municipal Code provides the Criteria for designation of historic resources to the Huntington Park Historic Register:

- A. Historic Resource. A Historic Resource is a building, structure, site, object, landscape, sign, or contributing member to a Historic District that is significant in American history, architecture, engineering, archeology, or culture and is designated by the City according to the following criteria:
  1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the history of the City, Region, State or Nation;
  2. Associated with the lives of persons who are significant in the history of the City, Region, State or Nation;

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a Historic Resource property type, period, architectural style, or method of construction, or that is a representation of the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder whose work is significant to the City, Region, State or Nation, or that possesses high artistic values that are of City, Regional, Statewide, or National significance;
  4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history of the City, Region, State or Nation.
- B. A Historic Resource designation may include significant public or semi-public interior spaces and features. The criteria used to determine if an interior is significant includes the following:
1. Historically the space has been open to the public; and
  2. The materials, finishes and/or detailing are intact or later alterations are reversible; and
  3. The plan, layout and features of the space is illustrative of its historic function; or
  4. Its form and features articulate a particular concept of design; or
  5. There is evidence of distinctive craftsmanship.
- C. Historic Signs. A Historic Sign will include all signs designated historically significant by the Historic Preservation Commission and such sign meets the criteria described in Section 9-3.1806(A)(3). All other regulations described in Title 9, Chapter 3, Article 12 of this Code will also apply.
- D. Historic District. A Historic District is an area that is geographically defined as possessing a concentration of Historic Resources or a thematically related grouping of properties which contribute to each other and is designated by the City according to the procedures set forth by the National Register of Historic Places Bulletin #21: "Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties" and the following criteria:
1. The grouping of properties are unified by planned or physical development or a significant and distinguishable entity of citywide importance;
  2. The components of the properties may lack individual distinction but are important as a collection representing one or more of a defined historic, cultural, development and/or architectural context(s).

### **City of Maywood (Frame 4)**

The City of Maywood has a historic preservation ordinance, which established a "voluntary historic resource designation program" (Ordinance 10-03). Landowners of potential historic properties, structures or improvements can apply to the City of Maywood's Planning Director to request a historic designation, detailing which of the criteria applies to their specific property (Section 5-45.04). Section 5-45.03 of the Maywood Municipal Code provides the local criteria for the designation of historic resources or historic sites in Maywood:

Prior to any site or specific improvement (or any portion thereof) being designated as an historic resources or historic site, any or all of the following National Register of Historic Places criteria will be applied:

- A. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city's cultural, social, economic, civic aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history.
- B. It is identified with persons or events significant in local, regional, state, or national history.

- C. It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, design ideology, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.
- D. It is representative of the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect.
- E. It contributes to the significance of an historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of not less than fifty (50) percent of historic or scenic properties or thematically related grouping of properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development.
- F. It has a unique location or singular physical characteristic(s) or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the City.
- G. It embodies elements of architectural design, detail materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation.
- H. It is similar to other distinctive properties, sites, areas, or objects based on an historic, cultural, or architectural motif.
- I. It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning.
- J. It is one of the few remaining examples in the city, region, state, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type or specimen.

However, the City of Maywood does not have dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, active landmark designation, or citywide historic resources survey. The *City of Maywood General Plan* does not include a historic preservation element. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resource ordinances.

#### **City of Vernon (Frame 4)**

The City of Vernon does not include a historic preservation element in its general plan. It also does not have a historic preservation ordinance, dedicated historic preservation commission or staff, active landmark designation, or citywide historic resources survey. Additionally, there are no specific archaeological or cultural resource ordinances.

#### **City of Glendale (Frame 6)**

The City of Glendale has a historic preservation ordinance (Title 15.20.050 of the Glendale Municipal Code), which enables the City of Glendale to designate historic resources provided that the proposed historic resource meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. The proposed historic resource is identified with important events in national, state, or city history, or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, political, economic, social, or historic heritage of the nation, state, or city;
2. The proposed historic resource is associated with a person, persons, or groups who significantly contributed to the history of the nation, state, region, or city;
3. The proposed historic resource embodies the distinctive and exemplary characteristics of an architectural style, architectural type, period, or method of construction; or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder, or architect whose genius influenced his or her profession; or possesses high artistic values;

4. The proposed historic resource has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to archaeological pre-history or history of the nation, state, region, or city;
5. The proposed historic resource exemplifies the early heritage of the city.

Glendale Municipal Code Section 30.25 establishes the designation and regulation procedures for historic district overlay zones in the city. Historic District Overlay Zones are similar to historic districts, meaning geographically definable areas that possess significant concentrations, linkages, or continuity of properties that constitute more than 60 percent of the total properties in the district, and which are united historically and aesthetically by plan or physical development. The designation criteria are:

- A. Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or natural history;
- B. Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history;
- C. Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
- D. Represents the work of notable builders, designers, or architects;
- E. Has a unique location or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood community or of the city;
- F. Embodies a collection of elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation;
- G. Reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning;
- H. Conveys a sense of historic and architectural cohesiveness through its design, setting, materials, workmanship, or association; or
- I. Has been designated a historic district in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources. (Ord. 5399 Attach. A, 2004)

Chapter 2.76 of the Glendale Municipal Code provides for the creation of a Historic Preservation Commission and covers the requirements for appointment to and qualifications for the commission members, as well as meeting procedures and powers of the commission. The City of Glendale maintains a list of historically important sites in Glendale and historic districts, also known as the Glendale Register of Historic Resources.

The *City of Glendale General Plan's* Historic Preservation Element includes the following goals and objectives that are specific to this section:

**Goal 1:** Preserve historic resources in Glendale which define community character

- 1-6 Discourage demolition of historic resources
- 1-7 Encourage the preservation and maintenance of historic landscaped areas
- 1-8 Encourage the preservation of individual historic resources and historic themes and historic geographic districts
- 1-10 Support the preservation and maintenance of historic street furniture including street lights.

**Goal 2:** Create and continue programs and practices which enable an appreciate of history and historic preservation in Glendale.

- 2-18 Support the preservation of street furniture in its original location
- 2-19 Support the reuse of historic street furniture in historically appropriate settings when its original location is not feasible.
- 2-27 Discourage relocation of historic resources
- 2-30 Establish a program which requires mitigation monitoring to include payment of fees to subsidize preservation of historic resources and storage space for artifacts.

### **City of Burbank (Frame 7)**

The City of Burbank regulates preservation of historic resources through its Historic Resource Management Ordinance (Division 6. Historic Preservation Regulations). City of Burbank Ordinance 3381 was adopted in 1994 and established the Burbank Heritage Commission and local historic preservation regulations. It established the following ten criteria for designation of a property as a Historic Place or a Structure of Merit:

- A. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city's cultural, social, economic, civic, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history;
- B. It is identified with persons or events significant in local, regional, state, or national history;
- C. It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, design ideology, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
- D. It is representative of the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect;
- E. It contributes to the significance of an historic area, being a geographically definable areas possessing a concentration of not less than fifty percent (50%) of historic or scenic properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan of physical development;
- F. It has a unique location or singular physical characteristic(s) or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the City of Burbank;
- G. It embodies elements of architectural design, detail materials or craftsmanship that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation;
- H. It is similar to other distinctive properties, sites, areas, or objects based on historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
- I. It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning;
- J. It is one of the few remaining examples in the city, state, region, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type of specimen.

The *Burbank2035 General Plan*, adopted on February 19, 2013, includes discussion of historical and cultural sites in several places where goals and policies are mentioned. Within the Land Use Section, Goal 3 relates to community design and character, laying out policies to maintain a strong sense of place and "small town" feeling. Policy 3.10 states, "Preserve historic resources, buildings, and sites, including those owned by private parties and government agencies, including the City of Burbank. Alter such resources only as necessary to meet contemporary needs and in a manner that does not affect the historic integrity of the resource." Policy 3.11 states, "Carefully consider the evolution of community character over time. Evaluate projects with regard to their impact on historic character,



their role in shaping the desired future community character, and how future generations will view today's Burbank.”

Furthermore, Goal 6 (Open Space Resources), Policy 1.2 in the Open Space and Conservation section describes involving community groups in the identification, acquisition, and management of natural resource areas, recreation facilities, historical and cultural sites, and aesthetic and beautification programs. Policy 6.1 states that it is City policy to recognize and maintain cultural, historical, archaeological, and paleontological structures and sites essential for community life and identity.

### 3.4.3 Resources Within the Project Study Area

#### 3.4.3.1 Identification Efforts and Methods

This section describes the background literature search and framework for identifying historical resources in the project study area (i.e., the LA River channel and 1 mile on either side of the LA River). Although a cultural resources records search is typically a first step in obtaining all available cultural resources surveys and site records for a site-specific project area of potential impact (API), no formal records search was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center, which is located at California State University Fullerton. As this is a program-level analysis, the broad nature of the record search results would have been quickly invalid for use at the project-level; therefore, rather than conduct a records search, location-specific historical research was completed. The South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) is a branch of the California Historical Resources Information Center, which maintains the State of California's official records of previously recorded cultural resource studies, recorded archaeological and historical sites. SCCIC maintains the records for Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Ventura, and Orange Counties. A formal records search will be conducted during environmental analysis of specific subsequent projects and locations when identified as later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. (See Mitigation Measure CR-1 below.) Archaeological resource data is not publicly available and thus not included in this PEIR analysis, archaeological resource locations will be obtained as subsequent location- and project-specific records searches are conducted for later activities.

