

APPENDIX E.1 HISTORIC CONTEXT STATEMENTS

GREATER LOS ANGELES BASIN (INCLUDING ALL AREAS)-PREHISTORY

The Greater Los Angeles Basin is associated with two main prehistoric populations: the Fernandeno of the San Fernando Valley and the Tongva/Gabrielino of the San Gabriel Valley. In each case, the populations are considered close relatives, separated mainly by their respective affiliations with Spanish Period Mission establishments. Grenda, in Becker (1999:7-14), summarized the history of this particular area of Southern California:

Ethnographic and ethnohistoric sources agree that the project area falls within the boundaries of Gabrielino territory (Bean and Smith 1978; Johnston 1962; Kroeber 1976; McCawley 1996). This territory stretches from San Bernardino to the coast, from Aliso Creek north to the San Fernando Valley, and includes Santa Catalina, San Nicolas, and San Clemente Islands. The people who lived in the San Fernando Valley are more correctly known as Fernandeno, and spoke a slightly different dialect than the Gabrielino (Kroeber 1976:620). The Fernandeno and Gabrielino are so closely related, however, that distinguishing between them is unnecessary (Bean and Smith 1978; Johnston 1962; Kroeber 1976; McCawley 1996). "Gabrielino," as used throughout this report, includes the Fernandeno. According to Bean and Smith (1978), surrounding cultures included the Chumash to the west, the Tataviam to the north, the Serrano to the north and northeast, the Cahuilla to the east, and the Luiseno to the southeast.

Similar to many ethnographically recorded villages in southern California, Gabrielino villages (rancherias) had their own territories and were often located in defensible canyons or coves along slopes near good water supplies (Beals and Hester 1974; Bean and Shipek 1978). Most groups practiced some form of seasonal movement. Some inland groups would move to the coast in the winter after their acorn stores had been depleted, whereas others moved to the coast during the summer months. Coastal groups were relatively sedentary, although seasonal movement by subunits of a village was common. Population estimates for the Gabrielino are nearly impossible to make, although populations for villages are secure, ranging between 50 and 200. At the time of contact with Europeans, more than 100 Gabrielino villages may have existed.

At the time of contact, Gabrielino subsistence was based on foraging. Agriculture was not practiced, although the Gabrielino probably burned native vegetation to enhance the growth of wild plant foods (Bolton 1971; Davis 1990). Along the coast, shellfish and other marine resources constituted a large part of the diet. At inland locations, acorns and other seeds were a very important part of the diet. The hunting technology involved in the procurement of food included the bow and arrow, throwing club, snares, deadfall traps, harpoons, fishing line and fishhooks, nets, fire and animal decoys. Gathering technology included digging sticks, burden baskets, beaters, and tongs for gathering cactus fruit (De Barros and Koerper 1990). Manos and metates were used in the preparation of food, as were the mortar and pestle and leaching baskets (Heizer 1968:11).

A significant amount of economic activity took place in the Gabrielino culture area. Soapstone, fish shell beads (used as money), and otter pelts were traded from the islands to coastal groups, which probably then exchanged with inland groups for such items as seeds and deer skins (Heizer 1968). Other important goods that moved from the inland areas toward the coast included obsidian (Ericson, 1978 and 1981; Hughes and True, 1985; Koerper, Ericson, Drover, and Langenwaller, 1986; Laylander, 1991), chert and jasper, and ceramics. Most of this trade probably followed a down the line

pattern of exchange, although the distances involved do not preclude expeditions to the sources. Economic relations were strong with the Serrano (Kroeber 1976) and probably with the Cahuilla (Bean, 1972). Exchanges also likely took place with the Juaneno, Luiseño, and Chumash (Du Bois, 1908; Hudson, 1969). Long distance trade is indicated by the presence of southwestern pottery at several sites in southern California (DuBois, 1908; Hudson, 1969).

The Gabrieliño (and Fernandeno) are known as a society identified by Late Prehistoric/Proto-historic ethnographic records and archaeological data identifying Late Prehistoric occupation of Southern California. Changes identified between the earlier periods and the Late Prehistoric are evident in the archaeological record and in variations seen in technologies, social/community patterns and, in some cases, population estimates. Populations preceding the Gabrieliño, and likely directly related to the Gabrieliño, can be archaeologically identified as separate or variant forms of the evolving culture.

Early studies of the Gabrieliño (see Smith and Teggart, 1909; Benedict, 1924; Bolton, 1927; Robinson, 1939; and Kroeber, 1925) emphasized anthropological/ethnographic studies while more recent investigations have relied on archaeological data (e.g., Drover, 1980; Koerper, Drover and Langenwalter, 1983; McKenna, 1985 and 1986; Hudson, 1969 and 1971; Rice and Cottrell, 1976; Wallace, 1955; Warren, 1968; Greenwood, 1978; and Mason et al., 1994). The majority of data currently available to archaeologists can be referenced in publications of the Society for California Archaeology (1990 to date).

The term "Gabrieliño" is a reference to the direct association between the Native American population of the San Gabriel Valley and the Mission San Gabriel de Archangel. The Mission was originally located in the Whittier Narrows area but relocated shortly after its founding because of unstable ground along the Rio Hondo/San Gabriel River channels. [The Fernandeno are spatially associated with the Mission San Fernando and are "cousins" of the Gabrielino.] The ethnographic boundaries for the Gabrieliño are presented by Bean and Smith (1978:538) and refined by McCawley (1996).

The Late Prehistoric Gabrieliño/Fernandeno utilized numerous plants and animals for food, shelter, and medicines. Citing Kroeber (1976: 649-650), they used seeds most often, followed by foliage, shoots, fruits, and berries. Mountain shrubs, ash, elder, and willow were used for shelters and tool materials (e.g., bows). Over twenty plants were used regularly for medicinal purposes. Fauna used as food sources included deer, rabbits, wood rats, squirrels, quail, and ducks. Animals specifically not used were dog, coyote, bear, tree squirrel, pigeon, dove, mud hen, eagle, buzzard, raven, lizards, frogs, and turtles (Kroeber, 1976:652). Along the coast, wetlands and ocean resources were exploited.

The Gabrieliño/Fernandeno used numerous styles of bows, bedrock mortars, portable mortars, pipes, chisels, metates, manos, and various forms of chipped stone tools. Prior to the establishment of the Mission system, populations tended to live in larger villages with a series of "daughter" or "satellite" sites (limited activity areas) with lesser populations. Seasonal migration was practiced for the exploitation of resources and protection from seasonal weather conditions (Scientific Resource Surveys, 1979:7). Habitation structures were constructed of branches, grasses, and mud and interior hearths were used for heat. Cooking was generally conducted outdoors with hearths generally used for food preparation.

Archaeological data and correlations with ethnographic data have resulted in the determination of a generalized chronology for prehistoric Southern California. The project area is located within the inland

areas of Gabrieliño/Fernandeno territory while chronological data has emphasized coastal occupations. Nonetheless, current archaeological data has indicated that the coastal chronological data derived by Wallace (1955), Warren (1968), and later by Koerper and Drover (1983) can be applied to this region (Mason, 1984; McKenna, 1986). The coastal chronology generally accepted for Southern California has been as follows:

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

Recent investigation of sites in the Newport Bay/Irvine area of Orange County (Mason and Peterson 1994) have yielded significant data resulting in refinements of the coastal chronological sequences. Mason and Peterson’s conclusions were based on the radiocarbon dates from 326 samples representing thirty-one archaeological sites or cultural contexts. Summarizing their results, Mason and Peterson (1994:55) found that the majority of sites were occupied during the Milling Stone (Horizon) period or the Late Prehistoric (Horizon) period “... without much overlap ...”. Only four sites yielded results suggesting occupation during more than one cultural period (e.g CA-ORA-64). In a few instances, dates suggested occupation during the Intermediate (Horizon) period.

Mixtures of dates appeared in limited areas and could be directly associated with areas of agricultural activities. The frequency distribution of radiocarbon dates from the Mason and Peterson investigations were grouped in blocks of fifty year intervals and yielded a range of dates from 200 B.P. (before present) to 9280 B.P. (dates from CA-ORA-246 indicate occupation of the Newport Bay area as early as the Paleo-Coastal period or [Early Man Horizon]). Mason and Peterson’s conclusions (1994:57) do not necessarily change the basic chronology, but distinguish more individualistic periods of occupation that are not necessarily evident in the analysis of an artifact assemblage. Mason and Peterson’s refined chronology is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Refined Coastal Chronology as Defined by Mason and Peterson (1994)

Cultural Horizons	Defined 1986	Cultural Periods	Redefined 1994	Temporal Correlations
Paleo-Coastal	Pre-6000 B.C.	Paleo-Coastal	Pre-8000 B.P.	Pre-6000 B.C.
Milling Stone	6000 to 1000 B.C.	Milling Stone 1	8000 to 5800 B.P.	6000 to 3800 B.C.
		Milling Stone 2	5800 to 4650 B.P.	3800 to 2650 B.C.
		Milling Stone 3	4650 to 3000 B.P.	2650 to 1000 B.C.
Intermediate	1000 B.C. to A.D. 750	Intermediate	3000 to 1350 B.P.	1000 B.C. to A.D. 650
Late Prehistoric	A.D. 750 to European Contact	Late Prehistoric 1	1350 to 650 B.P.	A.D. 650 to 1350
		Late Prehistoric 2	650 to 200 B.P.	A.D. 1350 to Contact

The Mason and Peterson discussions emphasize that the early definitions of “horizons” were based on artifact assemblages and these correlations have not been altered by the redefined chronology. Through the application of radiocarbon dating and comparative site analyses, studies have resulted in identifying relatively discrete subdivisions within the Milling Stone and Late Prehistoric sites. Variations appear within these two horizons/periods which can be explained by temporally discrete occupations. Future studies of sites yielding statistically valid artifact assemblages and radiocarbon samples can be conducted to further the understanding of Native American activities throughout Southern California. These studies can also assist in understanding the relative lack of data for the Intermediate Horizon/Period.

A number of factors led to the deterioration of the Native American lifeways. Missionization, the Gold Rush, and the granting of statehood to California brought many Europeans and Anglo-Americans to the area (Bancroft, 1886; Kroeber, 1976). Mission San Gabriel was founded in 1771, and by 1778 mass conversions of Native American villages began. Many Native Americans were brought to the mission, where they were taught the Catholic faith, the Spanish language, and crafts (Bean and Shipek, 1978). The change in lifeways was forced on the Gabrielino, and led to destruction of Native American lifeways and massive population reduction because of disease in the densely settled missions.

The success of the missions began to decline in 1833, when a Native American emancipation decree was passed. The missions were confiscated by the Mexican government in 1835. At that time, land was granted to citizens for use as grazing land (Elliot, 1967; Moyer, 1969). Additional stress came with the secularization of the missions and the lands being split up. Local Native Americans were forced to either work on ranches or become rebels (Moratto and Greenwood, 1991; Moratto et al., 1994).

