Chapter 9
Native American Histories and Perspectives
9.0 NATIVE AMERICAN HISTORIES AND PERSPECTIVES

Native Americans living in the vicinity of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL) have long been associated with the site and have a perspective unlike that of other community members. Their varied interests regarding SSFL include territorial history; cultural connection to and continuity in the region; the presence of archaeological sites, plants, and animals traditionally used; other traditional uses; tribal and group memory, culture, and history; and concern for the environment. They have also expressed the desire to have input on plans for cleanup efforts at SSFL, so that those activities will be designed in consideration of the unique perspectives of Native Americans and conducted in a manner that offers protections to cultural resources.

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) takes its responsibilities to provide opportunities for tribal participation in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process seriously. Laws, regulations, and guidance supporting engagement with tribal entities include NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act; American Indian Religious Freedom Act; the Presidential Memorandum on Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments; and Executive Orders (EOs) 13007, Indian Sacred Sites, and 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments. To meet its consultation responsibilities, DOE has established government-to-government consultation with the federally recognized Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians and instituted forums for consultation with other tribes in the region.

In July 2014, DOE, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), The Boeing Company (Boeing), and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) hosted a summit to introduce the intended site cleanup to regional tribal groups and organizations. The summit hosts combined their lists of Native American contacts and invited all to participate (refer to Appendix E, “Consultations,” Table E–2).

One outcome of the July 2014 summit was the formation of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory Sacred Sites Council. Independently of DOE, NASA, Boeing, and DTSC, the summit attendees determined that the SSFL Sacred Sites Council would include representatives of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, Fernandeño Tataviam and Gabrielino Tongva (the latter also includes the Kizh/Gabrielino). The SSFL Sacred Sites Council serves as a central point for communication among the tribes and the various entities involved in cleanup at SSFL. Through periodic discussions conducted over teleconferences and during in-person meetings, the SSFL Sacred Sites Council coordinates tribal input to DOE, NASA, Boeing, and DTSC.

DOE understands that the site is important to Native American tribes; every tribal group brings its own unique perspective and history to their understanding of the site. The background information on the affected environment presented in Chapter 3, Section 3.11, Cultural Resources, was compiled based on an academically sourced summary of current knowledge regarding site history, ethnography, archaeological resources, and traditional cultural properties and sacred sites. Section 3.11 may not always be congruent with tribal perceptions of history, especially in regards to territory. For this reason, among others, DOE provided the forums represented by this chapter on the premise that it is appropriate to provide interested tribal parties an opportunity to be included and to contribute Native American perspectives on the site’s history and significance. SSFL Sacred Sites Council members were invited to present their own histories, in some cases illustrated with territorial maps reflecting their perspective. DOE presents all submissions as pieces of the larger
story regarding the significance of SSFL to the Native peoples who inhabited the site before DOE and its predecessors began operations.

The following sections were authored and submitted by the identified groups and individuals. Respecting the materials as the histories and perspectives of those who submitted them, DOE is presenting them as received, with only minor changes to correct typographical errors and to format them for presentation in this EIS. References cited by the authors are provided in footnotes or listed at the end of each section.

The sections are presented alphabetically, by the tribal name provided by each group in its contribution. The order has no significance in terms of primacy or authority. The following sections are the submittals from the Chumash (Sections 9.1 and 9.2), Fernandeño Tataviam (Section 9.3), and Gabrielino groups, consisting of Gabrielino Tongva (Section 9.4), Kizh/Gabrieleno (Section 9.5), and Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation (Section 9.6).

**9.1 Chumash**

*Brian Holguin*

**The Archaeological Record of the Chumash People: A Brief Overview**

The Chumash people occupy almost two hundred miles of California’s coastline, stretching from the beaches of Malibu all the way up through San Luis Obispo County. Their territory includes the Northern Channel Islands, which serve as the boundary in the West, while the eastern boundary extends to the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley. The region inhabited by the Chumash shows continuous occupation that can be traced back 13,000 years, with no evidence of cultural upheaval or signs of cultural replacement (Arnold 2001). Chester King’s chronology is most commonly used when illustrating the history of the Chumash region through time, therefore it will be applied within this summary (King 1990).

**Paleo-Coastal Period: 11,000-7,000 cal. B.C.**

During the terminal Pleistocene, the sea level was much lower than it is currently. Due to the lowered sea level, the Northern Channel Islands formed a single landmass, called Santarosae (Johnson et al. 2000). Arlington Springs, an archaeological site located on modern day Santa Rosa Island, dates approximately to 11,000 cal B.C., contemporary with the existence of Santarosae (Glassow et al. 2007; Johnson et al. 2000).