Without the basis for a formal record search, the identification of potential historical resources has been completed through a series of steps. If a municipality was identified in the regulations presented in Section 3.4.2.2, *Thresholds of Significance*, to have a historical register or to have conducted surveys of historical resources, a desktop search was completed to obtain that material. These data was available in various forms, such as embedded lists, Microsoft Word, and Adobe Acrobat pdfs (either embedded in a secondary website or available for download), in one case as a Google Map, and through open source ArcGIS data. Using addresses or coordinates (depending on which was available), each historical resource was mapped using Google Earth Pro. These layers, when laid over the project study area, provided the data shown in the tables in Section 3.4.3.2, *Resources Identified in the Project Study Area*.

The following information sources were reviewed as part of the desktop background literature search .

- NRHP National Park Service online website
- Office of Historic Preservation Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD)

- California Historical Landmarks
- California Points of Historical Interest
- California Historical Resource Inventory System
- California Register of Historical Resources
- County of Los Angeles Landmarks List (general plan)
- *City of Bell 2030 General Plan*
- City of Burbank Heritage Commission website
- City of Cudahy Residential Survey (1984)
- *City of Glendale General Plan*, Historic Preservation Element
- City of Glendale Historic Register
- City of Glendale Historic District Master List
- Glendale Register of Historic Resources Google Map
- City of Burbank Historic Preservation Plan
- *City of Long Beach General Plan*, Historic Preservation Element
- City of Long Beach historic context
- City of Long Beach Districts and Landmarks lists (online)
- City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments list
- City of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Overlay Zone Program
- SurveyLA historic resource information at [historicplacesla.org](http://historicplacesla.org)
- *South Gate General Plan 2035*
- Los Angeles Conservancy Report Card
- Los Angeles Public Library
- Historic Aerials (NETR Online)

Table 3.4-1 through Table 3.4-6 are presented in the next section for informational purposes only based on the best information that could be obtained from the desktop search at the time of preparation of this draft PEIR, and provide some initial insight on potential historical resources for when specific subsequent project locations are identified and are in initial planning or design stages. However, similar to what has been stated above with archaeological resources, a formal records search at the SCCIC will need to be conducted as specific subsequent projects and their locations are identified to be guaranteed the latest available and most accurate data for historical resources.

### 3.4.3.2 Resources Identified in the Project Study Area

With the aim of identifying historical resources in the project study area, data sources listed in Section 3.4.3.1, *Identification Efforts and Methods*, were reviewed, specifically to establish whether each community had: 1) A historic preservation element in their general plan, 2) A historic preservation ordinance, 3) A historic preservation staff person or commission, and 4) Any historical

resources register or historical resources survey. The results of that literature review are discussed in this section.

The following section provides, in tabular form, the historical resources that are located within 1 mile to either side of the LA River, by community.

## LA River Flood Channel (Frames 1 through 9)

Within all frames, there is one common feature: the LA River Flood Channel (Channel), which is part of a larger, countywide flood management system. The Channel could be defined as a structure or a site, or even a district, for the purposes of CEQA, but this linear resource in its entirety has never been evaluated for eligibility for local, state, or federal historic registers. Although segments of the Channel have been evaluated for local, state, and federally funded projects for many years, those evaluations only looked at the relative significance of each segment individually, and/or as part of the larger resource, without explicitly evaluating the Channel as a whole. As discussed above, a formal records search at the SCCIC was not conducted as part of this exercise, so a comprehensive collection of all the recordation of the Channel was not possible. However, several of the most recent evaluations of segments of the river have been summarized below to demonstrate the discussions of potential eligibility, character-defining features, and integrity.

Some of the most recent evaluations of segments of the Channel have resulted in presumptive NRHP and/or CRHR eligibility, under Criterion A/1 and C/3, with one evaluation identifying character-defining features. Excerpts of these evaluations has been included below:

- The most recent was prepared as part of a Phase 1 Cultural Resource Investigation for the Water Wheel Project, north of Downtown Los Angeles (Applied Earthworks 2009). The report recorded a 2,366 foot long segment of the Channel near the Lincoln Heights neighborhood, finding that it appeared to be a contributing element of a potential district that includes the 51-mile-long Channel, under Criterion A/1 for its association with flood management in the greater Los Angeles region and its role in the development of river-adjacent areas in greater Los Angeles. In addition, the authors stated that the Channel appears to be eligible under Criterion C/3 as a significant USACE design and construction project. The period of significance for this potential district was recorded as 1938-1960. The segment of the Channel was found to retain integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship, and association with the Channel. Furthermore, the distinctive characteristics of the Channel were found to be intact:
  - The trapezoidal reinforced concrete channels,
  - The parapet paved berms, and
  - The central trench at the bottom to guide water flow.
- In 2013, a 7-mile stretch of the Channel in the Glendale Narrows location was evaluated (DPR 2013) and while also considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP under any criteria, maintained integrity of location, design, materials, feeling and association for the period of significance of 1939. This evaluation also stated:

While the system as a whole may be viewed as historically important, this particular section of the LA River channel does not possess any special or noteworthy associations with the flood control program developed and implemented by the USACE the organization primarily responsible for its implementation.

- In addition to these most recent evaluations, the American Society for Civil Engineers Los Angeles Section considers the Los Angeles County Total Flood Control System to be a historic civil engineering landmark (Landmark No. 38), which naturally includes the entire LA River (<http://67.225.175.217/ASCE/ASCE-Region-9-Landmarks/LosAngelesSection/All-Landmarks/38-LosAngelesCountyTotalFloodControlSystem/los-angeles-county-flood-control-district.htm>, accessed June 28, 2020).

For the purposes of this document, therefore, the LA River Flood Channel has a California Historical Resource Status Code “7N,” “Needs to be reevaluated – formerly coded as may become NR eligible with specific conditions.”

### Los Angeles County, Unincorporated (Frames 2 through 4, Frame 7)

Chapter 22.124.130 of the Los Angeles County historic preservation ordinance discusses the designation of county-owned properties as a landmark; there are no landmarked county-owned properties within 1 mile to either side of the LA River.

### Long Beach (Frame 1 and Frame 2)

**Table 3.4-1. City of Long Beach Historical Resources within 1 mile to Either Side of the LA River**

Name	Address/Location	Designation <sup>1</sup>	OHP Status Code <sup>2</sup>
First Congregational Church of Long Beach	241 Cedar Avenue	Local, NRHP -listed	1S <sup>3</sup>
The Willmore	315 W. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street	Local, NRHP-listed	1S
First National Bank of Long Beach	101 Pine Avenue	Local, NRHP-listed	1S
Long Beach Professional Building	117 E. 8 <sup>th</sup> Street	Local, NRHP-listed	1S
US Post Office – Long Beach Main	300 Long Beach Boulevard	Local, NRHP-listed	1S

<sup>1</sup> Properties listed in these tables have been either been identified in a local survey or listed on a local register, listed in the CRHR, or eligible for listing or listed in the NRHP.

<sup>2</sup> OHP Status codes are used to classify historical resources by providing a shorthand way to understand the level of identification, evaluation, and designation: <https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1068/files/Resource-Status-Codes.pdf>. Current as of 3/1/2020.

<sup>3</sup> OHP Status Code 1S: Individual property listed in NRHP by the Keeper. Listed in the CRHR.

