

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### 5.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section of the EIR evaluates the potential for implementation of the Proposed Project to impact cultural resources. Cultural resources or historical resources as defined by CEQA include 1) a resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources by the State Historical Resources Commission; 2) a resource in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code (PRC) or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC section 5024.1(g); and 3) any objects, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. The analysis in this section is based in part on cultural records research, consultations, and a professional field survey. The analyses and findings are summarized in this section.

- *Cultural Resources Assessment*, McKenna et al., May 17, 2016

The complete cultural resources assessment report and documentation are in Appendix H of this EIR.

#### 5.4.1 Environmental Setting

##### 5.4.1.1 REGULATORY SETTING

###### Federal

###### *National Historic Preservation Act*

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (US Code, Title 16, §§ 470 et seq.) authorized the National Register of Historic Places and coordinates public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect the nation's historic and archaeological resources.

Section 106 (Protection of Historic Properties) of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. Section 106 Review refers to the federal review process designed to ensure that historic properties are considered during federal project planning and implementation. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, an independent federal agency, administers the review process with assistance from State Historic Preservation Offices.

###### *National Register Criteria*

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must be at least 50 years old and possess significance in American history and culture, architecture, or archaeology. The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and that meet one or more of four established criteria (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 60, § 60.4):

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- b) Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- c) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- d) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to prehistory.

#### *Physical Integrity*

According to National Register Bulletin No. 15, “to be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must not only be shown to be significant under National Register criteria, but it also must have integrity” (NPS 1990). Integrity is defined in National Register Bulletin No. 15 as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.” Within the concept of integrity, the National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. They are defined by National Register Bulletin No. 15 as follows:

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed or the historic event occurred.
- **Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- **Setting** is the physical environment of a historic property.
- **Materials** are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
- **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- **Feeling** is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- **Association** is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

#### *Context*

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must also be significant within a historical context. National Register Bulletin No. 15 states that the significance of a historic property can be judged only when it is evaluated in its historical context. Historic contexts are “patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific . . . property or site is understood and its meaning . . . is made clear” (NPS 1990). A property must represent an important aspect of the area’s history or prehistory and possess the requisite integrity to qualify for the National Register.

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

### *Historic Districts*

The National Register includes significant properties, which are classified as buildings, sites, districts, structures, or objects. A historic district “derives its importance from being a unified entity, even though it is often composed of a variety of resources. The identity of a district results from the interrelationship of its resources, which can be an arrangement of historically or functionally related properties” (NPS 1990).

A district is a geographically definable area with a significant concentration of buildings, sites, structures, or objects that are united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A district’s significance and historical integrity should help determine the boundaries. Other factors include:

- Visual barriers that mark a change in the historic character of the area or that break the continuity of the district, such as new construction, highways, or development of a different character.
- Visual changes in the character of the area due to different architectural styles, types, or periods, or to a decline in the concentration of contributing resources.
- Boundaries at a specific time in history, such as the original city limits or the legally recorded boundaries of a housing subdivision, estate, or ranch.
- Clearly differentiated patterns of historical development, such as commercial versus residential or industrial.

Within historic districts, properties are identified as contributing and noncontributing. A contributing building, site, structure, or object adds to the historical associations, architectural qualities, or archeological values for which a district is significant because:

- It was present during the period of significance, relates to the significance of the district, and retains its physical integrity, or
- It independently meets the criterion for listing in the National Register.

### *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards*

The Secretary of the Interior’s “Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings” or “Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings” assist in the preservation of a property’s historical significance by preserving historical materials and features of historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy. The standards include preservation of exterior and interior building components, related landscape features, and the building’s site and environment as well as the compatibility of attached, adjacent, or related new construction. Implementation of these standards is identified in Section 15064.5(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines as generally resulting in the reduction of an impact on an identified historic resource to a less than significant level.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

#### *Archaeological Resources Protection Act*

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (US Code Title 16, §§ 470aa et seq.) regulates the protection of archaeological resources and sites that are on federal and Indian lands.

#### *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act*

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (US Code Title 25, §§ 3001 et seq.) is a federal law passed in 1990 that provides a process for museums and federal agencies to return certain Native American cultural items, such as human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony, to lineal descendants and culturally affiliated Indian tribes.

### State

#### *California Register of Historical Resources*

California PRC Sections 5079 to 5079.65 define the functions and duties of the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). The OHP is responsible for the administration of federal- and state-mandated historic preservation programs in California and the California Heritage Fund.

PRC 5020–5029.5 continued the former Historical Landmarks Advisory Committee as the State Historical Resources Commission. The commission oversees the administration of the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR or California Register) and is responsible for the designation of State Historical Landmarks and Historical Points of Interest. The CRHR includes the following types of resources, either as an individual property or a contributor to a historic district: (1) properties listed in or determined eligible for listing in the National Register (automatically included); (2) California Historical Landmarks numbered 770 and higher (automatically included); (3) California Points of Historical Interest recommended for listing by the OHP; and (4) resources nominated for listing and determined eligible by meeting one or more of the CRHR criteria.

The criteria for listing resources in the CRHR, which were expressly developed to be consistent with the previously established National Register criteria, are stated below.

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association and that:

- (A) Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or
- (B) Are associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; or

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

- (C) Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values;  
or
- (D) Have yielded, or have the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

Historic resources eligible for listing in the California Register may include buildings, sites, structures, objects, and historic districts. The minimum age criterion for the CRHR is generally 50 years. Under the Special Considerations in the California Code of Regulations, resources less than 50 years old may be eligible for listing if “it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance” (Title 14, Division 3, Chapter 11.5, § 4852[d][2]). Once listed, the historical resource is protected from any detrimental changes, and any alterations, repairs, and additions must be reviewed and approved by the State Historical Resources Commission under the State Historical Building Code to ensure that the quality of the resource remains intact.

