IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
O. CULTURAL RESOURCES
2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

A Cultural Resources Assessment for the proposed project was prepared by W.H. Bonner Associates in April 2003 to analyze the potential archaeological resources impacts associated with the proposed project. A summary of the Cultural Resources Assessment with respect to potential archaeological resources impacts is set forth below. The Cultural Resources Assessment, which is incorporated herein by this reference, is included in its entirety as Appendix L to this Draft EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

According to W.J. Wallace,[1] four main horizons exist in the Southern California prehistoric cultural chronology:

Early Man Horizon. Spanning the period from the end of the Pleistocene to approximately 6,000 B.C., archaeological assemblages attributed to this horizon are characterized by large projectile points and scrapers. The limited data available suggests that prehistoric populations focused on hunting and gathering, moving about the region in small nomadic groups.

Milling Stone Horizon. Characterized by the appearance of handstones and millingstones, this horizon tentatively dates to between 6,000 B.C. and 1,000 B.C. Assemblages in the early Milling Stone period reflect an emphasis on plant foods and foraging subsistence systems. For inland locales, it has been assumed that exploitation of grass seeds formed a primary subsistence activity. Artifact assemblages include choppers and scraper planes, but generally lack projectile points. The appearance of large projectile points in the latter portion of the Milling Stone Horizon suggests a more diverse economy. The distribution of Millingstone sites reflects the theory that aboriginal groups may have followed a modified central based wandering settlement pattern. In this semi-sedentary pattern, a base camp would have been occupied for a portion of the year, but a small population group seasonally occupied subsidiary camps in order to exploit resources not generally available near the base camp. Sedentism apparently increased in areas possessing an abundance of resources which were available for longer periods of time. More arid inland regions would have provided a seasonally and areally dispersed resource base, restricting sedentary occupation.

Intermediate Horizon. Dated to between 1,000 B.C. and 750 A.D., the Intermediate Horizon represents a transitional period. Little is known about the people of this period, especially those of

---

[1] *Wallace, W.J., "A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology, Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, 1955.*

inland Southern California. Sites assemblages retain many attributes of the Milling Stone Horizon. In addition, Intermediate Horizon sites contain large stemmed or notched projectile points and portable mortar and pestles. The mortars and pestles suggest that the aboriginal populations may have harvested, processed, and consumed acorns. Neither the settlement-subsistence system or the cultural evolution of this period is well understood due to a general lack of data. It has been proposed that sedentism increased with the exploitation of storable food resources (e.g., acorns); the duration and intensity of occupation of base camps increased, especially toward the latter part of this horizon.

Late Prehistoric Horizon. Extending from 750 A.D. to Spanish contact in 1769, the Late Prehistoric Horizon reflects an increased sophistication and diversity in technology. This is characterized by the presence of small projectile points which imply the use of the bow and arrow. In addition, assemblages include steatite bowls, asphaltum, grave goods, and elaborate shell ornaments. Use of bedrock milling stations was widespread during this horizon. Increased hunting efficiency and widespread exploitation of acorns provided reliable and storable food resources. These innovations apparently promoted greater sedentism.

Investigation Methodology and Results

An archaeological resources records review was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) prior to onsite monitoring. This review was required to determine whether archaeological resources have been recorded on or within a one-half mile radius of the project site. It also revealed whether any previous archaeological assessments have been performed on or within a one-half mile radius of the project site. The records review involved a review of archaeological resources maps, historic topographic maps, and historic register lists. Geologic maps of the area were also examined.

Onsite Investigation. Upon completion of the map review and records check, an inspection of the project site was conducted. The site inspection was conducted over two days on July 24-25, 2001. The survey was performed by two qualified field persons walking parallel tracts approximately ten meters (30 feet) apart over all accessible portions of the project site. Only those portions of the project site with a slope of fifteen degrees or less could be examined. Access to much of the project site was limited due to private roads, lack of access from Interstate 210, and the overall ruggedness of the property. More than two-thirds of the project site is located on slopes greater than 15 degrees. It is unlikely that archaeological remains would exist in these locations. A total of less than fifty acres was accessible. No archaeological remains were noted in those portions of the project site where access was possible.

Archaeological Resources. The records review indicated no prehistoric archaeological resources have been recorded on or within a one-half mile radius of the project site. Two previous investigations assessed portions of the subject property, while five additional field assessments were conducted in adjoining parcels. None of these assessments recorded any cultural resources.

Oral Information. The records investigation included research with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to determine whether any prehistoric remains have been found on the project site in the past. The SHPO does not have any information that such remains have been found.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would have a significant impact on the environment if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource (as defined in Section 21083.2(g) of the California Public Resources Code); or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Project Impacts

Based upon the results of the records review and onsite field inspection, development of the proposed project would not impact any known unique or non-unique archaeological resources (as defined in subsections (g) and (h) of Section 21083.2 of the California Public Resources Code). All accessible portions of the project site were field examined and no archaeological resources were discovered. According to the consulting archaeologist, due to its steep and rugged character, it is highly unlikely that any archaeological resources would occur on the inaccessible portions of the project site. These conclusions are supported by two previous investigations that assessed portions of the project site, and five field assessments conducted on adjoining parcels, none of which have revealed the presence of any

archaeological resources.[2] Based upon these results, the following conclusions have been reached:

- The development of the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of any unique or non-unique archaeological resource.
- The development of the proposed project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The proposed project would not adversely affect any known archaeological resources and therefore mitigation measures are not required. However, there is the potential that unknown unique archaeological resources could be disturbed during the course of project development. The following measures are recommended to provide direction in the event such resources are discovered:

O.2-1 If buried cultural materials are exposed during construction, work shall be halted in the immediate vicinity of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess their significance.

O.2-2 If the finds are termed significant (i.e., a unique archaeological resource), the archaeologist and a Native American Observer shall be permitted to remove the items in a professional manner for further laboratory evaluation.

O.2-3 If human remains are unearthed during construction, no further disturbance shall occur until the Los Angeles County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the remains are determined to be those of a Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento shall be contacted before the remains are removed in accordance with Section 21083.2 of the California Public Resources Code.

---

[2] *Bouscaen, Stephen, EIR, An Archaeological Assessment of the La Tunas Debris Disposal Area, Los Angeles County, California, prepared by LSA, Novato, 1984; UCLA, Archaeological Survey Proposal UCAS 082D, 1965; Armstrong, Douglas V., An Archaeological Resource Survey and Impact Assessment of TT No. 37597, City of Los Angeles, 1979; Anonymous, Draft EIR, McGroarty Estates TT # 33315, 1990; Singer, Clay and John Atwood, Cultural Resource Survey and Impact Assessment for a 20-Acre Property at 8100-8150 McGroarty Street in Sunland, Los Angeles County, California, 1990; Padon, Beth, An Archaeological Assessment of TT No. 33315 Los Angeles, California, 1986; Weil, Ed.B., Intermountain Power Project IPP Microwave Loop Extension Project Cultural Resources Records Check and Field Survey Results, 1986.*

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

There are no known archaeological resources on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project, in combination with related projects in the vicinity, would not result in a cumulative impact on archaeological resources.

LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Because no known unique archaeological resources would be affected by the proposed project, impacts are expected to be less than significant. However, because there is the potential that unknown resources could be encountered during the course of project development, implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would ensure that no significant impacts occur to a unique archaeological resource.