Daisy Cave, an archaeological site located on San Miguel Island, dates to roughly 9,000 years BP or about 7,000 BC. Daisy Cave contains some of the earliest evidence for the hook and line method of fishing in North America (Erlandson et al. 2005). It is clear that fishing was the most important method of obtaining food at Daisy Cave due to the large amounts of fish bones present at the site. This site, along with Arlington Springs, provides the earliest evidence of human occupation in North America (Glassow et al. 2007; Johnson et al. 2000). Other sites on the coast show evidence for net fishing during this time, supported by the presence of fish that normally travel in schools (Erlandson et al. 2005).

**Millingstone Horizon: 7,000-5,000 cal. B.C.**

Increased population densities along the Chumash coastal region occurred during this period, along with an increase in the presence of millingstones (metate and mano) within archaeological assemblages (Glassow et al. 2007). An increased diversification of food resources, such as a greater focus on shellfish, birds, and small mammals, accompanied the increase in millingstone frequency.
Due to the increased prevalence of millingstones in the archaeological record, it is clear the main portion of the diet came from the processing and the milling of hard seeds or grains. Individual populations during this time never reached a size larger than extended families of mobile foragers with limited socio-political complexity (Glassow et al. 2007). In the Santa Monica Mountains, millingstone sites usually consist of flaked stone tools, cores, and core tools such as scraper planes (King 1990).

**Early Period: 5,000-500 cal. B.C.**

Three phases of the early period were identified by Chester King (1990), which were termed X, Y, and Z. These three phases were created as a result of the identification of a sequence of changes in beads and ornaments (King 1990). During this period, mainland subsistence appears to have relied heavily on terrestrial plant foods. Those fortunate to live by the coast appear to have relied on shellfish in addition to plant foods (Erlandson et al. 1992).

Toward the end of the early period, we begin to see an increase in fishing tackle and mortars/pestles within the archaeological record, which appears to be a result of an increased focus on land mammals, fish, and acorns. The Channel Islands were devoid of most land mammals, therefore shellfish and certain plant species that were available to the island Chumash were more intensively used (Erlandson et al. 2009).

**Middle Period: 500 cal. B.C.-1150 A.D.**

During the middle period, population size increases, tool technology becomes more complex, new food resources begin to be utilized and a greater increase in social complexity occurs. There is also a substantial increase in evidence for intergroup trade and interaction between the coastal groups and the mainland groups (Glassow et al. 2007). Shell beads manufactured on the Channel Islands begin to appear in mainland coastal sites as well as the interior valley. Obsidian seems to be the material used to trade for these beads, but since no source is present locally, it most likely came from the inland desert region, possibly through Newhall pass or the Simi Valley pass (Corbett and Guttenberg 2014).

The increase in the breadth of tool technology includes an increased emphasis on mortar/pestle use (expanding from the increased use in the middle period) and an increase in the prevalence of flaked stone within archaeological sites, which denotes an increase in hunting. The circular fishhook also seems to appear within this period, as well as a large breadth of shell and bone tools (Glassow et al. 2007). The Chumash archaeological sites dating to this time suggest that groups lived in small seasonal or year-round camps (Glassow et al. 2007).

The Chumash *tomol* is invented during this time, evident by the increased presence of fin fish vertebrae (species of and relating to swordfish) as you move through the middle period from around 500 A.D. (Arnold 2001, 2007). An elaborate headdress made from the scales of a swordfish was found and has been dated to around 600 AD. The tomol was the only Chumash watercraft capable of taking swordfish in the open ocean (Arnold 2007).

**Late Period: 1150 A.D.-Contact**

The hallmarks of the late period include a substantial increase in the number of settlements along the coast, as well as a change in social organization and technology. A greater emphasis on fishing, which is a direct result of the increase in tool technology, also occurred during this time. During this period, the tomol reached its peak form, allowing the facilitation of sociopolitical activities such as information exchange, elite individual’s manipulation of goods and craft production, accumulation of goods and moving large quantities of goods over long distances (Arnold 1995). Using their lithic
innovations, inland populations became more effective hunters, relying on terrestrial animals as well as acorns and tubers for food (Glassow et al. 2007).

Sedentism increased during this period, particularly on the coast. In addition, changes in social organization in this period indicate an increased focus on ceremonial and elaborate ritual practice (Gamble, 2008). There is also much greater evidence for a further increase in trade between the Channel Islands and the mainland Chumash groups (Glassow et al. 2007).