### City of Los Angeles (Frame 1, Frames 5 through 9)

**Table 3.4-2. City of Los Angeles Historical Resources within 1 mile to Either Side of the LA River**

Historic Cultural Monument Number	Name	Address	Designation
3	Plaza Church	535 North Main Street and 100–110 Cesar Chavez Avenue	HCM <sup>1</sup> , 1D <sup>2</sup>

<b>Historic Cultural Monument Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Designation</b>
6	Bradbury Building	300–310 South Broadway and 216–224 West 3rd Street	HCM, 1D, 1S
9	Shadow Ranch House	22633 Vanowen Street	HCM, 2S2/3D
17	Saint Vibiana's Cathedral	110–136 East 2nd Street	HCM, 2S2
22	Palms – Southern Pacific Railroad Depot	3800 Homer Street	HCM
26	Site of the First Cemetery of Los Angeles	521 North Main Street	HCM
29	Site of Campo De Cahuenga	3919 Lankershim Boulevard	HCM
32	Saint Saviour's Chapel Harvard School	3700–3946 Coldwater Canyon Avenue	HCM, 3S
37	Fire Station No. 23	225 East 5th Street	HCM, 1S
40	Hale House (Heritage Square)	3800 Homer Street	HCM, 1S
42	San Antonio Winery	738–744 Gibbons Street and 725–749 Lamar Street	HCM
48	Chavez Ravine Arboretum	Elysian Park	HCM
54	6th Street Wooden Bridge Across Hollenbeck Park Lake	Hollenbeck Park Lake	HCM
64	Los Angeles Plaza Park	Alameda Street	HCM, 1D
65	Valley Knudsen Garden and Residence (Heritage Square)	3800 Homer Street	HCM
67	Cedar Trees	Los Feliz Boulevard (between Riverside Drive and Western Avenue)	HCM
82	River Station Area	1231 North Spring Street	HCM, 2S2
97	Residence	1620 Pleasant Avenue	HCM
98	Mount Pleasant House (Heritage Square)	3800 Homer Street	HCM, 1S
101	Los Angeles Union Station Passenger Terminal and Grounds	800–850 North Alameda Street and 357 Aliso Street	HCM, 2D <sup>3</sup> /3S <sup>4</sup>
102	Residence	1030 Cesar E. Chavez Avenue	HCM
108	Beaudry Avenue House	3800 Homer Street	HCM
110	Los Angeles Police Academy Rock Garden	1880 North Academy Road	HCM
111	Hollywood Sign and land underneath (Griffith Park perimeter)	Mount Lee	HCM
123	Lovell House	4616 Dundee Drive	HCM, 1S <sup>5</sup>
124	Tierman House	2323 Micheltorena Street	HCM
126	Franklin Avenue Bridge (Shakespeare Bridge)		HCM, 2S2 <sup>6</sup>

<b>Historic Cultural Monument Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Designation</b>
138	Coca Cola Building	1200–1334 South Central Avenue	HCM, 3S
144	Residence	2054–2056 Griffin Avenue	HCM
145	Residence	3537 Griffin Avenue	HCM
150	Los Angeles City Hall	200 North Spring Street	HCM, 2S2
153	Lincoln Park Carousel	Valley Boulevard and Mission Road	HCM
156	Fire Station No. 1	2230 Pasadena Avenue	HCM
157	Residence	3110 North Broadway	HCM
161	Wolfer Printing Company Building	416–426 South Wall Street and 301–311 Winston Street	HCM
162	William Mulholland Memorial Fountain	Riverside Drive and Los Feliz Boulevard	HCM
163	Animation School for the Walt Disney Studios from 1935-1940	2646–2664 and 2710–2746 Griffith	HCM
164	Glendale-Hyperion Bridge, Bridge #53C-1179		HCM, 2S2
184	Tower of Wooden Pallets	15357 Magnolia Boulevard	HCM
211	Granite Block Paving (Between Alameda and N. Main St.)		HCM
224	Macy Street Viaduct (between Mission and Vignes), Bridge #53C-130	Cesar E. Chavez Avenue (between Mission Road and Vignes Street)	HCM, 2S2
228	Laurelwood Apartments	11833–11847 Laurelwood Drive	HCM
245	Lincoln Avenue Church Building (Heritage Square)	3800 Homer Street	HCM, 3S
261	Lincoln Heights Branch Library	2530 Workman Street	HCM, 1S
271	Farmers and Merchants Bank Building	401–411 South Main Street	HCM, 1D/3S
281	Cathedral High School	1253 Bishops Road	HCM, 2S2
288	Barclay Hotel	103–107 W. 4th Street	HCM, 1D
290	La Reina Theater	14626 Ventura Boulevard	HCM
293	The Magnolia	13242 Magnolia Boulevard	HCM
312	Japanese Union Church of Los Angeles	120–122 North San Pedro Street	HCM
313	Los Angeles Homba Hongwanji Buddhist Temple	355–369 East 1st Street and 109–119 North Central Avenue	HCM, 1D/2S2
322	Fletcher Drive Bridge over the LA River, Bridge #53C-0096	Fletcher Drive	HCM, 2S2
337	Engine Company No. 56	2838 Rowena Avenue	HCM

<b>Historic Cultural Monument Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Designation</b>
384	Department of Water and Power Building	2417 Daly Street	HCM, 2S2
388	Edison Electric Company, Los Angeles #3 Steam Power Plant	650 South Avenue 21	HCM, 2S2
396	Federal Bank Building	2201 North Broadway	HCM
401	Feliz Adobe	4730 Crystal Springs Drive	HCM
404	Los Angeles Railway Huron Substation	2640 North Huron Street	HCM
413	Octagon House (Heritage Square)	3800 Homer Street	HCM
422	Silverlake and Ivanhoe Reservoir	Armstrong Avenue	HCM
442	Albion Cottages and Milagro Market	1801-1813 Albion Street	HCM
443	Bowman Residence	2425 Griffin Avenue	HCM
468	Sacred Heart Church	2801 Baldwin Street and 2210-	HCM, 3S
474	Little Nugget (Travel Town - Griffith Park)	5200 Zoo Drive	HCM,
481	Mauer House	932 Rome Drive	HCM
483	J.B. Merrill House	815 Elyria Drive	HCM
488	Canoga Park (original Owensmouth Southern Pacific R.R. Station)	21355 Sherman Way	HCM
533	Residence	2660 Sichel Street	HCM
553	Midtown School	4155 Russell Avenue	HCM
569	Van De Kamp's Holland Dutch Bakery	3016-3020 San Fernando Road and 2900-30 Fletcher Drive	HCM
587	Lincoln Heights Jail / Los Angeles City Jail	401-449 North Avenue 19	HCM, 2S4 <sup>7</sup>
590	Brooklyn Avenue Neighborhood Corridor	Cesar E. Chavez Avenue (between Cummings Street and Mott Street)	HCM, 2S2
592	Philosophical Research Society	3341-3351 Griffith Park Boulevard and 3910-3918 Los Feliz Boulevard	HCM
615	San Pedro Firm Building	108-116 North San Pedro Street	HCM, 1D/2S2
638	El Paradiso	11468 Dona Cecilia Drive	HCM
640	Richard and Dion Neutra VDL Research House	2300 Silver Lake Boulevard	HCM
676	Neutra Office Building	2379 Glendale Boulevard	HCM, 1S
683	Chase Knolls Garden Apartments	13401 West Riverside Drive	HCM
691	Carl C. Warden Residence	878 North Rome Drive	HCM
700	Canoga Park Branch Library	7260 Owensmouth Avenue	HCM

<b>Historic Cultural Monument Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Designation</b>
704	John R. Hunt House	2055 North West Silver Lake Drive	HCM
713	Santa Fe Hospital	610 South Saint Louis Street	HCM
728	San Fernando Building	400 South Main Street	HCM, 1S
729	Hellman Building	411 South Main Street and 410 South Spring Street	HCM, 3D <sup>8</sup>
735	Jeffries House	571 Cypress Avenue	HCM
759	Gerst Residence	3437 Adina Drive	HCM
763	Studio Theatre at the Denis Building	3433 Cahuenga Boulevard West	HCM
770	Red Car Trestle Footings	Fletcher Drive and Riverside Drive	HCM
788	Sears, Roebuck and Co. Mail Order Building	2650 East Olympic Boulevard	HCM, 1S
795	Santa Fe Inbound Freight House	355 South Santa Fe Avenue and 960 East 3rd Street	HCM, 2S3
807	Church of the Epiphany	2808 North Altura Street	HCM, 1S
825	Chinatown West Gate	954 North Hill Street	HCM
826	Chinatown East Gate	945 North Broadway	HCM
828	Harry J. Wolff House	4000 North Sunnyslope Avenue	HCM
839	Paul Landacre Cabin and Grounds	2006 West El Moran Street	HCM
845	Mount Washington Hotel / Self Realization Fellowship International Headquarters	3880 and 3846 San Rafael Avenue	HCM
849	Nickel Leong Mansion	3501-3511 Thorpe Street	HCM
860	Kallis House	3580 North Multiview Drive	HCM
868	O'Neill Duplex No. 1	2342-2344 West Cove Avenue	HCM
869	Bakman House	10623 Riverside Drive	HCM
872	Raphael Junction Block Building	1635-1637 North Spring Street	HCM
873	Higgins Building	108 West 2nd Street	HCM
888	National Biscuit Company Building	1850 Industrial Street	HCM
891	Boyle Hotel - Cummings Block	101-105 North Boyle Avenue	HCM, 1S
892	Nin-Pole Residence	2335 Hidalgo Avenue	HCM
895	How House	2422 North Silver Ridge Avenue	HCM
897	Haven of Rest	2432 North Hyperion Avenue	HCM



