

Communication from Public

Name: A Constituent

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 01:35 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: This is a GORGEOUS building It deserves to live a rich full life NOT DEMOLISHED It SICKENS me that I have to keep writing PLUM on behalf of these innocent buildings I am disabled Getting to City Hall is very hard for me right now But I am a Constituent And I DEMAND to be heard And I DEMAND that THIS committee listen to and oblige the Constituents And DO THE RIGHT THING NOT eject important people from the PLUM committee NOT allow a deluded Councilwoman DEMOLISH her Silver Lake home & power trip in this committee and run for Mayor This is a farce at this point We ALL take our time to contact you This is not easy WE ARE WATCHING OVER YOUR DECISIONS We are NOT just "filling a room" We are mad as Hell and we are not going to take it anymore You are THERE to represent the City & proceed in a way that supports the people of Los Angeles STOP this new construction, these inhumane coffin sized apartments YOU personally are destroying LA with your concerning decisions SAVE this building mic drop

Communication from Public

Name: Kara Grant

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 03:11 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: Please find attached comments from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation.



**GABRIELEÑO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS –
KIZH NATION**

P.O. Box 393
Covina, CA 91723
Office: 844-390-0787



February 24, 2026

Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee
Los Angeles City Council
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Re: Public Comments in Opposition to the Barry Building Demolition
Project – Council File No. 25-1518**

Honorable Members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to formally express our vehement opposition to the proposed demolition of the Barry Building (HCM #887), located at 11973-11975 West San Vicente Boulevard (the “Project”). The City of Los Angeles’s approval of this Project is predicated on a fundamentally flawed and legally indefensible environmental review that violates the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), specifically the tribal consultation provisions of Assembly Bill 52 (“AB 52”).

As set forth in detail below, the DEIR is legally deficient because it fails to adequately analyze the Project’s impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources (“TCR”), disregards the substantial evidence provided by the Tribe during AB 52 consultation, and fails to incorporate feasible and effective mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts to TCRs. The City’s approach is contrary to both the letter and spirit of Assembly Bill 52 (“AB 52”), CEQA, and the legislative intent animating these laws. For these reasons, the Kizh Nation urges you to grant the appeal and overturn the Project’s approvals.

A. The Project Site is a Sacred Tribal Cultural Resource

The Project site is not merely a parcel of land awaiting redevelopment; it is an integral part of the sacred Gabrieleno village of Kuruvungna. This area, which includes the adjacent Kuruvungna Springs, is a landscape of immense cultural, spiritual, and historical significance to the Kizh Nation, whose connection to this land predates the City of Los Angeles by millennia. The Kizh Nation informed the City of its ancestral and cultural ties to the Project location during the AB 52 consultation process, and provided substantial evidence of its deep historical connections in good faith and with diligence. The record demonstrates the following:

The City mailed a Project notification letter to the Tribe dated July 27, 2020. The Tribe responded on July 31, 2020, formally requesting consultation pursuant to AB 52. A consultation conference call was conducted on October 7, 2020, during which Chairman Salas explained the cultural significance of the area and the extensive prehistoric human activity that occurred in and around the Project Site. Prior to the call, City staff provided the Tribe with site details including aerial imagery, soil conditions, the proposed excavation depth of approximately five feet below grade, and confirmation that the Sacred Lands File search by the Native American Heritage Commission yielded negative results.

On November 2, 2020, the Tribe submitted extensive documentation to the City, including:

- A. Historical maps from 1871, 1881, 1898, 1900, 1920, and 1938 showing the Project Site and vicinity, including the location of villages, trade routes, waterways, and the Rancho San Vicente and Santa Monica land grants;
- B. Excerpts from scholarly and historical publications, including “Koruuvunga: The First Angelinos” (1996) and “California’s Gabrielino Indians” (1962);
- C. A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Archaeological Sensitivity Letter from the South Central Coast Information Center (SCCIC);
- D. An ERA CRM Monitoring Letter;
- E. The Kizh Nation’s proposed mitigation measures (July 2020), formally approved by the Kizh Nation Tribal Government for use with the Project;
- F. Oral history and elder testimony regarding the cultural significance of the Project area, including the Village of Kuruvungna, sacred waterways, trade routes, ceremonial sites, and burial areas.

As explained by the Tribe, the Project Site is located within the Village of Kuruvungna. Trade routes traversing the Project area were used by the Tribe’s ancestors not only for trade, but also for visiting family, travelling to ceremonies, and accessing recreation and foraging areas. The Tribe explained that isolated burials may be located near these trade routes, and that these routes constitute a “cultural landscape” as defined under PRC Section 21074(a) and protected under AB 52.