### *California Environmental Quality Act*

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines requires a lead agency to determine whether a project would have a significant effect on one or more historical resources. A “historical resource” is defined as a resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR (PRC § 21084.1); a resource included in a local register of historical resources (California Code of Regulations, Title 14 § 15064.5[a][2]); or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (California Code of Regulations, Title 14 § 15064.5[a][3]). The definitions of “historic” for CEQA purposes have been summarized by the California appellate courts as including mandatory, presumptive, and discretionary categories.

Projects that affect the historical significance of a resource that is listed in or has been formally determined eligible for listing in the CRHR are considered to have a significant effect on the environment. Impacts to cultural resources are thus considered significant and adverse under Section 15064.5 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines if the project (1) physically destroys, demolishes, relocates, or alters the resource or its immediate surroundings; or (2) materially impairs, demolishes, or alters the physical characteristics of a historical resources.

Tribal cultural resources are defined in CEQA (PRC 21074) and may include a historic resource or unique archaeological resource or nonunique archaeological resource which meets qualifying criteria and are a site, feature, place cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe.

### *Native American Historic Resource Protection Act*

PRC Sections 5097.9 to 5097.991 provide protection to Native American historical and cultural resources and sacred sites and identify the powers and duties of the Native American Heritage Commission. They also require notification to descendants of discoveries of Native American human remains and provide for treatment and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

PRC Section 21074—effective in 2014—adds a new definition of tribal cultural resources to the category of cultural resources. Tribal cultural resources consist of sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, or objects with cultural value to a tribe and are listed or eligible for listing on the CRHR or a local register.

#### *Discovery of Human Remains*

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code provides for the disposition of accidentally discovered human remains. Section 7050.5 states that if human remains are found, no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the county coroner has determined the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains.

Section 5097.98 of the PRC states that if the remains are determined by the coroner to be of Native American origin, the coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours, who in turn must identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete his/her inspection and make a recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The MLD's recommendation shall be followed if feasible and may include scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials. If the landowner rejects the MLD's recommendations, the landowner shall rebury the remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location that will not be subject to further subsurface disturbance.

### Local

#### *County of Los Angeles*

The County Historic Preservation Ordinance (County Code, Title 22, Part 28, Chapter 22.52) became effective in October 2015. The County has adopted a historic preservation ordinance that generally applies to all private property in the unincorporated County area and to County-owned landmarks. The ordinance provides a process to nominate a landmark or historic district at the County level. The Board of Supervisors may designate any County-owned property as a landmark if it determines that the property satisfies applicable criteria, which are similar to the criteria for eligibility for the state's register of historic resources.

#### *City of Los Angeles*

The City of Los Angeles General Plan Conservation Element has a policy and program related to the City's archaeological and paleontological sites and/or resources.

- Policy: 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.
  - Program: Permit processing, monitoring, enforcement, and periodic revision of regulations and procedures.

The conservation element also has a policy and programs related to the City's cultural and historic resources.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

- Policy: Continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition or property modification activities.
  - Program 1: Development permit processing, monitoring, enforcement, and periodic revision of regulations and procedures.
  - Program 2: Prepare the Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources Element of the general plan.
  - Program 3: Continue to survey buildings and structures of any age in neighborhoods throughout the city in order to develop a record that can be used in the present and future for evaluating their historic and cultural value as individual structures and within the context of surrounding structures.
  - Program 4: Continue to establish Historical Preservation Overlay Zones throughout the city.

#### 5.4.1.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

##### Cultural Resources Assessments

The following tasks were performed to evaluate the cultural significance of the Project Site.

- **Archaeological Records Check.** A standard archaeological records check was performed through the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton. This research included a review of previously completed studies in or around the Project area and a review of site/resource records, historic maps, and listings for federal, state, and locally significant resources. The results are in Appendix B of the Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix H of this EIR).
- **Native American Consultation.** The Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento was contacted requesting information on the presence/absence of sacred or religious Native American resources in the vicinity of the Project. Letters describing the Project and requesting information on the area were sent to identified local Native American representatives, and all responses have been documented. Related correspondence is presented in Appendix C of the Cultural Resources Assessment (EIR Appendix H).
- **Historic Research.** Historic background research included a review of historic maps at the South Central Coastal Archaeological Information Center; review of permits at the City Department of Building and Safety and the County Department of the Engineer; research at the County Assessor's Office Archives, Norwalk, and the Los Angeles Public Library Historical Research Room; and data compilation from Environmental Data Resources and the McKenna et al. in-house library. The results are in Appendices C and E of the Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix H of this EIR). The Los Angeles Conservancy was also contacted for any records pertaining to the MCJ or the specific Project area, but no relevant data was reported.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

- **Paleontological Overview.** A paleontological overview was prepared by Dr. Samuel McLeod of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. The result is in Appendix D of the Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix H of this EIR).
- **Property Survey.** A property survey was conducted by Jeanette A. McKenna, Principal Investigator for McKenna et al., on December 18, 2014. This survey was conducted to visually inspect the existing improvements (structures, activity acres, landscaping, etc.) and current conditions. The survey goals included documenting the architectural elements and obtaining photographs and data needed to complete the state recordation forms (DPR-523). The field survey was supplemented by field notes (on file, McKenna et al.) and a photographic record. The results are in Appendices F and G of the Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix H of this EIR).