GREATER LOS ANGELES (INCLUDING CENTRAL AREA)-HISTORY

When Spanish occupation of California began in 1769, an expedition led by Gaspar de Portola was initiated to establish *El Camino Real*, the series of missions to be built along the California coast (Heumann, 2002). Portola and his crew camped by a river where water availability impressed Father Juan Crespi, who believed that the location had all the necessities for a large settlement. Crespi designated the river *El Rio de Nuestra Senora La Reina de Los Angeles Porciuncula*, or “The River of Our Lady the Queen of the Angels Porciuncula” (SCHS, 2003). In the late 18th Century, Spanish Governor of California Felipe de Neve sought to establish a pueblo along the Los Angeles River, west of the Mission San Gabriel, in order to strengthen Spain’s claim over the territory. The pueblo was conceived not only to protect the territory from encroachment by Britain and Russia, but was also created as a supply post that would serve Spain’s military (Heumann, 2002). Twelve years after Portola’s trek, the location de Neve chose was the spot favored by Father Crespi. He recruited a company of 44 settlers known as *Los Pobladores*, a group of twelve families from Mexico who traveled through Baja to arrive at the site of what would soon be the new pueblo (LACO, 2003a). Governor de Neve recorded September 4, 1781 as the official date of the establishment of *El Pueblo de la Neustra Senora la Reina de los Angeles Porciuncula*, or the Town of our Lady the Queen of Angels of the Porciuncula River (LAA, 2003). Over time, the area became known simply as Los Angeles (LACO, 2003).

Following the Mexican Revolution, Spanish governance in California was overthrown in 1821 after a decade of instability. The Republic of Mexico claimed California as an official territory in 1825 (Heumann, 2002). In 1831, Spanish Governor Manuel Victoria was overthrown in “The Battle of Los

Angeles,” after which California was divided into northern and southern provinces. Pio Pico became governor of the southern province and established a government in Los Angeles. A civil war broke out between the north and the south and as a result of a famous battle on the Cahuenga Pass, *Alta California* gained independence and Pico was elected governor of the entire state (LAA, 2003). The Mexican Congress awarded Los Angeles city status, replacing Monterey as California’s capital (SCHS, 2003). After two years of hostilities between Mexico and the United States, the U.S. took control in 1846. In 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo made California an official U.S. territory and Los Angeles was established as one of the state’s original counties. A county government was formed following its first official election and on April 4, 1850, Los Angeles was incorporated as an American city (Heumann, 2002).

Immediately following its incorporation, Los Angeles swiftly began building an infrastructure of public services, including a public school system, libraries, a board of health, banks, trolley lines, and the publication of its first newspaper. By 1860, the population had grown to 4,399 and plans were being made to expand the region with the construction of railroads. A large subsidy was approved that insured that the Southern Pacific Railroad would pass through the city, linking it to San Francisco and eventually to the rest of the country. Rapid development began soon after Southern Pacific reached the city in 1876, followed by the arrival of the Santa Fe Railway, sparking the real estate boom that marked the beginning of the city’s urban sprawl (SCHS, 2003). The turn of the century brought the arrival of Los Angeles’ first automobile as well as Henry E. Huntington’s Pacific Electric Railway Company, which would link Los Angeles communities by a network of railcars (LAA, 2003). The city’s population had grown to 50,395 by 1890 and 102,479 by 1900. In the first decade of the twentieth century, the population more than tripled (SCHS, 2003). Between 1880 and 1920, infrastructure development within Los Angeles continued to accelerate. The local production of sewer pipe, street paving materials, and electricity brought the City into a new era of development that permitted increased settlement through opportunities for gainful employment and a shift away from rural/agricultural lifestyles. The need for additional schools followed shortly thereafter.

In addition to rail, the arrival of water from Owens Valley and electricity from Nevada to the region played a major impact in the development of Los Angeles. Engineered by William Mulholland, the Los Angeles Aqueduct began delivering water in 1913, in what was the largest municipal water system in the country. By 1920, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District took its search for water to the Colorado River and twenty years later the Colorado River Aqueduct was completed, becoming the single largest water source for the Los Angeles area (LAA, 2003). Meanwhile, the construction of the Boulder Dam brought electricity to Los Angeles, which by 1930 had become the fifth largest city in the U.S. with a population of almost 1.3 million, as it continued to attract large numbers of immigrants both from within the U.S. as well as ethnic groups from other parts of the world (SCHS, 2003).

Until 1900, the economy of Los Angeles was based on agriculture produced in the surrounding region, but the construction of Los Angeles Harbor stimulated profitable industrial activities. By the 1920s, the region’s economy was boosted by the discovery of oil and by the motion picture business, and while the impacts of the Depression were felt, the population continued to grow as people migrated from other parts of the country. The Los Angeles City Planning Commission was busily approving forty new subdivisions a week in what was city’s second major real estate boom. During this time 150 new miles of street were built as the automobile was quickly replacing railroad as the favored mode of transportation. The first freeway in the western United States, Arroyo Seco Parkway (the Pasadena

Freeway), opened in 1940, followed shortly by the opening of the San Gabriel and Hollywood freeways, as well as downtown Los Angeles' four level freeway interchange in 1949 (SCHS, 2003).

During World War II (1941 thru 1945), the modern industrial phase of Los Angeles' history began in a period of explosive growth. Employment in the city's aircraft plants, shipyards, and other war-related industries attracted an influx of people, resulting in more cars, homes, and infrastructure. Economic development continued after the war, particularly in the fields of aerospace and electronics, while established industries, such as agriculture, petroleum, and fishing, became relatively less important. As growth continued, developers bought cheap land and built new communities for the expanding work force. By 1960, the diverse population had grown to 2,479,015, and was not comprised of any single majority (SCHS, 2003). During the 1970s the city's economy continued to diversify with the expansion of manufacturing, television and music recording, and service industries such as health care and banking. By 1984, Los Angeles displaced Chicago as America's second largest city (SCHS, 2003) and to this day is rivaled only by New York City as the nation's most populated metropolis (CENSUS, 2003).

Valley Area

On August 5th, 1769, an expedition of Spaniards led by Gaspar de Portola crossed the Santa Monica Mountains and came upon a expansive valley inhabited by the native Tvonga, which the explorers named *El Valle de Santa Catalina de Bononia los Encinos*. Franciscan missions were being built to establish Spanish dominance of the region and to bring Christianity to the Tongvas, who the Spaniards named the Gabrielinos. *Mission San Gabriel Archangel* (San Gabriel Mission) was founded in 1771 and in 1797, *San Fernando Rey de Espana Mission* (Mission San Fernando) was established (Robins 2000). *El Valle de los Encinos* became *El Valle de San Fernando*, in what is now known as the San Fernando Valley (Roderick, 2001). Spanish rule continued until 1845 when a battle along the Los Angeles River ended with the overthrow of Spanish Governor Micheltorena. He was replaced by Pico Pico, a native *Californio* who owned almost the entire San Fernando Valley (Roderick, 2001). In 1846, after the United States declared war on Mexico, Pio Pico sold the Valley for \$14,000 to Eulogio de Celis, a Spaniard living in Los Angeles. De Celis returned to Spain and Pio's brother Andres acquired an interest in the southern portion of the Valley in 1854, which he then transferred back to Pio (Atkinson, 1988). In 1869, Pio Pico sold his share to a group of investors led by Isaac B. Lankershim's San Fernando Home Association for a price of \$2 per acre (Roderick, 2001).

Lankershim acquired the Valley's southern half and planted the world's largest wheat-growing empire with his partner Isacc Newton Van Nuys (Roderick, 2001). In 1874, the northern half of the Valley was sold to Senator Charles Maclay and his partner George K. Porter, whose decision to purchase the land was influenced by Leland Stanford's plans to connect the Southern Pacific Railroad from San Francisco to Los Angeles, with the construction of a tunnel through mountains in the northeastern corner of the Valley (McAvoy, 1994). Maclay was so encouraged by the arrival of the railroad that he founded the Valley's first township, San Fernando, that same year. The primary attraction to the Valley at that time was an abundance of cheap land. In 1882, Maclay divided the northern portion of the Valley with his partners, George Porter and Benjamin Porter (Roderick, 2001). Leslie C. Brand, who founded the City of Glendale, purchased a portion of George Porter's land in 1904, and was a pivotal figure along with Henry E. Huntington in the construction of the line of the Pacific Electric railway from downtown Los Angeles via Van Nuys to San Fernando (McAvoy, 1994).

Both the Pacific Electric and the Southern Pacific railways laid the tracks for future development and population growth in the San Fernando Valley. In 1909 the most significant subdivision in the history of Los Angeles took place when *Los Angeles Times* executives Harrison Gray Otis and Harry Chandler, patriarchs of the Los Angeles Suburban Homes Syndicate, paid \$53 an acre for 47,500 acres of the Valley's southern half (Americas Suburb, 2003). Their business interests were not in agriculture but in real estate and home-building: along with Moses Hazeltine Sherman, Otto Freeman Brant, and Hobart Johnstone Whitley, Chandler & Otis embodied the Syndicate's Board of Control. These five "self-described capitalists" wielded tremendous influence in crafting the Valley's borders and townships and played a critical role in the expansion of the region's development in the early 1900s (Roderick, 2001).

Meanwhile, the city's chief water engineer, William Mulholland, was designing plans to bring the arid region a steady supply of water far beyond the capacity of the Los Angeles River, which had been the area's primary domestic water source up to that time. In 1913 Mulholland's aqueduct between the Owens Valley in the Eastern Sierras and a reservoir west of San Fernando opened and the Valley's landscape was permanently altered. Engineered to provide water for the entire Los Angeles basin, the Valley sought to enjoy the bounty by voting for annexation to Los Angeles in 1915. Most of the Valley was annexed and only San Fernando, Glendale, Calabasas, and Burbank remained outside of the Los Angeles borders (Roderick, 2001). The water allowed towns to prosper and expanded its agricultural output beyond wheat and cattle to fruits, vegetables, and legumes, crops that required heavy, large-scale irrigation. The image of the Valley changed as the landscape became lush and fertile as a result of the area's newly abundant water resources, attracting thousands of new residents. The area was also becoming famous with its association to the movie business as early cinematic icons such as D.W. and Cecil B. DeMille grew partial to the Valley's climate and terrain both as a place to film and to build large ranches on which to live (Americas Suburb, 2003).

In the 1920s and 30s the movie business and Burbank's growing aircraft industry began to grow alongside the Valley's thriving agricultural economy. The population grew from 21,964 in 1920 to 51,000 in 1930. The decade of the 1930s ushered in a period of rapid settlement due in part to the increased use of the automobile and the construction of new roadways, as well as the presence of abundant land available at a reasonable price. By 1940, the Valley's population had swelled to 112,000. During World War II its economy continued to be dominated by agriculture (Preston, 1965). By the end of the war, the San Fernando Valley rapidly became the nation's fastest growing area (Americas Suburb, 2003), and as the economy and population continued to grow, manufacturing outgrew agriculture. The aircraft and movie businesses, as well as the Cold-War driven production of defense materials, became the Valley's leading industries (Roderick, 2001). By 1950 the population had doubled, by 1960 had doubled again, and by the decade's end had surpassed a million (Americas Suburb, 2003). During this era the San Fernando Valley became a symbol of the new American suburb, an image that it has maintained well into the 21st Century with a population that has now exceeded 1.5 million (Roderick, 2001).