<b>Historic Cultural Monument Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Designation</b>
900	North Spring Street Bridge, No. 53C0859		HCM, 2S2
901	North Main Street Bridge, No. 53C1010		HCM, 2S2
902	Olympic Boulevard Bridge, Bridge No. 53C0163		HCM, 2S2
903	Washington Boulevard Bridge, No. 53C1375		HCM, 2S2
904	Seventh Street Bridge, No. 53C1321		HCM, 2S2
906	Fourth Street Bridge, No. 53C0044		HCM, 2S2
907	North Broadway-Buena Vista Street Bridge, No. 53C0545		HCM, 2S2
908	Riverside-Figueroa Bridge, No. 53C0160		HCM, 6Y <sup>9</sup>
909	First Street Bridge, No. 53C1166		HCM, 2S2
910	Riverside-Zoo Drive Bridge, No. 53C1298		HCM, 2S2
918	Lydecker Hilltop House	3820 Buena Park Drive	HCM
920	Aoyama Tree	119 North Central Avenue	HCM
922	Edward A. "Tink" Adams House	2331 West Cove Avenue	HCM
937	Westinghouse Electric Building	420 South San Pedro Street	HCM
942	Griffith Park	2715 Vermont Avenue	HCM, 2S2
964	Ross House	2123 North Valentine Street	HCM
965	Wilson House	2090 North Redcliff Street	HCM
966	Douglas Building	257 South Spring Street	HCM
972	Shire Art House	2354 South Vista Gordo Drive	HCM
973	Henry Shire Residence	2208 North Princeton Avenue	HCM
976	Corbin Palms House	6118 North Jumilla Avenue	HCM
977	Idle Hour Café	4824 Vineland Avenue	HCM
982	Gless Farmhouse	131 South Boyle Avenue	HCM, 2S2
1004	Richard Henry Dana Branch Library	3320 Pepper Street	HCM, 1S
1009	Heritage Square Museum	3800 Homer Street and 3504 Pasadena Avenue	HCM
1011	McAlmon House	2717 West Waverly Drive	HCM
1014	Ward-Berger House	3156 North Lake Hollywood Drive	HCM
1017	Young-Gribbling Residence	3320 North Griffin Avenue	HCM
1024	Lechner House	11600 West Amanda Drive	HCM

<b>Historic Cultural Monument Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1025	Durex Model Home	3410 North Amesbury Road	HCM
1026	Sherwood House	3435 Amesbury Road	HCM
1065	McTernan Residence	2226 North Wayne Avenue	HCM
1072	Ray S. Linn House	7820 W Mulholland Drive	HCM
1076	Presburger House	4255 Agnes Avenue	HCM
1082	Laurel Terrace Street Trees		HCM
1101	Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center	1700 East Stadium Way	HCM, 2D2
1109	Casa De Mi Sueno	3820 East San Rafael Avenue	HCM
1111	Jules Salkin Residence	1430 West Avon Terrace	HCM
1116	Albert Van Luit Complex	4000-4010 East Chevy Chase Drive	HCM
1139	Catalina Swimwear	336 East Winston Street	HCM
1144	Ortiz Taylor House	2650-2656 North Lake View Avenue	HCM
1154	Joannes Brothers Company Building	310 South Hewitt Street	HCM
1159	Albert R. Bell Residence	4217-4221 Agnes Avenue	HCM
1160	Standard Oil Company Sales Department Building / Woman's Building	1727 North Spring Street	HCM
1161	The Ralph G. Walker House	2100 North Kenilworth Avenue	HCM
1163	Corbin Palms Model H-3	6134 North Jumilla Avenue	HCM
1166	Sabsay House	2351 North Silver Ridge Avenue	HCM
1174	Times Mirror Square	100-142 South Broadway	HCM
1189	Hunter Ranch House	1309 Killarney Avenue	HCM
1198	Tokio Florist/Sakai-Kozawa Residence	2718 North Hyperion Avenue	HCM
1205	C.B. Van Vorst Co. Manufacturing Plant/Santa Fe Art Colony	2401 S. Santa Fe Avenue	HCM
1200	Willard Bell Residence	4233 N Agnes Avenue	HCM
1204	Hawk House	2421-2425 Silver Ridge Avenue	HCM
1199	Arthur and Nina Zwebell Residence	4227 N Agnes Street	HCM

<sup>1</sup> HCM: Historic Cultural Monument

<sup>2</sup> OHP Status Code 1D: Contributor to a district or multiple resource property listed in NRHP by the Keeper. Listed in the CRHR.

<sup>3</sup> OHP Status Code 2D: Contributor to a district determined eligible for NRHP by the Keeper. Listed in the CRHR.

<sup>4</sup> OHP Status Code 3S: Appears eligible for NRHP as an individual property through survey evaluation.

<sup>5</sup> OHP Status Code 1S: Individual property listed in NRHP by the Keeper. Listed in the CRHR.

<sup>6</sup> OHP Status Code 2S2: Individual property determined eligible for NRHP by a consensus through Section 106 process. Listed in the CRHR.

- <sup>7</sup> OHP Status Code 2S4: Individual property determined eligible for NRHP pursuant to Section 106 without review by SHPO. Listed in the CRHR.
- <sup>8</sup> OHP Status Code 3D: Appears eligible for NRHP as a contributor to a NRHP eligible district through survey evaluation.
- <sup>9</sup> OHP Status Code 6Y: Determined ineligible for NRHP by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for CRHR or Local Listing.

### Cudahy (Frame 3)

A survey of “old” houses in Cudahy was completed in 1984, but no updated or recent historic resources surveys have been completed since that time. Twenty-one houses in Cudahy’s residential neighborhoods were selected for survey on the basis of unique architectural significance. A review of that survey reveals 18 of those “old” houses are located in the project study area.

**Table 3.4-3. City of Cudahy “Old Houses” within 1 mile of the LA River**

Name	Address/Location	Designation	OHP Status Code
Unknown	8212 Atlantic Avenue	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	7505 Atlantic Avenue	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	5159 Clara Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	5224 Clara Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	5260 Clara Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	4820 Elizabeth Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	5000 Elizabeth Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	5016 Elizabeth Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	5257 Elizabeth Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	4728 Live Oak Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	5037 Live Oak Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	5041 Live Oak Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	5309 Live Oak Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	4446 Santa Ana Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	4768 Santa Ana Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	4948 Santa Ana Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A
Unknown	4956 Santa Ana Street	Old House Survey, 1984	6U <sup>1</sup>
Unknown	7315 Wilcox Street	Old House Survey, 1984	N/A

<sup>1</sup> OHP Status Code 6U: Determined ineligible for NRHP pursuant to Section 106 without review by Office of Historic Preservation (OHP)

### Bell (Frame 4)

The City of Bell maintains a list of identified significant sites. There are 17 in total, all commercial structures and all located on Gage Avenue; two are in the project study area.

**Table 3.4-4. City of Bell Significant Sites within 1 mile of the LA River**

Name	Address/Location	Designation	OHP Status Code
J & V Auto Repair Services	4612 Gage Avenue	Local	6Y
Rocio's Fashion	4722 Gage Avenue	Local	N/A

### Glendale (Frame 6)

There are six structures listed on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources, consisting of two bridges and four buildings. Please see the table below for additional information.

**Table 3.4-5. City of Glendale Historic Resources within 1 mile of the LA River**

Name	Address/Location	Designation	OHP Status Code
Concord Street Bridge/ Bridge No. 53C-0742	Over Verdugo Flood Control	Local	N/A
Taylor House	1027 Glenwood Road	Local	N/A
Grand Avenue Air Terminal	1310 Air Way	Local, NRHP-listed	1S <sup>1</sup>
Kenilworth Avenue Bridge/ Bridge No. 53C-0741	Over Verdugo Flood Control	Local, NRHP-eligible	2S2 <sup>2</sup>
Southern Pacific Rail Depot	400 W. Cerritos Avenue	Local, NRHP-listed	1S
Seeley's Building	1800 S. Brand Boulevard	Local	N/A

<sup>1</sup> OHP Status Code 1S: Individually listed in the NRHP by the Keeper. Listed in the CRHR.

<sup>2</sup> OHP Status Code 2S2: Individually determined eligible for NRHP by consensus through Section 106 process. Listed in the CRHR.

In addition, the City of Glendale has completed the North Glendale Historic Context (2012) and an associated Community Plan and is in the process of completing the South Glendale Community Plan and Historic Context.

### Burbank (Frame 7)

There are eight officially designated historic resources in the city, and the City of Glendale maintains a list of potentially significant properties. The city's historic preservation ordinance provides for the City of Glendale Planning Department to maintain this inventory of potentially significant historic places, structures, and improvements. Only one designated historic resource is located in the project study area, and it is listed in the table below.

**Table 3.4-6. City of Burbank Historic Resources within 1 mile of the LA River**

Name	Address/Location	Designation	OHP Status Code
Bob's Big Boy	4211 Riverside Drive	N/A	7P <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OHP Status Code 7P: State Point of Historical Interest that does not meet CR criteria.

Of the remaining ten cities in the project study area, all lacked a historic preservation element in their general plans (with Compton including a historic preservation element in their *Draft Compton General Plan 2030*). The Cities of Bell Gardens, Commerce, Huntington Park, Maywood, and South Gate all have historic preservation ordinances, but only Huntington Park has dedicated preservation

staff or a commission. The Cities of Bell Gardens, Commerce, and Huntington Park have designated historical resources, or conducted a survey of local historical resources, but none of those listed are located in the project study area. These results have been provided in Table 3.4-7 below.