The 1900 and 1938 maps further indicated that waterways in the Project area were relied upon by the Tribe’s ancestors for sustenance, and that seasonal and permanent hamlets, trade depots, ceremonial and religious prayer sites, and burials and cremation sites were located along these waterways. The soil on the Project Site itself is “from the thousands of years of prehistoric activities that occurred within and around these Tribal Cultural landscapes.”

The City’s own investigation confirmed that while artificial fill was present from zero to two feet below grade, the soil from two to five feet was undisturbed—the very stratum where TCRs are most likely to exist.

B. AB 52’s Legislative History Establishes That Tribes Possess Unique Expertise Regarding Their Cultural Resources

The California Legislature, in enacting AB 52, expressly recognized that California Native American tribes possess unique expertise concerning TCRs for the geographic areas with which they are traditionally and culturally affiliated. The Senate Floor Analysis of AB 52,

dated August 19, 2014, emphasized that early consultation with tribes “solves many potential problems that would arise in more serious forms later in the review process” and “has been helpful to . . . identify the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed.” (AB 52, Senate Floor Analysis, 8/19/14, at p. 10.)

Critically, the Legislature acknowledged that tribal cultural resources are by their very nature different from conventional archaeological or historical resources. Comments on AB 52 explained: “A traditional ceremonial location may look like merely a mountaintop, a lake, or a stretch of river; a culturally important neighborhood may look like any other aggregation of houses, and an area where culturally important economic or artistic activities have been carried out may look like any other building, field of grass, or piece of forest in the area. As a result, *such places may not necessarily come to light through the conduct of archeological, historical, or architectural surveys. The existence and significance of such locations often can be ascertained only through interviews with knowledgeable users of the area*, or through other forms of ethnographic research.” (AB 52, Senate Floor Analysis, August 9, 2014, pp. 10–11, emphasis added.)

The Legislature further recognized that “[t]raditional cultural values are often central to the way a community or group defines itself, and maintaining such values is often vital to maintaining the group’s sense of identity and self-respect. Properties to which traditional cultural value is ascribed often take on this kind of vital significance, so that any damage to or infringement upon them is perceived to be deeply offensive to, and even destructive of, the group that values them. As a result, it is extremely important that traditional cultural properties be considered carefully in planning.” (*Id.*)

The City’s dismissal of the substantial evidence provided by the Kizh Nation directly contradicts this legislative intent. ***By concluding that the Tribe’s extensive documentation and oral history do not constitute substantial evidence, the City is effectively substituting its own judgment for the expertise that the Legislature specifically vested in the Tribe.*** As opponents to AB 52 themselves acknowledged, the law “puts the lead agency in the position of trying to argue against what only tribes can truly know – what is culturally significant to that tribe.” (AB 52, Senate Environmental Quality, pp. 16–17.)

C. The Tribe’s Submissions Constitute Substantial Evidence Under CEQA

Under CEQA, “substantial evidence” includes “fact, a reasonable assumption predicated upon fact, or expert opinion supported by fact.” (PRC § 21080(e)(1); CEQA Guidelines § 15384.) The California courts have confirmed that public comments may constitute substantial evidence where they are supported by an adequate factual foundation. (*Clews Land & Livestock v. City of San Diego* (2017) 19 Cal.App.5th 161, 195.) Similarly, comments founded on relevant personal observations constitute substantial evidence for purposes of CEQA. (*Protect Niles v. City of Fremont* (2018) 25 Cal.App.5th 1129.)

Here, knowledgeable representatives from the Kizh Nation—whom the Legislature deems to be “experts” on their Tribe’s cultural resources, history, and places—relayed relevant portions of their oral history to explain why the Project Site lies within a sensitive area for purposes of their TCRs. The Tribe provided the City with documentation illustrating the geography, trade routes, villages, waterways, ceremonial sites, and burial areas of their people spanning centuries of historical cartography and academic scholarship. The documents, records, oral history, and elder testimony provided during consultation for this Project unequivocally constitute substantial evidence under CEQA. CEQA does not authorize a lead

agency to negate or ignore substantial evidence of a project's impacts to tribal cultural resources.

The AB 52 Natural Resources Agency analysis further explained that tribal cultural resources “include, but are not limited to, sites, features, places, or objects with cultural value to descendant communities, traditional culture properties, or tribal cultural landscapes consistent with the guidance of the federal National Park Service’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.” (AB 52, Natural Resources Agency, at p. 2.)

