

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

4.12 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Acronyms

AB	Assembly Bill
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
NAHC	California Native American Heritage Commission
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SLF	Sacred Lands File

This section addresses the potential for the existence of tribal cultural resources on the proposed Project Site and in the proposed Project area, and the potential for Project impacts on those resources. The analysis of tribal cultural resources provided in this section is based on a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search conducted by the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), project notification and offer to consult letters sent by the City to Native American individuals and organizations, and follow-up Native American consultation pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52. The findings of these studies are presented in the Cultural Resources Assessment Report within the Initial Study in Appendix A and a Tribal Consult Memorandum is provided as Appendix L of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Tribal cultural resources are defined as sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); or included in a local register of historical resources; or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant. Historical resources, unique archaeological resources, or non-unique archaeological resources may also be tribal cultural resources if they meet these criteria.

4.12.1 Environmental Setting

4.12.1.1 Existing Conditions

Ethnographic Setting

The presence of occupation in this area by the ethnohistoric Gabrielino (Tongva) people began to be demonstrated about 1,000 years ago. The term Gabrielino most likely came from the group's association with Mission San Gabriel Arcangel, established in 1771. However, today the group prefers to be known by their ancestral name Tongva. The proposed Project site appears to be located within the core territory of the Tongva. Ethnohistorically, the Tongva were semi-sedentary hunters and gatherers whose language



**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
CITY OF GLENDALE BIOGAS RENEWABLE GENERATION PROJECT**

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

is one of the Cupan languages in the Takic family, part of the Uto-Aztecan linguistic stock (Bean and Smith, 1978).

The Tongva territory encompassed a vast area that stretched from Topanga Canyon in the northwest, to the base of Mount Wilson in the north, to San Bernardino in the east, Aliso Creek in the southeast and the Southern Channel Islands, in all an area of more than 2,500 square miles (Bean and Smith, 1978; McCawley, 1996). At European contact, the tribe consisted of more than 5,000 people living in various settlements throughout the area (McCawley, 1996). Some of the villages could be quite large, housing up to 150 people. The Tongva are considered to have been one of the wealthiest tribes and they appear to have greatly influenced tribes they traded with (Kroeber, 1976:621).

The Tongva practiced hunting and gathering economy, and subsistence zones exploited were marine, woodland and grassland (Bean and Smith, 1978). At the time of contact plant foods were the more significant part of the Tongva diet with acorns being the most important food source exploited. Therefore, it was necessary that villages be located near water sources to allow for the leaching or removal of tannic acids from the acorns. Grass seeds and chia were also heavily utilized. Seeds were parched then ground and cooked as mush in various combinations according to taste and availability. Other fruit and plant foods would be eaten raw or cooked and they could be dried for storage. Bulbs, roots, and tubers were dug in the spring and summer and usually eaten fresh. Mushrooms and tree fungus were prized as delicacies. Various teas were made from flowers, fruits, stems, and roots for medicinal cures as well as beverages (Bean and Smith, 1978:538-540).

The principal game animals were deer, rabbit, jackrabbit, woodrat, mice, ground squirrels, antelope, quail, dove, ducks, and other birds (Bean and Smith, 1978). Predators were largely avoided as food, as were tree squirrels and most reptiles (Bean and Smith, 1978). Fresh water fish were caught in the streams and rivers, while salmon were available when they ran in the larger creeks (Bean and Smith, 1978). Sea mammals, fish, and crustaceans were hunted and gathered from both the shoreline and the open ocean, using reed and dugout canoes by coastal Tongva groups. Shellfish were the most common resource, including abalone, turban, mussels, clams, scallops, bubble shells, and others (Bean and Smith, 1978:538-540).

Houses were domed, circular structures thatched with tule or similar materials (Bean and Smith, 1978:542). The Tongva are renowned for their workmanship of steatite and these artifacts were highly prized (Bean and Smith, 1978). Common everyday items were often decorated with inlaid shell or carvings reflecting the intricately developed skill (Bean and Smith, 1978:542).

Archival Research

As part of the Cultural Resources Assessment Report within the Initial Study (Appendix A), a records search of the entire Project Area was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) on October 15, 2015. The search entailed a review of all previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites located within a 0.5-mile radius of the proposed Project Area, as well as a review of all known cultural resource survey reports, excavation reports and regional cultural overviews.



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Results of the records search indicated that no cultural resources studies were previously conducted within the current Project Area; however, five negative cultural resource surveys (Bonner, 2004a, 2004b; Brunell, 2014; Singer, 1987; Wlodarski, 1981) were conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the current Project Area (**Table 48**).

