

1 **5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

2 The project networks are planned within two large areas of California which are separated at their
3 closest points by more than 300 miles. Consequently, the cultural resources setting, in general, for
4 these regions varies somewhat due to differences in climate, vegetation, landform, and
5 prehistoric/historic land use. Within the two project areas are also sub-settings. The San Francisco
6 Bay Area Network contains the coastal environs of San Francisco Bay, and the East Bay, a portion
7 of the near-coastal foothills and valleys. The Los Angeles Basin Network consists of a small
8 portion of the coastal Santa Monica Mountains in the north, with most of the project area located to
9 the south in the greater Los Angeles Basin. As is described in the narratives for the various project
10 sub-areas and the surrounding environment, the level of archaeological and historical studies that
11 have been completed ranges from extensive studies to no field surveys. Overall, the cultural
12 resource setting includes prehistoric sites that may extend back for several thousand years, with
13 some sites showing evidence of contact with early European cultures. The historic sites reflect the
14 broad cultural panorama of this region of California. Historic sites in the region include those
15 associated with early exploration and colonization; the Spanish, Mexican, and American
16 expansions; the Gold Rush; the boom of the 1880s–1890s; post-1900 industrialization; and the
17 growth of the region during World War I, World War II, and post-war eras.

18 Pre-dating human habitation are paleontological resources, in the form of fossilized remains of
19 organisms that lived in the region in the geologic past. Paleontological resources are also present
20 in the regions of interest and preserve an additional aspect of prehistory.

21 **5.5.1 Regulatory Setting**

22 **5.5.1.1 Federal**

23 Federal regulations and policies pertain to those actions that involve federal funding, federal
24 licensing, or federal permitting. Examples may include federal grants or licensing (FERC and ICC)
25 and federal permits associated with vegetation and wetlands (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
26 [Corps] Section 404 permits). It has been determined that for the San Francisco Network that a
27 Preconstruction Notification to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is required in order to seek a
28 National 12 permit.

29 *Section 106 Review*

30 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and its amendments effective June
31 1999, requires that all federal agencies review and evaluate how their actions or undertakings may
32 affect historic properties. Review under Section 106 is designed to ensure that historic properties
33 are considered throughout the various stages of federal project planning and execution. Under
34 Section 106, historic properties are resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the National
35 Register of Historic Places. Compliance responsibility is placed upon the federal agency initiating
36 an undertaking; the review process is administered by the Advisory Council on Historic
37 Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Recent changes to the Section 106
38 process have somewhat increased the role and authority of the SHPO and reduced the role of the
39 Advisory Council.

1 For actions and projects specific to the project, the Section 106 process may apply if there is a later
2 requirement for a Corps Section 404 permit for river and stream crossings or other waterways
3 under the Corps' jurisdiction.

4 **5.5.1.2 State**

5 With the CPUC as the lead agency, California policies and regulations are the primary source of
6 regulations and guidelines.

7 *California Environmental Quality Act*

8 Historical resources are considered to be part of the environment as defined by CEQA. A
9 substantial adverse change to the significance of a historical resource constitutes a significant effect
10 on the environment. A "substantial adverse change" means "demolition, destruction, relocation,
11 or alteration such that the significance of a historical resource would be impaired" (Section
12 15064.5). All properties eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources that
13 may be effected by a project must be considered under CEQA. The fact that a resource or property
14 is not listed on the California Register does not preclude it from being significant and does not
15 make it exempt from CEQA evaluation.

16 *State Historical Building Code*

17 In California, the State Historical Building Code (SHBC) provides some degree of flexibility to
18 owners of historic structures towards meeting building code requirements. The SHBC standards
19 and regulations are performance-oriented rather than prescriptive unlike most housing codes
20 which are more prescriptive. Jurisdictions must use the SHBC when dealing with qualified
21 historical buildings, structures, sites, or resources in permitting repairs, alterations and additions
22 necessary for the preservation, rehabilitation, relocation, related reconstruction, change of use, or
23 continued use of a historic property. The State Historical Building Safety Board has adopted the
24 following definition for a qualified historical house or resource:

25 A qualified historical building or structure is any structure, collection of structures,
26 and their associates sites, deemed of importance to the history, architecture or
27 culture of an area by an appropriate local, state, or Federal governmental
28 jurisdiction. This should include designated structures declared eligible or listed on
29 official national, state, or local historic registers or official inventories such as the
30 National Register of Historic Places, State Historic Landmarks, State Points of
31 Historical Interest, and officially adopted city or county registers or inventories of
32 historical or architecturally significant sites, places, or landmarks.