Accordingly, the cultural landscapes identified by the Tribe—including the Village of Kuruvungna, the adjacent waterways, and the trade routes—fall squarely within this definition.

D. The City Lacks Discretion to Disregard the Tribe’s Substantial Evidence

PRC Section 21084.2 provides that “[a] project with an effect that *may* cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” (Emphasis added.) The use of the word “may” establishes a low threshold. A project that *may* have a significant effect on the environment requires appropriate mitigation. (PRC § 21082.3(b).)

Through the consultation process, AB 52 authorized California Native American tribes to assist lead agencies in identifying, interpreting, and determining the significance of TCRs. (See AB 52, Legislative Digest.) CEQA places the burden on the Tribe to show, through substantial evidence, that a project *may* have a significant impact on a TCR. ***Once this showing is met, the project at issue is by definition one that will have a significant effect on the environment, requiring either an EIR or a Mitigated Negative Declaration.*** The statute does not provide a mechanism by which the City may simply avoid the requirements triggered by the Tribe meeting its burden under CEQA.

What is instead triggered is the City’s duty to complete the consultation process by one of the prescribed methods and incorporate appropriate mitigation measures into the Project. (See PRC § 21082.3(b) [if a project “may have” a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency’s CEQA document must discuss whether the project “has” a significant impact and whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures will avoid or substantially lessen the impact]; *see also* PRC § 21082.3(e) [unless the environmental document includes mitigation measures agreed on during consultation, “if substantial evidence demonstrates” the project “will cause” a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the agency must “consider” feasible mitigation measures “pursuant to” PRC § 21084.3(b)].)

In this case, the City lacks legal discretion to disregard or rebut the impacts the Project may have to the Kizh Nation’s TCRs that was demonstrated through the substantial evidence contained in the record.

E. The EIR’s Mitigation Measures are Inadequate and Legally Deficient

The City’s sole proposed response to the Tribe’s concerns is the imposition of a standard “Condition of Approval – Tribal Cultural Resource Inadvertent Discovery” condition. While the Tribe does not object to inadvertent discovery provisions in principle, relying exclusively on a post-hoc inadvertent discovery protocol as a substitute for proactive, pre-construction mitigation is legally inadequate for several reasons.

First, an inadvertent discovery condition is by definition reactive; it applies only after a potential TCR has already been disturbed or damaged. The very purpose of CEQA’s

mitigation framework is to avoid or minimize impacts before they occur, not merely to respond after irreversible harm has been inflicted. (*See* PRC §§ 21002, 21002.1 [public agencies should not approve projects with significant environmental effects where feasible alternatives or mitigation measures can substantially lessen such effects].)

Second, the City rejected the Tribe’s proposed mitigation measures—which were specifically crafted to address the unique sensitivity of the Project Site—without any substantive explanation of why those measures were infeasible. AB 52 and CEQA require the City to consider feasible mitigation measures proposed during consultation. (PRC § 21082.3(b), (e); PRC § 21084.3(b).) The Tribe’s proposed mitigation measures, which include provisions for tribal cultural resource monitoring during ground disturbance activities, were developed by the Tribe’s experts with specific knowledge of the cultural, tribal, and historical sensitivity of this geographic area. The City’s failure to adopt or meaningfully respond to these measures violates its obligations under AB 52.

Third, ground-disturbance below two feet will penetrate undisturbed soils—the risk of encountering and destroying TCRs during these activities is not merely speculative. It is a foreseeable consequence that demands proactive mitigation, including but not limited to: qualified tribal monitoring during all ground disturbance activities; authority for the tribal monitor to halt work upon discovery of potential TCRs; and appropriate treatment and disposition protocols developed in consultation with the Tribe.

F. The City’s Refusal to Adopt Adequate Mitigation Will Cause Irreparable Harm

The destruction of tribal cultural resources is, by its very nature, irreparable. Once ancestral burial sites, ceremonial grounds, artifacts, or cultural landscapes are disturbed or destroyed by construction activities, they cannot be restored. The loss is permanent and devastating—not only to the physical integrity of the resources themselves, but to the cultural identity, spiritual practices, and historical continuity of the Kizh Nation.

The Gabrieleño people have inhabited the greater Los Angeles basin for millennia. The Village of Kuruvungna and its surrounding cultural landscapes represent one of the last remaining connections between the Kizh Nation and its ancestral homeland in an area that has been extensively developed over the past century. The Legislature recognized this reality when it observed that “any damage to or infringement upon” properties of traditional cultural value “is perceived to be deeply offensive to, and even destructive of, the group that values them.” (AB 52, Senate Floor Analysis, August 9, 2014, pp. 10–11.)