During this time, we see the appearance of the bow and arrow in the archaeological record. This dramatically increased the effectiveness of hunters due to the increased accuracy over the atlatl. Craft specialization becomes more developed at this time, particularly on the Channel Islands with regards to shell bead manufacturing (Arnold 2001). During this time, the Ventureño Chumash occupied the western portion of the Simi Hills as well as the area immediately north of Simi Valley, making the SSFL a place of frequent and prolonged cultural interaction (Corbett and Guttenberg 2014).

The Chumash: An Ethnographic Description

At the time of European contact, the Chumash people were made up of eight subgroups, each speaking mutually unintelligible languages that collectively formed the Chumashan language family. This language family is not affiliated with any other language family in the Americas, making it a classificatory isolate (Arnold 2001; Golla 2011). This would suggest great antiquity for the Chumashan language family within the region. These eight groups consisted of the Barbareño, Ventureño, Purisimeño, Obispeño, Ineseño, Cruzeño, Emigdiano, and the Cuyama Chumash. The first five sub-groups were named due to their affiliation with missions that were erected within their territory after the Spanish conquest of California; however these names were not what these groups identified as. Each of these groups shared a large amount of their material culture and religious practices (Arnold 2001).

The Chumash region at the time of contact began at modern day Malibu and stretched up to San Luis Obispo and included extensive land in the backcountry and the Northern Channel Islands. The land area occupied by the Chumash totaled over 25,000 square kilometers. The Chumash population at the time of contact is thought to be around 20,000 individuals with around 66% of them living in coastal and island villages (Johnson 1999). These prime areas make up only 6% of the total land occupied by the Chumash. This means that roughly 12,000 individuals occupied an area of 1,500 square kilometers while the other 6,000 occupied an area of more than several thousand square kilometers (Arnold 2001). Many of these high density villages were located along the coastline in areas where marine resources were at their richest, as well as areas that proved to be good launching points for the tomol and the tule balsas (Arnold 2001).

The Chumash were one of the most complex hunter/gatherer societies in the world (Arnold 1995). Chumash society was organized within a hierarchy, with high status positions being ascribed. The hereditary chief or wot was the central authority. Sometimes there were more than one wot at a village (King 2011). This position was not gender bound, as the Spanish noted during their exploration of the Chumash region. The chief held inherited rights to all aspects of Chumash life, such as rights to property, rituals, titles, and had control over the labor and activities of others (Arnold 1995).

The Chumash economic system was far reaching and involved interactions with surrounding tribal groups which resulted in trade beads being found a large distance from their source. This intensive craft specialization occurred at sites out on Santa Cruz Island (Arnold 2001).
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Economic reach is evident by the presence of steatite bowls that were made on Catalina Island, which is one of the southern Channel Islands, by the Gabrielino/Tongva and traded to the Chumash (Arnold 2001). Fragments of steatite, obsidian, and shell beads manufactured on the northern Channel Islands were found in sites within the SSFL, a testament to the long-range trade network controlled by the Chumash (Corbett and Guttenberg 2014).

Chumash material culture and subsistence strategies were as complex and diverse as their society itself. Their material culture partially consisted of steatite bowls, sandstone bowls, basketry made from plant fibers, projectile points used for hunting, harpoons for marine mammals and fin fish, hook/line technology, nets, net weights, digging stones, pipes, beads, and canoes such as the tomol and the tule balsa (Gibson 1991). This rich array of cultural material is directly related to the rich environment the Chumash lived in. The most well known piece of Chumash material culture is the tomol. The tomol was a 30-foot plank canoe that was utilized by the Chumash for crossing the channel and transporting goods to and from the islands and the mainland. The invention of the tomol is directly related to the increase in sociopolitical complexity and attainable wealth observed in the archaeological record between the middle and late periods (Arnold 2001).

The Chumash intensely relied on plants and animals for their survival and utilized just about every aspect of their environment. Plants played a role in almost everything the Chumash made or used, such as housing material and basketry to name a few (Timbrook 2007). Plant materials were also used in healing and to treat specific ailments. Plants made up roughly 75% of the Chumash diet; even more than that in villages located away from the coast (Gibson 1991).

Animals included within their diet consisted of deer, fox, rabbits, squirrels, coyotes, and various other land dwelling animals (Grant 1978). The Chumash also hunted birds and reptiles as well. The bulk of the Chumash diet consisted of shellfish and marine resources, particularly true of villages on the coast and on the islands (Arnold 2001).

The Chumash were makers of some of the finest basketry in the world. The Chumash utilized basketry in every aspect of their lives. Baskets were used as water bottles, for storage, for leaching tannic acid from acorns, and for cooking (Hudson and Blackburn 1983). Baskets that served as water bottles had a small bottleneck near the mouth of the basket and were lined with asphaltum to make them waterproof (Hudson and Blackburn 1983). The Chumash were capable of incorporating elaborate designs into their weaving techniques which allowed them to make baskets that were as visually appealing as they were functionally superior.