33 Under the provisions of the SHBC, new construction or modifications, such as placing a generating
34 station or other fiber optic facility in a historic building must conform to prevailing codes,
35 although the elements of the existing structure are given the flexibility of reasonable and sensitive
36 alternatives. The alternative building standards and regulations encompassed by the SHBC are
37 intended to facilitate the renovation in a manner that assists in the preservation of original or
38 restored architectural elements and features, encourages energy conservation, provides a cost-
39 effective approach to preservation, and ensures the safety of occupants.

1 **5.5.1.3 Counties**

2 The policies and regulations of the various counties as they apply to historical resources in the
3 project area are limited. Each affected county has policies (ordinances and General Plans) that
4 echo CEQA and also reflect local policy on the preservation and enhancement of historical
5 resources.

6 **5.5.1.4 Cities**

7 The policies and regulations of the various cities as they apply to historical resources in the project
8 area are limited. Each affected city has policies (ordinances and General Plans) that echo CEQA
9 and also reflect local policy on the preservation and enhancement of historical resources.

10 **5.5.2 Environmental Setting**

11 **Methods**

12 *Archaeological Resources*

13 The following archaeological impact assessment is based upon the project's cultural resource
14 reconnaissance survey and inventory report (Mooney & Associates 2000). The paleontological
15 impact assessment is based on a detailed technical memorandum (ESA memorandum dated May
16 26, 2000). Each study was verified and updated as needed during an independent peer review by
17 SAIC and GANDA.

18 Archaeological site records and literature searches were performed at the Northwest Information
19 Center at Sonoma State University for the San Francisco Bay Area and at the South Central Coastal
20 Information Center at the University of California at Los Angeles for the Los Angeles Basin. These
21 searches included a review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listings, the State of
22 California Historic Landmarks registers, and county and city registers for historic sites. Results of
23 the listed historic and prehistoric archaeological sites are indicated below for the two project areas.
24 Portions of the project area previously surveyed were selectively spot-checked in the field, and
25 reconnaissance surveys were conducted in areas indicated as not previously surveyed (Mooney &
26 Associates 2000). Because most of the project alignment and ancillary facility sites would be
27 located in built environments such as below paved streets and landscaped developments, ground
28 visibility during field surveys was frequently severely inhibited.

29 Native American consultation for this project is an ongoing process. Letters have been sent to the
30 Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requesting a search of their Sacred Lands files.
31 Protocols for Native American consultation and involvement will comply with the standard
32 procedures requested by the NAHC and with the recommendations discussed at the February 4,
33 2000, meeting of NAHC, i.e., continuous consultation with the affected groups and sincere
34 consideration of Native American concerns regarding prehistoric sites and resources. To date,
35 Metromedia's archaeological consultants have contacted 52 Native Americans representing a wide
36 range of groups and tribal affiliations in the San Francisco and Los Angeles region (Metromedia
37 Fiber Optic Project Native American Contact List, on file at Mooney & Associates). It is assumed
38 that Native Americans will serve as consultants and will be a part of the construction monitoring
39 team in those areas containing resources that are important to local Native American people. To
40 date, Andrew Galvan of the Ohlone Indian Tribe has been contacted regarding monitoring of the

1 San Francisco Bay Area Network, and Samuel Dunlap of the Gabrielino has been contacted
2 regarding monitoring of the Los Angeles Basin Network.

3 *Paleontological Resources*

4 Paleontologists consider all vertebrate fossils to be of significance. Fossils of other types are also
5 considered significant if they represent a new record, new species, an oldest occurring species, the
6 most complete specimen of its kind, a rare species worldwide, or a species helpful in the dating of
7 formations. However, even a previously designated low potential site may yield significant fossils.

8 To obtain full understanding of the paleontological resources in the San Francisco Bay Area, ESA
9 consulted the California Division of Mines and Geology in San Francisco and the U.S. Geological
10 Survey Library in Menlo Park. ESA consulted staff paleontologists, geologic maps, published
11 papers, site-specific field surveys, and various reference books. Communication was also initiated
12 with geologists at the planning offices for the counties crossed by the San Francisco Bay Area
13 Network. ESA consulted Professor Lisa White of San Francisco State University's Geoscience
14 Department.

