IV. Environmental Impact Analysis

D.2 Cultural Resources – Archaeological and Paleontological Resources

1. Introduction

The following section addresses potential impacts associated with archeological and paleontological resources. This section is based in part on the findings and conclusions of the *Cultural Resources Assessment for the Forest Lawn Memorial-Park - Hollywood Hills, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California,* prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., dated January 2009. The Cultural Resources Assessment addresses the undeveloped portions of the Project Site and is provided in Appendix D-3 to this Draft EIR.

2. Environmental Setting

a. Existing Regulatory Framework

Federal, State, and local governments have developed laws and regulations designed to protect significant cultural resources that may be affected by actions that they undertake or regulate. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), National Historic Preservation Act, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) are the basic federal and state laws governing preservation of historic and archaeological resources of national, regional, State and local significance. As archaeological resources are also considered historic, regulations applicable to historic resources are also applicable to archaeological resources and are discussed and analyzed in this section.

(1) Federal

(a) National Historic Preservation Act

Enacted in 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is the principal Federal law dealing with historic preservation. The NHPA establishes a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the nation, and for other purposes. The NHPA expressly authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to expand and maintain a National Register of Historic Places (National Register) composed of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. Eligibility for listing in the National Register is determined for

districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and: (a) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or (b) are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or (c) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or (d) have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(2) State

(a) California CEQA and California Register of Historic Places

State archaeological regulations affecting this Project include the statutes and guidelines contained in CEQA (California Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, Section 15064.5). CEQA requires lead agencies to carefully consider the potential effects of a project on archaeological resources. CEQA recognizes that archaeological resources are part of the environment, and a project that "may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource [including archaeological resources] is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment" (P.R.C. Section 21084.1). For purposes of CEQA, a historical resource is any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources (P.R.C. Section 21084.1).

A resource is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources and considered a "historical resource" under CEQA if it meets any of the following criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history [CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3)].

Archaeologists assess archeological sites based on all four criteria but usually focus on the fourth criterion, above. The CCR also provides that cultural resources of local

significance are eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources (CCR Title 14, Section 4852).

If a lead agency determines that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of Section 21084.1 of the PRC and Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines described above apply. If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria for a historical resource contained in the CEQA Guidelines, then the site is to be treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083.2, which refer to a unique archaeological resource. As used in CEQA, "a unique archaeological resource" means 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 that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person [PRC Section 21083.2(g)].

In addition to having significance, resources must have integrity for the period of significance. The "period of significance" is the date or span of time within which notable events transpired at a site, or the period that notable individuals made their important contributions to a site. Integrity is the ability of that property to convey its significance.

CEQA requires the lead agency to: consider whether the project would have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources or resources eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, and to avoid these resources when feasible or to mitigate any effects to less than significant levels (PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1). The CEQA Guidelines note that if an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(c)(4)).

Paleontological resources are also afforded protection by environmental legislation set forth under CEQA. Appendix G (part V) of the CEQA Guidelines provides guidance relative to significant impacts on paleontological resources, stating that "a project will normally result in a significant impact on the environment if it will …disrupt or adversely affect a paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, except as part of a scientific study." Section 5097.5 of the PRC specifies that any unauthorized removal of

paleontological remains is a misdemeanor. Further, the California Penal Code Section 622.5 sets the penalties for damage or removal of paleontological resources.

(3) Local

(a) City of Los Angeles General Plan

The City of Los Angeles guidelines for the protection of archaeological resources are specified in Section 3 of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Conservation Element. As stated therein, it is the policy of the City of Los Angeles that the City's archaeological resources be protected for research and/or educational purposes. Section 5 of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Conservation Element recognizes the City's responsibility for identifying and protecting its cultural and historical heritage. The Conservation Element establishes the policy to continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition or property modification activities, with the related objective to protect important cultural and historical sites and resources for historical, cultural, research, and community educational purposes.

(4) Native American Consultation

Government Code Section 65352.3 (Senate Bill [SB] 18) requires local governments to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or specific plan. The State Office of Planning and Research's technical advice series recommends that agencies solicit the concerns of Native Americans and other interested persons and corporate entities, including, but not limited to, museums, historical commissions, associates and societies as part of the process of cultural resources inventory. In addition, California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods regardless of the antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains.

b. Cultural Setting

(1) Prehistoric Setting

Southern California researchers have used changing artifact assemblages and evolving ecological adaptations to divide regional prehistory into four stages: the Early Period, the Milling Stone Period, the Intermediate Period and the Late Period.