### Prehistoric Chronology

A generalized chronology for prehistoric southern California has been determined from archaeological data and correlations with ethnographic data. The Project area is within the inland areas of Gabrieliño territory. The coastal chronology generally accepted for southern California and considered applicable to inland areas as well, has been:

- **Early Man Horizon:** Predating 6,000 BC. Characterized by the presence of large projectile points and scrapers, suggesting a reliance on hunting rather than gathering.
- **Milling Stone Horizon:** 6,000 to 1,000 BC. Characterized by the presence of hand stones, milling stones, choppers, and scraper planes; tools associated with seed gathering and shell fish processing with limited hunting activities; evidence of a major shift in the exploitation of natural resources.
- **Intermediate Horizon:** 1,000 BC to AD 750. Reflects the transitional period between the Milling Stone and the Late Prehistoric horizons; little is known of this time period, but evidence suggests interactions with outside groups and a shift in material culture reflecting this contact.
- **Late Prehistoric Horizon:** AD 750 to European Contact. Characterized by the presence of small projectile points; use of the bow and arrow; soapstone containers and trade items, asphaltum; cremations; grave goods; mortars and pestles; and bedrock mortars.

A more detailed coastal chronology based on radiocarbon dating of archaeological sites or cultural contexts is in the Cultural Resources Assessment (see Appendix H of this EIR).

### Prehistoric Cultural Setting

The Project Site is in an area associated with the prehistoric and protohistoric Native American populations generally referred to as the Gabrieliño/Tongva. Protohistory refers to a period between prehistory and history during which a culture or civilization has not yet developed writing but other cultures have already noted its existence in their own writings (Wikipedia 2015). The Gabrieliño/Tongva are known from Late Prehistoric/Protohistoric ethnographic records and archaeological data identifying Late Prehistoric

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

occupation of Southern California. Populations preceding the Gabrieliño/Tongva, though likely directly related to the Gabrieliño, can be archaeologically identified as separate or variant forms of the evolving culture.

The term Gabrieliño is a reference to the direct association with Native American populations under the jurisdiction of the historic Mission San Gabriel de Archangel (Mission San Gabriel) in the present-day City of San Gabriel. Mission San Gabriel serviced the entire Los Angeles Basin and into the San Bernardino area. The present-day City of Los Angeles is near the center of the ethnographic boundaries for the Gabrieliño.

The Gabrieliño utilized numerous plants and animals for food, shelter, and medicines. They developed bow styles, bedrock mortars, portable mortars, pipes, chisels, metates (i.e., large flat rocks used for grinding), manos (i.e., a grinding rock that fits in the hand), and various forms of chipped stone tools. Prior to the establishment of the Mission system, populations tended to live in larger villages with a series of satellite sites with smaller populations. Seasonal migration was practiced for the exploitation of resources and protection from seasonal weather conditions. Dwelling structures were constructed of branches, grasses, and mud, and interior hearths were used for heat.

### Historic Background

The earliest known records of European contact with Southern California Native Americans are from early Spanish explorations in the mid-1500s. Populations were identified from ships but no direct contact occurred. The first personal contact was made in the 1770s, when Father Garces traversed the Mojave Desert and entered coastal Southern California through the Cajon Pass. In the 1770s, the Spanish padres, under the direction of Junipero Serra, began establishing a series of missions throughout California.

The area surrounding the Project Site is within the historical territory of Mission San Fernando Rey de Espana, founded in 1797 in what is now the Community of Mission Hills in the City of Los Angeles. The City (pueblo) was officially founded in September of 1781 at the present-day address of 125 Paseo de la Plaza, about 0.44 miles southwest of the Project Site. By 1870, Los Angeles' population was approximately 5,000, mostly of Hispanic background.

### Cultural Resources Records Search

An archaeological records search was completed through the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton (see Appendix B in Cultural Resources Assessment in EIR Appendix H). This research confirmed that the Project area was not previously surveyed for cultural resources, but a minimum of 69 studies have been completed in the immediate vicinity (quarter-mile radius). McKenna et al. defined the area boundary of research to a quarter-mile radius based on the location of the Project area and the extent of recorded resources outside the quarter-mile radius. Specifically, McKenna et al. limited the research to the area north of the 101 freeway, west of the Los Angeles River, and east of Main Street. Although there are many additional properties outside this defined area, researching the many resources dissociated from the MCJ and the associated governmental complex served no purpose and would not change the conclusion that the Project area is highly sensitive for prehistoric and historic resources. As a result of these studies, 20 cultural resources were identified, as shown in Table 5.4-1. The majority of the

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

resources identified in the vicinity of the current Project area are historic period resources, with the exception of #1 P-19-001575, which suggested the location of the village of *Yangna*.