The Chumash made paints from red ochre and other soft stones which they used for painting rock art on the walls of rock shelters (Gibson 1991). The Chumash were avid users of asphaltum. They would line their baskets with it to make them waterproof, caulked the tomol planks with it to form a waterproof seal, use it to mount shell beads onto various objects such as bowls, baskets and even the tomol. It is thought that asphaltum was traded to the islands from the mainland due to the lack of a reliable source on the Channel Islands (Arnold 2001).

The Chumash Presence at the SSFL

The Santa Susana Field Laboratory is located in the Eastern Simi Hills and contains numerous archaeological sites, of which Burro Flats is the most well-known. Burro Flats is a rock art site that contains numerous polychrome pictograph motifs, as well as monochrome pictographs in black, red, and white; all of which can be placed within the Ventureño Chumash sub-style (Grant 1965; Knight 2012). The Chumash are not the only native peoples to leave their mark on Burro Flats, as
evident by pictographs that are not typically found within Chumash rock art. This is most likely due to the multi-tribal use of the land in and around the SSFL.

In addition to the presence of the Ventureño sub-style of rock art present at Burro Flats, ethnohistoric data exist to further support the presence of the Chumash within the Simi Hills and Santa Susana Mountains. Several villages within the region had names in both Chumash and Fernandeño (Johnson 1997). One such village was Humaliwu (Chumash name), which was the main village of the region and today is known as Malibu (Knight 2012). Another example of this is the well-known Rancheria name El Escorpión, nestled in the western end of the San Fernando Valley. The Ventureño Chumash name for El Escorpión was Huwam, however it appears as “Jucjauybit” in Mission San Fernando’s records (Johnson 2006). The existence of multiple names for these locations can be seen as evidence to support the frequent, multi-tribal use of the SSFL and its surrounding area.
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### 9.2 Embracing our Past

*Patrick Tumamait*

In the early part of Spring 2010, I was invited by the Boeing Company to attend a bus tour of Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL) property along with other Native representatives from the surrounding area. Boeing graciously provided a tour bus for all of us to see the old ROCKETDYNE facility. Mr. Paul Costa of Boeing also informed us of the toxic fuel waste that was not properly disposed of. For the past 50 years the facility was used as a rocket testing site and failed to properly dispose the hazardous waste material. Now, a massive hazardous waste clean-up by Boeing, NASA, and the Department of Energy is planned. Many of the people in the group were uncomfortable and worried about their safety. Mr. Costa assured us that we were safe and had nothing to worry about. He advised us that the property had been closed off to the general public for the past 50 years and had concerns about the archaeological and cultural resources in the area.

Like many, I did not know what to expect. Looking out of the window at the grassy meadow surrounded by large wave-like sandstone outcrops, I wanted to exit the bus and climb onto each and every one of them. After a few minutes into the ride, the bus stopped, overlooking the valley below. With the cool morning breeze blowing through my hair and the clear blue sky above, I thought to myself what a beautiful day for a bus ride. My mind began to wander and I could hear the sunrise morning song blowing in the wind and feel the peace and serenity of the Native people who once lived on the land. I envisioned the footsteps of my brothers and sisters walking through the tall blades of grass greeting one another after a long journey. Everything came to life with the feeling of
returning home after being gone for so long. Tears of sadness and joy weighed upon my heart. I knew then I wanted to be a part of the project. After the brief stop, we drove to the area where the Red Burro painting was in a small rock shelter at the west end of the property known as Burro Flats. By the end of the day, we visited many other sites, each one as unique as the first one. After the tour, everyone left with mixed emotions about what to do except for me. I was excited and anxious to return to the site and wanted to know more about how to get involved. I asked Mr. Costa what I needed to do to apply for the monitoring position. He stated that my contact number and my address was all that was needed. A few months passed and I received a call from a Mr. Frank Spizzio, a Boeing representative, requesting information regarding a contract for hire.