(a) Early Period (pre-6000 BC)

The Early Period (also known as the Hunting Period) covers the interval from the first presence of humans in Southern California until postglacial times (5500 to 6000 BC). Artifacts and cultural activities from this period represent a predominantly hunting culture; diagnostic artifacts include extremely large, often fluted bifaces associated with the use of the spear and the atlatl. In Southern California, important Early Period sites have been found near prehistoric Lake Mojave and along the San Dieguito River.

(b) Milling Stone Period (6000-3000 BC)

The transition from the Early Period to the Milling Stone Period is marked by an increased emphasis on the processing of seeds and edible plants and is estimated to have occurred between 6000 BC and 3000 BC. Milling Stone Period settlements were larger and were occupied for longer periods of time than those of the Early Period, and mortuary practices included both flexed and extended burials as well as reburials. Diagnostic artifacts recovered from Milling Stone Period archaeological sites include metates, manos, large projectile points indicating the continued use of darts and atlatls, discoidals and cogged stones.

(c) Intermediate Period (3000 BC-AD 500)

Approximately 3000 BC, coastal populations began relying more on marine resources, as evidenced by circular shell fishhooks, which first appeared at coastal sites in this period. Further inland, populations centered around pluvial lakes created by runoff from melting glaciers. Intermediate Period sites are characterized by the appearance of the mortar and pestle, and small projectile points. The use of the mortar and pestle may indicate an increased reliance on acorns as a food source, while the small projectile points suggest that the bow and arrow were in limited use. Intermediate Period burials were generally by interment in a flexed position, face down, although a site at Big Tujunga Wash in the San Fernando Valley contained both reburials under stone cairns and cremations.

(d) Late Period (AD 500-1769)

The Late Period witnessed a number of important cultural developments in Southern California, including the concentration of larger populations in settlements and communities, greater utilization of the available food resources, and the development of regional subcultures. Cremation was the preferred method of burial during the Late Period, and elaborate mortuary customs with abundant grave goods were common. Other cultural traits diagnostic of the Late Period include increased use of the bow and arrow, steatite containers, circular shell fishhooks, asphaltum (as an adhesive), bone tools, and personal ornaments of bone, shell, and stone. Obsidian from Obsidian Buttes near the Salton Sea was used sporadically in the manufacture of lithic artifacts until sometime after AD 1000,

when its use in the Los Angeles Basin became much more common. A number of the cultural elements found in Southern California during the Late Period have been linked to the migration of Uto-Aztecan speaking peoples from the Great Basin; these traits include the manufacture of ceramics, the use of small triangular arrow points, and interment by cremation. The date of the Uto-Aztecan migration has been dated as early as 2000 BC and as late as AD 700.

c. Ethnographic Setting

The Late Prehistoric Period ended abruptly when Franciscan friars and Spanish soldiers began establishing mission outposts along the California coast. The San Fernando Valley area was then occupied by two different groups: the Gabrielino and the Chumash Indians.

The Project Site, located within the foothills of the Santa Monica Mountains, is situated in a border area close to villages of two different groups and utilized by both the Gabrielino and the Chumash. Gabrielino villages known to have been situated in the San Fernando Valley include Totogna and Topangna, located near the southwestern edge of the valley and near the Project area. Huwam, located near the western edge of the San Fernando Valley, is the closest known Chumash village to the Project area.

(1) The Gabrielino Indians

The Gabrielino were hunters and gatherers who used both inland and coastal food resources. Gabrielino living within the San Fernando Valley generally located their campsites and villages near the few water sources the valley provided such as around the creeks and drainages found in the canyons, the perennial water source near Cahuenga Pass, or the Big Tujunga River. In addition to permanent settlements, the Gabrielino occupied temporary campsites used seasonally for hunting, fishing, and gathering plant foods and shellfish. Gabrielino villages generally contained populations with 50-100 inhabitants, although larger communities may have existed. These communities were the focus of family life. Villages were united under the leadership of a tomyaar, or chief, who inherited his position from his father. Shamans also played an important role in Gabrielino society, serving as the principal doctors, therapists, philosophers, and intellectuals; often, the tomyaar himself was an important and influential shaman. Gabrielino culture was characterized by an active and elaborate system of rituals and ceremonies.

Gabrielino territory included the watersheds of the Los Angeles, San Gabriel, and Santa Ana Rivers, several smaller intermittent streams in the Santa Monica and Santa Ana Mountains, all of the Los Angeles Basin, the coast from Aliso Creek north to a point

between Topanga and Malibu Creeks, and the islands of San Clemente, San Nicolas, and Santa Catalina.