The City’s refusal to adopt the mitigation measures proposed by the Kizh Nation—measures that are feasible, reasonable, and specifically tailored to protect the TCRs present in this sensitive area—places these irreplaceable resources at imminent risk of permanent destruction. This outcome is precisely what AB 52 and CEQA were enacted to prevent.

G. Conclusion

The Kizh Nation has met and exceeded its burden under CEQA by providing the City with substantial evidence—through oral history, elder testimony, historical documentation, academic scholarship, and cultural expertise—demonstrating that the Project Site lies within a culturally sensitive area with a high probability of impacting tribal cultural resources. The City’s determination that no substantial evidence exists directly contradicts the record before it and violates the City’s obligations under AB 52 and CEQA. As lead agency, it is the City’s

duty to ensure that the Project does not result in the destruction of the Kizh Nation's last remaining tribal cultural resources. In light of the foregoing, the City must grant the appeal.

The Kizh Nation reserves all rights to raise additional issues and submit further comments throughout the environmental review process, including during any subsequent public comment periods related to this Project.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kara E. Grant". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kara" being more prominent than the last name "Grant".

Kara E. Grant, *General Counsel for the*
Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation

Communication from Public

Name: Jamie T. Hall

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 03:20 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: Please see the letter from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation.



**GABRIELEÑO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS –
KIZH NATION**

P.O. Box 393
Covina, CA 91723
Office: 844-390-0787



February 24, 2026

Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee
Los Angeles City Council
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Re: Public Comments in Opposition to the Barry Building Demolition
Project – Council File No. 25-1518**

Honorable Members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to formally express our vehement opposition to the proposed demolition of the Barry Building (HCM #887), located at 11973-11975 West San Vicente Boulevard (the “Project”). The City of Los Angeles’s approval of this Project is predicated on a fundamentally flawed and legally indefensible environmental review that violates the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), specifically the tribal consultation provisions of Assembly Bill 52 (“AB 52”).

As set forth in detail below, the DEIR is legally deficient because it fails to adequately analyze the Project’s impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources (“TCR”), disregards the substantial evidence provided by the Tribe during AB 52 consultation, and fails to incorporate feasible and effective mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts to TCRs. The City’s approach is contrary to both the letter and spirit of Assembly Bill 52 (“AB 52”), CEQA, and the legislative intent animating these laws. For these reasons, the Kizh Nation urges you to grant the appeal and overturn the Project’s approvals.

A. The Project Site is a Sacred Tribal Cultural Resource

The Project site is not merely a parcel of land awaiting redevelopment; it is an integral part of the sacred Gabrieleno village of Kuruvungna. This area, which includes the adjacent Kuruvungna Springs, is a landscape of immense cultural, spiritual, and historical significance to the Kizh Nation, whose connection to this land predates the City of Los Angeles by millennia. The Kizh Nation informed the City of its ancestral and cultural ties to the Project location during the AB 52 consultation process, and provided substantial evidence of its deep historical connections in good faith and with diligence. The record demonstrates the following:

The City mailed a Project notification letter to the Tribe dated July 27, 2020. The Tribe responded on July 31, 2020, formally requesting consultation pursuant to AB 52. A consultation conference call was conducted on October 7, 2020, during which Chairman Salas explained the cultural significance of the area and the extensive prehistoric human activity that occurred in and around the Project Site. Prior to the call, City staff provided the Tribe with site details including aerial imagery, soil conditions, the proposed excavation depth of approximately five feet below grade, and confirmation that the Sacred Lands File search by the Native American Heritage Commission yielded negative results.

On November 2, 2020, the Tribe submitted extensive documentation to the City, including:

- A. Historical maps from 1871, 1881, 1898, 1900, 1920, and 1938 showing the Project Site and vicinity, including the location of villages, trade routes, waterways, and the Rancho San Vicente and Santa Monica land grants;
- B. Excerpts from scholarly and historical publications, including “Koruuvanga: The First Angelinos” (1996) and “California’s Gabrielino Indians” (1962);
- C. A California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Archaeological Sensitivity Letter from the South Central Coast Information Center (SCCIC);
- D. An ERA CRM Monitoring Letter;
- E. The Kizh Nation’s proposed mitigation measures (July 2020), formally approved by the Kizh Nation Tribal Government for use with the Project;
- F. Oral history and elder testimony regarding the cultural significance of the Project area, including the Village of Kuruvungna, sacred waterways, trade routes, ceremonial sites, and burial areas.