A few weeks later I was on the job site monitoring with my good friend Charlie Cooke, an honorary Chief of the Chumash Nation. I first met Charlie through my father, Vincent James Tumamait, at a POW-WOW. Since that time we have been good friends. Charlie and I spent many hours together on the project and often checked on Charlie for he was not in the best of health. Our job was simple. We monitored the earth disturbance by the HYDROGEOLOGIC (HGL) crew and the vegetation clearing crew. It was a simple task but it allowed me the time to think about how the Native people survived and utilized the area as their home. Every day was an adventure. I could see a pattern in the landscape of how they would hunt for deer and small game. The rock shelters and hunting blinds on either side of the meadow gave them an advantage. I was truly fascinated by the surrounding landscape. The archaeologist on site was a good friend of mine, Allen Knight. Al and I surveyed the grounds for evidence of occupation and artifacts left behind by the Native people. We often talked about how they lived here on the land. It was late spring / early summer and the deer began to feed on the tall grass in the meadow. That particular day I counted and photographed seven bucks grazing on the tall grass. I'm sure that they felt safe even though it was close to hunting season because hunting was not allowed on site. As time passed, I was able to take many other photos of the animals on the site including horned toad lizards, cottontail rabbits and birds. The wildlife was abundant and thriving off the land. By this time Al and I had covered a lot of land. With his expertise and my keen eye we discovered eight new sites and met some new friends. Working with HGL and their staff was a rewarding experience for me. I have a great respect for the work that they do and it was an honor to work with them. To the Boeing staff, NASA, and the Department of Energy I owe a great deal of gratitude on how we were treated and respected as Native Chumash people during the project.

Sincerely,

Patrick Tumamait

9.3 Fernandeño Tataviam

The information presented in this ethnography is based off the interpretations of the present-day enrolled citizens, elders, and the tribal leadership of the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, constructed off data gathered by anthropologists, archaeologists, and linguists.

Fernandeño: Regional Terms

“Fernandeño” (or “Fernandiño”) is a Spanish regional term representing the people of four diverse territories enslaved during the Mission San Fernando period. J.P. Harrington archives Fernandeño Takic terms, one of the many languages spoken among the Indians of Mission San Fernando, for the four related, yet culturally diverse, territories prior to the Mission period. Using Pasekivitam, the people of the villages of San Fernando, the Mission, and the basin of the valley, as a central point of reference would position Tatavitam as the people of the region north of Pasekivitam, Simivitam as the
western people inhabiting Simi Valley in territories south of Tatavitam, and the Vanyume as the most eastern groups encompassing Antelope Valley (Harrington 1917). The Tatavitam, Pasekivitam, and Vanyume maintained slightly distinct Takic languages, while the people of Simi Valley and coastal areas were members of the Chumashan language. There are several alternative names that represent ethnic (tribal) perspectives for the words recorded by both the Spanish priests and Harrington, but the general rule stands with four important Takic suffixes: -vit, -pet, -bit, or -bet refer to one person or lineage, -am is plural and can convert one person (-vit) to multiple people (-vitam), and -nga is a locative reference. Language types and marital patterns did not determine political or national organization among the pre-mission Fernandeños. They exercised power over territory, self-government, a judicial system, and upheld a network of social, economic, and political ties to other lineages over an extensive area. The lineages are important distinctions from physical locations, since the actual villages were abandoned when the Indians were recruited to Mission San Fernando. These lineages continued as the major form of social and political organization through the Mission period, and are the primary form of indigenous organization among the present-day descendants of the Fernandeños.

**Fernandeño and Gabrieleño: The Difference**

Although the Fernandeño and Gabrieleño are linguistically related, they represent two geographical areas that shall not be confused, or interchanged, with one another. Sivavitam, the people of Los Angeles Basin, are known as the Gabrieleños during the Mission period. The people of Mission San Gabriel, Gabrieleños, referred to the Fernandeños as Pavasikwar, which exemplifies the separate native identities associated with the two post-Mission era names. Additionally, the Fernandeños referred to the Gabrieleños inhabiting areas further east of the Los Angeles Basin as Komivitam, or the people in the eastern portion of San Gabriel Valley, which further established a line between the two mission-associated regional terminologies.

**Pasekivitam, Tatavitam, and Simivitam Overview**

The distinct community of the present-day Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (Band) (Figure 9–4) originated in the lineages, villages, and culture of the pre-Mission period. Mission San Fernando was established on September 8, 1797 at the village of Achoicominga and, for years following, gathered converts from the Indian villages in the geographically surrounding area, ranging from present day Santa Catalina Island and Malibu in the west, Cahuenga and Encino in the south, Tujunga in the east, and the present-day Tejon Ranch in the north. Before the founding of Mission San Fernando, the Indians in the region lived in lineages within villages that were associated with territories. The tribal villages, or tribelets, consisted of speakers from the Takic branch of the Uto-Aztecan language, who intermarried with individuals from other linguistic groups within the area, as well as strengthened economic, social, and cultural relations with those outside of their language group by practicing exogamy. Each tribelet or lineage held territory and maintained political and economic sovereignty over its local area, but was also linked through social exchange to neighboring villages and lineages.