(2) The Chumash Indians

Although the Chumash were first observed by 17th century European explorers as living along the coast, smaller groups of Chumash also occupied inland areas. Within the San Fernando Valley, the Chumash generally occupied the western and southwestern foothills, including the Santa Monica Mountain foothills. The Chumash village consisted of a main settlement and multiple surrounding seasonal camps, processing areas, and resource acquisition areas. Each village had one chief whose position was inherited patrilineally. The greatest power, however, rested with the community shamans.

A typical Chumash village consisted of several hemispherical houses, a sweathouse, storehouses, a ceremonial enclosure, and a gaming area. The Chumash manufactured cooking utensils (e.g., bowls, cooking plates) and ritual objects out of steatite quarried on Santa Catalina Island. The islands off the coast of California were accessed with plank canoes called tomol. For hunting, the Chumash used the bow and arrow. The rock paintings of the Chumash are some of the most spectacular in the United States and can be found throughout Chumash territory.

Chumash occupied territory from San Luis Obispo to Malibu Canyon along the coast, inland areas as far east as the western edge of San Joaquin Hills, the Santa Monica Mountains, and the Santa Barbara Channel Islands.

d. Historic Setting

(1) Spanish Mission Period (1769-1821)

In 1542, Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo explored the California coast by ship. Although the Cabrillo expedition, the first European exploration of Southern California, anchored ships near present day Santa Monica during its voyage, it was not until August 5, 1769, when Gaspar de Portola's expedition to Monterey passed through the San Fernando Valley that Europeans first recorded the area. Father Juan Crespi, the expedition's spiritual advisor, called it de Valle de Santa Catalina de Bononia de los Encinos. Father Fermín de Lasuén established the first Franciscan mission in the Valley, Mission San Fernando Rey de España, on September 8, 1797, which consisted of a cross and a small arbor that acted as a temporary church.

In 1795, the San Fernando Valley was divided into two large ranchos, El Encino Rancho, which was deeded to Francisco Reyes, and San Rafael Rancho, which was

deeded to Jose Maria Verdugo. Ultimately, the land for the El Encino Rancho was given to the San Fernando Mission, and Reyes was given land elsewhere.

Ultimately, Spanish colonization resulted in the destruction of both the Gabrielino and the Chumash society and culture. Two important factors that contributed to this decline were (1) the removal of the youngest, healthiest, and most productive Indians from their traditional communities and their incorporation into the Mission system, and (2) introduction of highly infectious diseases, eventually leading to epidemics and reduced birth rates. As a result, the traditional Indian communities were depopulated and the survivors integrated into local Mexican-American communities. Several Gabrielino groups still live in the Los Angeles area today, while the current Chumash population is spread throughout Southern California, with one reservation at Santa Ynez in Santa Barbara County.

(2) Mexican Rancho Period (1821-1848)

In 1821, Mexico gained independence from Spain and, in 1848, the United States formally obtained California in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. It was during this period that large tracts of land termed ranchos were granted by the various Mexican Governors of Alta California, usually to individuals who had worked in the service of the Mexican government. During this time, the two ranchos that comprised the San Fernando Valley were broken into several smaller ranchos. In 1843, the El Providencia Rancho No. 424 (4,064 acres, or one square league) was granted to Jose Castro, Luis Arenas, and Vincente de la Osa by Governor Micheltorena. De la Osa retained sole ownership of the rancho.

(3) American Period (post-1848)

Following the end of hostilities between Mexico and the United States in January of 1847, the United States officially obtained California from Mexico through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on February 2, 1848. In 1850, California was accepted into the Union of the United States.

The cattle industry in California reached its greatest prosperity during the first years of the American Period. More people began moving into the San Fernando Valley. However, unprecedented floods in 1861-1862 were followed by two years of drought, which was a turning point in the economic history of Southern California. The era of the great cattle ranchos ended, and many of the landowners who survived the collapse of the cattle industry were forced to sell their property due to the drought. In 1867, El Rancho Providencia was purchased by Dr. David Burbank, a dentist from New Hampshire who wanted to raise sheep and grow wheat.

Southern California's economic transition continued through the 1870s. Rancho Providencia became the principal source of grain for the San Fernando Valley and for Los Angeles during this time, and in 1874, the Southern Pacific Railroad began running through the Valley. Although Rancho Providencia was one of only four locations with water in the Valley, by 1886, drought spurred Burbank to sell his 9,000 acres to the Providencia Land and Water Development Company. By the early 1900s, Rancho Providencia had shrunk to 1,000 acres and was better known as the Providencia Ranch.