South Area

In 1765, King Carlos of Spain executed orders to colonize California so that Spanish claim over the region would not be lost to foreign invaders. He planned a land expedition to travel from Mexico, a group of 62 members that included two Spanish soldiers, Juan Jose Dominguez and Francisco Xavier, as well as Spain's first mission padre, Juniper Serra. Governor of Baja California Gaspar de Portola

was designated to lead the group. They arrived in San Diego in 1769 where Serra established the expedition's first mission. Portola continued north with a smaller party to explore the California coast, looking for possible sites to build Spanish missions and military forts on a journey that established the route that became known as *El Camino Real* (Marinella, 1994).

It was during this trip that Juan Jose Dominguez first saw the land south of *El Pueblo Los Angeles* that would become the first Spanish land grant, which he received after retiring from the army in 1784. Rancho San Pedro consisted of 75,000 acres, from San Pedro to what is now Rosecrans Avenue to the north and from the coast and to the Los Angeles River on the east (Marinella, 1994). When Dominguez died in 1809, his nephew Cristobal Dominguez inherited the Rancho, who then left the land to his family, naming his son Manuel Dominguez as executor. Manuel sold a portion of the land in 1858 to Phineas Banning, who soon became a pivotal figure in South Bay development. *Rancho San Pedro* stayed in the Dominguez family until Manuel's daughter married Henry Carson, who assumed management of the Rancho after the death of his father-in-law. Representing the Dominguez Land Corp., John Manuel Carson, grandson of Manuel Dominguez sold 2,800 acres of land to the Torrance-Marshall Co. in 1911 (Marinella, 1994).

After retiring from the Spanish army in 1783, Francisco Xavier Sepulveda made his home in Los Angeles. His grandson, Jose Dolores Sepulveda, obtained permission from his friend Manuel Gutierrez to raise cattle in the southern part of Rancho San Pedro in the area that is now Palos Verdes Peninsula. Jose was killed in 1824, and ten years later, his heirs obtained a judicial decree from Governor Jose Figueroa that awarded them almost 32,000 acres of *Rancho San Pedro*, including the Peninsula, which they named *Rancho de los Palos Verdes*. The U.S. Land Commission, established in 1850, required all ranchos to show proof of title, which the Sepulveda's were unable to do without borrowing heavily off their land. Forced to foreclose, they lost 16,000 acres to Jonathon Bixby, who along with his brother George are considered the founders of Long Beach, and 3,500 acres to Nathaniel Narbonne, who developed and formed the Lomita area. In 1913 the Bixby's sold the Peninsula to Frank A. Vanderlip who developed the land into the planned communities that are now the four cities of Palos Verdes (Marinella, 1994).

The growth of the South Bay area of Los Angeles can be attributed largely to the work of Phineas Banning and the development of the San Pedro Harbor. An immigrant from Delaware, Banning in the late 1850s founded the new town of Wilmington near San Pedro (SCHS, 2003), and began developing a port which opened as San Pedro Harbor in 1861 (LAA, 2003). Later that decade the city's first rail line, the Los Angeles-San Pedro Railroad was constructed (Atkinson, 1988), a twenty-mile track running between Los Angeles and San Pedro that provided a necessary link between the city and the harbor (SCHS, 2003). Development of the San Pedro Harbor increased trade and transportation that allowed for growth in such communities as Compton and Carson (Atkinson, 1988). After the turn of the century, the City of Los Angeles sought to access the harbor directly by annexing a shoestring strip of land extending south to San Pedro. Wilmington and San Pedro were annexed in 1909 (LAA, 2003), and the port became Port of Los Angeles (Marinella, 1994).

The core of the Southern area of Los Angeles, which includes Gardena, Hawthorne, Inglewood, and Torrance, experienced significant growth after World War II with the success of the aircraft and oil industries. In the 1920s and 30s, oil was discovered in the L.A. area and refineries were built in the Wilmington area, as well as Carson, Torrance, and El Segundo. Growth was also fueled by the

conversion of wartime industries into aerospace and as a result of the expanding workforce, large residential areas of tract housing were built in the 50s and 60s. Throughout the 1970s, industrial, office, recreational and retail centers were developed to meet the growing population as the Southbay continues to diversify (SBC, 2003).

Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)¹

Origins of Public Schooling in Los Angeles

Public schooling in Los Angeles is generally acknowledged to have begun with a primary school opened in 1817, by order of the last Spanish governor, Pablo Vicente de Sola, while the California territory was still under Spanish rule and Los Angeles a pueblo of around five hundred residents. In a communication to the Spanish viceroy in 1818, Governor Sola reported that “each of the four presidios and two pueblos now had a primary school where children were taught religion, reading, writing and reckoning by settlers or retired soldiers of good character.” Presided over by disabled and retired soldier Maximo Pina, who promoted reading and writing over traditional religious teachings despite community objections, the school remained in session intermittently for approximately a year until Pina’s departure, followed by an apparent hiatus in formal schooling in Los Angeles of nearly ten years.

The second school in Los Angeles opened in 1827, about a year after California became a territory of Mexico, and was taught at the residence of its teacher, Don Ygnacio Coronel, on Los Angeles Street near Arcadia. Classes were also held at a church in the plaza. Like its Spanish-era predecessor, the school held intermittent sessions until its closure in 1831; it was noted for admitting female pupils and teachers for the first time. Historical accounts variously attribute periodic suspension of classes to the lack of regular attendance by students, unqualified teachers, and the occasional dismissal of teachers for reasons ranging from salary increase requests to the refusal to administer corporal punishment. School was also subject to interruption, sometimes for extended periods, by local rebellions requiring the participation of the teacher and any young men in enrollment. It is estimated that no more than ten cumulative years of school sessions were held in Los Angeles between the end of Spanish rule in 1821 and California’s admission to the Union in 1850, with the longest active sustained period between 1838 and 1844.

Incorporation of the City of Los Angeles in 1850 marked the beginning of more concerted efforts to institute a program of formal education in the City of Los Angeles, aided by the recent passage of state legislation explicitly addressing education. The state Constitution of 1849 established a Superintendent of Public Instruction, created a schools fund and made it mandatory for the legislature to provide for a system of common schools to be kept open at least three months a year. Subsequent legislation passed in 1851 provided for the creation of a superintending school committee in each city, town or incorporated village, directed the creation of school districts, allowed for the levy of a district school tax and authorized the establishment of high schools.

Los Angeles, with a resident population of just 1,700 as of 1850, waged a continual struggle throughout this period to elevate its status to that of a recognized center of government and accordingly established a number civic institutions, including a post office, a Protestant church, a synagogue, and southern

¹ Information taken from *Preliminary Historic Resources Survey of the Los Angeles Unified School District*. Huemann, 2002.

California's first newspaper, the Los Angeles Star. As part of its city-building efforts, the Los Angeles town council appointed two committee members in 1850 to establish a public school. Acting as the school board, the council hired the Reverend Henry Weeks and his wife to head the City's first English-speaking school, which opened in January 1851 in the Weeks home. The City adopted its first school ordinance in July of the same year, which decreed that both English and Spanish were to be taught, with additional instruction to be negotiated between the teachers and parents of children in attendance. In 1853, the city adopted an additional ordinance providing for the establishment and maintenance of city public schools, while simultaneously abolishing subsidies of private schools. The ordinance also empowered the council to appoint a Board of Education, and the first superintendent of schools, Stephen C. Foster, then-mayor of Los Angeles, was appointed in 1854.

Three more schools were founded in the five years following the opening of the Reverend Weeks's school, supported in part by the state's assessment in 1852 of a dedicated education tax of five cents per \$100 of taxable property value. Los Angeles promptly adopted a similar tax of ten cents per \$100 of taxable property value to support its schools. Until this time, "rate bill common" schools were funded by fees enforceably collected from parents. Construction of the first dedicated public schoolhouse was undertaken in 1855 at the corner of Second and Spring Streets, then a southern suburb of the city proper and the terminus of the transcontinental Butterfield Stagecoach line. A second school opened shortly thereafter on North Main Street. Each was two stories in height and constructed of brick; the founding of a kiln in the city in 1852 provided a ready supply of brick, for the first time displacing adobe as the predominant building material and enabling multistoried buildings. Announcing a beautification program, the School Board authorized landscaping and fencing of Public School No. 1 shortly after its opening to keep wandering cattle and wild horses out of the schoolyard. While girls were permitted to attend city schools, coeducation was forbidden and separate classes were conducted for the sexes.

Los Angeles was still a largely rural settlement in the 1850s, and truancy remained problematic among school-age children. A contemporary newspaper account noted: "There are now 1,191 children between the ages of four and eighteen in Los Angeles, El Monte, and San Gabriel school districts; yet not more than 150 in all attend school." Seven schools were in operation in all of Los Angeles County by 1856-1857, four of them in the city of Los Angeles. In 1860 the state allocated \$2,500 for education in Los Angeles County, but the 1860s proved less than progressive years for Los Angeles. The distant civil war took its toll on state resources and the attentions of those in state and local government, serious local droughts caused economic collapse throughout southern California, and the disastrous 1861-1862 floods washed away a substantial portion of the new city. Los Angeles's population grew by only 1,000 between 1860 and 1870. The City's school building program likewise suffered; the San Pedro Street School, built in 1861, was the only new school erected during this decade. A one-room brick building, it occupied the same site as the present school of the same name; the property is recorded as the oldest in the ownership of the School District. A formal enrollment record prepared for the 1865-1866 school year indicates a district-wide total of three schools and six teachers with an enrollment of 244 pupils.

Formation of the Los Angeles City School District

Los Angeles's fortunes turned in the 1870s, years of growing prosperity preceding southern California's "Boom of the '80s." The state legislature made education compulsory in 1872 with passage

of the “Act to Enforce the Educational Rights of Children,” passed a bond issue for school buildings and required each city to create a board of education consisting of five members with the power to appoint a superintendent. In this manner, a City school district, separate of the County, was formed. Two new schools, the first in Los Angeles in a decade, were built in 1872 and 1873. The 1873 school represented the first high school in Los Angeles and in southern California. A three- or four-room building known as the Central School, it was located atop “Pound Cake Hill” at Temple and Broadway (then Fort) Streets (later housing the Fort Hill Welfare Center and now the site of the County Courthouse) and built at a cost of \$25,000. Three more high schools were built later the same year.

Aided by the completion of the transcontinental railroad and expansion into Los Angeles, tourism increased dramatically as the 1880s approached and ushered in a land rush and an era of unprecedented prosperity and population growth throughout southern California. The population of Los Angeles grew from 11,000 to more than 100,000 during the 1880s. The general prosperity of the region was reflected in the growth of the City’s school system, which underwent an extended period of expansion that led to overcrowding in very short order. By the Board of Education’s count, the school district encompassed six schools, 18 teachers and 875 pupils in 1874; by 1876, 1,262 students and 19 teachers; and by 1884 it had grown to 3,417 students and 66 teachers.