---

1 For consistency, the contemporary Fernandeño Tataviam (Band) administration made the decision to use the –bit suffix when referring to lineages.
Band’s Link to Villages/Rancherías

The entire Fernandeño region formed a network of intermarriages that produced the basis for cooperative economic and social exchanges. Each lineage group, from which citizens of the Band descend, were economically, socially, and politically autonomous. Although the villages2 of Jucjayanga, Momonga, and Tapuu (Figure 9–1) were predominantly Simivitam3 the intermarriages with Tatavitam4 highlight the Band’s ancestral ties to families of Simi Valley and surrounding areas. The mixed marriages among lineages and across linguistic lines were typical of the region before the establishment of Mission San Fernando. Specifically, the Ortega and Garcia lineages, which link to the Band’s progenitors, can be traced to the three former villages.

Ortega: ties to Tapuu and Momonga

Maria Rita Alipas is a progenitor of the Ortega lineage. Tracing her ancestry patrilineally, through her father Francisco Papabubaba, leads us to Juan Maria, a first generation convert born in the lineage of Chaguayabit. Francisco’s wife, Paula Cayo, was born at Mission San Fernando. Paula’s father, Tiburcio Cayo, was born at Tapuu, the Simivitam village in present-day Simi Valley (Figure 9–1). In short, Maria Rita Alipas had ancestors from the lineages of Chaguayabit (Chaguayanga), Cabuebit (Cahuenga), Suitcabit (Siutcanga), and Tapuu. This reveals that her ancestry contained members of the Takic and Chumashan linguistic groups and indicates the regularity of mixed marriages between the Tatavitam and Simivitam. Maria’s relationship with the lineage of Tapuu links Ortega tribal descendants, enrolled with the Band today, to the ancient ancestral sites of Simi Valley and surrounding areas. Moreover, on September 1, 1845, Maria Rita Alipas and Benigno were married at Mission San Fernando. The list of witnesses for this marriage illustrates the breadth of community that continued to exist. For example, the first witness was Thomas of Momobit, the lineage located at Momonga, east of present-day Stoney Point. Momonga was located near a major trail that crossed over the original Santa Susana Pass into Simi Valley, which was home to the rancherías located at Tapuu, Simii, and Quimisac (Johnson 2006:15), and likely contained members of both Takic and Chumashan languages. Another witness was Vicente Francisco, an Alcalde who was a member of a prominent family at Fort Tejon, and a progenitor for the Fort Tejon Tribe.

---

2 Note: the lineages that existed at those villages are noted on the map: Jucjayubit, Momobit, and Tapuu.
3 See “Fernandeño: Regional Terms.” Simivitam: People of Simi Valley prior to the recruitment of Mission San Fernando.
4 See “Fernandeño: Regional Terms.” Tatavitam: People of the region north of the Simivitam prior to the recruitment of Mission San Fernando. Their territory extended to the south-facing slopes of Liebre and Sawmill mountains (King and Blackburn 1978: 535).
Garcia: Ties to Tapuu

Leandra Culeta, the progenitor of the Garcia line, was born at Mission San Fernando on March 28, 1840. Culeta’s ancestor, Amando, originated at Chaguayabit, the Tatavitam lineage ancestrally tied to the Ortega family. Culeta’s patrilineal ties to Chaguayabit suggest that she is a blood relative to Francisco Papabubaba, and his daughter Maria Rita Alipas. Culeta’s godmother was Rafaela, the wife of Vicente Francisco, the Alcalde who witnessed Benigno and Maria Rita Alipas’ marriage in 1845. Vicente Francisco was also Leandra Culeta’s great uncle, since his sister Teofila married Culeta’s maternal grandfather, Francisco del Espiritu Santo. The godparenting relation of Rafaela to Leandra Culeta reaffirmed relations between Culeta and her Kitenamuk relatives at Tejon. Rafaela was born at Mission San Fernando, and her parents Dionisio and Dionisia, were both from the Simivitam lineage at Tapuu. Leandra and Juan Leyva’s daughter, Josephine Levy, also had a daughter. She, Frances Garcia Cooke, was a sister to Petra Garcia Rivera Valenzuela, an ancestor of the Fernandeño Tataviam Band’s citizens through her great granddaughter Victoria Olivarez. Frances Garcia Cooke and her daughter, Della Cooke Martinez, were active in organizing the Garcia lineage members, living in Newhall in 1928, to apply to the California Indian judgment roll. Frances Garcia Cooke’s son, Dolore Cooke, was the father of Charlie Cooke, the elder who visited the Burro Flats pictographic site in the late 20th century. In summary, Leandra’s patrilineal ties to Chaguayabit and matrilineal ties to Tujubit were augmented by social ties to the Simivitam lineage at Tapuu.