In the early 1900s, movie makers such as D.W. Griffith and Cecil B. DeMille took advantage of the open, western-looking terrain and predictably sunny weather of the San Fernando Valley to film several movies. Valleywood, as some would nickname the San Fernando Valley, played a critical role in the development of the Hollywood movie industry. By January of 1915, 50 studios in and around Los Angeles were producing feature films.

(4) W.I. Hollingsworth and Company Property

By the early 1900s, the real estate company, W.I. Hollingsworth and Company, had acquired large portions of the Providencia Ranch, including a large portion of what is now the Project Site. After Jesse Lasky leased the Providencia Ranch in 1914, Providencia Ranch became more commonly known as the Lasky Ranch. Lasky leased the ranch to film big scenes and maintained a stock farm.

Lasky's lease expired around the late 1920s, and the old Lasky Ranch reverted to W.I. Hollingsworth and Company interests. Warner Brothers leased the 1,000-acre old Lasky Ranch in 1929 from W.I. Hollingsworth and Company and by 1930, the Lasky Ranch had been in almost constant demand by studios for nearly 20 years. Films made at the Lasky Ranch include many of Cecile B. DeMille's early films; D.W. Griffith's *The Birth of a Nation*; *All Quiet on the Western Front*; several of Charlie Chaplin's early comedies, including *Sunnyside*; and many of W.C. Fields' early comedies such as *It's a Gift*.

By the mid-1920s, the ranch manager's residence, a ranch house, a shed, and a barn with corrals had been built on a portion of the Providencia Ranch within the current boundaries of the Project Site. Ernest G. Carter, the ranch manager for W.I. Hollingsworth and Company, lived on the property with his wife, Ramona. Carter eventually became a vice president at W.I. Hollingsworth and Company and moved off the property a few years after Forest Lawn purchased it.

By the mid-1930s, the old Lasky Ranch consisted of approximately 500 acres. The majority of the property was still owned by W.I. Hollingsworth and Company and included approximately 300 acres of the current Project Site. Several buildings were constructed on the property during the 1930s and early 1940s to serve the movie industry. By 1945, the

ranch consisted of all the original buildings, two additional residences, a water tank, an additional barn, two additional sheds, a blacksmith shop, two offices, a clubhouse, a saddle house, an oil station, and two movie sets.

After the departure of Warner Brothers, the old Lasky Ranch was leased to the Hudkins brothers. The Hudkins Stables Riding Academy, also known as the Hudkins Brothers Movie Ranch, supplied horses, wagons, and gear to the movie industry and provided riding instruction for San Fernando Valley residents. During the early 1930s, a track (the Lasky Park track) was created on the ranch. A pump house and several stables were associated with this track. The Los Angeles Polo Club as well as much of the polo crowd in Hollywood used the infield for matches, and races were run on the track.

By 1946, the remaining open acres of the Providencia Ranch (old Lasky Ranch or Hudkins Ranch) property had been purchased by Forest Lawn to create a memorial-park similar to the existing Forest Lawn Memorial-Park in Glendale. Construction of the memorial-park did not begin immediately after the land purchase, while Forest Lawn obtained a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to operate the property as a cemetery. The Hudkins brothers remained on the Hudkins Ranch until the late 1940s.

(5) Mack Sennett Property

In 1918, Mack Sennett became the largest private landowner in Los Angeles when he purchased 500 acres of property, including 304 acres of what is now Griffith Park. Approximately 150 acres of this purchase were located within the Providencia Ranch and within the boundaries of the current Project Site. Sennett envisioned building a mansion atop Mount Sennett, now known as Mount Lee. Sennett removed 69 feet from the top of Mount Sennett to create a suitable house pad for his mansion. By 1926, the house pad was almost complete. However, Sennett lost approximately $5 million in the stock market crash of 1929 and by 1934, Sennett was bankrupt; the full-sized house was never built. Sennett's property in Los Angeles was sold at a tax sale in the late 1930s. Although Sennett's property included a house built circa 1916 and an adjacent circa 1925 barn, built during the time he owned the land, there is no mention of the house or barn in the Sennett autobiography. By 1941, all of the former Mack Sennett property within the current Project Site boundaries had been sold to private individuals, Edward (Bud) Furer and K.O. Anderson. Edward Furer was the son of a Swiss immigrant and owner of the Acme Tool and Manufacturing Company. Eben Coe, who acquired K.O. Anderson's acreage, was an actor and singer in the 1920s and 1930s.