In 1881, the California State legislature authorized the establishment in Los Angeles of the Los Angeles State Normal School for the education of teachers. The school opened on the site of the present Central Library at Fifth Street and Grand Avenue. The school later moved to a Vermont Avenue site in 1919 and was renamed the Southern Branch of the University of California. It represented the second campus in the University of California system after Berkeley (Oakland), as the state reorganized its Normal Schools into a state college system. The school was once again renamed as the University of California at Los Angeles in 1927 and moved to its present Westwood location in 1929.

School districts in Los Angeles County typically formed according to an established administrative formula determined by the district’s location and type of jurisdiction served (i.e., county or chartered city) and outlined as early as 1916 in a report to the Board of Education. Separate “regular” districts encompassed clusters of schools of a single educational level, generally leading to the formation of elementary school districts, high school districts, and junior college districts. “Union” districts denoted a combination of two or more geographically contiguous elementary school districts, or a high school district overlapping one or more constituent elementary school districts. Union districts usually formed in sparsely populated rural parts of the county, where few schools were required to serve a large geographic area. “Joint” or “joint union” districts identified school districts encompassing areas in more than one county. Finally, “unified” school districts were defined as two or more regular or union districts administratively unified so as to offer instruction at two or more levels, with no more than one district at each level. Unified school districts were found most often in urban or urban-rural areas, as high schools were typically less heavily attended than elementary schools and therefore served larger constituent areas. The same organizational formula remains in use in many school districts throughout Los Angeles County today.

The Board’s annual report for 1884 reported a 40 percent increase in enrollment across the school district and a corresponding increase in teachers of 35 percent. Administrative concerns cited in the report included lack of scholastic uniformity among the schools, the greatly disparate educational levels of entering pupils, crowded classroom conditions necessitating turning students away, and poor

financial support of the schools. School district boundaries were dynamic, shifting to accommodate changes in settlement patterns and population flux. Accordingly, growth of school districts in Los Angeles County reflected the region's increasing urbanization and was particularly influenced by municipal incorporation. The newly formed City School District first annexed the Rosedale and Harmony school districts in 1896, and thereafter regularly annexed additional high school and elementary school districts at the rate of several every year or two through the 1960s, with the greatest number of annexations recorded during the 1920s and 1930s.

Early concerns about rapid expansion of the school district were to prove prescient, as growth in the first part of the twentieth century continued at an extraordinary rate. By 1910, with the City of Los Angeles's population at 319,000, the City, and therefore the school district, encompassed over 85 square miles and enrollment stood at over 46,500. By 1912, both the City and district had grown to 197 square miles. By 1916, district enrollment stood at 78,658 and the district served an area of 400 square miles, or 112 more square miles than the City itself, a reflection of the fact that school districts, as state, rather than city, agencies pursuant to the Education Code of 1872, included both incorporated cities and adjacent unincorporated land, and frequently portions of other incorporated cities. In some cases, areas annexed by the Los Angeles City School district already possessed schools sufficient to serve their own needs; more often, new schools needed to be built to accommodate the increased enrollment represented by the added area. An Advisory Committee report to the Board of Education in 1916 indicates that 22 schools had been annexed in the five years since 1911, with construction of an additional 31 elementary and high school buildings undertaken during the same period. The district's first junior high school was organized in 1911, and four more followed later the same year. Masonry construction increasingly supplanted frame construction; the 1916 report details that the majority of the new schools were of brick construction, together with three frame buildings, five of plaster and wood, one of concrete and plaster, and two of plaster on tile. School construction did not keep pace with the enrollment, however; repeal of the annual school census by the state legislature in 1911 meant that the school district had no accurate way to gauge enrollment, and hence no sound basis for appeals for state funds for new construction.

Corollaries to the establishment of elementary and high schools include the founding of settlement houses and kindergartens, both of which played supporting roles in the early history of schooling in Los Angeles. Although of different origins, both institutions served predominantly lower and middle-class families as vehicles for assimilation into society. Settlement houses, forerunners of today's community centers and YMCAs, were generally operated under secular, albeit reform-driven, auspices and provided healthcare, childcare, schooling, language and vocational training, free libraries, plunge baths and a host of other social services to largely immigrant populations. Kindergartens, or preschools, were also seen as a critical part of the school curriculum, as they provided an opportunity to teach American middle-class values at a young age to children of immigrant communities. The first kindergarten was established in the City in 1876; it closed shortly thereafter, but by 1890 a widespread kindergarten program was in operation within the school system.

The Frank Wiggins Trade School, the first of its kind in the district, was established in 1925 on Grand Avenue and relocated in 1927 to a "height limit fireproof structure" located at 1646 South Olive Street. Named for the longtime secretary of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, it provided a course of adult education in specific vocations and placement of students in the occupations for which they had been trained. Among its other curricula, the school offered the first professional culinary training

program in the nation, an offshoot of the home economics program. The trade school evolved into the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, still operational today as part of the nine-campus 882-square-mile Los Angeles Community College District.

The establishment of the District's first junior college in 1929 was represented as the crowning accomplishment of the administration then in office. The school district purchased the Vermont Avenue campus of the former State Normal School when it relocated to Westwood and established the Los Angeles Junior College, which was an immediate success. The curriculum constituted the freshman and sophomore years of college, and included semi-professional courses for students interested in a two-year education, as well as certificate work for those planning to qualify for subsequent admission to a university. Together with the trade schools, junior college fulfilled an important social need by supplying focused adult education and career training during the Depression years, and enrollment steadily increased as the war approached.

A 1931 report prepared by the School Board for teachers and visitors associated with a National Education Association Convention describes the recent growth of the District's area, including elementary and high school districts, from 482 square miles around 1915 to 688 square miles within the elementary school district and 1,039 square miles, or three times the size of the area of the City of Los Angeles, within the high school district. Student enrollment stood at 102,340 in 1915; it reached 404,351, a fourfold increase, by 1930. School facilities in 1930 totaled 350 and included 260 kindergartens, 294 elementary schools, 23 junior high schools and 31 high schools, one trade school and one junior college. The boom in school attendance and new school construction during the 1920s reflected a correspondingly dramatic growth in Los Angeles County, when new subdivisions were being opened at one point at a rate of 40 per week in Los Angeles city alone. By the end of the decade Los Angeles was the fifth largest city in America, with a population of 1,238,048; county population had reached 2,208,492.

The 1931 School Board report details the design for school campuses built in that era. Elementary schools were typically constructed in three units. The first unit usually contained administrative offices, a kindergarten and nine classrooms, and was constructed at an average cost of \$75,000-\$80,000. The second unit, erected when enrollment reached 400, contained additional classrooms and facilities for home economics and manual education, as well as a cafeteria; the unit's cost was about \$70,000. The arrangement of the third unit, added when enrollment reached 900, was more variable but usually included an auditorium sufficient to seat half the enrollment, additional classrooms and any needed service rooms.

1933 Long Beach Earthquake and the Field Act

In 1914, the citizens of Los Angeles voted to replace wood frame construction school buildings with masonry structures, in keeping with the new emphasis in building on fire resistance. Masonry's vulnerability to earthquakes was not a consideration, as the risk was not recognized. New schools built during the 1920s were generally of masonry construction. Los Angeles had grown 112 percent during the 1920s, and by 1925 enrollment exceeded available school capacity. Average daily attendance in 1933 was 243,264, with enrollment approximately twenty percent higher; both represented a 500 percent increase over figures of twenty years earlier. Classrooms were severely overcrowded by the end of the 1930s, and the district was forced to occupy basements, tents, and temporary bungalows to accommodate its students.

The state adopted building codes recognizing earthquake hazards in response to the 1925 Santa Barbara earthquake, and in 1927 the City of Los Angeles revised its City Building Ordinance and adopted additional requirements for schoolhouse construction. The district, accordingly, implemented the required construction improvements and techniques in its schools built after 1927. Improvements included fire resistant corridors, stairs and exterior walls, and reinforced concrete beams within floors and roofs, and schools built with these features proved more resilient to the March 1933 Long Beach earthquake than those constructed prior to 1933. Nonetheless, the school district suffered great losses as the result of the 1933 earthquake, which made evident the structural inadequacy of many of the its facilities. According to a report prepared in 1935 by the Board of Education entitled “The Reconstruction Program of the Los Angeles City Schools: 1933-1935 (Inclusive),” of the 1,691 buildings on 395 campuses, 40 masonry buildings were so damaged that they required condemnation and demolition. Following a preliminary survey of the schools by structural engineers within ten days of the earthquake, all damaged or “precariously placed” chimneys, parapets, fire walls and ornamentation were removed.

The district planned and implemented a phased school building reconstruction program immediately following the earthquake. The district already possessed \$5.3 million in unsold bonds that had been recently voted for school building purposes. The federal Public Works Administration purchased the bonds in response to the earthquake and granted additional matching funds of up to 30 percent of funds raised by the district for construction. The district set aside other funds as they became available, and a total of \$12.1 million was ultimately raised for the 1933-35 reconstruction program. Approximately \$250,000 of this sum was immediately used to create temporary classroom housing for displaced students in order to minimize the interruption of the school year. An estimated 879 tents and 139 bungalows were initially erected to house the district’s enrollment of 300,000 students.

The state passed the Field Bill, or Act, in 1933 in response to public outcry over the vulnerability of school buildings to earthquake-related damage. The Act directed the State Division of Architecture to develop and enforce regulations to ensure earthquake resistant structures; this led to State oversight of school building activities through establishment of a building code and construction inspection for schools. The City of Los Angeles Board of Education further decreed that elementary school buildings were not to exceed one story in height and high school buildings were to be limited to two stories. Rehabilitation of schools was undertaken where economically feasible; rehabilitation methods typically included installation of reinforcing steel columns, beams and diagonal bracing, exterior refacing with reinforced gunite, and installation of reinforced concrete walls. New buildings similarly incorporated recent construction advances and prominently featured the use of structural steel and reinforced concrete. On sites where soil load-bearing properties were found to be low, demolished schools were replaced with earthquake-resistant wood frame buildings.

Two years after the earthquake, the school reconstruction was reported to be only one-third complete. Despite substantial new construction since 1933, the tents erected in 1933, plus approximately 957 bungalows built since then, remained in use as temporary classrooms. It was estimated that 75 percent of the classrooms in use as of 1935 were still located in buildings that did not comply with Field Act school building code requirements. Another 132 unreinforced masonry buildings remained in use; they had not been damaged by the earthquake but were known to be vulnerable in the future. One, the second Los Angeles High School building, built in 1889 and then in use as the Central Junior High School, was the oldest brick school building in the City. An additional 275 buildings had been

constructed in accordance with the 1927 City building code and were considered reasonably safe, although they did not comply with the Field Act. An estimated 211 reinforced and new masonry buildings, most already in use by 1935, met Field Act requirements. Finally, 51 two-story frame-construction schools erected during a building campaign waged between 1903 and 1905 were still in use. The final projected steps in the reconstruction program included planned reinforcement or replacement of the 132 unreinforced masonry buildings, strengthening of the 275 buildings built since 1927 to Field Act standards, replacement of the 51 wood frame buildings, and elimination of the temporary classroom housing.