15 Paleontological information for the Los Angeles areas was obtained from the California Division of
16 Mines and Geology geologic maps, Dibblee Foundation geologic maps, and a geologic map
17 compiled by J.E. Schoelhamer of the Los Angeles Basin. Literature on fossil-bearing potentials of
18 specific geologic formations, and literature on major fossil localities were used to determine
19 potential fossil types within each geologic formation that would be disturbed by the construction
20 in the Los Angeles Basin Network. Other sources of information included fossil locality
21 information from the City of Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework EIR, the LA County
22 Natural History Museum, and a professional paper on the Geology of Orange County was
23 obtained from available geologic maps.

24 **5.5.2.1 San Francisco Bay Area Network**

25 The two Backbone segments of the San Francisco Bay Area Network, designated as the Peninsula
26 and East Bay Backbone alignments, are located within existing Caltrain and Union Pacific Railroad
27 corridors. These two railroad corridors each run roughly north-south and extend along the
28 peninsula or western (Caltrain) and eastern (Union Pacific) sides of San Francisco Bay. For these
29 two Backbone alignments, 18 locations for repairs of conduit segments to the existing Pacific Bell
30 Structure, and the construction of Points of Presence (POPs) at various locations along the network
31 constitute the three types of construction activities evaluated in this study for the potential to
32 impact significant cultural resources.

33 As noted above, the Backbone segments extend almost entirely along railroad rights-of-way
34 (ROWs). These ROWs consist mostly of unpaved corridors of varying widths ranging from
35 approximately 100 feet to more than 500 feet in some rail yard areas. Within these corridors,
36 existing railroad tracks are present numbering from a single set to more than eight in rail yard
37 areas. The majority of the POPs are also situated in unpaved areas, as they are located within or in
38 an area contiguous to the railroad corridors. The Pacific Bell conduit repair locations however, are
39 nearly all located under existing paved and or landscaped (with lawns, etc.) streets.

40 At the time of first European contact (circa 1579), the San Francisco portion of the project area was
41 occupied by two Penutian derived groups, the Coastanoan and the Coast Miwok (Mewuk). The

1 Coastanoan and the Coast Miwok, although linguistically related, were sufficiently distinct to be
2 considered as separate groups. The Coastanoan consisted of eight subgroups that together
3 inhabited most of the San Francisco Bay Area. In spite of having a common language base, they
4 were not bound together in any political sense. Therefore, they *did* not have a single term or word
5 in their language by which they referred to themselves as a whole. Europeans referred to them as
6 Costanos or “people of the coast” from which the name “Coastanoan” was derived. Today, the
7 surviving descendents of these people frequently use a native language term “Ohlone” to
8 designate themselves. The Ohlone inhabited most of the Bay Area except the northwestern side of
9 the Bay. The linguistically distinct Coast Miwok inhabited this latter area at the time of contact.
10 As with all California Native Americans, these groups subsisted by hunting and gathering, with
11 coastal groups relying to a significant degree on marine food resources such as fish, shellfish, and
12 marine mammals as well as terrestrial resources for shelter and sustenance (Kroeber 1925; Levy
13 1978:485-495; Kelly 1978:414-425).

14 *Archaeological Resources*

15 THE SAN FRANCISCO BACKBONE

16 The records and literature search revealed that 651 cultural resource studies/surveys have been
17 previously conducted within a radius of 1,000 feet of the project Backbone alignments, conduit
18 repair locations, and POP facility locations. These previous survey studies include narrow width
19 project corridors for pipelines, utility lines, and roadways, as well as projects that cover a more
20 extensive areal plot such as building and facility. The 651 studies/surveys cover portions of or
21 involved resources present within these project areas. The portions of the project area covered
22 ranged from small (less than 0.5 acre) to extensive (several miles of pipeline or transmission line or
23 entire city blocks). Two extensive studies previously conducted in the project area include Hattoff
24 et al. (1995), for the Mojave Northern Expansion pipeline project, and Biosystems Analysis, Inc.
25 (1989) for the WTG-West, Inc. Los Angeles to San Francisco and Sacramento Fiber Optic Cable
26 Project. The Hattoff et al. study covered substantial portions of both the Peninsula and East Bay
27 Backbone alignments in the San Francisco Bay Area Network, while the Biosystems study
28 evaluated most of the length along the Peninsula corridor. Another cultural resources study in
29 progress, which also evaluates much of the length of the Peninsula corridor, is being conducted by
30 KEA for the Williams Communications, Inc., Fiber Optic Cable System Installation Project (1999).
31 Overall, it appears that nearly 70 percent (i.e., approximately $\frac{2}{3}$) of the total extent of the
32 Backbone network has been previously surveyed. The rest of the network was surveyed as part of
33 the present project (Mooney & Associates 2000).