e. Local and Site Conditions

(1) Geology and Geomorphology

The Project Site lies in the foothills of the Santa Monica Mountains within the City of Los Angeles. The Santa Monica Mountains are part of the Transverse Range, which extends 350 miles east to west from San Bernardino County to the Pacific Ocean. Specifically, the Santa Monica Mountains fall within the western segment of the Transverse Range and consist of two major east-trending uplifts separated by a tectonic depression. The topography of the Project Site is rolling hills. The Project Site includes currently undeveloped areas of the Forest Lawn Memorial-Park – Hollywood Hills property within the foothills of the Santa Monica Mountains, at the southern end of the San Fernando Valley. Portions of the Project Site are associated with Sennett Canyon. Sennett Creek flows in a north-south direction through the Forest Lawn Memorial-Park – Hollywood Hills property. Geologically, this area is composed of Middle Miocene Formation marine sedimentary rocks. To the north of this is Recent Alluvium and to the south Mesozoic Granitic Rocks.

f. Records Search

A cultural resources records search was conducted by LSA Associates, Inc. at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), located at California State University Fullerton. It included a review of all recorded historic archaeological sites and architectural resources as well as all known cultural resource survey and excavation reports within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project area. In addition, LSA examined the National Register, the California Register, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest. The Historic Properties Directory (2005) maintained by the State Office of Historic Preservation was also inspected for addresses within the Project area.

Based on the findings of the cultural resources records search, the address of the Project Site is listed in the Historic Properties Directory; however, the site description refers to the original Forest Lawn Memorial-Park and Mortuary in Glendale, which opened in 1906. No other previously recorded cultural resources were identified within the Project Site or within 0.5 mile of the Project Site.

g. Archival Research

Archival research was conducted by an LSA archaeologist. Research methodology focused on the review of a variety of primary and secondary source materials relating to the history and development of the Project area. Sources included but were not limited to historic maps, aerial photographs, City directories, County assessor's maps, and written histories of the area. A magnification analysis of the historic aerials was conducted to ascertain build dates of historic resources. A detailed list of repositories, publications, and

individuals that were contacted regarding the historical land uses and the locations of research materials pertinent to the Project Site is contained in Appendix D-3 to this Draft EIR.

h. Recent History of the Forest Lawn Memorial-Park - Hollywood Hills Property

A review of historic maps and aerials shows three different houses as well as associated outbuildings that were constructed within the Project Site more than 50 years ago.

The first building constructed within the project area first appears on the USGS 1921 Santa Monica, California 15-minute topographic map. A 1916 building improvement, listed in the current information for the parcel on which this building is located, is likely associated with this building. The owner of the property and the builder of the house are unknown, as Los Angeles County Assessor's records are unavailable for this property until 1924. However, Mack Sennett acquired this property in 1918, as discussed above, had planned to construct a mansion on top of Mount Sennett (now Mount Lee), and had completed the grading of a road and a house pad, which was never built. Several roads are visible on the 1928 aerial in the vicinity of the house and into and out of Griffith Park. It is not clear whether Sennett ever occupied the house on his property. However, Los Angeles County Assessor's records show building improvements to the property in 1925, a second building near the first appears on the 1926 topographic map, and historic aerials show this second structure is a barn, so the house appears to have been occupied during this time.

By 1934, Sennett was bankrupt and the acreage was divided and sold at a tax sale to two parties, Edward (Bud) Furer and K.O. Anderson. Edward Furer owned the majority of the acreage, approximately 125 acres, including the circa 1916 house.

Between 1941 and 1945, a second house was built in proximity to the circa 1916 house. This house was a large residence with a pool and included a pump house, a generator house, and a feed room. Although this house was erected on the property owned by K.O. Anderson from 1941 to 1943 and Eben Coe from 1943 to 1945, it is unclear which individual built and occupied it, as no building permits were found for this building and no directory listings were found for any residents of this building. By 1946, Forest Lawn had acquired approximately 490 acres on the Rancho Providencia and Scott tract, Tract 17266.

In 1947, Bud Furer constructed a new residence and an adjacent garage on the property. The redwood and brick residence measured approximately 1,000 square feet, had a copper roof, and was completed in 1949. By 1948, Bud Furer had also constructed a

third barn on his ranch. By 1948, the Furer Ranch consisted of three residences, three barns, corrals, a chicken house, a garage, a generator house, a pump house, and a feed room.