As explained by the Tribe, the Project Site is located within the Village of Kuruvungna. Trade routes traversing the Project area were used by the Tribe’s ancestors not only for trade, but also for visiting family, travelling to ceremonies, and accessing recreation and foraging areas. The Tribe explained that isolated burials may be located near these trade routes, and that these routes constitute a “cultural landscape” as defined under PRC Section 21074(a) and protected under AB 52.

The 1900 and 1938 maps further indicated that waterways in the Project area were relied upon by the Tribe’s ancestors for sustenance, and that seasonal and permanent hamlets, trade depots, ceremonial and religious prayer sites, and burials and cremation sites were located along these waterways. The soil on the Project Site itself is “from the thousands of years of prehistoric activities that occurred within and around these Tribal Cultural landscapes.”

The City’s own investigation confirmed that while artificial fill was present from zero to two feet below grade, the soil from two to five feet was undisturbed—the very stratum where TCRs are most likely to exist.

B. AB 52’s Legislative History Establishes That Tribes Possess Unique Expertise Regarding Their Cultural Resources

The California Legislature, in enacting AB 52, expressly recognized that California Native American tribes possess unique expertise concerning TCRs for the geographic areas with which they are traditionally and culturally affiliated. The Senate Floor Analysis of AB 52,

dated August 19, 2014, emphasized that early consultation with tribes “solves many potential problems that would arise in more serious forms later in the review process” and “has been helpful to . . . identify the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed.” (AB 52, Senate Floor Analysis, 8/19/14, at p. 10.)

Critically, the Legislature acknowledged that tribal cultural resources are by their very nature different from conventional archaeological or historical resources. Comments on AB 52 explained: “A traditional ceremonial location may look like merely a mountaintop, a lake, or a stretch of river; a culturally important neighborhood may look like any other aggregation of houses, and an area where culturally important economic or artistic activities have been carried out may look like any other building, field of grass, or piece of forest in the area. As a result, *such places may not necessarily come to light through the conduct of archeological, historical, or architectural surveys. The existence and significance of such locations often can be ascertained only through interviews with knowledgeable users of the area*, or through other forms of ethnographic research.” (AB 52, Senate Floor Analysis, August 9, 2014, pp. 10–11, emphasis added.)

The Legislature further recognized that “[t]raditional cultural values are often central to the way a community or group defines itself, and maintaining such values is often vital to maintaining the group’s sense of identity and self-respect. Properties to which traditional cultural value is ascribed often take on this kind of vital significance, so that any damage to or infringement upon them is perceived to be deeply offensive to, and even destructive of, the group that values them. As a result, it is extremely important that traditional cultural properties be considered carefully in planning.” (*Id.*)

The City’s dismissal of the substantial evidence provided by the Kizh Nation directly contradicts this legislative intent. ***By concluding that the Tribe’s extensive documentation and oral history do not constitute substantial evidence, the City is effectively substituting its own judgment for the expertise that the Legislature specifically vested in the Tribe.*** As opponents to AB 52 themselves acknowledged, the law “puts the lead agency in the position of trying to argue against what only tribes can truly know – what is culturally significant to that tribe.” (AB 52, Senate Environmental Quality, pp. 16–17.)

C. The Tribe’s Submissions Constitute Substantial Evidence Under CEQA

Under CEQA, “substantial evidence” includes “fact, a reasonable assumption predicated upon fact, or expert opinion supported by fact.” (PRC § 21080(e)(1); CEQA Guidelines § 15384.) The California courts have confirmed that public comments may constitute substantial evidence where they are supported by an adequate factual foundation. (*Clews Land & Livestock v. City of San Diego* (2017) 19 Cal.App.5th 161, 195.) Similarly, comments founded on relevant personal observations constitute substantial evidence for purposes of CEQA. (*Protect Niles v. City of Fremont* (2018) 25 Cal.App.5th 1129.)

Here, knowledgeable representatives from the Kizh Nation—whom the Legislature deems to be “experts” on their Tribe’s cultural resources, history, and places—relayed relevant portions of their oral history to explain why the Project Site lies within a sensitive area for purposes of their TCRs. The Tribe provided the City with documentation illustrating the geography, trade routes, villages, waterways, ceremonial sites, and burial areas of their people spanning centuries of historical cartography and academic scholarship. The documents, records, oral history, and elder testimony provided during consultation for this Project unequivocally constitute substantial evidence under CEQA. CEQA does not authorize a lead

agency to negate or ignore substantial evidence of a project's impacts to tribal cultural resources.