Rocha: Ties to Jucjayunga (El Escorpión)

A third lineage progenitor is Rogerio Rocha, a captain in San Fernando in the 1850’s. The Band has exhausted research on Rocha’s family and cannot identify any living descendants. However, the Garcia lineage identified him as the previous captain of their family on the 1928 California Indian judgment roll. Rocha’s father, German, was a captain during the Mission period. Rocha’s grandfather, Mariano Antonio, and German were born at the Simivitam village of Quimisac, which was located in the region north of present-day Simi Valley. His wife, Maria Manuela, was born at Mission San Fernando. Maria’s mother, Nerea, was from the Tatavitam lineage of Pirubit located at Piiruknga, and her father, Efren, was from the lineage located at Jucjayunga, historically located at El Escorpión, at the mouth of Bell Canyon. Efren’s mother, Benita, and maternal grandmother, Saturnina, were both born at El Escorpión. Rocha’s in-laws in the Tujubit lineage were of the same lineage as Leandra Culeta’s ancestors. Both Culeta and Rocha lived and worked in the same village, as well as shared a common ancestral identity.

El Escorpión (Jucjayunga) and Rocketdyne: Rudy Ortega, Sr. and Charlie Cooke

The Simivitam village located at the mouth of Bell Canyon was called Huwam in the neighboring language, but was most often referred to as Jucjayunga in the registers of Mission San Fernando (Johnson 2006:5). Jucjayunga is identified, in the post-mission period, as El Escorpión (Harrington 1917 Reel #106-152:1:7). The El Escorpión Rancheria may have been occupied as recently as 1820 C.E. (Knight 2002, NASA 2010:22). Some speculate that native speakers of both Takic and Chumashan languages resided at El Escorpión, creating a multilingual community (Brown 1967:8; Forbes 1966:138; King and Johnson 1999:88-89, 91-92; Johnson 2006:7). Moreover,

---

5 See “Ortega: Ties to Tapuu and Momonga”
6 Also known as Pиру
7 See “Garcia: Ties to Tapuu”
8 Also known as El Escorpión de las Salinas
El Escorpión was one of the larger villages in the San Fernando Valley during the period of recruitment from the area by the Mission San Fernando (King 2011:46).

The west San Fernando Valley was an area of religious and ceremonial prominence for the Simivitam, Tatavitam, Pasekivitam, and Sivavitam. The polychrome pictographs located in the Simi Hills were, most likely, places where ceremonial activities took place (Romani 1981:91). Studies suggest that the northern component of the village of Jusjuyunga was the host village for the regional winter solstice festivals, in honor of the return of the sun (Romani 1981:92-93). In 1917, J.P. Harrington, while visiting the El Escorpión Rancheria, encountered the ancestral polychrome and red monochrome pictographs of the Lake Manor site, located near the Chatsworth reservoir in the northern section of the area inhabited by the eastern Simivitam and western Pasekivitam. Another important ceremonial location and pictographic site west of San Fernando Valley is part of the Pasekivitam village of Momonga (Johnson 2006:15-23; NEA and King 2004:112) and contained fresh water and sulphur springs that remain active today (Knight 2002:265).

Just north of El Escorpión, at Chatsworth Lake Manor, are the complex polychrome Burro Flats pictographs. In 1971, fifth generation Mission Indian Rudy Ortega, Sr. (Figure 9–2 and Figure 9-3), of the Ortega lineage, began his pursuit of preserving the dramatic and well-preserved pictographs left behind by his ancestors. His contribution to the protection of Santa Susana led the descendants of the Mission San Fernando Indians to conduct a petition drive that pushed for a portion of Rocketdyne’s engine test site to be declared a historical monument. Since 1978, Charlie Cooke, of the Garcia lineage, visited Burro Flats Cave site and witnessed winter and summer solstices. On September 10, 2013, Cooke submitted a letter to the Native American Heritage Commission requesting that Burro Flats Pictograph Cave site be listed by California as a sacred place. In 2009, Elders of the Fernandeño Tataviam Band gathered at Burro Flats to honor the sacred site. An attempt to hold a small winter solstice ceremony at the pictographic site in 2013 demonstrates the continued use and importance of the cultural resources of the area. The presence of scattered pre and post-Mission activity present in the Simi Valley, in the form of pictographs and ancient ancestral deposits, elucidate the extent of preservation that Rudy Ortega, Sr. and Charlie Cooke fought for.