**Table 3.4-7. Cities With No Historical Resources within 1 mile of the LA River**

City	Historic Preservation Element/Plan	Historic Preservation Ordinance	Historic Preservation Staff or Commission	Historic Register or Survey
Bell Gardens	No	Yes	No	Yes. No resources in the project study area.
Carson	No	No	No	No
Commerce	No	Yes	No	Yes. No resources in the project study area.
Compton	Yes * draft general plan	No	No	No
Downey	No	No	No	No
Huntington Park	No	Yes	Yes	Yes. No resources in the project study area.
Lynwood	No	No	No	No
Maywood	No	Yes	No	No
Paramount	No	No	No	No
South Gate	No	Yes	No	No

## 3.4.4 Impact Analysis

### 3.4.4.1 Methods

This analysis qualitatively evaluates the impacts of the proposed Project on existing aesthetic resources as a result of the construction and operations of the proposed Project. The analysis determines if there is the potential for impacts on existing resources in the 18 jurisdictions in the study area during construction and operation. Data from jurisdictions' respective general plans, design guidelines, and municipal codes, as well as site visits to the LA River in March 2020, were used to evaluate impacts on scenic vistas and resources, visual quality, and light and glare. Impacts associated with Typical Projects (i.e., the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways), the six kit of parts (KOP) categories, and related design components—as well as the *2020 LA River Master Plan* in its entirety—are analyzed qualitatively at a program level. Where the two Typical Projects or the six KOP categories have similar impacts related to a specific criterion, the discussion is combined. Where differences between the Typical Projects or the KOP categories are identified, the impact analysis is presented separately.

### 3.4.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

- 3.4(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.
- 3.4(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.
- 3.4(c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

### 3.4.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

#### **Impact 3.4(a): Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**

##### **Typical Projects**

##### **Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways**

##### ***Construction***

Construction of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects would involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials to build facilities such as cafés, pavilions, restrooms, multi-use trails, art/performance spaces. Construction would generally occur along the right-of-way (ROW) and include an area of approximately 3 acres (for Common Elements) or up to 40 acres (for the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways) and last 10 to 20 months, respectively. Ground disturbance would include site clearing and excavation. Excavation would be to a maximum depth of 7 feet below ground surface (bgs) to construct pavilions and install footings for bollards, lighting, or fences and generally 2 feet bgs for trails.

Depending on the specific design and location of the project, as well as the type of cultural resource(s) that could be located on or near the site, construction of the Typical Projects may cause a substantial adverse change in historical resources in or near the Typical Project area. As discussed in Section 3.4.3.2, *Resources Identified in the Project Study Area*, segments of the Channel have been found eligible as contributing features of a potential historic district that includes the 51-mile-long Channel; character-defining features of the Channel that have been called out specifically are the parapet paved berms, trapezoidal channels, and central trench at the bottom. New construction has the potential to cause ground disturbance, demolish historical resources or alter character-defining features of historical resources, and/or make changes to the setting of historical resources. These factors may result in an adverse change to a significant historical resource, resulting in a significant impact.

##### ***Impact Determination***

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures***Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.**

For later activities under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, during design and prior to construction, the implementing agency will conduct a cultural resources assessment to determine the potential for presence of historical/built, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources.

As part of this assessment, the implementing agency will identify sensitive historical resources that physically may be outside the construction area, but could be affected by changes in noise levels or alterations to visual continuity, if these features are important to the significance of the historical resources. During the design phase of the Project, the implementing agency will conduct a records search/literature review. The records search will be conducted at the South Coastal Central Information Center and will cover a quarter-mile around the location-specific project study area. The records search will provide background information on cultural surveys and site identification and will be supplemented by reviewing the maps/tables of identified historical resources. For the literature review, additional background research conducted online and in person will be conducted.

Required information sources will include, at a minimum:

- NRHP National Park Service online website (<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm> and <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm>)
- Office of Historic Preservation ([https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=30338](https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=30338))
  - California Historical Landmarks
  - California Points of Historical Interest
  - California Historical Resource Inventory System
  - California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)
- Local historical societies
- Local registers and general plans
- Sacred Land File Search at Native American Heritage Commission

Supplemental information sources that could be consulted include:

- Sanborn maps (available at the Los Angeles Public Library)
- Historic U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangles
- Historic aerial maps
- Ethnographic data
- Surface geological data

In addition to conducting literature review and searches, the implementing agency tiering from the PEIR will coordinate with the applicable California Native American Tribe, to verify the presence/absence of tribal cultural resources (TCRs) in the API. The California Native American

Tribe will identify TCRs and provide substantial documentation of the TCR per PRC Section 5024.1. All TCR documentation and information obtained during consultation will be confidential and not included in public documents.

If, following the records search, literature review, sacred land file search, and coordination with the tribe, it is determined that there are no historical/built, archaeological, and TCRs present in the API, then the impact would be less than significant and no further action is required.

If, following the records search, literature review, sacred land file search, and coordination with the tribe, it is determined that historical/built, archaeological, or TCRs are present in the API, then Mitigation Measure CR-1b would be implemented.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings.**

- **Conduct Field Survey of API:** The implementing agency will hire qualified architectural historians and/or historians and archaeologists to physically inspect the API, verify the presence or absence of known historical resources, and document potentially historical resources. This will be accomplished through intensive pedestrian surveys, photo-documentation, and written notes, at a minimum.
- **Record and Identify Cultural Resources:** Each historical resource and archaeological site that has been previously identified will be recorded with an updated California Natural Resources Agency – Department of Parks and Recreation DPR form (Continuation Sheet, DPR 523-L). Newly identified historical resources and archaeological sites will be recorded on DPR 523A (Primary Record), DPR 523B (Building, Structure, Object Record), and DPR 523J (Location Map), with recordation on DPR 523D (District Record), DPR 523E (Linear Feature Record), and DPR 523L (Continuation Sheet) completed as appropriate. DPR forms will be completed by a qualified architectural historian, historian, or archaeologist.
- **Prepare Technical Report and Evaluate Identified Resources:** The report will include the background, research, methods, results, and evaluation of any identified cultural resources. All cultural resources identified in the project area will be evaluated for their inclusion in the CRHR and, if determined to be historical resources (eligible), then a determination of impacts would occur. Each technical report, which includes proposed subsurface work elements, will need to include a buried site sensitivity analysis, which assesses the potential for the location-specific subsequent project study area to contain buried cultural deposits. For areas determined to be sensitive for buried deposits, archaeological monitoring will be required.

If, following the physical survey of the API, and eligibility determination, it is determined that the later activity *would not* cause an adverse change in the significance of a significant historical resource, then the impact would be less than significant, and no further action is required.

If, following the physical survey of the API, and eligibility determination, it is determined that the later activity *would* cause an adverse change in the significance of a significant historical resource, then the impact would be significant and Mitigation Measures CR-2a through CR-2c will be implemented.



**Mitigation Measure CR-2a: Avoid or Relocate Historical/Built Resources.**

If significant impacts are identified for historical/built resources after completing Mitigation Measures CR-1a and CR-1b, the implementing agency will implement one of the following measures:

- **Avoidance/Redesign:** Avoid historical resource impacts during the design process and require redesign of the Project to avoid impacts.
- **Relocation:** If a historical resource cannot be avoided but can be relocated (if location, setting, and association are not important aspects of its integrity or support the significance of the resource), then the following actions are required:
  - Contact local historical societies, community resource groups, and/or local groups with an interest in the type and/or style of the historical resource who may have a suitable site for relocation.
  - Contact specialized movers of historical resources to develop a plan for preparing of and moving of the resource from its original location and for conducting groundwork necessary for the transplanting of the resource to the new location.
  - Conduct photo documentation of the resource in the original and new locations.

**Mitigation Measure CR-2b: Prepare and Implement a Historical Resources Mitigation Plan during Construction.**

If historical resources are present in the API and cannot be avoided in the design stages, nor relocated, then the implementing agency will prepare a Historical Resources Mitigation Plan (HRMP) for Construction. The following actions are required in the preparation of the HRMP:

- Survey or photographic documentation of the historical resource before construction begins as a baseline condition for assessing damage
- Preparation of protocols for the documentation of inadvertent damage, should it occur, as well as notification to the appropriate owner and/or jurisdiction
- Strategy for repair of historical resource in accordance with the SOI's Standards

**Mitigation Measure CR-2c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Construction.**

If noise and/or vibration are considered a potential significant impact of construction, then instrumentation that will capture those impacts will be installed at a suitable location, as necessary (i.e., noise and/or vibration monitors), and qualified preservation architects and/or historic preservation specialists will review the feedback from those instruments on a regular basis. These instruments will monitor the historical resource for physical changes, such as cracks in the exterior material, or inadvertent changes to a historical resource, such as character-defining features falling from a structure, due to increased vibration. A preconstruction survey must be prepared for each individual historical resource to identify existing issues, such as cracks, or other damage, which must include general photos of the historical resource, detailed photos of existing damage, and detailed photos of potentially affected features. Instrumentation may be physically attached to building/structures or placed in close vicinity if damage would occur from the installation of the measuring instruments. Similarly, preconstruction noise surveys will establish base levels of noise if a quiet setting is a

character-defining features of the historic setting. During and post-construction noise measurements must be taken to determine if ambient or specific noise occurrences are present. Thresholds will be determined on a case-to-case basis. If impacts are discovered due to noise and vibration, then a strategy for repair in accordance with the Standards would be required. See Mitigation Measure CR-2b.