The AB 52 Natural Resources Agency analysis further explained that tribal cultural resources “include, but are not limited to, sites, features, places, or objects with cultural value to descendant communities, traditional culture properties, or tribal cultural landscapes consistent with the guidance of the federal National Park Service’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.” (AB 52, Natural Resources Agency, at p. 2.)

Accordingly, the cultural landscapes identified by the Tribe—including the Village of Kuruvungna, the adjacent waterways, and the trade routes—fall squarely within this definition.

D. The City Lacks Discretion to Disregard the Tribe’s Substantial Evidence

PRC Section 21084.2 provides that “[a] project with an effect that *may* cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” (Emphasis added.) The use of the word “may” establishes a low threshold. A project that *may* have a significant effect on the environment requires appropriate mitigation. (PRC § 21082.3(b).)

Through the consultation process, AB 52 authorized California Native American tribes to assist lead agencies in identifying, interpreting, and determining the significance of TCRs. (See AB 52, Legislative Digest.) CEQA places the burden on the Tribe to show, through substantial evidence, that a project *may* have a significant impact on a TCR. ***Once this showing is met, the project at issue is by definition one that will have a significant effect on the environment, requiring either an EIR or a Mitigated Negative Declaration.*** The statute does not provide a mechanism by which the City may simply avoid the requirements triggered by the Tribe meeting its burden under CEQA.

What is instead triggered is the City’s duty to complete the consultation process by one of the prescribed methods and incorporate appropriate mitigation measures into the Project. (See PRC § 21082.3(b) [if a project “may have” a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency’s CEQA document must discuss whether the project “has” a significant impact and whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures will avoid or substantially lessen the impact]; *see also* PRC § 21082.3(e) [unless the environmental document includes mitigation measures agreed on during consultation, “if substantial evidence demonstrates” the project “will cause” a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the agency must “consider” feasible mitigation measures “pursuant to” PRC § 21084.3(b)].)

In this case, the City lacks legal discretion to disregard or rebut the impacts the Project may have to the Kizh Nation’s TCRs that was demonstrated through the substantial evidence contained in the record.

E. The EIR’s Mitigation Measures are Inadequate and Legally Deficient

The City’s sole proposed response to the Tribe’s concerns is the imposition of a standard “Condition of Approval – Tribal Cultural Resource Inadvertent Discovery” condition. While the Tribe does not object to inadvertent discovery provisions in principle, relying exclusively on a post-hoc inadvertent discovery protocol as a substitute for proactive, pre-construction mitigation is legally inadequate for several reasons.

First, an inadvertent discovery condition is by definition reactive; it applies only after a potential TCR has already been disturbed or damaged. The very purpose of CEQA’s

mitigation framework is to avoid or minimize impacts before they occur, not merely to respond after irreversible harm has been inflicted. (*See* PRC §§ 21002, 21002.1 [public agencies should not approve projects with significant environmental effects where feasible alternatives or mitigation measures can substantially lessen such effects].)

Second, the City rejected the Tribe’s proposed mitigation measures—which were specifically crafted to address the unique sensitivity of the Project Site—without any substantive explanation of why those measures were infeasible. AB 52 and CEQA require the City to consider feasible mitigation measures proposed during consultation. (PRC § 21082.3(b), (e); PRC § 21084.3(b).) The Tribe’s proposed mitigation measures, which include provisions for tribal cultural resource monitoring during ground disturbance activities, were developed by the Tribe’s experts with specific knowledge of the cultural, tribal, and historical sensitivity of this geographic area. The City’s failure to adopt or meaningfully respond to these measures violates its obligations under AB 52.

Third, ground-disturbance below two feet will penetrate undisturbed soils—the risk of encountering and destroying TCRs during these activities is not merely speculative. It is a foreseeable consequence that demands proactive mitigation, including but not limited to: qualified tribal monitoring during all ground disturbance activities; authority for the tribal monitor to halt work upon discovery of potential TCRs; and appropriate treatment and disposition protocols developed in consultation with the Tribe.

F. The City’s Refusal to Adopt Adequate Mitigation Will Cause Irreparable Harm

The destruction of tribal cultural resources is, by its very nature, irreparable. Once ancestral burial sites, ceremonial grounds, artifacts, or cultural landscapes are disturbed or destroyed by construction activities, they cannot be restored. The loss is permanent and devastating—not only to the physical integrity of the resources themselves, but to the cultural identity, spiritual practices, and historical continuity of the Kizh Nation.