**Table 5.4-1 Cultural Resources Identified within One-Quarter Mile of the Project Site**

No.	Primary No.	Trinomial	Cultural Studies Citation	Description
1	P-19-001575	CA-LAN-1575/H	Foster et al. 1989; Home et al. 2000	MR-1 (Yangna)
2	P-19-002828	CA-LAN-2828H	Bissell 2000	William Mead Homes
3	P-19-003103	CA-LAN-3103H	Wesson 2002; Gibson 2011; Carren 2014	Zanja Madre Water Features
4	P-19-003181	CA-LAN-3181H	Hale 2004	J.M. Griffith Co.
5	P-19-004183	CA-LAN-4183H	Foster 2011	College St. Pavement
6	P-19-004200	CA-LAN-4200H	Amarat 2007	Alameda St. Surface
7	P-19-004201	CA-LAN-4201H	Amarat 2007	Naud's Junction
8	P-19-004202	CA-LAN-4202H	Amarat 2007	Alameda St. Tracks
9	P-19-167020		Hunt 1972; Miller et al. 1981; Gardner and Charleton 1990	Los Angeles Plaza Historic District
10	P-19-167098		Sitton 1974	San Antonio Winery
11	P-19-170973		Jacques and Carrico 1982; Robertson 1984	Terminal Annex
12	P-19-171159		Smith and Sitton 1976	Union Station
13	P-19-171578		Anonymous 1981	Flora's
14	P-19-175558		McAvoy 1994	720 N. Spring St.
15	P-19-176368		McAvoy 1994	DWP HQ
16	P-19-186110		Ashkar 1999; Living-stone and Hamilton 2002; Smith and Harper 2007	Union Pacific Railroad; Hobart Tower
17	P-19-186112		Ashkar 1999; Herbert 2002; Ramirez and Smith 2009; Smith and Steely 2009	Union Pacific Railroad; Sunset Line
18	P-19-187085		Elder 1989	Mojave Road
19	P-19-188242		Greenwood 2002; Taniguchi and Tanigu-chi 2005; Loftus 2011	Friedman Bag Co.
20	P-19-188246		Carlisle et al. 2002	AT&SF Mission Tower

### Onsite Historic Uses

In 1848, the Project Site along Bauchet Street was associated with the Louis Bauchet family, one of 103 proprietors of town farms. By 1859, the Project Site was known as the Alanis Vineyard Tract, and after being sold a number of times, the Project Site became part of the holdings of the Sepulveda family in the late 1800s. Then the land was subdivided into five lots; Lot E (the Project Site) was owned by Edward Strasburg in 1900. Historical topographic maps dated 1896, 1900, and 1901 show the Project Site as vacant (Alta 2015a).

By 1906, the Project Site was occupied by two industrial uses: the Los Angeles Pressed Brick Company on the southern part of the site and the Puente Oil Company on the northern part. The Los Angeles Pressed Brick

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

Company operated onsite until about 1960. The Los Angeles Pressed Brick Company merged with Gladding McBean in 1926 and continued operating under its original name under Gladding McBean's ownership. Bauchet Street does not appear on a 1906 map, but it is shown on a 1923 aerial photograph.

In the 1940s, the northeasternmost portion of the Project Site was associated with the neighboring manufactured gas plant facility, but no production activities occurred within the Project Site boundary. The northeastern portion of the Project Site then housed an oil storage tank, a small office, and storage buildings. By 1947, the gas plant production decreased significantly, and most of that facility was demolished by 1952 (Alta 2015b).

The Gladding McBean facility was sold to the county for development of a new jail, and demolition of the facility began in 1960. The Project Site is shown as developed with industrial uses—warehouse/factory buildings, storage silos, and plant equipment—on aerial photographs from 1923, 1928, 1938, 1948, and 1952 (Alta 2015a).

Construction of the main MCJ complex began in 1960 and was completed in 1963 (i.e., 52 years of age), and the remaining MCJ structures and improvements were constructed in the 1970s and in 1997, less than 50 years ago, and are considered modern. The approximate completion years for MCJ facilities are:

- Five-story 1960s-era MCJ complex (1963)
- Infirmary (1963 and expanded in 1970s)
- Four-story Parking Structure and Bus Maintenance Facility (1970s)
- Six-story 1970s-era jail MCJ complex (1970s)
- Court Line and Bus Queuing area (1970s)
- Central Arraignment Court (1970s)
- Two-story Parking Deck (1970s)
- Central Heating Plant (1970s)
- Bridge between MCJ and Twin Towers (1997)

In 1997, the Twin Towers Correctional Facility opened at 450 Bauchet Street, across Bauchet Street from the Project Site.

### **Onsite Paleontological Resources**

The Project Site consists of younger Quaternary alluvial surficial sediments deposited in the floodplain of the Los Angeles River. The Quaternary Period extends from about 1.8 million years before present to the present. The younger alluvium is relatively shallow and underlain by older Quaternary deposits that are considered highly sensitive for paleontological resources. For example, paleontological specimens were found beneath the recent alluvium identified along Wilshire Boulevard and in the area of the La Brea Tar Pits and along the Alameda Corridor during construction of the Metrorail system. The nearest specimens were recovered from an area near Mission Road and Daly Street, about 0.8 mile east of the Project Site.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

#### Native American Scoping

The Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento was contacted requesting information on the presence/absence of sacred or religious Native American resources in the vicinity of the Project area. The results are presented in Appendix C of the Cultural Resources Study (Appendix H to the EIR). Letters were sent on October 23, 2014, to the identified local Native American representatives, describing the Project and requesting information on the area. The contacted Native American tribes and individuals are listed below:

- John Tommy Rosas, Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
- Anthony Morales, Chairperson, Gabrielino/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
- Sandonne Goad, Chairperson, Gabrielino Tongva Nation
- Robert Dorame, Cultural Resources, Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California
- Andrew Salas, Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians
- Sam Dunlap, Gabrielino Tongva Nation

A phone communication from Anthony Morales, Chair of the Gabrieliño/Tongva provided a general overview for the area and noted that the area was known to have been within the territory inhabited by Native Americans (Tongva) and sensitive for resources associated with the village of *Yangna*. No other responses were received.