World War II and Postwar Growth

The World War II era and its aftermath had a profound effect on the growth and organization of the school district. The geographic area served by the school district fluctuated over time, expanding during the 1920s and 1930s as it annexed adjacent school districts and served new areas, and later contracting as it lost districts that chose to split off and form self-contained districts. As of 1935, the school district enrolled 300,000 students housed in 384 schools, including 293 elementary schools, 22 junior high schools, 35 high schools, a trade school and a junior college, and served an area of over 1,095 square miles. The general trend in school district organization during the late 1930s and 1940s was toward the splitting-off of smaller from larger school districts as communities urbanized and developed identities. For example, between 1936 and 1945, the Beverly Hills, Torrance, Culver City, and William S. Hart Union High School districts formed after leaving the Los Angeles City School District. Nonetheless, despite the geographic dynamics of the district, enrollment steadily increased. Rapid postwar residential development greatly increased enrollment within the Los Angeles City School District and perpetuated the need for funds for additional classroom space and other resources. To examine apportionment of state aid to school districts, in 1954 the state legislature created the State Commission on School Districts and directed it to examine unification and other means of reorganization of school districts in the state. The state's policy thereafter was the encouragement of unionization and unification for reasons of streamlining administrative functions and costs, enlarging tax bases and reducing dependence on state aid. Developing suburbs were, accordingly, encouraged to align themselves with the existing Los Angeles City School District, further contributing to its growth.

Through the 1950s, the Los Angeles City School District remained organized as an Elementary School District, High School District, and Junior College District. Vocational training related to war production efforts succeeded traditional educational emphases at the high school and junior college levels, drawing upon adult education programs already in place since the establishment of the district's first junior college in 1929. Building construction, which had slowed to a standstill during the war years, exploded in the 1950s as new tracts and suburbs were constructed for veterans who moved to Los Angeles and started families. Areas such as the San Fernando Valley witnessed unprecedented growth during this period.

Today, the Los Angeles Unified School District serves the second largest student population in the nation, encompassing more than 720,000 students located in a 707-square mile area including the City of Los Angeles, areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County and parts of 25 other municipalities. Its most recent reorganization, implemented in July 2000, divided the district into 11 semi-autonomous Local Districts, each serving 50,000 to 77,000 students and overseen by a Local District Superintendent. The district presently operates 429 elementary schools, 76 middle schools, 52 senior

high schools, 13 multi-level schools, and a range of other facilities including children's centers, continuation high schools, special education schools, 155 magnet schools and centers, community adult schools, and employment preparation centers.

Architectural Overview

The earliest schoolhouses built in Los Angeles were typically one- and two-story, vernacular-type wood buildings, typically modeled after rural communal buildings and easily enlarged or otherwise modified to accommodate growth or a range of uses. It was this generation of school construction that introduced the bell tower as a signature element of a school building, perhaps modeling school buildings after early churches. A few examples of these “first-generation” wooden schoolhouses, the favored construction method beginning in 1875 and lasting through approximately 1910, have survived; the library building at Canyon Elementary School, for example, was built in 1894.

If the wooden buildings had looked to small homes, meeting houses, and churches for design prototypes, their masonry successors seemingly were more influenced by courthouses, city halls, or mansions. No longer constrained to a severely limited number of rooms, these more substantial schoolhouses were up to two or three stories in height and featured the architectural styles of the day. The Classical Revival was especially favored, and impressive porticos of colossal columns proclaimed the importance attached to education. Most of these schools fell victim to the 1933 Long Beach Earthquake; the San Fernando Middle School Auditorium, constructed as part of a six year high school in 1916, is one of the few remaining examples of this era.

Most of the oldest school buildings extant in the District today (2002) were constructed between the early 1920s and World War II. These surviving third-generation school buildings were generally, although not always, of masonry; brick was a popular structural and decorative cladding material, as were hollow clay tile and concrete, the latter often manipulated to resemble stone or other materials. Most often two stories in height, third generation schools introduced new styles, including the Romanesque Revival, Italian Renaissance Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, and Collegiate Gothic Revival. During the 1930s, Moderne styled buildings were favored.

As a rule, a school initially would be planned as a single building, with spaces allocated for standardized classrooms; special kindergarten rooms with toilets en suite; principal's and vice principal's offices; and boys' and girls' toilet rooms. Rooms were arrayed off of double-loaded corridors in the most common arrangement, establishing a linear organization to building plans that had been missing in earlier plans. During this period designers were increasingly concerned with the provision of natural light and fresh air, and as a consequence, another signature element of school design became a regular feature: the repetition of bays of windows, often stacked three high. Buildings were either massed as single rectangular unit or embellished with wings set perpendicular to the main body of the building, frequently enclosing, all or in part, a courtyard space. Usually auditoriums, or cafeterias if provided, would be located in a wing or a separate building. Gymnasiums, introduced at the junior high and senior high levels, were housed in separate buildings of more utilitarian design. Similarly, shops were often located in industrial-like buildings, provided with large spaces and open truss roofs.

A new emphasis upon earthquake-resistant structural engineering design and construction guided school building plans after 1933. Earthquake reconstruction efforts for existing buildings encompassed

foundation reinforcement, major structural reinforcement and architectural modification, replacement of plaster elements with more modern materials, removal or abrasion of exterior brick or masonry surfaces and application of gunite, and other tasks. The 1930s also witnessed the application of a variety of modern innovations to school plans, reflecting educational reforms of the time and encompassing advances in ventilation, illumination, hygiene, sanitation, school furnishings and landscaping. Most schools reconstructed in the wake of the earthquake exhibited the mix of classicism, Art Deco, and streamlining referred to as “P.W.A. Moderne” (Gebhard and Winter, 1977) A new interest, grounded in California’s mild climate, was also prevalent, in one story schools more easily opened to the outdoors and in the provision of open loggias and arcades for circulation.

After the construction hiatus caused by World War II, the International Style was adopted for schools, as pioneered by Viennese-born architect Richard Neutra in some Los Angeles area schools; the unfamiliar, plain and increasingly standardized designs earned schools of this style the derogatory term “learning factories” (Maddox, 1985). The 1950s and 1960s saw the rise of predominantly one-story, open-air plan schools. One-story design meant the elimination of the wasted space usually needed for corridors and stairwells, and easily accommodated expansion through the addition of new wings, separate structures, or portable classrooms. Such ease of expansion was in keeping with the postwar baby boom and corresponding explosion of suburban development, where many of the new schools were necessarily located.

These schools were generally constructed where land was plentiful, and in contrast to the earlier schools with more urban surroundings, usually enjoyed sites of around seven acres. These plants are characterized by sprawling, low clusters of buildings connected by covered walkways. Buildings and classrooms possessed individual patios or open courtyards, encouraging air circulation and taking maximum advantage of the climate. It was postulated that such a layout was a descendant of the earliest Mission classrooms, held in rooms arranged about patios and under arcades (Hayes, date unavailable). One-story buildings also substantially reduced the overall superstructure and consequently earthquake and fire risks, as access to the outdoors was readily available. Such architecture was primarily applied to grade schools, while multi-story design was still favored for high schools.

Throughout each period of school construction, prominent architects of the region as well as the District’s own architectural department supplied the school designs. The following architects and firms were responsible for many of the historic school buildings still extant in the District in the early years of the twenty-first century: Robert Alexander, John C. Austin, Austin and Ashley, Edwin Bergstrom, Stiles O. Clements, Roland Coate, Edelman and Zimmerman, Sidney Eisenstadt, Frank Hudson, Hudson and Munsell, Myron Hunt, Hunt and Chambers, Hunt and Burns, Gordon B. Kaufmann, George Lindsey, Marsh, Smith, and Powell, A. C. Martin, A. S. Nibecker, Richard Neutra, Noerenberg and Johnson, Parkinson and Parkinson, Charles Plummer, Alfred Rosenheim, Sumner Spaulding, Spaulding, and Rex and Walker and Eisen.

Of the over 700 campuses and administrative complexes operated by the District as of 2002, 410 contain permanent buildings that are at least 45 years old or older. Because of the pattern of growth in the District, not all of the permanent buildings at any individual campus were likely to have been constructed at the same time. In order to be considered historically significant, these buildings and/or campuses must satisfy at least one criterion for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources. Schools in the City of Los Angeles are exempt by statute

from designation as Historic-Cultural Monuments (i.e., as local landmarks), although schools located in other jurisdictions may be eligible for local recognition if the appropriate municipal code enables such designations. The National Register criteria, and California Register criteria that are modeled on them, address association with historic events or activities; association with important persons; distinctive design or physical characteristics; and potential to provide important information about prehistory or history. Integrity of the property, that is the ability of the property to convey a sense of time and place, is also an important consideration in the evaluation of historic resources. Under these criteria, properties may be significant at the local, state, or national level.

REFERENCES

- America's Suburb. 2003 Brief History by Era. America's Suburb.com [Website based on the book The San Fernando Valley: America's Suburb: Roderick, Kevin 2001]. Accessed at <http://www.americassuburb.com/lore.html>.
- Atkinson, Janet L. 1988. Los Angeles County Historical Directory. Library of Congress Cataloguing-in Publication, Jefferson, NC.
- Bancroft, Hubert Howe. 1886. The History of California: The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft. History Company. San Francisco, California.
- Beals, R.L. and J.A. Hester, Jr. 1974. Indian Land Use and Occupancy in California. American Indian Ethnohistory: California and Basin-Plateau Indians, Vol. III, ed. By D.A. Horr. Garland, New York.
- Bean, Lowell J. 1972. Mukat's People: The Cahuilla Indians of Southern California. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.
- Bean, Lowell J. and Florence Shippek. 1978. Luiseno. In: Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8: California, ed. by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 550-563. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Bean, Lowell J. and Charles Smith. 1978. Gabrielino. In: Handbook of North American Indians: California, Volume 8, pp. 538-550. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Becker, Kenneth. 1999. Boundary Definition at Tujunga Village (CA-LAN-167), Hansen Dam Flood Control Basin, Los Angeles County, California. Statistical Research, Inc. Technical Series 99-59. Tucson, Arizona.
- Benedict, Ruth. 1924. A Brief Sketch of Serrano Culture. American Anthropologist 26(3):366-392.
- Bolton, Herbert E. 1927. Spanish Explorations in the Southwest, 1542-1706. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Bolton, Herbert E. 1971. Fray Juan Crespi: Missionary Explorer on the Pacific Coast, 1769-1774. AMS Press, New York.
- CENSUS. 2003. Population Estimates for Cities and Towns. U.S. Census Bureau [Website]. Accessed at <http://eire.census.gov/popest/data/cities/tables/SUB-EST2002-01.php>.
- Chartkoff, Joseph L. 1966. Appendix I: Evaluating a Midden Sampling Technique at the Big Tujunga Site (LAN-167). On file, California State University, Fullerton, South Central Coastal Information Center, Fullerton, California.
- Chartkoff, Joseph L. 1966, Archaeological Site Survey Record: CA-LAN-111 (Supplement). On file, California State University, Fullerton, South Central Coastal Information Center, Fullerton, California.