The Gabrieleño people have inhabited the greater Los Angeles basin for millennia. The Village of Kuruvungna and its surrounding cultural landscapes represent one of the last remaining connections between the Kizh Nation and its ancestral homeland in an area that has been extensively developed over the past century. The Legislature recognized this reality when it observed that “any damage to or infringement upon” properties of traditional cultural value “is perceived to be deeply offensive to, and even destructive of, the group that values them.” (AB 52, Senate Floor Analysis, August 9, 2014, pp. 10–11.)

The City’s refusal to adopt the mitigation measures proposed by the Kizh Nation—measures that are feasible, reasonable, and specifically tailored to protect the TCRs present in this sensitive area—places these irreplaceable resources at imminent risk of permanent destruction. This outcome is precisely what AB 52 and CEQA were enacted to prevent.

G. Conclusion

The Kizh Nation has met and exceeded its burden under CEQA by providing the City with substantial evidence—through oral history, elder testimony, historical documentation, academic scholarship, and cultural expertise—demonstrating that the Project Site lies within a culturally sensitive area with a high probability of impacting tribal cultural resources. The City’s determination that no substantial evidence exists directly contradicts the record before it and violates the City’s obligations under AB 52 and CEQA. As lead agency, it is the City’s

duty to ensure that the Project does not result in the destruction of the Kizh Nation's last remaining tribal cultural resources. In light of the foregoing, the City must grant the appeal.

The Kizh Nation reserves all rights to raise additional issues and submit further comments throughout the environmental review process, including during any subsequent public comment periods related to this Project.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kara E. Grant". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kara" being more prominent.

Kara E. Grant, *General Counsel for the*
Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation

Communication from Public

Name: Bob Blue

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 07:19 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: Please see attached public comments made by me at the 02/24/2026 PLUM Committee Meeting, Agenda Item 10 in Support of Appeal.

PLUM Committee Meeting of 02 / 24 / 2026; Agenda Item 10
In Support of the Appeal, rescinding all actions taken by
the LADBS staff and BBSC

My name is Bob Blue. I strongly support the appeal to save the Barry Building.

In 2007, City Council designated this an HCM without owner opposition, creating a legal duty under Administrative Code Section 22.171 to maintain it.

Today's request for demolition is based on a self-imposed financial hardship. After evicting all tenants in 2017, the owner chose to let a revenue-generating building sit vacant for nearly a decade while ignoring maintenance.

If this appeal is denied, the only benefit is a financial gain for the Munger family—not the public. The public will be left with scorched earth, just like the 3 houses and art gallery they demolished and left as dirt lots for a decade.

This blight was directly caused by the applicant. We must hold the property owner accountable for their stewardship, not reward them for their neglect. I urge the PLUM Committee to uphold the appeal. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Ziggy Kruse Blue

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 07:22 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: Please add document "02-24-2026 PLUM Meeting_ZKB Public Comment" to Council File 25-1518.

ITEM 10, CD 11, Council File # 25-1518

02-24-2026 PLUM Committee Meeting

Public Comment in Support of the Appeal and against demolition

Referencing Failure to meet AB 52 obligations:

I'm Ziggy Kruse Blue, and I am speaking today to strongly support the appeal for the Barry Building.

As a concerned stakeholder, I have submitted a detailed technical comment to the record regarding the City's failure to meet its AB 52 obligations. While others will address the architectural significance of this landmark, I am here to highlight a critical procedural failure: the lack of meaningful AB 52 tribal cultural resource consultation.

The record shows that mandatory consultation requirements have not been met in good faith. Under CEQA, these are not optional checkboxes; they are a legal requirement for certifying an EIR. Moving forward with unresolved tribal concerns and an incomplete record is a violation of state law and invites an immediate legal challenge.

I urge this committee to grant the appeal and ensure that the City's tribal consultation obligations are fully honored before any further action is taken.

Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Katherine

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 10:06 AM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: The Barry Building a city landmark. We should not tear down landmarks with no proposed new project and ignore CEQUA, and say that there's no actual impact because there is no greater impact than demolishing an historical landmark with no new project. The potential precedent if this is allowed to stand, is that any property owner who has the inconvenience of owning a landmark property can simply do what the Mungers have done. Get rid of the tenants. Board it up and find a friendly agency within the city of Los Angeles and bring it all down for nothing.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 01:01 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: I Support the Appeal to Preserve the Barry Building and oppose the City's approval of demolition of the Barry Building (Historic-Cultural Monument #887) and the earlier decision by the Los Angeles Board of Building and Safety Commissioners to deny relief. Angelenos for Historic Preservation has filed an appeal to challenge the City's approval, which will be reviewed by the PLUM Committee. Built in 1951 and once home to the beloved Dutton's Bookstore, the Brentwood landmark is a rare example of postwar Modern architecture and a longtime community gathering place. Notably, the owner is proposing demolition for what would likely become a vacant lot, despite viable alternatives for rehabilitation and reuse—a troubling scenario for a designated Historic-Cultural Monument. I am deeply concerned that rewarding years of demolition-by-neglect would set a harmful precedent for historic resources across Los Angeles. Please grant the Appeal to Preserve the Barry Building.