The Forest Lawn Memorial-Park - Hollywood Hills opened in 1952. The Furers remained in residence into the mid-1960s, per an agreement with Forest Lawn. It is unclear which house the Furers occupied—the early 1940s house or the 1947 house. The circa 1916 house and the smaller barn and chicken house were removed by 1965, presumably for the building of the Hall of Liberty. By 1968, the barn built by Bud Furer had been removed. The circa 1925 barn was removed by 1982, and the 1947 Furer house is no longer visible on the aerial, although the garage is visible. The early 1940s house was removed in 1991, as it was in an extreme state of disrepair. None of the Furer Ranch buildings are visible in a circa 2000 aerial photograph.

i. Current Land Use

The majority of the area surveyed for cultural resources within the Project Site is undeveloped. Portions of the undeveloped areas of the Project Site appear to have been graded for storage of soil removed during preparation of interment spaces, a 1990s YMCA camp, and surface mining activities that occurred between the 1960s and 1990s.

j. Fieldwork

A systematic pedestrian cultural resource survey was conducted by an LSA archaeologist and architectural historian. Located in the foothills of the Santa Monica Mountains, the majority of the undeveloped portion of the Project Site is typified by oak- and brush-covered slopes. Sennett Creek bisects the Project Site, and vegetation around the creek is thick with poison oak, reeds, and grasses. The remainder of the Project area is typified by narrow ridgelines with steep slopes.

The pedestrian survey was unable to locate physical manifestations of the Furer houses and barns that were identified during archival research. Portions of the Project Site appear to have been graded for storage of soil removed during preparation of interment spaces, a circa 1990s YMCA camp, and modern mining activities.

One cultural resource, discussed below, was located during the pedestrian survey.

(1) Archaeological Resources Observed

This site is the remnants of a water conveyance system, the remnant of two roads, part of a cobble and mortar wall, a graded pad, and two bridges. The water conveyance

system consists of five features: two pumps, a wall lining the creek, a water line, and a spigot with a valve. The water conveyance system is located primarily within Sennett Canyon along the creek. The ten features are described in further detail below.

- **Features 1 and 2.** Features 1 and 2 are bridges that span the small creek that bisects the Project Site. Feature 1 is a continuous span simple deck beam wooden pedestrian bridge that measures 14.5 feet long. The deck is constructed of 6-inch-wide wooden floor beams nailed to wood post support beams. The footings consist of four wooden posts sunk into the banks of the creek and nailed to the other posts that span the creek. The remains of a square pagoda-style arch are built on one side of the bridge and measure 8 feet tall. Feature 2 is a 21-foot-long closed spandrel deck arch bridge constructed of concrete and cobbles. The arches have been faced with concrete. The deck is made of wooden 6-inch-wide wooden floor beams nailed to wood post support beams that span the creek and are set in concrete footings on either side of the creek. The construction and size of this bridge appear to be suitable for vehicular traffic.

- These two bridges appear to have provided access to the Edward Furer house. Both bridges are in very poor condition. Support braces for the wooden bridge have fallen from the bridge and are lying at the bottom of the creek. The posts sunk into the bank of the creek are shaky. The concrete bridge has no integrity left. The supports for this bridge are in differing states of disrepair, and the planks are mostly gone, leaving only the concrete supports and wooden support beams.

- **Feature 3.** The third feature is a pump motor. The motor is sunk into the ground with an attached metal pipe that runs into the ground. The pump appears to have been manufactured by the A.O. Smith Corporation, and the Smithway models of electric motors from this company were not manufactured until 1940, when A.O. Smith purchased Sawyer Electric Manufacturing Company. The pump does not appear functional.

- **Feature 4.** The fourth feature is a spigot located on the opposite side of the creek from the pump motor. The spigot emerges from a drilled hole in a rock along the creek and extends approximately six inches from the rock. A screw valve is located on the top of the spigot to open and close the spigot. There is a joint on the end of the pipe, and the pipe appears to have been filled in.

- **Feature 5.** This feature is a cobble and mortar wall located on the northern bank of the creek. The wall is approximately 20 inches tall and the visible portion is approximately 40 feet long. Individual cobbles measure 3 to 10 inches in diameter and are stacked three courses high. The wall averages 9 inches wide, depending on the size of the cobbles. The portion of the wall remaining appears to be in fair condition. The function of this wall is unclear; it is possible that the wall stabilized the bank of the creek.

- **Feature 6.** This feature consists of a small graded pad that measures 100 x 100 feet. This pad is located along a ridge and connects to a graded access road. The pad is visible on the 1928 aerial and appears to be associated with the circa 1916 house. One historic ceramic kettle was observed in association with this pad. Based on a magnification analysis of historic aerials, commencing with the 1928 aerial, nothing appears to have ever been erected at this site. It is possible that this pad was intended for a water reservoir or a small residence.