-
- Davis, Owen. 1990. Pollen Analysis of Archaeological Sites of the San Joaquin Hills Transportation Corridor Archaeological Test Excavation Sites. In: Final Rest Investigation Report and Request for Determination of Eligibility for 23 Sites along the San Joaquin Hills Transportation Corridor, ed. By P. deBarros and H.C. Koerper. On file, California State University, Fullerton, South Central Coastal Information Center, Fullerton, California.
- DeBarros, Phillip, and Henry C. Koerper (eds.). 1990. Final Rest Investigation Report and Request for Determination of Eligibility for 23 Sites along the San Joaquin Hills Transportation. On file, California State University, Fullerton, South Central Coastal Information Center, Fullerton, California.
- Drover, Christopher E. 1980. See Citation for Koerper, Drover, and Langenwaller (1983).
- DuBois, Constance Goddard. 1908. The Religion of the Luiseno and Dieguito Indians of Southern California. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 8(3):69-186. Berkeley, California.
- Elliott, Wallace W. 1967. History of San Bernardino and San Diego Counties, California, with Illustrations. Riverside Museum Press, Riverside, California. (reprint).
- Ericson, Jonathon E. 1978. Obsidian Hydration Dating in California. In: Occasional Papers in Method and Theory in California Archaeology No. 2, pp. 43-54. Society of California Archaeology, Salinas, California.
- Ericson, Jonathon E. 1981. Exchange Production System in California Prehistory: The Results of Hydration Dating and Chemical Characterization of Obsidian Sources. BAR International Series, British Archaeological Report. Oxford, England.
- Gebhard, David and Winter, Robert. 1977. Architecture in Los Angeles and Southern California. Peregrine, Smith, Inc., Santa Barbara and Salt Lake City.
- Greenwood, Roberta S. 1978. Obispeno and Purisimeno Chumash. In: Handbook of North American Indians: California, Volume 8, edited by R.F. Heizer, pp. 520-523. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Hayes, William. n.d. One-Story and Open-Air Schoolhouses in California. Architectural Forum, v. 7.
- Heizer, Robert F. (ed.). 1968. The Indians of Los Angeles County, California. Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly 5(1):1-68.
- Heumann, Leslie. 2002. Preliminary Historic Resources Survey of the Los Angeles Unified School District. Los Angeles Unified School District, Facilities Service Division.
- Hudson, Dee Travis. 1969. The Archaeological Investigations During 1935 and 1937 at ORA-237, ORA-238, and ORA-239, Santiago Canyon, Orange County, California. Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly 5(1):1-68.
- Hudson, Dee Travis. 1971. Proto-Gabrielino Patterns of Territorial Organization in South Coastal California. Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly 7(2):48-76.
- Hughes, Richard E., and Delbert L. True. 1985. Perspective on the Distribution of Obsidians in San Diego County, California. North American Archaeologist 6:325-339.
- Johnston, Bernice E. 1962. California's Gabrielino Indians. Southwest Museum, Los Angeles, California.

-
- Koerper, Henry C. and Christopher E. Drover. 1983. See Citation for Koerper, Drover, and Langenwalter (1983).
- Koerper, Henry C., Jonathon E. Ericson, Christopher E. Drover, and Paul E. Langenwalter. 1986. Obsidian Exchange in Prehistoric Orange County. Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly 22(1):33-69.
- Koerper, Henry C., Christopher E. Drover, and Paul E. Langenwalter II. 1983. Early Holocene Human Adaptation on the Southern California Coast: A Summary Report on Investigations at the Irvine Site (CA-ORA-064), Newport Bay, Orange County, California. Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly 19(3-4):1-84.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. 1925. Handbook of California Indians. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. Reprinted 1976, Dover Publications.
- LAA. 1998-2003. Headline History. Los Angeles Almanac [Website], Given Place Publishing. Accessed at <http://www.losangelesalmanac.com/topics/History.htm#Headline%20History>.
- LACO. 2003. History of Los Angeles County. Los Angeles County Online [Website]. Accessed at <http://lacounty.info/history.htm>.
- Laylander, Don. 1991. Phase II and Extended Phase I Tests at Seven Prehistoric Archaeological Sites (CA-IMP-6297/6298, -6417, -6419, -6422/6423, -6425, -6427, and -6429) in the Kane Spring Area, Imperial County, California. On file, Caltrans, San Diego Offices.
- Los Angeles Board of Education Advisory Committee. 1916. Report of the Advisory Committee to the Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles on Certain Aspects of the Organization and Administration of the Public School System, Los Angeles (Begun April 17 and Concluded May 22).
- Los Angeles City Board of Education. 1935. The Reconstruction Program of the Los Angeles City Schools, 1933-1935 (Inclusive), Los Angeles.
- Maddox, Diane, ed. 1985. Built in the U.S.A: American Buildings From Airports to Zoos. The Preservation Press, Washington D.C.
- Marinella, Carmen L. 1994. "Growing Up Together: A Collection of South Bay Memories." The Daily Breeze, Torrance, California.
- Mason, Roger D. 1984. Eastern Corridor Alignment Study, Orange County, California. Scientific Resource Surveys, Inc., Huntington Beach, California. On file, University of California, Los Angeles, Archaeological Information Center.
- Mason, Roger D., M.L. Peterson, L.P. Klug, J.E. Ericson, H.C. Koerper, A.B. Schroth, R.O. Gibson, C.D. King, and R. McCleary. 1994. Newport Coast Archaeological Report: Newport Coast Settlement Systems: Analysis and Discussion, Volume 1. On file, University of California, Los Angeles, Archaeological Information Center.
- Mason, Roger D. and Mark L. Peterson. 1994. Results: Chronometric Analyses. In: Newport Coast Archaeological Report - Newport Coast Settlement Systems: Analysis and Discussion, Volume I, pp. 54-59. The Keith Companies Archaeological Division, Costa Mesa, California.
- McAvoy, Christy J. 1994. South Brand Boulevard Residential District. Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record. Document prepared for the State of California.
- McCawley, William. 1996. The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles. A Malki-Ballena Press Cooperative Publication.

-
- McKenna, Jeanette A. 1985. CA-ORA-849: Reinvestigation of a Late Prehistoric-Historic Archaeological Site in Orange County, California. On file, McKenna et al., Whittier, California.
- McKenna, Jeanette A. 1986. Final Report of Archaeological Investigations at Sites CA-OR 858, CA-ORA-859, and CA-ORA-698, Rancho de Los Alisos, Orange County, California. On file, McKenna et al., Whittier, California.
- Moratto, Michael J., and Roberta S. Greenwood. 1991. Historic Properties Treatment Plan San Luis Rey River Flood Control Project, San Diego County, California. On file, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District.
- Moratto, Michael J., A. Schroth, J.M. Foster, D. Gallegos, R.S. Greenwood, G. Romani, M.C. Romano, L.H. Shoup, M.T. Swanson, and E.C. Gibson. 1994. Archaeological Investigations at Fives Site on the Lower San Luis Rey River, San Diego County, California: Final Report. On file, Greenwood and Associates, Pacific Palisades, California.
- Moyer, C.C. 1969. Historic Ranchos of San Diego. Union Tribune, San Diego.
- Preston, Richard E. 1965. The Changing Landscape of the San Fernando Valley Between 1930 and 1964. Center for Urban Studies Reprint Series, No. 1. A Reprint from California Geographer, v. VI.
- Rice, Glen E. and Marie G. Cottrell. 1976. Report on Excavations at CA-ORA-111, Locus II. Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly 12(3):7-65.
- Robins, Kaplan, Miller and Ciresi. 2000. Cultural Heritage Masterplan Final Draft for the City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department. Historic Resources Group and Project Management Advisors, Inc.
- Robinson, W.W.I. 1939. The Indians of Los Angeles: Story of the Liquidation of a People. (Early California Travel Series 8); Los Angeles: Dawson. (possibly ca. 1951).
- Roderick, Kevin. 2001. The San Fernando Valley: America's Suburb. Los Angeles Times Books, Los Angeles.
- SBC. (South Bay Cities). 2003. History. South Bay Cities Council of Governments. <http://southbaycities.org/history.htm>.
- SCHS. 2003. A Southern California Chronology. Southern California Historical Society. <http://www.socalhistory.org>.
- Scientific Resource Surveys. 1979. Archaeological Survey Report on a 1700+ Acre Parcel of Land Designated the "Campeau Project" Located in the Lake Mathews Area of Riverside County. On file, University of California, Riverside, ARU.
- Smith, D. E. and F. J. Teggart (eds.). 1909. Diary of Gaspar de Portolá During the California Expedition of 1769-1770. Academy of Pacific Coast History Publications 1 (3).
- Wallace, William J. 1955. A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 11(3):214-230.
- Warren, Claude N. 1968. Cultural Traditions and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. Eastern New Mexico University Contributions in Anthropology 1(3):1-14.

PURPOSE

In implementing its New School Construction Program, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) is committed to the protection and preservation of cultural resources, where feasible. This document furthers that commitment by establishing procedures for the identification of historical resources, unique archaeological resources, and paleontological resources pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Paleontological resources have been included in this discussion because CEQA requires assessment of potential impacts to such resources, and the topic is addressed in Environmental Checklists and Initial Studies (CEQA §15063 [d] [3] and Appendix G) under the heading of “Cultural Resources.”

DEFINITIONS

Key terms used in these Procedures are defined below.

Archaeological Resources/Unique Archaeological Resources

Archaeological Resources are cultural resources of prehistoric or historic origin that reflect human activity. Archaeological Resources include both structural ruins and buried resources. The term *Unique Archaeological Resources* is defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) § 21083.2(g) as follows:

...‘unique archaeological resources’ 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:

- (1) Contains information need to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
- (2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- (3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Architectural Master Reviewers

Architectural Master Reviewers review architectural historic resource investigations in connection with school construction projects, advise on the adequacy of such investigations, and recommend alternative ways to protect architectural Historical Resources. To serve as an Architectural Master Reviewer, an individual must meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A), and have fifteen (15) years or more of professional experience with standard architectural review processes. The duties of Architectural Master Reviewers are more fully described below.

Architectural Resource

Architectural Resources include buildings, structures, objects, and sites of the built environment.

Historical Resources

Historical Resources are buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts that have been formally evaluated and found to meet one or more of the significance criteria identified in CEQA §15064.5 (a)(3). While most Historical Resources will be fifty years old or older, resources that have achieved

significance in less than fifty years may also be considered historic, provided that a sufficient time has passed to understand their historical importance. (CCR Title 14, Chapter 11.5, §4852[d][2].)

Historic District

A *Historic District* is a concentration of historic buildings, structures, objects, or sites within precise boundaries that share a common historical, cultural, or architectural background, and meet one of the criteria for significance set forth in CCR Title 14, Chapter 11.5, §4852(b). (CCR Title 14, Chapter 11.5, §4852[d][5].)