34 The record search revealed that 68 prehistoric, historic, and multi-component sites containing both
35 prehistoric/historic archaeological sites have been recorded within a 1,000 foot radius of the
36 project Backbone alignments, repair locations, and POP facility locations. One additional site, a
37 historic trash deposit, was discovered along the Peninsula North segment during the current field
38 reconnaissance survey.

39 No ethnographic or traditional cultural resources were identified in the project area.

40 As indicated above, the majority of prehistoric sites present in the project areas consist of shellfish
41 refuse deposits (shell middens). In the San Francisco Bay Area this is especially true along the
42 Peninsula Backbone segment. This is not surprising given the segment’s proximity to the Bay.

5.5 Cultural Resources

1 Most of these sites are located in largely developed areas and are likely to have been substantially
 2 disturbed by previous historic and/or modern activities such as construction and/or agriculture.
 3 Nonetheless, intact portions of some sites may lie buried beneath existing streets, sidewalks,
 4 railroad ROWs, construction fill, and other modern developments. Prior to disturbance, some of
 5 these shell middens undoubtedly represented prehistoric habitation sites as indicated by the
 6 presence of varying amounts of developed deposit (depth), diverse artifacts, and/or ecofactual
 7 remains and, in some instances, by the presence of human burials. Previously recorded historic
 8 resources located within the study areas consist of trash deposits and scatters, bridges, trestles, and
 9 various railroad related structures.

Table 5.5-1. Summary of Cultural Resources Locations by Project Component for the San Francisco Bay Area Network

| <i>Segment or Facility</i> | <i>Within 1,000 Feet of Project</i> | <i>Within 100 Feet or Less of Project</i> |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| BACKBONE | | |
| East Bay North | 7(P), 1(H) | 1(P) |
| East Bay South | 5(P), 1(H) | 1(P), 1(H) |
| Peninsula North | 16(P), 4(H), 1(P/H) | 4(P), 3(H) |
| Peninsula South | 14(P), 9(H), 1(P/H), 1 unknown | 2(H) |
| Point of Presence (9 Locations) | 2(H) | None |
| PACIFIC BELL STRUCTURE (CONDUIT REPAIR OR REPLACEMENT) | | |
| Marin County Segment | 6(P) | 1(P) |
| Walnut Creek Segment | 1(P) | None |
| Hayward Segment | None | None |
| Dumbarton Crossing Segment | 1(P), 1(H), 1 unknown | 1(H) |
| Oakland Segment | 1(P) | 1(P) |
| Peninsula Segment | 2(P), 14(H) | 7(H) |
| (P) Prehistoric period (H) Historic period (P/H) Prehistoric and historic periods | | |

10 Of the previously or newly recorded cultural resource sites identified within 1,000 feet of the
 11 project construction activities, 12 are present within 100 feet of the two project Backbone
 12 alignments (see Table 5.5-1). Seven of these resources (four prehistoric, three historic) are in the
 13 Peninsula North segment; two historic resources are in the Peninsula South segment; one
 14 prehistoric resource is in the East Bay North segment; and two resources (one prehistoric and one
 15 historic) are in the East Bay South segment.

16 POINT OF PRESENCE (POP)

17 Two previously recorded resources are located within 1,000 feet of two of the nine proposed POP
 18 facility locations. Both are historic resources and neither is located within 100 feet of the project.