Additionally, the records search results indicated that no cultural resources were previously documented within the current Project Area; however, one historic period resource was previously documented within a 0.5-mile radius of the current Project Area. No other cultural resources were previously documented within the proposed Project Area or within a 0.5-mile radius of the proposed Project Area.

As part of the archival research at the SCCIC, the following sources were consulted: the California Archaeological Inventory Records, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Historic Landmark Registry, California Points of Historical Interest, Inventory of Historic Structures, and Historical Landmarks for Los Angeles County. Additionally, the following historic period maps were consulted: Pasadena, CA (1894; 1900 edition, reprinted in 1940; 1953; 1966 and 1995) 15-minute topographic quadrangles.

Table 48 Records Search Results

Author	Year	Level of Investigation	Results	Report Reference Number
Bonner, W.	2004a	Survey	Negative	LA12657
Bonner, W.	2004b	Survey	Negative	LA07446
Brunell, D.	2014	Survey	Negative	LA07453
Singer, C.	1987	Survey	Negative	LA01662
Wlodarski, R.	1981	Survey	Negative	LA00943

4.12.2 Laws, Ordinances, Regulations and Standards

4.12.2.1 State

Assembly Bill 52

AB 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) requires lead agencies to consider the effects of projects on tribal cultural resources and to conduct consultation with federally and non-federally recognized Native American Tribes early in the environmental planning process. AB 52 applies specifically to projects for which a Notice of Preparation (NOP) or a Notice of Intent to adopt an EIR has been filed after July 1, 2015.

The goal of AB 52 is to include California Tribes in determining whether a project may result in a significant impact to tribal cultural resources that may be undocumented or known only to the Tribe and its members. This bill specifies that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. AB 52 defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe” that are either included or determined to



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR or included in a local register of historical resources (PRC § 21074 (a)(1)).

AB 52 requires that prior to determining whether a Negative Declaration, MND, or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is prepared for a project, the lead agency must consult with California Native American Tribes, defined as those identified on the contact list maintained by the NAHC, who are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed Project, and who have requested such consultation in writing. Consultation must be initiated by a lead agency within 14 days of determining that an application for a project is complete or that a decision by a public agency to undertake a project. The lead agency shall provide formal notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American Tribes that have requested notice. At the very least the notice should consist of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed Project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American Tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section. The lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a California Native American Tribe's request for consultation. According to PRC §21080.3.2(b), consultation is considered concluded when either the parties agree to measure to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource, or a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached.

4.12.3 Methodology and Thresholds of Significance

4.12.3.1 Methodology

As per AB 52, the Fernandeno Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, and Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation were notified of the proposed Project by City letter and invited to request consultation. Of these three tribes, only the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation requested consultation. Additionally, information from the Cultural Resources Assessment Report within the Initial Study (Appendix A) was included for the analysis supporting impact conclusions in the following section. These impacts were compared against the Thresholds of Significance set forth below in Section 4.12.3.2 to determine their significance.

4.12.3.2 Thresholds of Significance

As determined in the Initial Study, the proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or in a local register of historical places. As there would be no resulting impacts for this topic, only the following checklist question was evaluated in this EIR.



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

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

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

4.12.4 Project Impacts

Threshold: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

The City consulted with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation regarding the proposed Project's potential to impact Tribal cultural resources on May 1, 2019. The City provided an overview of the proposed Project and the Gabrieleño provided an overview of their tribe's history, cultural importance, and interest in consultation to protect tribal cultural resources. The Gabrieleño explained that tribal cultural resources are most likely to be found along tribal trade routes, travel corridors, and water sources. The landscape, notably the ridges and native vegetation are also of important value. After further discussion and Gabrieleño review of the aforementioned features in comparison to the Biogas Renewable Generation Project, the Gabrieleño determined that the Biogas Renewable Generation Project was unlikely to adversely affect Gabrieleño tribal cultural resources and no further evaluation or mitigation was recommended. The attendees expressed their appreciation of each other's correspondence and participation in the consultation. A memorandum summarizing the tribal consultation meeting is included in Appendix L. In consideration of the results of the tribal consultation meeting and Cultural Resources Assessment, the proposed Project would have a less than significant potential impact on tribal cultural resources.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less than Significant Impact



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

4.12.5 Cumulative Impacts

Construction and operation of the project would include activities limited to the confines of the proposed Project site. As described above, the tribal consultation has determined that the proposed Project is unlikely to adversely affect tribal cultural resources. Therefore, because the proposed Project would not contribute to or cause an impact on tribal cultural resources, no cumulatively considerable impact could occur.