Qualified Architectural Historians

Qualified Architectural Historians investigate and evaluate Architectural Resources in connection with new school construction projects. Qualified Architectural Historians must meet the minimum requirements of the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A). The duties of Qualified Architectural Historians are more fully described below.

Qualified Archaeologists

Qualified Archaeologists investigate and evaluate Archaeological Resources in connection with new school construction projects. Qualified Archaeologists must meet the minimum requirements of the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A). In addition, it is preferred that Qualified Archaeologists be Registered Professional Archaeologists (RPA).

Paleontological Resource

A *Paleontological Resource* is a natural resource characterized as faunal or floral fossilized remains, but may also include specimens of non-fossil material dating to any period preceding human occupation.

HISTORICAL RESOURCE DETERMINATION CRITERIA

Cultural resources are considered to be Historical Resources if they meet one or more of the four criteria outlined in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, §15064.5 and retain integrity to their period of significance as defined in the regulations implementing the California Register (CCR Title 14, Chapter 11.5, §4852[c]). Specifically, §15064.5 states: "For purposes of this section, the term "historical resources" shall include the following:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (PRC §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).
2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements [of] section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the

California Register of Historical Resources (PRC §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852), which are:

- A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
 - B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
 - C. 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
 - D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
4. The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1 (k) of the PRC), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1 (g) of the PRC) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

This document establishes assessment methodologies for Architectural Historical Resources, Archaeological Resources, and Paleontological Resources. The extent of investigation depends on the nature of the proposed project and the site being investigated. The LAUSD New School Construction Program may include (1) new school construction (which may involve site clearance); (2) reconfigurations or additions to existing schools; (3) re-opening closed schools; and (4) adaptive use of existing buildings.

Architecture

Prior to the approval of any construction project, the LAUSD shall evaluate each potential project site for historically significant Architectural Resources. These investigations shall be conducted by Qualified Architectural Historians, implementing the following procedures:

Site Reconnaissance. A Qualified Architectural Historian shall conduct a reconnaissance of each proposed project site, consisting of the following steps:

Site Visit. During the CEQA review process, a Qualified Architectural Historian shall visit each proposed school project site to confirm the presence or absence of Architectural Resources over 45 years of age, and evaluate their integrity. During the site visit, the Qualified Architectural Historian shall compile detailed notes on architectural elements, conditions, alterations, and/or additions. The Qualified Architectural Historian shall define any Area of Potential Effect (APE) within which direct or indirect impacts on Historical Resources could occur. In some cases, the APE may be limited to the project site itself, while in other situations, the APE may include adjacent or facing properties, or a Historic District. In addition, the Qualified Architectural Historian shall prepare a photographic record of the site. Data compiled during the site visit will be used to evaluate the resource in accordance with CEQA criteria for identifying Historical Resources.

Background Research. For each proposed school project site, the Qualified Architectural Historian shall perform record searches and background research to determine whether Architectural Resources 45 years of age or older are present, and whether Architectural Resources on the site have been previously evaluated and/or identified as historically

significant. Records searches shall include review of each property address in the *LAUSD Historic Resources Survey* and the Historic Property Data File (HPDF) for Los Angeles County. The HPDF should be no more than two years old at the time of the records search. The Qualified Architectural Historian shall also consult city and county building records, as well as General Plans, local registers and surveys, where applicable, of cities located either entirely or partially within the boundaries of the district, including the City of Los Angeles list of Historic-Cultural Monuments and Historic Preservation Overlay Zones. The Qualified Architectural Historian shall also attempt to obtain and consult local Historical Resources surveys, such as those prepared for the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency, the City of Los Angeles Department of Planning, and the City of Los Angeles Department of Engineering. Architectural resources record searches may be performed at the South Central Coastal Information Center (Information Center). The Qualified Architectural Historian shall conduct additional research, as necessary, to evaluate the potential significance of historical events and persons associated with the proposed site and its immediate surroundings, to aid in an evaluation of California Register eligibility.

Initial Technical Report. Upon completion of the site survey and background research, the Qualified Architectural Historian shall prepare an initial technical report presenting the details of the site visit and background research. In the initial technical report, the Qualified Architectural Historian shall also evaluate the historical significance, both individually and as part of any Historic District, of any Architectural Resources at the site that are 45 years of age or older. This evaluation shall apply the California Register eligibility criteria.

The initial technical report shall also evaluate the integrity of any identified Historical Resources. “Integrity” is defined in state guidelines as:

“... the authenticity of an historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the physical survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance.... Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which the resource is proposed for eligibility [to the California Register]. Alterations over time to a resource or historic changes in its use may themselves have historical, cultural, or architectural significance. It is possible that historic resources may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.” (CCR Title 14, Chapter 11.5, § 4852[c]).

The technical report shall identify any applicable local regulations, including General Plans and/or local register of Historical Resources listings. The technical report shall also include recommendations with respect to additional studies, if necessary, and must be supplemented with all appropriate and previously prepared forms (Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms, local register nomination forms, etc.), a current photographic record, and any other documentation needed for review by the Architectural Master Reviewer. Generally, a Primary Record form (DPR 523A) will be prepared for all resources that are 45 years old or older. The technical report must be prepared on letterhead and signed by the Qualified Architectural Historian. The technical report shall be submitted to an Architectural Master Reviewer for review and concurrence. The Architectural Master Reviewer’s comments and review must be prepared on letterhead and signed by the Architectural Master Reviewer. If potential Architectural Historical Resources are identified in the technical report, unless an Architectural Master Reviewer disputes the findings, an intensive survey shall be prepared.

Intensive Survey

Once potential Architectural Historical Resources are identified in the Initial Technical Report and confirmed by an Architectural Master Reviewer, the Qualified Architectural Historian shall prepare an intensive survey to substantiate initial California Register eligibility findings presented in the technical report. The intensive survey shall include additional background research, as necessary, and preparation of appropriate DPR 523 series forms (e.g., Building, Structure, and Object Record, DPR 523B, and/or District DPR 523D). The DPR forms shall be submitted to an Architectural Master Reviewer for review and concurrence. All DPR forms prepared as part of the site reconnaissance and/or intensive survey process, which have been reviewed and confirmed by an Architectural Master Reviewer, will be submitted to the Information Center.

Archaeology

The approach to Archaeological Resources differs from that of the architectural investigations because the presence or absence of Archaeological Resources is often unknown until after some level of ground breaking. This is often the case when dealing with urban settings and built environments, where undisturbed natural soils are not available for visual inspection. This document describes the Phase I Site Investigation process and the Phase II Site Evaluation process that LAUSD will follow in identifying Archaeological Resources.

Phase I Site Investigation

Each project initiated by the LAUSD must include, at minimum, a Phase I Site Investigation conducted by a Qualified Archaeologist. A Phase I Site Investigation includes the completion of an archaeological records check, background research, consultation, a field survey, and the preparation of a technical report.

- *Archaeological Records Check.* Each proposed project site must be subjected to a standard archaeological records check. This level of investigation is completed through the California State University, Fullerton, South Central Coastal Information Center (CSUF-SCCIC), the local repository for all previously completed cultural resource investigations. The CSUF-SCCIC will provide information on known archaeological sites, areas of sensitivity for Archaeological Resources, and will also provide a summary of recorded federal, state, and local Historical Resources (e.g. standing structures).
- *Background Research.* The Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a brief history of the project area with specific attention to impacts to the property (e.g., previous development). Such research provides the background for the evaluation of any resources that may be identified within the project area boundaries.
- *Consultation.* The Qualified Archaeologist shall consult with the Native American Heritage Commission, and local Native American representatives, and local historical societies.
- *Field Survey.* The Qualified Archaeologist shall survey all proposed project sites for Archaeological Resources. Surface evidence of archaeological remains may be present and, therefore, all accessible areas need to be visually inspected.
- *Report Preparation.* The Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a Phase I Site Investigation report in accordance with the Archaeological Resource Management Report (ARMR) guidelines prepared by the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), Sacramento. This report must include all pertinent data and present recommendations for additional studies, if warranted. The Phase I Site Investigation will determine whether the resource has a:

-
- Low sensitivity – unlikely that Unique Archeological Resources would be identified on the property;
 - Medium sensitivity – although no surface evidence of Unique Archeological Resources, the Phase I Site Investigation shows potential for such resources; or
 - High sensitivity – research shows a known Unique Archeological Resource or a strong potential for such resources.

If the Phase I Site Investigation identifies Unique Archaeological Resources, the LAUSD shall consider whether to avoid the resources through project design or abandon the site. If the Phase I Site Investigation identifies either a Medium Sensitivity or a High Sensitivity for Unique Architectural Resources, LAUSD shall prepare a Phase II Evaluation.

Phase II Evaluation

A Phase II Evaluation involves the formal assessment of a resource and, as such, may take various forms, depending on the nature of the resource. Where a Phase II Evaluation is necessary, a Qualified Archaeologist shall develop a site-specific protocol under direction of the LAUSD.

Depending on site-specific conditions, Phase II evaluations may involve limited subsurface testing, inventorying and evaluation of any artifacts recovered, the possibility of specialized studies (e.g., c14), and the preparation of a final report presenting the results of the investigations and recommendations for additional studies, if warranted. Where the Phase I Site Investigation identifies a Medium Sensitivity, the Phase II Investigation shall include, at a minimum, an archaeological monitoring program for future construction activities. Where the Phase I Site Investigation identifies a High Sensitivity, the Phase II Investigation shall include an exploratory testing program prior to grading the project site.

The results of the Phase II Evaluation must include the Phase I Site Investigation (e.g., records check data, consultation, etc.) and be prepared in accordance with ARMR. If the Phase II Evaluation confirms that the site contains Unique Archaeological Resources, LAUSD shall consider whether to avoid the resources through project design or by abandoning the proposed site. If, based on the Phase II Evaluation, the LAUSD determines not to avoid the resources through project design or by abandoning the site, and the identified resources are extensive, the LAUSD shall perform a Phase III Data Recovery/Mitigation Program.

Paleontology

Paleontological overviews will be completed through consultation with the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History, Vertebrate Paleontological Department. The LAUSD Qualified Archaeologist will contact the Museum, provide the location for a given project, and obtain a response identifying previously recorded paleontological specimens, a statement on the relative sensitivity for an area to yield significant specimens, and recommendations for additional studies, as warranted. This information will be included in the cultural resources report prepared for the project.