1 PACIFIC BELL NEW BUILD LOCATIONS

2 The field reconnaissance and records search for the Pacific Bell conduit repairs revealed 27 cultural
3 resources within 1,000 feet of repair segments in eight of the 18 repair locations. All the sites are
4 previously recorded; no new sites were noted during the field reconnaissance. These sites consist
5 of 11 prehistoric, 14 historic, and one unidentified resource. Of these 27 resources, 10 are situated
6 within 100 feet of the proposed repair work activities. Of these 10, one prehistoric resource is
7 located along the Oakland Segment, one prehistoric resource is located along the Marin Segment,
8 one historic resource is located along the Dumbarton Segment, and seven historic resources are
9 located along the Peninsula Segment.

10 *Paleontological Resources*

11 An exhaustive discussion of paleontological resources and rock units crossed by the project route
12 in the San Francisco region is presented in a technical memorandum prepared for this project
13 (ESA, memorandum dated May 26, 2000, on file at the CPUC). Because the route does not cross
14 through or near any known fossil localities, the following provides only a brief summary of the
15 results of the memorandum.

16 Alluvial soil dominates the San Francisco Bay margin. On a geologic scale, the marine sediments
17 are relatively young and may contain fossiliferous material. Invertebrate fossils found in marine
18 sediments are usually not considered by paleontologists to be significant resources because they
19 are often widespread, abundant, fairly well preserved, and in predictable locations. Therefore, the
20 same or similar fossils can be located at any number of sites throughout California. Most
21 limestone deposits are prolific with invertebrate skeletal material; organic mudstones are also
22 enriched with invertebrate fossils. It is the abundance of invertebrate fossils in marine rocks that
23 makes them less significant. However, a new marine invertebrate fossil discovery that might
24 extend a marine layer or shed light on a new genus or species would be considered significant.

25 In addition to being alluvial soil, the majority of the project route follows the railroad right-of-way.
26 The backbone follows the Caltrain right-of-way on the west side of the Bay and the Union Pacific
27 Railroad on the east side. Because the soil has already been disturbed by the railroad, and because
28 the project would not exceed a construction depth of 5 feet for open trench construction, there is
29 low risk of encountering fossiliferous material along the San Francisco Bay Area Network.

30 Mollusks (clams, snails, and cephalopods) and echinoids (sand dollars and sea urchins) are the
31 most abundant fossils in the San Francisco Bay Area. The area, overall, has resulted in minimal
32 paleontological discoveries. While the San Francisco Bay Area Network would not cross any
33 known paleontological localities, some possibility of discovering fossiliferous material exists when
34 excavating. However, the chances for paleontological occurrence along this project route are
35 remote.

36 **5.5.2 Los Angeles Basin Network**37 *Archaeological Resources*

38 The Los Angeles Basin Network consists of 18 alignments or loops designated as Local Segments.
39 The area in which these segments are distributed extends from the southeastern end of the Santa
40 Monica Mountains in northern Los Angeles County to the City of Irvine in south central Orange

5.5 Cultural Resources

1 County. The Los Angeles Basin Network includes 15 Points of Presence (POPs) at various
2 locations along the network. The Local Segments are nearly all located under existing paved
3 and/or landscaped (with lawns, etc.) streets. The POP facilities would be located within existing
4 buildings or areas contiguous to existing paved and or landscaped streets. The locations of these
5 two types of construction activities were evaluated in this study for the potential to impact
6 significant cultural resources.

7 The records and literature search revealed that 261 cultural resource studies/surveys have been
8 previously conducted within a radius of 1,000 feet of the project Local Segments. These previous
9 survey studies include narrow width project corridors for pipelines, utility lines, and roadways, as
10 well as projects of a greater areal extent such as building and facility construction. The 261
11 studies/surveys covered portions of or involved resources present within these project segments.

12 For the Los Angeles Network, the portions of the project area covered by these previous studies
13 are small with no study covering a substantial amount. Overall, it appears that less than 30
14 percent of the total extent of the network has been previously surveyed.

15 A reconnaissance survey was conducted of all of the Local Segments and POP locations (Mooney
16 & Associates, 2000). As noted above, vision was severely inhibited during these surveys by the
17 built environment in which these alignments and locations are planned, i.e., paved and/or
18 landscaped streets. No new cultural resources were discovered during the reconnaissance survey.