- **Feature 7.** Feature 7 is the remnant of a graded dirt road and adjoining cemented cobble wall. The wall measures approximately 50 feet long and stands two to three courses high. The wall is approximately 1 foot thick. Each of the cobbles measures approximately 3.94 to 7.87 inches (in). The wall represents a road border. The road appears to have been used for automobiles, as it is 8 feet wide and partially paved with asphalt and gravel. This road appears to have provided access to the 1947 Furer house.

- **Feature 8.** Feature 8 is a second pump. The pump appears to be circa 1940 and is likely another part of the overall water conveyance feature related to the Furer Ranch. The pump does not appear to function any longer.

- **Feature 9.** Feature 9 is a second section of road. This section is an unpaved road segment that has been cut into the hillside and measures approximately 300 x 6 feet. This road segment is associated with the pedestrian and vehicular bridges and is likely related to accessing the 1947 Furer house.

- **Feature 10.** Feature 10 is a section of 2-inch-diameter metal water pipe running along a small drainage from Feature 9 (a water pump) to where it daylights near the top of the ridge and beyond. This water line is no longer in use. The line is part of the overall water conveyance system related to the Furer Ranch.

- All features appear to be related to the 1940s Furer Ranch, which is no longer extant. As Feature 3, a water pump, was not manufactured before 1940, and the construction methods and materials of these features are consistent with each other and a date in the 1940s, it is likely that the bridges, road, and water conveyance features are related to the period when the Furers occupied the houses and expanded the ranch in the 1940s. The graded pad, which predates the other features as it was created before 1928, still appears to be related to the 1916 house. The roads and bridges appear to be related to access to the houses and the 1948 barn. Since Edward Furer kept horses at his ranch from the 1940s through the 1960s, it is likely that the water conveyance features are related to this endeavor.

3. Environmental Impacts

a. Methodology

A cultural resources records search was conducted to identify known resources within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Site. The records search included a review of all recorded historic archaeological sites and architectural resources, a review of all known cultural resource survey and excavation reports, and a review of the National Register, the California Register, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest databases. The findings of this research effort were supplemented by a systematic pedestrian archaeological resource survey of the Project area conducted by an archaeologist and architectural historian. The results of these efforts were included in the *Cultural Resources Assessment for the Forest Lawn Memorial-Park - Hollywood Hills, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California*. The proposed Project's development was then evaluated for its potential to impact any identified on-site resources.

To address potential impacts associated with paleontological resources, an evaluation of the existing conditions and previous disturbances within the site, the geology of the Project Site and anticipated depths of grading were used to determine the potential for uncovering of such resources.

b. Thresholds of Significance

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides a set of screening questions that address impacts with regard to cultural resources. These questions are as follows:

Would the project:

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

As mentioned above, archeological resources are often considered historic resources for having yielded, or having the ability to yield, information important in prehistory or history. Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that a project involves a "substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource" when one or more of the following occurs:

1. Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means 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.
2. The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project results in any of the following:
    - o Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register.
    - o 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 PRC or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, 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.
    - o Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

In the context of these questions from the CEQA Guidelines, the *City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide* states that a project would normally have a significant impact upon archaeological resources if it could disturb, damage, or degrade an archaeological resource or its setting that is found to be important under the criteria of CEQA because it:

- Is associated with an event or person of recognized importance in California or American prehistory or of recognized scientific importance in prehistory;
- Can provide information which is both of demonstrable public interest and useful in addressing scientifically consequential and reasonable archaeological research questions;
- Has a special or particular quality, such as the oldest, best, largest, or last surviving example of its kind;
- Is at least 100 years old and possesses substantial stratigraphic integrity; or
- Involves important research questions that historical research has shown can be answered only with archaeological methods.

With regard to paleontological resources, the *City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide*, states that the determination of the significance of paleontological impacts shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors:

- Whether, or the degree to which, the project might result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a paleontological resource; and
- Whether the paleontological resource is of regional or statewide significance.

Based on these factors, the proposed Project would have a significant impact on paleontological resources, if:

- The proposed Project would result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a paleontological resource of regional or statewide significance.

c. Project Impacts

No prehistoric archeological resources were observed on the Project Site. Further, the historic archeological resources observed are not recommended for listing in the National or California Register. Grading, excavations, and the development of proposed structures, interment sites and other improvements are anticipated to result in the disturbance and grading within an area with the recorded artifacts associated with the Furer Ranch that was developed in the early 1900s, as described above. The ten features recorded are not eligible for listing in the National Register nor in the California Register due to the poor integrity of the water conveyance system, road, wall, and bridges, and because these features do not appear to be related to persons or events important to the development of the San Fernando Valley or to the history of Valleywood. The features are not associated with an event or person of recognized importance. Therefore, the removal of these features would not result in a significant impact to an archaeological resource that is found to be important under the criteria of CEQA and no mitigation measures are required. Nevertheless, because buried remains often go undetected during a pedestrian survey, the build date and builder of the 1916 Furer house are unknown, and the surrounding area is sensitive for historic resources, future expansion and development could impact unknown historic resources. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure IV.D.2-1 and IV.D.2-2 are recommended to reduce impacts to previously unidentified archaeological resources in the unlikely event any such materials are encountered.