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

#### **Operations**

Activities related to the operation of the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects have the potential to cause substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources. For example, impacts could include damage to historical resources due to water and/or waste leakages from hygiene facilities, restrooms, and/or water features; if historical resources are integrated into the design of the proposed Project, increased foot traffic could affect the integrity of material. Depending on the project design and location, presence or absence of historical resources, and the character-defining features of the historical resource, the impact could be significant.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

##### **Mitigation Measure CR-3a: Avoid Impacts on Historical/Built Resources During Operations.**

If historical resources are identified within a project API during design of subsequent projects, indirect effects during operations will be avoided, including redesigning project elements. Specific steps to be taken during operations include but are not limited to the following:

- Secure resource from accessibility or visitation.
- Prepare an operations and maintenance/restoration plan to avoid degradation of resource. Identify a baseline of conditions (e.g., photo-documentation, written documentation) that is stored with the appropriate jurisdiction (e.g., Los Angeles County or other implementing agency) in the plan, with a requirement that the implementing agency or project proponent conduct visual inspection of the historical resource at least twice a year. The baseline condition report must be supplemented with yearly photographs, yearly updates on condition, and any additional reports related to vandalism, accidental damage due to humans or animals, and damage due to weather or earthquakes.

##### **Mitigation Measure CR-3b: Prepare and Implement Historical Resources Mitigation Plan for Operations.**

If historical resources are present in the API and potential effects cannot be avoided in the design stages or the resource cannot be relocated, then the implementing agency will prepare an HRMP for operations. The following actions will be implemented for the HRMP.

- Survey or photographic documentation of the historical resource will be completed before construction begins as a baseline condition for assessing damage.
- Protocols for the documentation of inadvertent damage, should it occur, will be prepared, and notification made to the appropriate owner and/or jurisdiction.
- Strategy for repair of historical resource will be developed in accordance with the SOI's Standards.

### **Mitigation Measure CR-3c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Operations.**

If it is determined that noise and/or vibration are considered a potential significant impact of operations, then instrumentation that will capture those impacts will be installed (i.e., noise and/or vibration monitors), and the feedback from those instruments will be reviewed on a regular basis by qualified preservation architects and/or historic preservation specialists.

These instruments will monitor the historical resource for physical changes, such as cracks in the exterior material, or inadvertent changes to a historical resource, such as character-defining features falling from a structure, due to increased vibration. A preconstruction survey must be prepared for each individual historical resource to identify existing issues, such as cracks, or other damage, which must include general photos of the historical resource, detailed photos of existing damage, and detailed photos of potentially affected features. Instrumentation may be physically attached to buildings/structures or placed in close vicinity if damage would occur from the installation of the measuring instruments. Similarly, preconstruction noise surveys will establish base levels of noise if a quiet setting is a character-defining feature of the historic setting. During and post-construction noise measurements must be taken to determine if ambient or specific noise occurrences are present. Thresholds would be determined on a case-to-case basis. If impacts are discovered, then a strategy would be required for repair in accordance with the Standards. See Mitigation Measure CR-2b.

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

### **2020 LA River Master Plan Kit of Parts**

Within all frames, the Common Elements Typical Project analyzed above could be implemented in whole or as a combination of its individual elements with all the KOP categories discussed below. Therefore, for potential impacts of Common Elements Typical Projects, see above. The impact discussion below focuses on specific KOPs only. Each of the KOPs is analyzed separately where differences in impacts exist; KOPs with similar impacts are grouped together. Appendix E presents a summary table of potential construction and operations impacts under each KOP category.

#### **KOP Categories 1 through 6**

##### ***Construction***

Construction activities for KOP Categories 1 through 6 would be similar and involve a variety of tasks and features, ranging from trail modifications to development of facilities, habitat corridors, flood management infrastructure, channel access ramps, affordable housing, and solar fields anywhere in the project study area. Design components of these KOPs may cause a substantial adverse change to historical resources in or near the project area. New construction has the

potential to cause ground disturbance, demolish historical resources, or alter character-defining features of historical resources and/or make changes to the setting of historical resources. These factors may result in an adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. Therefore, construction of KOP Categories 1 through 6 could result in potentially significant impacts associated with ground disturbance and changes to the setting, as well as alteration or demolition of historical resources.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-2a: Avoid or Relocate Historical/Built Resources.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-2b: Prepare and Implement Historical Resources Mitigation Plan during Construction.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-2c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Construction.**

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

#### ***Operations***

Potential impacts from operation of the design components under the KOPs would vary depending on the specific design component and its intended function, as well as on the specific location, including whether it is in-channel or off-channel. The specific location and design for these components has not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. As described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, operation of the KOPs could result in direct and indirect impacts on historical resources, including physical damage to historical resources within or along the proposed trails, due to intentional (i.e., vandalism) or inadvertent (i.e., accidental collision) actions. For example, the introduction of an amphitheater could affect the integrity of a sensitive historical resource due to the increase in noise, vibration, light, and/or glare. Considering the KOPs include a range of flood management, recreation, and ecological functions, and would involve landscapes, parks, and recreational facilities, operation of the KOPs could include such impacts as ground disturbance and changes to the setting, as well as alteration or demolition of historical resources.

These activities also could result in exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or removal of existing resources and previously unrecorded significant archaeological resources. Other KOP operations that include off-channel water features, floodplain storage, and

wetlands could expose previously undocumented surface-exposed or buried cultural resources through stream or off-channel degradation processes and water erosional processes related to floodplain storage activities.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-3a: Avoid Impacts on Historical/Built Resources During Operations.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-3b: Prepare and Implement Historical Resources Mitigation Plan for Operations.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-3c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Operations.**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation**

As described in the *2020 LA River Master Plan*, it is anticipated that approximately 107 projects ranging in size from extra-small (less than 1 acre) to extra-large (150+ acres/10+ miles) would be implemented over the 25-year horizon period to meet the proposed Project's nine objectives. These would include Typical Projects that would be implemented in specific spacing along the river and subsequent projects composed of the KOP categories' multi-benefit design components. These elements together comprise the entirety of the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. As described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, the greatest number of projects (85) anticipated under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are extra-small and small projects (up to 3 acres), followed by 10 medium projects (3 to 40 acres/5 miles in size), 11 large projects (40 to 150 acres/10 miles in size), and one extra-large project (150+ acres/10+ miles in size).

**Construction**

Construction impacts would be the same as for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* KOP categories. Some subsequent projects would cover more area than others, but the same general construction equipment and activities would be involved (e.g., the use of backhoes, trucks, hand-held power equipment, generators). As noted, some subsequent projects would be larger than others and include a wide variety of design components. Similar to the reasons identified above for the Typical Projects, the location, design details, and construction phasing of subsequent projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* are not known. Therefore, it is possible that construction activities could result in an adverse change to a significant historical resource, resulting in a significant impact.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-2a: Avoid or Relocate Historical/Built Resources.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-2b: Prepare and Implement Historical Resources Mitigation Plan during Construction.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-2c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Construction.**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

***Operations***

The operations impacts for the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be the same as for Typical Projects and KOPs described above. When constructed and operational, the 107 projects would include a range of flood management, recreation, and ecological functions, and would involve landscapes, parks, and recreational facilities, and could include such impacts as ground disturbance and changes to the setting, as well as alteration or demolition of historical resources. Activities related to these 107 projects have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources, including damage to historical resources; if historical resources are integrated into the design of the Project, then increased foot traffic could affect the integrity of material. Therefore, the impact could be significant.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-3a: Avoid Impacts on Historical/Built Resources During Operations.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-3b: Prepare and Implement Historical Resources Mitigation Plan for Operations.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-3c: Prepare Noise and Vibration Plan for Operations.**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

## **Impact 3.4(b): Would the proposed Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**

### **Typical Projects**

#### ***Construction***

Construction of the Typical Projects would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials. Construction would occur along the ROW and include an area of approximately 3 acres (for Common Elements) or up to 40 acres (for the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways) and last about 10 to 20 months, respectively. Ground disturbance would include site clearing and excavation. Excavation would be to a maximum depth of 7 feet bgs to construct pavilions and install footings for bollards, lighting, or fences, and generally 2 feet bgs for trails. Previously recorded or unrecorded CRHR-eligible archaeological resources could be present within the API of subsequent projects. Therefore, the construction of the Typical Projects could destroy, remove, disturb, and alter surface-exposed and buried archaeological resources, resulting in an adverse change in the significance of the resource.