Communication from Public

Name: Joyce Dillard

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 01:05 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: The Administrative Code reads: CHAPTER 2 DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY ARTICLE 3 POWERS AND DUTIES IN GENERAL Sec. 22.21. The Board of Building and Safety Commissioners. There shall be a Board of Building and Safety Commissioners who shall be appointed, removed, and organized in accordance with Charter Sections 501-503. The Board shall have the power to make slight modifications for individual cases in the provisions of the building ordinances of the City, and in the yard area requirements of the zoning ordinance, provided that in each modification the Board shall first find that a special, individual reason makes the strict letter of the ordinance impractical and that the modification is in conformity with the spirit and purpose of the ordinance involved. Any such action shall be by resolution of the Board, duly entered in its minutes. SECTION HISTORY Based on Charter, Sec. 93. Amended by: Ord. No. 173,290, Eff. 6-30-00, Oper. 7-1-00. COMMENTS The Board is not qualified to approve any CEQA documentation including this EIR. Although the Mayor issued a Declaration of Local Emergency, the Directives are not in line with the laws. These laws remain unchanged. Please rule favorably for the Appeal. Joyce Dillard Los Angeles, CA 90031

Communication from Public

Name: Alan Pachter

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 05:59 AM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: It's always too late when the dust settles and the regrets begin. Please give this unique and historically significant location a chance to continue existing for future generations to enjoy.

Communication from Public

Name: West Adams Heritage Association, Jean Frost

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 12:06 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Member of PLUM: The West Adams Heritage Association supports the appeal by Angelenos for Historic Preservation (Representative: Jamie Hall, Channel Law Group, LLP) of the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners June 6, 2025 action to certify an Environmental Impact Report. As the CHC recommended: "At the 09/05/2024 meeting of the Cultural Heritage Commission, the CHC Commissioners voted unanimously to NOT adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations that would allow the demolition of the Barry Building. The DCP, Office of Historic Resources (OHR) staff and the CHC Commissioners are the City of Los Angeles most qualified subject matter experts on Historic-Cultural Monuments and historical buildings. Three of the commissioners are licensed architects with a combined experience of more than 70 years." We urge the Committee to support the appeal for the many reasons already stated in the appeal and in the comments above by the CHC, the Los Angeles Conservancy and scores of others.



February 24, 2026

Planning and Land Use Management Committee
200 North Los Angel Spring Street
Re: 11973A 90 395 0 12 11975 West San Vicente Boulevard
Council File No. 251518
Via LACouncilComment.com

Honorable Member of PLUM:

The West Adams Heritage Association supports the appeal by Angelenos for Historic Preservation (Representative: Jamie Hall, Channel Law Group, LLP) of the Board of Building and Safety Commissioners June 6, 2025 action to certify an Environmental Impact Report.

As the CHC recommended:

"At the 09/05/2024 meeting of the Cultural Heritage Commission, the CHC Commissioners voted unanimously to NOT adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations that would allow the demolition of the Barry Building. The DCP, Office of Historic Resources (OHR) staff and the CHC Commissioners are the City of Los Angeles most qualified subject matter experts on Historic-Cultural Monuments and historical buildings. Three of the commissioners are licensed architects with a combined experience of more than 70 years."

We urge the Committee to support the appeal for the many reasons already stated in the appeal and in the comments above by the CHC, the Los Angeles Conservancy and scores of others.

The West Adams Heritage Association consists of over several hundred stakeholders many of whom live in West Adams/South Los Angeles. WAHA supports the cultural and architectural heritage which includes retention and adaptive reuse of historic properties. We have nominated over three dozen monuments, including eight HPOZs and numerous National and California Register districts within our boundaries.

The statements made in 2009 by the (then) CHC are true today: demolition on the basis of overriding considerations with no replacement project will erode our monument designation system and its integrity.

Please support the appeal.

Jean Frost
Vice President
West Adams Heritage Association
c/o 2341 Scarff Street, LA, CA 90007
indiejean@att.net

Communication from Public

Name: James Karukas

Date Submitted: 02/24/2026 12:21 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: The Barry Building can and should be spared from demolition. Save Los Angeles historic heritage, save important mid-century modern buildings.