With regard to paleontological resources, no paleontological resources are known to exist at the Project Site. In addition, the uppermost soil layers are not likely to contain paleontological resources. However, the proposed Project would result in excavations and grading on previously undisturbed portions of the Project Site and would also result in deeper excavations on previously disturbed portions of the Project Site. As such, the

possibility exists that a subsurface paleontological resource may be found during earth work activities. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure IV.D.2-3 is recommended to reduce impacts to previously unidentified paleontological resources in the unlikely event any such materials are encountered.

The Project Site is not known to contain any buried human remains outside of the designated interment sites within the developed portions of the Forest Lawn Memorial-Park. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65352.3, the Native American Heritage Commission was consulted during the NOP process and did not provide any response to the NOP consultation request. In addition, no recorded Native American burial sites were identified during the cultural resources records search or archival records search or field surveys. Nevertheless, grading and earthwork activities have an inherent potential to disturb previously undiscovered and unknown buried human remains, including those of Native Americans. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure IV.D-4 is recommended to ensure any unanticipated impacts to buried human remains, including those of Native American Indians are mitigated to less-than-significant levels in accordance with the prescribed statutes of State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

4. Cumulative Impacts

The Project in combination with cumulative development could contribute to the progressive loss of undeveloped land, which could potentially contain archaeological resources. Although no previously recorded prehistoric archaeological sites occur on the Project Site or its vicinity, implementation of the recommended mitigation measures regarding the protection of such resources would ensure that potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources tend to be site specific and are addressed on a site-by-site basis. Similar to the proposed Project, determinations regarding the significance of any cultural resources would be made on a case-by-case basis and, if necessary, the applicants of the related projects would be required to implement appropriate mitigation measures. Furthermore, the proposed Project's impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Therefore, the proposed Project would not contribute to any potential cumulative impacts, and cumulative impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

5. Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are recommended to ensure that impacts to yet unknown archaeological and paleontological resources would be mitigated in the unlikely event any resources are encountered during the grading and excavation phase.

Mitigation Measure D.2-1 If any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of the Project development, the Project shall be halted in the area of the discovery. The services of an archaeologist shall be secured by contacting the Center for Public Archaeology - Cal State University Fullerton, or a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologist (SOPA) or a SOPA-qualified archaeologist to assess the resources and evaluate the impact. Copies of the archaeological survey, study or report shall be submitted to the UCLA Archaeological Information Center.

Mitigation Measure D.2-2 The Applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor any ground-disturbing activities in the currently undeveloped southeastern portion of the Project Site near the Adolf Furer house location. The monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt grading operations in the area of the discovery until the resources are properly assessed and subsequent recommendations are determined by the lead agency.

Mitigation Measure D.2-3 If any paleontological materials are encountered during the course of the Project development, work in the area should be halted. The services of a qualified paleontologist shall be secured by contacting the Center for Public Paleontology - USC, UCLA, Cal State Los Angeles, Cal State Long Beach, or the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum, to assess the resources and evaluate the impact. In addition, a report on the paleontological findings shall be prepared by the qualified paleontologist. A copy of the paleontological report shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.

Mitigation Measure D.2-4 Pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are encountered on-site, no further disturbance shall occur until the Applicant or its contractor contacts the County Coroner and the Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The Applicant or its contractor shall notify the County Coroner immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner shall notify the Native American Resource Center, which shall then determine and notify a most likely descendant of the deceased. The most likely descendant may inspect the site of the discovery with the permission of the landowner, or his or her authorized representative. The most likely descendant shall complete its inspection within 48 hours of its notification by the Native American Heritage Commission. The most likely descendant may recommend scientific removal and analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

6. Level of Significance After Mitigation

No known previously recorded pre-historic, archaeological or paleontological resources or human remains have been recorded on the Project Site or in the immediate Project vicinity. Implementation of Mitigation Measures D.2-1 through D.2-4 would reduce any unforeseen project impacts associated with the unlikely discovery or disturbance of any Native American human remains or archaeological and paleontological resources to less than significant levels.