#### 5.4.1.3 SPRING STREET PARKING STRUCTURE SITE

##### Historical Uses

The SSPS Site was originally developed for industrial, commercial, and residential use as early as 1888. Historical site uses included the operation of various businesses, including various warehouses, a junkyard, blow pipe factory, metal and machine shops, plastics manufacturing, a foundry, and a blacksmith and welding shops. Some of these uses appear in a 1970 Sanborn map. The existing surface parking lot appears in a 1977 aerial photograph (Alta 2014).

##### Prehistoric Cultural Setting

The SSPS Site's general prehistoric cultural environment is the same as for the Project Site, and therefore is not discussed separately.

##### Paleontological Resources

The SSPS Site is approximately 0.3 mile west of the Project Site and is also underlain by natural alluvial soils (Converse 2015). No past paleontological resources assessment has been conducted underneath the site, and the nearest known resources are 1.1 mile east of the SSPS Site in an area near Mission Road and Daly Street.

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

### 5.4.1.4 VIGNES LOT

#### Historical Uses

Based on available historical records, as early as the late 1800s, the subject property was developed with residential and agriculture uses. By 1906 the subject property was mostly redeveloped as an engine manufacturing facility, with a few residential dwellings remaining along the northern property line. The engine manufacturing facility operated under a variety of names, the most prominent being Fulton Engine Works. At that time, the facility consisted of a foundry, machine shop, boiler shop, coal storage bins, multiple aboveground tanks, and other industrial manufacturing equipment. By 1950, the subject property had been redeveloped as the Hydril Corporation and was used for manufacturing oil well equipment. This facility was (re)developed with a machine shop, heat treating room, “a cascade oxygen building,” storage sheds, and other equipment. This site use continued until the facility was razed in late 2005/early 2006. (Alta 2016).

#### Prehistoric Cultural Setting

The Vignes Lot’s general prehistoric cultural environment is same as for the Project Site, and therefore is not discussed separately here.

#### Paleontological Resources

The Vignes Lot is approximately 200 feet northwest of the Project Site and is also underlain by natural alluvial soils. No past paleontological resources assessment has been conducted underneath the site, and like the Project Site, the nearest known resources are 0.8 mile east of the Vignes Lot in an area near Mission Road and Daly Street.

### 5.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would normally have a significant effect on the environment if the project would:

- C-1 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.
- C-2 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.
- C-3 Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
- C-4 Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Pending additional state rulemaking to formally amend the Guidelines Appendix G, the County also acknowledges that tribal cultural resources as defined by PRC Section 21074 are historic resources for purposes of this analysis.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

C-5 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Section 21074.

Impacts to cultural resources are considered significant if the project would (1) physically destroy or damage all or part of a resource; (2) change the character of the use of the resource or physical feature within the setting of the resource which contributes to its significance; or (3) introduce visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of significant features of the resource.

### 5.4.3 Plans, Programs, and Policies

#### 5.4.3.1 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

RR CUL-1 All construction activities will be conducted in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code regarding the potential discovery of human remains. In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the County Coroner has been contacted. If applicable, the Native American Heritage Commission will be responsible for designating the most likely descendant (MLD), as required by Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code. If the landowner rejects the recommendations of the MLD, the burial location would be determined in compliance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98.

### 5.4.4 Environmental Impacts

The following impact analysis addresses thresholds of significance for potentially significant impacts on the Project Site. The applicable thresholds are identified in brackets after the impact statement.

---

**Impact 5.4-1: The Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. [Threshold C-1]**

---

#### *Impact Analysis:*

#### **Short-Term Construction Impacts**

The Cultural Resources Investigation evaluated the existing MCJ facility for cultural significance with respect to the federal and state guidelines, including architectural integrity of onsite structures. The MCJ structures were constructed in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1990s; therefore, only one building, the five-story 1960s-era MCJ complex, meets the minimum age (i.e., 50 years or older) for historical significance in the initial analysis. The remaining MCJ structures and improvements were constructed in the 1970s and 1990s and therefore are considered modern because they are less than 50 years of age. Prior to MCJ development, the Project Site was developed with the Gladding McBean and Company complex, and all structures were demolished or destroyed with the development of the MCJ.

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

As described below and shown in Table 5.4-2, *Summary of Findings per Applicable Criteria*, none of the existing MCJ structures, including the 1960s-era MCJ complex, meets the state or federal criteria for definition of historic resources:

- **Federal Criteria a and State Criteria A.** None of the MCJ structures have been associated with significant events. Although it can be argued that the construction of the MCJ represents one of the largest complexes of its type, all counties have jails, and all require some level of sheriff/police enforcement. The presence of this complex is not considered unique.
- **Federal Criteria b and State Criteria B.** None of the structures of MCJ are directly associated with significant persons. Although some temporary inmates have been considered famous or infamous, in general, this criterion has not been satisfied.
- **Federal Criteria c and State Criteria C.** Architecturally, the components of the complex consist of “Brutalism-Modernist Box” design elements and/or simple concrete parking structure construction. None of the components are considered exceptional or unique or involve any unique materials or designs, but exhibit only the minimal elements of the institutional structures indicative of the 1960s through 1980s.
- **Federal Criteria d and State Criteria D.** Without consideration for the standing structures, the MCJ property failed to exhibit any evidence of historic period or prehistoric archaeological resources.

