Appendix E2
Cultural Resources, AB 52
Consultation documentation
FORMAL NOTIFICATION

to Lead Agencies of all cities of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange Counties
regarding AB52 consultation with the correct Indian Tribe of the City’s in your project’s areas

Date: May 22, 2016

Dear Lead Agency,

I am the Tribal Chairman of the original Indian Tribe of the Los Angeles Basin – the Kizh/Gabrielenos. Prior to the European influence, our Tribe once inhabited a large area including all of Los Angeles County, the Channel Islands, a large portion of Orange County and extending into Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Within this territory there is only one Tribe whose native territory this is – ours.

The implementation of AB52 has made unclear the responsibilities of Lead Agencies, state government and tribal government. The purpose of this notification is to help you, as a Lead Agency, clarify who you should be consulting with in regards to tribal territory and affiliation. After AB52 went into effect, we have found that numerous surrounding tribes are now claiming that our ancestral traditional tribal territory is their own using the terms “culturally affiliated.” If you ask your professional archaeologists and anthropologists on your staff, it is well known through them as well as numerous historic texts and professionals from the time our history was first written that the traditional tribal territory of the Gabrieleno (or Kizh, pronounced “Keech”) is without dispute. We can provide numerous maps and references which prove this simple fact. The only time it may be somewhat up for dispute is at our tribal borders – often where we end up working alongside our neighboring tribes when monitoring construction projects as to protect the cultural resources of both tribes.

We are asking that you take the time to educate yourselves. Other Tribes will likely continue to contact you and request consultation regarding various projects, but we ask that you do not involve them as they have no true claim to territory that is within our tribal territory. We realize that the Native American Heritage Commission is at the heart of distributing the contact lists for various counties, but when we have asked them to help remedy this problem, their reply was to ask us to solve this issue intertribally, that these disputes are out of their jurisdictions. While we continue to consult with our neighboring tribes, it is still a work in progress. This is why we are contacting you directly with this information. We have asked these tribes to contact us directly with concerns as we ask you to do the same. While we all agree that the language of AB52 has created much confusion, we are left attempting to clarify for everyone’s benefit. Our Tribe looks forward to consulting with your Agency and the City you represent on upcoming projects.

With respect,

Andrew Salas, Chairman

Andrew Salas, Chairman
Albert Perez, treasurer I

Nadine Salas, Vice-Chairman
Martha Gonzalez Lemos, treasurer II

Dr. Christina Swindall Martinez, secretary
Richard Gradias, Chairman of the council of Elders

PO Box 393, Covina, CA 91723
www.gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com
On September 29, 2016, Ms. Dietler contacted Andrew Salas, Chairperson of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians/Kizh Nation, by phone regarding concluding AB 52 consultation on the South Bay Galleria Mixed Use Project (Project) for the City of Redondo Beach (City). Ms. Dietler explained to Mr. Salas that the reason for the call was to follow up on earlier correspondence sent by Mr. Salas and received by the City in May 2016 that did not identify tribal cultural resources in the Project site, but did request Native American monitoring nonetheless. Ms. Dietler explained that the archaeological study had since been completed and that the Project site was found to have a low sensitivity for archaeological resources due to the nature of the current onsite development and associated previous ground disturbance within the Project site. Given the low sensitivity of the Project site, the study did not recommend archaeological or Native American Monitoring; however, as part of their Project approval, the City was requiring archaeological monitoring during ground disturbance and that in the event that prehistoric archaeological materials were encountered, the appropriate Native American representatives be contacted for consultation regarding treatment. Mr. Salas responded that he found this approach an acceptable alternative to Native American monitoring. He trusts that the archaeological study was adequate and included the appropriate recommendations for the Project. He also trusts that appropriate qualified staff will be provided for the monitoring effort, and requested to please be kept in the loop if any prehistoric materials are found during construction.