19 The record search revealed that 17 prehistoric, historic, and multi-component sites that are both
20 prehistoric/historic archaeological sites have been previously recorded within a 1,000-foot radius
21 of the project alignment and POP locations (Mooney & Associates 2000; Table VII-2). Most of these
22 sites, due to their location in largely developed areas, have been substantially disturbed by
23 previous historic and/or modern activities such as construction and/or agriculture. As indicated
24 above, the majority of prehistoric sites present in all of the project areas (north and south) consist
25 of shellfish refuse deposits (shell middens). For the Los Angeles Basin Network this is especially
26 true, where 10 of the 17 sites identified are along the Marina Del Rey, Costa Mesa, and Fashion
27 Island Local Segments, all situated adjacent to past or present coastal areas in proximity to marine
28 resources. Prior to disturbance, some of these shell middens represented prehistoric habitation
29 sites as indicated by the presence of varying amounts of developed deposit (depth), diverse
30 artifacts, and/or ecofactual remains, and in some instances, by the presence of human burials.
31 Previously recorded historic resources located within the study areas consist of trash deposits and
32 scatters, and a Mexican Period (early 19th Century) adobe location.

33 LOCAL SEGMENTS

34 A total of 72 cultural resource sites are recorded within 1,000 feet of five of the 18 Los Angeles
35 Basin Network Local Segment alignments. Of these sites, 21 (14 prehistoric and three historic) are
36 recorded within 100 feet of project alignments and locations. Of these 21, nine are recorded along
37 the Irvine Local Segment; four along the Fashion Island Local Segment, one along the Costa Mesa
38 Segment, three along the Marina Del Rey Local Segment; one along the Carson to Costa Mesa
39 Segment, one along the Century City Local Segment, and two along the Burbank Local Segment
40 (see Table 5.5-2).

1 POINT OF PRESENCE FACILITIES RESULTS

2 During preparation of this analysis, the exact location of the POPs for the Los Angeles Basin
 3 Network was not known. However, as discussed in Chapter 4, the general vicinity of these POP
 4 sites is known. Metromedia proposes to locate all of these 15 POP sites within existing buildings
 5 and has proposed, as a mitigation measure in section 6.5, not to adversely affect any historic or
 6 potentially historic building.

**Table 5.5-2. Cultural Resources Locations by Project Element
 for the Los Angeles Basin Network**

| <i>Segment or Facility</i> | <i>Within 1,000 Feet of Project</i> | <i>Within 100 Feet of Project</i> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Burbank Local Segment | None | 2(H) |
| Pasadena Local Segment | None | None |
| Santa Monica Local Segment | None | None |
| Glendale Local Segment | None | None |
| Century City Local Segment | 2(P), 1(H) | 1(H) |
| Santa Monica to Burbank Local Segment | None | None |
| Hollywood Local Segment | None | None |
| Marina Del Rey Local Segment | 1(P) | 3(P) |
| LAX/Florence Segment | None | None |
| LAX Segment | None | None |
| El Segundo Segment | None | None |
| Long Beach/Downy Segment | None | None |
| Cypress/Buena Park Segment | None | None |
| Fashion Island Segment | 2(P) | 4(P) |
| Carson/Costa Mesa Segment | 3(P), 1(H) | 1(P) |
| Downtown Los Angeles Segment | None | None |
| Irvine Segment | 45(P) | 9(P) |
| Costa Mesa Segment | None | 1(P) |
| Point of Presence (POP) Sites | Unknown ^a | Unknown ^a |

^a Since the exact location of these sites is not known at this time, no definitive locations can be identified. However, general avoidance mitigation measures are presented in section 6.5, which address this issue. Furthermore, since the proposed location of the POP sites will be in existing facilities that will be selected such that they are not historic buildings it is unlikely that any prehistoric or historic resources will be affected.

(P) Prehistoric
 (H) Historic
 (P/H) Prehistoric and Historic

8 *Paleontological Resources*

9 The majority of the paleontological resources in Los Angeles are microfossils located deep below
 10 the surface. Significant paleontological discoveries have been made at the La Brea Tar Pits on
 11 Wilshire Boulevard in Los Angeles, in the Santa Monica Mountains, in Palos Verdes, along the
 12 coast of Orange County, and in the Santa Ana Mountains. The La Brea Tar Pits, for example,

5.5 Cultural Resources

1 constitute a rich and well-preserved assemblage of Pleistocene vertebrates, including both bird and
2 mammal species such as the saber-toothed tiger, mastodons, mammoths, and the giant ground
3 sloth. The exact locations of previous finds are proprietary to prevent the removal or destruction
4 of important, non-renewable resources.