APPENDIX E.3 ORDINANCE TABLE

City	Regulations	Local Register?
Bell Gardens	Codes not available online	
Carson	<p>Article II Administration, Chapter 7 Departments, Boards and Commissions, Section J: Fine Arts & Historical Commission, 2796.6 Duties and Functions of Commission</p> <p>The Fine Arts and Historical Commission will be a functioning arm of the City structure, as all other appointed commissions, and will be the responsibility of the Parks and Recreation Department. The functions of the Fine Arts and Historical Commission shall be to advise and recommend to the City Council and City staff on all matters relating to cultural arts and historic preservation and rehabilitation of buildings and sites and shall also: (h) Review and make recommendations concerning the designation of buildings and sites as historic monuments. (Ord. 79-482, § 1; Ord. 80-547, § 1) http://ci.carson.ca.us/Municipal%20Codes/MuniCodeFrame.htm</p>	
El Segundo	<p>Title 15 Zoning Regulation, Chapter 14 Historic Preservation, Section 15-14-1 Purpose</p> <p>The purpose of this Chapter is to promote the public health, safety and general welfare by providing for the identification, protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of historic buildings and structures within the City that reflect special elements of the City's historical heritage... http://www.sterlingcodifiers.com/CA/EI%20Segundo/index.htm</p>	Yes
Gardena	<p>Title 18 Zoning, Chapter 18.39 Specific Plans, Section 18.39.010 Intent and authority</p> <p>B. The regulations established in a specific plan zone will allow residential, commercial or industrial land uses and development standards created specifically for the project area, while ensuring compliance with the spirit, intent and provisions of Titles 17 and 18 of this code, the general plan of the city, and other applicable laws. Guidelines, regulations and development standards incorporated in any specific plan zone are intended to achieve the following: 3. Conserve the historic, cultural and scenic assets of the city; http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/gardena/</p>	
Huntington Park	<p>Title 9 Zoning Code, Chapter 2 Administration Article, 12 Design Review Procedures, 9-2.1207 Findings.</p> <p>The Director shall determine that a project adequately meets adopted City standards and design guidelines, based upon the following findings: 8. Special requirements or standards have been adequately incorporated, when applicable, into the site or building design (e.g., transportation demand management improvements, mitigation measures, utilities, American Disabilities Act regulations, density bonus requirements, open space, <i>historic</i> preservation, etc.). http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/Huntington/</p>	
Long Beach	<p>Title 2 Administration and Personnel, Chapter 2.63 Cultural Heritage Commission, Section 2.63.010 Purpose</p> <p>The purpose of this chapter is: A. To protect, enhance and perpetuate areas, districts, streets, places, buildings, structures, works of art, natural features and other similar objects which are reminders of past eras, events, and persons important in local, state or national history, or which provide significant examples of architectural styles of the past or are landmarks in the history of architecture, or which are unique and irreplaceable assets to the city and its neighborhoods, or which provide for this and future generations significant examples of the physical surroundings in which past generations lived; D. To intensify the visual and aesthetic character and diversity of the city and thus enhance its identity through the preservation of varied architectural styles which reflect the city's cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history... http://www.ci.long-beach.ca.us/cityclerk/lbmc/title%2D02/chapter%2D2%2D63.htm</p>	Yes
Montebello	<p>Title 15 Buildings and Construction, Chapter 15.36, Seismic Safety Code, 15.36.080 UBC Section 2319 added—Historical buildings</p> <p>(a) GENERAL. The standards and procedures established by this section shall apply in all aspects to a historical building except that as a means to preserve original architectural elements and facilities restoration, a historical building may, in addition, comply with the special provisions set forth in this section.</p> <p>Title 2 Administration and Personnel, Chapter 2.30 Advisory Commission, 2.3.120 Duties—Arts and Culture Commission</p> <p>A. The commission shall, from time to time, make recommendations to the city council regarding various arts and cultural programs. Such programs shall include topics relating to fine arts and applied arts; music; drama; dance; city history; civic beautification; cultural heritage; and literature. http://ordlink.com/codes/montebello/index.htm</p>	

City	Regulations	Local Register?
Monterey Park	<p>Title 2 Administration and Personnel, Chapter 2.62 Historical Heritage Commission, Section 2.62.030 Responsibilities</p> <p>It shall be the responsibility of the commission to:</p> <p>(1) Increase public awareness and appreciation of Monterey Park's history and heritage;</p> <p>(3) Act in an advisory capacity to the city council on all matters pertaining to the city's history and heritage. (Ord. 1606 §1 (part), 1983).</p> <p>http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/Monterey/</p>	
Rancho Palos Verdes	<p>Title 17, Chapter 17.40 Overlay Control Districts, Section 40.050 Socio-cultural Overlay Control District and Regulations</p> <p>A. Purpose. The socio-cultural overlay control district (OC-2) is established to:</p> <p>1. Preserve, protect and maintain land and water areas, structures and other improvements which have significant historical, archaeological or cultural importance;</p> <p>B. Application. The following lands, improvements and waters shall be included in this district and shall be maintained in compliance with the criteria of this chapter, unless otherwise excluded:</p> <p>1. All land areas, structures and improvements described in the historical resources section of the general plan and coastal specific plan, and sites designated in specific information on file with the director, as well as any additional land areas, structures and improvements which may be designated by the city as being of historical significance;</p> <p>3. All known and probable archaeological and paleontological sites, as designated in specific information on file with the director, as well as any additional sites which may be added as the result of information provided by qualified authorities in these fields;</p> <p>C. Performance Criteria. The following criteria shall be used in assessing any and all uses, developments and alterations of land included in this district, and shall provide that these actions not:</p> <p>4. Result in the use or conversions of such designated historical, archaeological, paleontological, scientific or educational lands, water or improvements as commercial profit-making ventures open to the general public without the application of specific approval and control by the city over hours, types, intensities, purposes, fees and other operations of such areas or facilities, including organized tours by motor vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian or boat;</p> <p>http://www.palosverdes.com/rpv/cityclerk/munidatabase/detail.cfm?this_title=17&this_section=050&this_chapter=40&title=&section=&chapter=&key=historic%20preservation&search_on=tcs_1</p>	
San Fernando	<p>Chapter 2 Administration, Article 5 Boards, Commissions, Committees, Agencies and Authorities, Division 3 Historical Commission</p> <p>The powers and duties of the historical commission shall be as follows:</p> <p>1) Initiate studies, investigations and surveys and make recommendations to the city council relative to the selection, establishment, maintenance, management, and control of historical sites and the preservation thereof.</p> <p>(2) Subject to the prior approval of the city council, adopt by resolution rules and regulations, not inconsistent with this Code or city ordinances, for the maintenance, management, use, and operation of such historical sites and for the preservation thereof. A complete file of such rules and regulations shall be maintained in both the city clerk's office and that of the secretary of the commission. Such resolutions shall be in the customary form and numbered numerically.</p> <p>(3) Upon request of the city council, make other investigations, reports, and recommendations upon subjects or other matters referred to it by the city council.</p> <p>http://livepublish.municode.com/3/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=main-hit-j.htm&2.0</p>	
Santa Monica	<p>Article 9 Planning and Zoning, Chapter 9.36 Landmarks and Historic Districts, Section 9.36.020 Purpose</p> <p>It is hereby declared as a matter of public policy that the purpose of this Chapter is to promote the public health, safety and general welfare by establishing such procedures and providing such regulations as are deemed necessary to:</p> <p>(a) Protect improvements and areas which represent elements of the City's cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history.</p> <p>(b) Safeguard the City's historic, aesthetic and cultural heritage as embodied and reflected in such improvements and areas.</p> <p>(c) Foster civic pride in the beauty and noble accomplishments of the past.</p> <p>(d) Protect and enhance the City's aesthetic and historic attractions to residents, tourists, visitors and others, thereby serving as a stimulus and support to business and industry.</p> <p>(e) Promote the use of Landmarks, Structures of Merit and Historic Districts for the education, pleasure and welfare of the people of this City. (Prior code § 9601; added by Ord. No. 1028CCS, adopted 3/24/76; amended by Ord. No. 1590CCS § 1, adopted 7/23/91)</p> <p>http://pen.ci.santa-monica.ca.us/municode/codemaster/Article_9/36/index.html</p>	Yes

City	Regulations	Local Register?
South Gate	<p>Title 7 Public Safety and Morals, Chapter 7.68 Preservation of Cultural Heritage, Section 7.68.010 Statement of Policy and Purpose</p> <p>The purposes of this chapter are as follows: (a) To protect, enhance and perpetuate areas, streets, places, buildings, structures, outdoor works of art, natural features and other similar objects which are reminders of past eras, events, and persons important in local, state or national history, or which provide significant examples of architectural styles of the past or are landmarks in the history of architecture, or which are unique and irreplaceable assets to the city of South Gate and its neighborhoods, or which provide for this and future generations significant examples of the physical surroundings in which past generations lived; http://www.bpcnet.com/codes/sgate/</p>	
Torrance	<p>Division 8 Building and Safety, Chapter 11 Earthquake Hazard in Existing Buildings, Section 811.1.7 Historical Buildings), a) General. The standards and procedures established by this chapter shall apply in all aspects to a historical building except that as a means to preserve original architectural elements and facilitate restoration, a historical building may, in addition, comply with the special provisions set forth in this section.</p> <p>Division 9 Land Use, Chapter 1-Purpose-Districts Established, Article 48 Downtown Residential Multiple Family Residential District, Section 91.48.5 Design Standards 4) The overall architectural design, building features and materials must acknowledge the historic nature of the original Torrance Tract and the character of the original multiple-family residential development within the area. http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/torrance/</p>	
West Hollywood	<p>Title 2 Administration and Personnel, Article 3 Commissions and Boards, Chapter 2.40 Cultural Heritage Commission, Section 2.40.100 Duties</p> <p>The Cultural Heritage Commission shall have the power and be required to: D. Prepare prescriptive standards and design guidelines to be used in reviewing applications for permits to construct, alter, remodel, relocate, enlarge, remove or demolish any cultural resource, or structure within a historic district, or conservation zone. Such design guidelines shall be based upon the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.</p> <p>Title 19 Zoning Ordinance, Article 19-4 Land Use and Development Permit Procedures, Chapter 19.58 Cultural Heritage Preservation, Section 19.58.050 Criteria for Designation of Cultural Resources</p> <p>The Cultural Heritage Commission may approve a nomination application for and recommend designation of, and the Council may designate a cultural resource, or any portion thereof (both interior and exterior) or historic district in compliance with Sections 19.58.060 (Designation of Historic Districts) and 19.58.070 (Review and Approval of Designations) below if it finds that the cultural resource meets one or more of the following criteria... http://nt2.scbbs.com/cgi-bin/om_isapi.dll?clientID=115641&hitsperheading=on&infobase=procode-6&jump=2.40&softpage=ref_Doc#JUMPDEST_2.40</p>	
Los Angeles County	<p>Title 3 Advisory Commissions and Committees, Chapter 3.30 Historical Landmarks and Record Commission, Section 3.30.080 Powers and Duties</p> <p>The commission shall consider and recommend to the board local historical landmarks defined to be worthy of registration by the state of California Department of Parks and Recreation, either as "California Historical Landmarks" or as "Points of Historical Interest," and may consider and comment for the board on applications relating to the National Register of Historic Places. Criteria for designation, including significance and access, and provision for maintenance, shall be as specified in state law, including the California Public Resources Code, or in regulations and interpretations of the State Historical Resources Commission. Criteria for consideration and comment on applications relating to the National Register of Historic Places shall be as specified in federal law and regulations relating to the National Register of Historic Places. http://ordlink.com/codes/lacounty/index.htm</p>	