#### ***Impact Determination***

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### ***Mitigation Measures***

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.**

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings.**

If it is determined that the Project would cause an adverse change to a significant historical/built archaeological resource or TCR, then the impact would be significant, and the following mitigation measures will be implemented in the order detailed below.

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-4a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist.**

The implementing agency will retain a qualified archaeologist defined as an archaeologist who meets the SOI's Standards for professional archaeology to carry out all mitigation measures related to prehistoric and historic period archaeological resources. The qualified archaeologist will be the subsequent project's Principal Investigator and will oversee and direct all archaeologists working on the subsequent project. For TCRs, a Native American Monitor, as determined by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during consultation, will coordinate with the Qualified Archaeologist as needed for mitigation measure implementation.

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-4b: Avoid Significant Archaeological Sites or TCRs through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas.**

If significant archaeological sites or TCRs are identified in the API, avoidance, where feasible, is the preferred method of treatment. Impacts on significant archaeological resources can be

avoided through establishing fencing around the known boundaries of these resources and delineating these locations as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs). Preservation in place of archaeological materials will maintain the critical relationship between archaeological artifacts and their archaeological context. Additionally, should sacred objects or objects of religious importance to Native American groups be identified, preservation in place avoids conflicts with traditional values of groups who ascribe meaning to these resources.

**Mitigation Measure CR-4c: Provide Archaeological and Native American Monitoring and Establish Archaeological Monitoring Plan.**

If avoidance is not feasible, and if the subsequent project-related ground disturbance is anticipated to occur at archaeological sites identified as a result of the archaeological fieldwork and inventory efforts, an archaeologist will be present to monitor ground-disturbing activity. If ground-disturbing activities are to proceed at archaeological sites that contain Native American cultural materials, a Native American monitor will be retained, in addition to an archaeological monitor. Prior to the commencement of fieldwork, an Archaeological Monitoring Plan (AMP) will be developed to guide archaeological monitoring work during ground-disturbing activities.

The AMP will be prepared and the Native American Consulting Tribes will be provided the opportunity to review and provide comments. The AMP will outline the requirement to conduct Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resource Awareness Training for construction workers and the qualifications necessary for archaeological monitors. The plan must also detail the locations where archaeological monitoring will take place and the depths of excavation that will require monitoring. The AMP must include roles and responsibilities for cultural resources staff and contact information for the Archaeological Principal Investigator, archaeological and Native American monitors, and appropriate management staff.

The AMP must detail monitoring procedures, discovery protocols, and general procedures for documenting and recovering archaeological materials, artifact identification, repository institution identification, associated repository fees, guidelines for preparing the archaeological monitoring, and the mitigation final report. The AMP must also include protocols for communication and response should an unanticipated discovery be made at times that archaeological monitors are not present.

The AMP must require attendance by construction personnel at a preconstruction meeting led by a Qualified Principal Investigator/Project Archaeologist. The Principal Investigator/Project Archaeologist will explain the likelihood for encountering archaeological resources, what resources may be discovered, and the methods that will be employed if anything is discovered (who to call, construction diversion away from the find, etc.). The AMP must include a sample proposed letter regarding transfer of salvaged materials to an appropriate museum curation facility, a sample daily monitoring report form, and recordation and analysis forms for all other pertinent archaeological resources.

The Native American monitor should be affiliated with a local Native American tribe. At a minimum, the archaeological monitor will meet the Society for California Archaeology professional qualification standards for an archaeological crew leader and will work under the direction of an individual that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology.



If unanticipated discoveries are made during archaeological monitoring, then the unanticipated discoveries protocol described in Mitigation Measure CR-5 will be enacted. This includes halting ground-disturbing activities for a reasonable period of time, consultation with the lead agency and Native American representatives (if the find is Native American in origin), development of a mitigation plan, and potential development and implementation of a data recovery plan. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the archaeological monitor will follow the HSC 7050.5 (Mitigation Measure CR-7), described in Section 3.4.2.2, *Regulatory*.

**Mitigation Measure CR-4d: Develop and Implement an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan to Evaluate Potentially Significant Archaeological Discoveries.**

If an existing archaeological resource cannot be avoided and has not been evaluated for the CRHR, then evaluation, testing excavations, recovery, and treatment will be needed to reduce the impacts on the resource. The implementing agency will develop an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan (AETP) that describes methods and procedures for conducting subsurface excavations to determine the vertical and horizontal extents of an archaeological site. Implementation of such a plan may include mechanical and/or manual excavations to provide data on the cultural constituents at the site and the depositional context of such materials (if found to exist). These data can be used to determine the integrity of the site and make a formal evaluation based on the eligibility criteria set forth in CEQA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for inclusion in the CRHR and NRHP. The AETP should define the parameters of archaeological testing at the site and the extent of excavation and analysis of any materials recovered. The AETP must also include guidelines for treatment and curation of any materials recovered during the testing process. Subsequent to implementation of the AETP, a technical report describing the methods and results of archaeological testing and formal evaluations of the archaeological sites and recommendations for further treatment will be completed. The AETP will be approved by the implementing agency and should involve consultation and review by interested Native American groups, if applicable.

**Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.**

If buried cultural resources of potential significance are discovered inadvertently during ground-disturbing activities, work will be temporarily halted in the area and within 50 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with the implementing agency. If the find is prehistoric or Native American in origin, consultation with local Native American tribes who have expressed interest and concern regarding the proposed Project will be undertaken.

The implementing agency's Principal Investigator will notify the implementing agency to discuss the significance determination and will also submit a letter indicating next steps required. If the discovery is determined to be not significant in consultation with the implementing agency, work will be permitted to continue in the area. If, in consultation with the implementing agency, a discovery is determined to be significant, the implementing agency will prepare a mitigation plan to be carried out in accordance with state guidelines. If the resource cannot be avoided, the implementing agency will develop a data recovery plan to ensure collection of sufficient information to address archaeological and historical-period research questions, with results presented in a technical report describing field methods, materials collected, and conclusions. The qualified archaeologist will treat recovered items in accordance with current professional

standards by properly proveniencing (i.e., establishing the *in-situ* location at the time of archaeological discovery), cleaning, analyzing, researching, reporting, and curating them in a collection facility meeting the SOI's Standards, as promulgated in 36 CFR 79.

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

#### **Operations**

Operational activities related to the Common Elements and Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways Typical Projects could include new single-story structures, such as pavilions and cafes, and restrooms, or lower-profile infrastructure, such as multi-use trails, signs, lighting, benches, and other associated recreational facilities that could introduce activities that may directly affect archaeological resources. Operation elements, such as increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas, could result from increased public use. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the Typical Projects near a CRHR-eligible archaeological resource could directly affect the resources either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance or increased looting potential due to increased use, and otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described above.

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.**

In addition, apply the following mitigation measure.

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-6: Avoid Archaeological Resources by Establishing Environmentally Sensitive Areas During Operations.**

The implementing agency will avoid significant archaeological resources through establishment of ESAs specific to Typical Projects' operations. If physical portions of previously identified archaeological resources are left in place after construction, then ESAs will be established to protect any remaining physical portions of the resource from further direct or indirect effects that may result as part of operations of Typical Projects. The implementing agency will establish ESAs in coordination and consultation with Native American Tribes, as necessary. As part of the operational avoidance activities, the implementing agency will:

- Prepare an operations and maintenance plan to minimize degradation of archaeological resources still extant in the API.
- Design and develop interpretive exhibits to provide education and understanding of the importance to avoid the resource.