Although the existing structures and the general site were found to retain their original locations in the integrity evaluation, such assessment would result in negligible impact because only one building meets the minimum age requirement, and none of the other criteria for significant cultural impact would be satisfied. Taking into consideration the potential for the more modern complex to still qualify as eligible for listing property (less than 50 years of age), issues of integrity and architectural design were also considered. However, the MCJ structures were determined to lack significant architectural designs and did not meet the federal Criteria Considerations or state Special Consideration needed to consider properties less than 50 years of age. The MCJ structures lost their “setting” with the extensive developments surrounding the property and negating the immediate identification of the property from the surrounding locations. While the “materials” are original, they are not unique and have not been used in any unusual manner. “Workmanship” is standard and to code at the time of construction. There is no evidence of unusual or outstanding workmanship or master planning or design. The “feeling” and “association” of the MCJ structures have been overshadowed by the construction of the adjacent Twin Towers Correctional Facility, which impacts the presence of the older MCJ facility. Therefore, development of the CCTF would not result in any significant historical resources impacts.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

**Table 5.4-2 Summary of Findings per Applicable Criteria**

Criteria	1960s Bldg.	1970s Bldg.	Parking Deck	Infirmary	Heating Plant	Parking & Bus Maint.	Bridge	General Site
<b>Federal<sup>1</sup></b>								
a	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
b	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
c	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
d	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b>State<sup>2</sup></b>								
A	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
B	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
C	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
D	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b>Integrity<sup>3</sup></b>								
Location	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Design	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Setting	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Materials	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Workmanship	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Feeling	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Association	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

<sup>1</sup> National Register of Historic Places Criteria (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, § 60.4).

<sup>2</sup> California Register of Historical Resources (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(a)(3)).

<sup>3</sup> National Register Bulletin No. 15.

As shown in Table 5.4-1, the Project Site in general is in an area with a high level of sensitivity for historic archaeological, prehistoric, and paleontological resources. Therefore, the Proposed Project's potential for yielding information important in prehistory or history (Criteria D) is addressed separately under Impacts 5.4-2 and 5.4-3.

#### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

The existing parking lot was constructed in the 1970s, and all previous above-grade structures were demolished. Development of the SSPS Site would not result in adverse historical resources impact.

#### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

All buildings and structures on the Vignes Lot were demolished in late 2005/early 2006. Development of the Vignes Lot would not result in adverse historical resources impact.

#### **Long-Term Operational Impacts**

After Project construction, operation of the Proposed Project would not result in any long-term historical resources impact.

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

After Project construction, operation of the SSPS would not result in any long-term historical resources impact.

### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

After Project construction, operation of the Vignes Lot would not result in any long-term historical resources impact.

*Level of Significance before Mitigation:* Impact 5.4-1 would be less than significant.

---

**Impact 5.4-2: The Proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource if encountered during construction activities. [Threshold C-2]**

---

### *Impact Analysis:*

#### **Short-Term Construction Impacts**

Project development would involve extensive disturbance of onsite soils and could uncover buried archaeological resources. The Project area history can be traced to the founding of the Pueblo de Los Angeles (i.e., City of Los Angeles) and activities associated with agriculture (vineyards), possibly residential complexes, and early industrial/commercial uses (L.A. Pressed Brick Co. and Gladding, McBean and Co. facilities). These activities preceded the construction of the MCJ facility, resulting in a continuous use of the property since the identification of the Alanis Vineyard Tract and the years preceding the acquisition of Alta California by the United States. Therefore, identified historic archaeological resources could be associated with the Spanish, Mexican, and/or American periods. In addition, Native American consultation indicated that the Project area was known to have been within the territory inhabited by Native Americans (Gabrieliño/Tongva) and sensitive for resources associated with the village of *Yangna*. Given its proximity to the Los Angeles River and the City center, in general the area is considered highly sensitive for archaeological resources. Thus, based on the relative sensitivity for the area to yield evidence of historic archaeological and archaeological resources, soil disturbance could damage such subsurface resources, and impacts would be potentially significant.

### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

Historical use of the SSPS Site included industrial, commercial, and residential dating back to 1888. Various business uses—including warehouses, a junkyard, blow pipe factory, metal and machine shops, plastics manufacturing, a foundry, and a blacksmith and welding shops—appeared in a 1970 Sanborn map, but the site is currently developed as surface parking lot. As with the Project Site, considering the sensitivity for the area to yield evidence of historic archaeological and archaeological resources, soil disturbance could damage such subsurface resources, and impacts would be potentially significant.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

#### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

Historical uses of the Vignes Lot included industrial, manufacturing, and residential dating back to the late 1800s. As with the Project Site, considering the sensitivity for the area to yield evidence of historic archaeological and archaeological resources, soil disturbance could damage such subsurface resources, and impacts would be potentially significant.

#### **Long-Term Operational Impacts**

Operation of the Proposed Project would not involve soil disturbances that may lead to discovery of archaeological resources. No impact would occur.

#### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

Operation of the SSPS Site would not involve soil disturbances that may lead to discovery of archaeological resources. No impact would occur.

#### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

Operation of the Vignes Lot would not involve soil disturbances that may lead to discovery of archaeological resources. No impact would occur.

*Level of Significance before Mitigation:* Without mitigation, Impact 5.4-2 would be potentially significant.