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**2020 LA River Master Plan Kit of Parts****KOP Categories 1 through 6*****Construction***

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOPs would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could result in an adverse effect on a significant archaeological resource. Impacts may be direct through proposed ground disturbance that could destroy, remove, disturb, or alter surface-exposed and buried CRHR-eligible archaeological resources.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-4a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-4b: Avoid Significant Archaeological or TCRs Sites through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-4c: Provide Archaeological and Native American Monitoring and Establish Archaeological Monitoring Plan.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-4d: Develop and Implement an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan to Evaluate Potentially Significant Archaeological Discoveries.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

***Operations***

Potential impacts from operation of the design components under the KOPs would vary depending on the specific component and its intended function, as well as on the specific location, including in-

channel or off-channel. The specific location and design for these components has not been determined yet and would depend on numerous factors, including project proponent and availability of funding. As described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, and under the construction section above, the KOPs include a variety of construction scenarios that include ground-disturbing activities. The operation of the KOPs could result in significant impacts on CRHR-eligible archaeological resources, which include increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas due to increased public use, as well as increased potential for looting. These activities could result in exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or removal of existing resources and previously unrecorded archaeological resources. Other KOP operations that include off-channel water features and floodplain storage and wetlands could expose previously undocumented surface-exposed or archaeological resources through stream or off-channel degradation processes and water erosional processes related to floodplain storage activities.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-6: Avoid Archaeological Resources by Establishing Environmentally Sensitive Areas During Operations.**

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

### **Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation**

#### ***Construction***

The construction impacts of the 107 projects for the overall *2020 LA River Master Plan* implementation would be similar to impacts for the KOPs. Some projects would cover more area than others, but the same general construction equipment and activities would be involved (i.e., the use of backhoes, trucks, hand-held power equipment, generators, etc.). As noted, the projects are expected to be constructed over a 25-year period. Therefore, it is possible that construction activities could result in an adverse change to the significance of an archaeological resource, resulting in a significant impact.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-4a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-4b: Avoid Significant Archaeological or TCRs Sites through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-4c: Provide Archaeological and Native American Monitoring and Establish Archaeological Monitoring Plan.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-4d: Develop and Implement an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan to Evaluate Potentially Significant Archaeological Discoveries.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

***Operations***

The operations impacts of the 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would be similar to the impacts of the KOPs, which could result in significant impacts on CRHR-eligible archaeological resources. These impacts include increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas, due to increased public use and increased potential for looting. These activities could result in exposure, disturbance, and potential destruction through damage or removal of existing resources and previously unrecorded archaeological resources. Other KOP operations, which include off-channel water features and floodplain storage and wetlands, could expose previously undocumented surface-exposed or archaeological resources through stream or off-channel degradation processes and water erosional processes related to floodplain storage activities.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-6: Avoid Archaeological Resources by Establishing Environmentally Sensitive Areas During Operations.**

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**Impact 3.4(c): Would the proposed Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?****Typical Projects*****Construction***

Existing known cemeteries are not anticipated to be affected under any of the proposed project scenarios for the Typical Projects. However, there is potential for previously unknown prehistoric to historic period burials and unmarked cemeteries to be located in the project study area. Holocene-aged alluvial deposits, which could contain burials and previously unknown human remains, are located in the project study area. This is not uncommon where burials and human remains are located concurrently with certain archaeological site types; therefore, areas with increased sensitivity for containing archaeological deposits maintain an elevated sensitivity for containing human remains.

Construction of the Typical Projects would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, and import and export of materials. Construction would occur along the ROW and include an area of approximately 3 acres (for Common Elements) or up to 40 acres (for the Multi-Use Trails and Access Gateways). Ground disturbance would include site clearing and excavation up to a maximum depth of 7 feet bgs for pavilions, footings for bollards, lighting, or fences, and generally 2 feet bgs for trails. Any disturbance of human remains is considered significant. Therefore, construction of the Typical Projects could result in potentially significant impacts on human remains.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures***Mitigation Measure CR-7: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.**

If human remains are found, no further disturbance will occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98 (State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5). In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, all work within 50 feet of the find will be halted until the remains have been evaluated by the county coroner, and appropriate action taken in coordination with the NAHC, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code or, if the remains are Native American, Section 5097.98 of the PRC. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the county coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant. The Most Likely Descendant will complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

*Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**Operations**

Operational activities related to the Typical Projects could introduce or increase public use activities, such as increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the Typical Projects near buried human remains could indirectly affect the resources either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance or increased looting potential due to increased use and could otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-7: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.***Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**2020 LA River Master Plan Kit of Parts****KOP Categories 1 through 6****Construction**

Similar to the Typical Projects, construction of the KOPs would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, use of construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could disturb human remains, resulting in significant impacts.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measure, which is described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-7: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.***Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

### ***Operations***

Similar to the Typical Projects, potential impacts from operation of the design components under the KOPs could result in increased human activity, landscape use, and channel erosion, which could result in potentially significant impacts on human remains. Operational activities related to the Typical Projects could introduce or increase public use activities, leading to increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the KOPs near buried human remains could indirectly affect the resources, either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance, or increased looting potential due to increased use, and could otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-6: Avoid Archaeological Resources by Establishing Environmentally Sensitive Areas During Operations.**

#### *Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

## **Overall 2020 LA River Master Plan Implementation**

### ***Construction***

Similar to the KOPs, construction of all 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* would generally involve site disturbance, movement of construction equipment, use of construction staging areas, and import and export of materials, all of which could disturb human remains, resulting in significant impacts.

#### *Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1a: Conduct a Cultural Resources Assessment for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources to Determine the Presence of Resources.**

**Mitigation Measure CR-1b: Conduct Cultural Resources Investigations for Historical/Built Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources, and Implement Findings.**



**Mitigation Measure CR-4a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist.****Mitigation Measure CR-4b: Avoid Significant Archaeological or TCRs Sites through Establishment of Environmentally Sensitive Areas.****Mitigation Measure CR-4c: Provide Archaeological and Native American Monitoring and Establish Archaeological Monitoring Plan.****Mitigation Measure CR-4d: Develop and Implement an Archaeological Evaluation and Treatment Plan to Evaluate Potentially Significant Archaeological Discoveries.****Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.****Mitigation Measure CR-7: Avoid or Minimize Impacts on Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.***Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

***Operations***

Similar to the KOPs, potential impacts from operation of the design components for all 107 projects under the *2020 LA River Master Plan* could result in increased human activity, landscape use, and channel erosion, which could result in potentially significant impacts on human remains. Operational activities related to the 107 projects could introduce or increase public use activities, leading to increased erosion along proposed trail alignments, facilities, and recreational areas. Additionally, introducing recreationists and trail users near new facilities associated with the projects near buried human remains could indirectly affect the resources either through exposure and removal from unanticipated disturbance or increased looting potential due to the increased use and could otherwise negatively affect the integrity of the resource.

*Impact Determination*

Impacts would be potentially significant.

*Mitigation Measures*

Apply the following mitigation measures, which are described above.

**Mitigation Measure CR-5: Temporarily Halt Ground Disturbance for Unanticipated Discoveries per SOI Standards.****Mitigation Measure CR-6: Avoid Archaeological Resources by Establishing Environmentally Sensitive Areas During Operations.***Significance after Required Mitigation*

Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

## Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts on cultural resources would be the greater Los Angeles region, which is rich with historic and archaeological resources. Any project that adversely affects a historic and archaeological resource in this geographic area would contribute to a cumulative impact. A description of the regulatory setting and approach to cumulative impacts analysis is provided in Section 3.0.2.

### Criteria for Determining Significance of Cumulative Impacts

The proposed Project would have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on cultural resources, if, in combination with other projects within the greater Los Angeles region, it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

### Cumulative Condition

Historic and archaeological resources are important parts of the region's identity. These resources are nonrenewable and irreplaceable. Cumulative land use and transportation projects located in the Southern California region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact associated with the loss of cultural resources. Due to the regional scale of the cumulative plans and programs in the Los Angeles region and the potentially large number of cultural resources that could be disturbed as a result of their implementation, a significant cumulative impact would result through the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of a resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired (SCAG 2020). These projects are regulated by federal, state, and local regulations, including PRC Section 5097, the Mills Act, State Health and Safety Code 18950–18962, and the SOI's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, and they are required to comply with the regulations. City, County, and regional goals and policies also aim to preserve and protect significant cultural resources to the extent practicable. Even with regulations in place, individual historical resources could still be affected or degraded (e.g., from demolition, destruction, alteration, structural relocation) as a result of new private or public development or redevelopment and implementation of land use strategies under cumulative plans and projects (SCAG 2020). Notification and inventory of archaeological resources, implementation of an unanticipated discovery plan, and compliance with the PRC and the California Health and Safety Code mandatory processes that are required to be followed in the event of a discovery of any human remains would help mitigate potentially significant impacts, but they are expected to remain significant when considered cumulatively due to the large number of archaeological resources within the greater Los Angeles region and the likelihood of yielding undiscovered human remains (SCAG 2020). Therefore, a cumulative condition exists for cultural resources.

### Contribution of the Project to Cumulative Impacts

The proposed Project could result in impacts on historic resources or archaeological resources (e.g., uncover buried artifacts or features). Such resources include, but are not limited to, prehistoric stone tools, hearths, and midden soils; historic-period refuse deposits, privies, building foundations, basements, and structural materials; and historic-period infrastructure, such as water and electrical

conveyance systems and utility vaults. Deeper excavation may be required for utility relocations and trenching under the *2020 LA River Master Plan*. In most cases, a project that follows the SOI's standards for an affected historical resource would result in a less-than-significant impact on that historical resource, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. However, although uncommon, there are cases when the SOI's standards cannot be followed or a substantial material change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource occurs even after following SOI's standards. Considering the existing significant cumulative impacts for cultural resources in the greater Los Angeles region, it would be reasonable to infer that the proposed Project could result in localized significant impacts on cultural resources. Mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce the Project's individual impacts (Mitigation Measures CR-1a-b, CR-2a-c, CR-3a-c, CR-4a-d, CR-5, CR-6, and CR-7). However, the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable despite implementation of mitigation. Therefore, the proposed Project's contribution to cumulative cultural resources impacts is considerable.