---

**Impact 5.4-3: The Proposed Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature if encountered during construction activities. [Threshold C-3]**

---

#### *Impact Analysis:*

#### **Short-Term Construction Impacts**

The Project Site is highly sensitive for the presence of paleontological resources. The onsite geologic units are characterized by shallow younger Quaternary alluvial deposits underlain by older alluvial deposits, which are known to yield paleontological specimen (vertebrate fossils) (Converse 2015). Any substantial excavations on or adjacent to the Project Site are likely to impact the older Quaternary deposits. Project development would involve extensive excavation of soils, exposing underlain natural deposits, and could therefore potentially impact paleontological resources. Impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

The SSPS Site is underlain by natural alluvial soils (Converse 2015). Any substantial excavations within or adjacent to the SSPS Site are likely to impact the older Quaternary deposits, which are known to yield paleontological specimens (vertebrate fossils). Project development would involve extensive excavation of soils, exposing underlain natural deposits, and therefore could potentially impact paleontological resources. Impacts would be potentially significant.

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

Like the Project Site, the Vignes Lot is underlain by natural alluvial soils. Any substantial excavations within or adjacent to the Vignes Lot are likely to impact the older Quaternary deposits, which are known to yield paleontological specimens (vertebrate fossils). Project development would involve extensive excavation of soils, exposing underlain natural deposits, and therefore could potentially impact paleontological resources. Impacts would be potentially significant.

### **Long-Term Operational Impacts**

Operation of the Proposed Project would not involve soil disturbances that may lead to discovery of paleontological resources. No impact would occur.

### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

Operation of the SSPS Site would not involve soil disturbances that may lead to discovery of paleontological resources. No impact would occur.

### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

Operation of the Vignes Lot would not involve soil disturbances that may lead to discovery of paleontological resources. No impact would occur.

*Level of Significance before Mitigation:* Without mitigation, Impact 5.4-3 would be potentially significant.

---

**Impact 5.4-4: The Proposed Project would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. [Threshold C-4]**

---

### *Impact Analysis:*

### **Short-Term Construction Impacts**

Project development would involve substantial ground disturbance. Based on the cultural records search and consultation with Native American representative, the Project area is known to have been within the territory inhabited by Native Americans (Gabrieliño/Tongva) and sensitive for resources associated with the village of *Yangna*. Therefore, there is a potential that grading activities could unearth human remains. Additionally, in 2010, during construction of LA Plaza de Cultura y Artes at 501 North Main Street in El Pueblo de Los Angeles, more than 100 individuals believed to be of European, Native American, and mixed descent were discovered (SWCA 2014; Wikipedia 2016). LA Plaza is approximately 0.44 mile southwest of the Project Site. Therefore, considering the culturally sensitive nature of the Project area, there is some possibility that human remains could be buried in soils under the Project Site and that such remains could be damaged by ground-disturbing activities. As stated in RR CUL-1, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that in the event that human remains are discovered within the Project Site, disturbance of the site shall halt and remain halted until the coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone, within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. The Proposed Project would comply with RR CUL-1, and potential impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

#### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

Project development would involve substantial ground disturbance in a culturally sensitive area. The SPSS Site is also in the territory in association with Gabrieliño/Tongva Native Americans and the village of *Yangna*, and LA Plaza is approximately 0.3 miles to the south at 501 N. Main Street. Therefore, as with the Project Site development, the County would be required to comply with RR CUL-1, and potential impacts to human remains would be reduced a less than significant level.

#### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

Project development would involve substantial ground disturbance in a culturally sensitive area. The Vignes Lot is also in the territory in association with Gabrieliño/Tongva Native Americans and the village of *Yangna*, and LA Plaza is approximately 0.4 miles to the southwest at 501 N. Main Street. Therefore, as with the Project Site development, the County would be required to comply with RR CUL-1, and potential impacts to human remains would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### Long-Term Operational Impacts

Operation of the Proposed Project would not involve soil disturbances that may lead to discovery of buried human remains. No impact would occur.

#### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

Operation of the SPPS Site would not involve soil disturbances that may lead to discovery of buried human remains. No impact would occur.

#### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

Operation of the Vignes Lot would not involve soil disturbances that may lead to discovery of buried human remains. No impact would occur.

***Level of Significance before Mitigation:*** With implementation of RR CUL-1, Impact 5.4-4 would be less than significant.

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

---

**Impact 5.4-5** The Proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in California Public Resources Code Section 21074, if encountered during construction activities.

---

### *Impact Analysis:*

#### **Short-Term Construction Impacts**

The Project Site has been fully developed and does not contain tribal cultural resources as defined by PRC Section 21074. However, as discussed in Impact 5.4-2, Native American consultation indicated that the Project area was known to have been within the territory inhabited by Native Americans (Gabrieliño/Tongva) and sensitive for resources associated with the village of *Yangna*. Therefore, grading activities could disturb previously unidentified tribal cultural resources and impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

As with the Project Site, the SSPS Site is in a culturally sensitive area with potential for discovery of previously unidentified tribal resources and impacts would be potentially significant.

#### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

As with the Project Site, the Vignes Lot is in a culturally sensitive area with potential for discovery of previously unidentified tribal resources and impacts would be potentially significant.

#### **Long-Term Operational Impact**

Operation of the Proposed Project would not involve any activities that may adversely affect tribal cultural resource. No impact would occur.

#### *Spring Street Parking Structure Site (Option 1)*

Operation of the SSPS Site would not involve any activities that may adversely affect tribal cultural resource. No impact would occur.

#### *Vignes Lot (Option 2)*

Operation of the Vignes Lot would not involve any activities that may adversely affect tribal cultural resource. No impact would occur.

***Level of Significance before Mitigation:*** Without mitigation, Impact 5.4-5 would be potentially significant.

### **5.4.5 Cumulative Impacts**

The area considered for cumulative impacts to cultural resources is Los Angeles County. Other projects in the region would demolish or alter existing historic resources that may be eligible for CRHR listing. Other projects would disturb soil and thus could damage archaeological and/or paleontological resources that could

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

be buried under those project sites. Other projects would be subject to CEQA review, including studies of historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources that are present or could be present onsite and historic architectural evaluation of structures onsite that could potentially be eligible for listing on the CRHR. Where significant or potentially significant impacts are identified, implementation of all feasible mitigation measures would be required to reduce those impacts. Therefore, cumulative impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant after mitigation, and after implementation of state law and appropriate mitigation measures, impacts of the Proposed Project on cultural resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

#### 5.4.6 Level of Significance Before Mitigation

The following impact would be less than significant:

- **Impact 5.4-1** The Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

With implementation of RR CUL-1, the following impact would be less than significant:

- **Impact 5.4-4** The Proposed Project would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be **potentially significant**:

- **Impact 5.4-2** The Proposed Project could cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource and cause a significant impact.
- **Impact 5.4-3** The Proposed Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature and cause a significant impact.
- **Impact 5.4-5** The Proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in California Public Resources Code Section 21074 and cause a significant impact.

#### 5.4.7 Mitigation Measures

##### Impact 5.4-2

CUL-1 Prior to the start of construction activities, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the County to attend the pregrading meeting with the construction contractor to establish, based on the site plans, appropriate procedures for monitoring earth-moving activities during construction. The archaeologist shall determine, based on consultation with the County, when monitoring of grading activities is needed. Monitoring should observe disturbance in the uppermost layers of sediment, including the younger Quaternary Alluvium. If any

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

archaeological resources are discovered, construction activities must cease within 50 feet of the discovery, as appropriate, and the resources shall be protected from further disturbance until the qualified archaeologist evaluates them using standard archaeological protocols. The archaeologist must first determine whether an archaeological resource uncovered during construction is a “tribal cultural resource” pursuant to Section 21074 of the California Public Resources Code, a “unique archaeologist resource” pursuant to Section 21083.2(g) of the California Public Resources Code, or a “historical resource” pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines. If the archaeological resource is determined to be a tribal cultural resource, unique archaeological resource, or historical resource, the archaeologist shall formulate a mitigation plan in consultation with the County that satisfies the requirements of the above-listed code sections. Upon approval of the mitigation plan by the County Director of Public Works, the Proposed Project shall be implemented in compliance with the mitigation plan.

If the archaeologist determines that the resource is not a tribal cultural resource, unique archaeological resource, or historical resource, she/he shall record the site and submit the recordation to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC). The archaeologist shall prepare a report of the results of any study prepared as part of a testing or mitigation plan, following accepted professional practice. The report shall follow guidelines of the California Office of Historic Preservation. Copies of the report shall be submitted to the County and to the CHRIS at the SCCIC at California State University, Fullerton.

### Impact 5.4-3

CUL-2 Prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities in native soils, a qualified paleontologist shall be notified and retained when earth-moving activities are anticipated to impact undisturbed deposits in the older Quaternary alluvium on the Project Site. The designated paleontologist shall be present during the pre-grading meeting to discuss paleontological sensitivity. The paleontologist shall determine, based on consultation with the County, when monitoring of grading activities is needed based on the onsite soils and final grading plans.

All paleontological work to assess and/or recover a potential resource at the Project Site shall be conducted under the direction of the qualified paleontologist. If any fossil remains are uncovered during earth-moving activities, all heavy equipment shall be diverted at least 50 feet from the fossil site until the monitor has had an opportunity to examine the remains and determines that earth-moving can resume. The extent of land area that is prohibited from disturbance shall be at the discretion of the paleontological monitor. Samples of older Quaternary alluvium shall be collected as necessary for processing and shall be examined for very small vertebrate fossils. The paleontologist shall prepare a report of the results of any findings following accepted professional practice.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

#### Impact 5.4-5

See MM CUL-1.

### 5.4.8 Level of Significance After Mitigation

#### Impact 5.4-2

With implementation of MM CUL-1, potential construction impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

#### Impact 5.4-3

With implementation of MM CUL-2, potential construction impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

#### Impact 5.4-5

With implementation of MM CUL-1, potential construction impacts to tribal resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

### 5.4.9 References

- Alta Environmental. 2014, November 25. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Parking Lot 45, 739 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015a, February 13. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Men's Central Jail, Los Angeles, California 90012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015b, February 20. Phase II ESA Subsurface Investigation, Men's Central Jail.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016, January 6. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, 1060 North Vignes Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.
- Converse Consultants. 2015, February 10. Geohazard Study Report, Los Angeles County Men's Central Jail (Off-Site Parking Structure), 739 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.
- McKenna et al. 2015, August 4. Cultural Resources Assessment.
- National Park Service (NPS). 1990. How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. National Register Bulletin. No. 15. US Department of Interior.  
<https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb15.pdf>.
- SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA). 2014, March 30. Grave Concerns: Keeping the LA Plaza Project on Track. <http://www.swca.com/index.php/media/newsdetail/grave-concerns-keeping-the-la-plaza-project-on-track/>.

## 5. Environmental Analysis CULTURAL RESOURCES

Wikipedia. 2015. "Protohistory." <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protohistory>.

———. 2016. "LA Plaza de Cultura y Artes." [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LA\\_Plaza\\_de\\_Cultura\\_y\\_Artes#cite\\_note-tobar-2](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LA_Plaza_de_Cultura_y_Artes#cite_note-tobar-2).

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

*This page intentionally left blank.*