Figure 9–2 Rudy Ortega, Sr. (Chief Little Bear) at Rocketdyne, 1971

9 Lake Manor Site (VEN-148/149)
10 Chatsworth Site (LAN-357)
11 Burro Flats Site (VEN-1072)
Although the pictographs are not definitively *Simivitam*, they are stylistically related. Through the genealogical evidence, one can deduce that the affiliation of the pictographs would lie with *Simivitam*, *Tataviam*, *Sivavitam*, and *Pasekivitam*, or, through intermarriage, a combination of the four. The pictographs and surrounding terrain had been described by Rudy Ortega, Sr. as being “important in the sense that it is a real find in the Mission Indian’s search for self-identity and heritage…they are the few physical links to our heritage.”
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9.4 Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California

Christina Conley

Columbia University cultural anthropologist, Alfred Kroeber, characterized the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California as the “wealthiest and most thoughtful of all the Shoshoneans of the state.”\(^{12}\) In 1805, sea captain, William Shaler, wrote that they were “a handsome people, remarkably sprightly, courteous, and intelligent, and display great ingenuity in all their arts.”\(^{13}\)

My family are descendants of the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California and lived on what is now called the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL). As with many tribes who lived in that area, their ability to sustain themselves with hunting and gathering allowed them to settle the land for many generations. This way of life fostered a spiritual culture of appreciating and respecting the land they lived on as it nourished and sheltered them like a parent.

Learning to sustain themselves with food from the land went beyond a lesson, it was also a bonding time between the young and old. The uncles of my uncles taught them how to hunt with a “throw stick” that was crafted with a hook on the end and would be cast toward the small animal prey. This rudimentary hunting would be a valuable trait when there was a lull in the capture of bigger game. The aunts of my aunts taught them to select and gather the vegetation to provide nourishment.

The many rock hunting blinds found on the property suggest the land was vibrant for hunting. A successful hunter would have awoken before dawn and tracked their prey by following wildlife trails which still exist today across the property. Successful tracking within the surrounding meadows required an intimate knowledge of the land: observation of newly etched antler marks made by bucks on trees and/or crows circling above in the sky. The hunter understood that the deer had a heightened sense of smell. Hunters did not perch themselves on the ridges or the large boulders but positioned themselves down-wind below the high points of the topography.

An increase of hunting success would have occurred before winter (August-November) during mating season. At this time, the bucks would stop eating and become weak and delirious and more vulnerable to a strike.

Hunters used soapstone from Catalina Island (steatite) to straighten arrow shafts in order to make their weapon more aerodynamic. Arrow tips were crafted from stone or bone. The arrow would shoot only as far as 30' demanding the hunter be expertly skilled. Some used disguises made of heads and necks of deer to enable the hunter to approach his prey more closely.

In our contemporary times, we perceive a person who is easily distracted as holding a negative trait, but for the Gabrielino Tongva hunter, it would have been a virtuous and admirable characteristic. This hunter relied on all of his senses and would continually check that the wind was in his face, mindful of his step and cognizant of the noise he generated. A focused hunter would not be acute to all of his senses: not recognizing the wind shifts which would take his scent to the prey and expose him, unaware of his footing and noisily stumbling. The SSFL area has a constant breeze along with the seasonal Santa Ana winds thus, a constant obstacle to the hunt. If a hunter gave away

---


his location to a deer, it would take at least 2 hours for the deer to return. The characteristics of this “focused” hunter would deem him less valuable to the tribe.

The myriad of complexities to the hunt of large animals forced them to find alternative sources of meat to compensate. Snares, throwing clubs and slings were used to capture rabbits, squirrels and other small animals.

The plentiful orchards of oak trees amongst the aromatic chaparral of the meadows still carry the voices of those who would gather their acorns for food. Acorns were pulverized in mortars and flushed with water to remove the tannic acid which made them bitter and unpalatable. Several mortars are found throughout the property and several large mortar bowls are found near the creek at the foot of Burro Flats ceremonial area. The winter and summer solstice celebrations held there would have required more food and hence, the larger volumed bowls.

The thoughtful preservation of this sacred land respects our past and preserves our future.

Christina Conley
Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California

9.5 Kizh/Gabrieleno: Ethnographic Culture and Project Area Connections

Ernest P. Salas Teutimes, Chief and Spiritual Leader,
Andrew Salas, Tribal Chairman,
Dr. Gary Stickel, Tribal Archaeologist

Ethnographic Culture

The Kizh/Gabrieleno people have lived in the southern California area for thousands of years. The Tribe occupied a vast area that “…the Gabrieleno mainland territory included…the San Fernando Valley, the San Gabriel Valley, the San Bernardino Valley, and the Los Angeles-Santa Ana Plain” (McCawley 1996, 24; cf Kroeber 1925; Johnston 1962, 1-2; Bean and Smith 1978; LaLone 1980). The Tribal territory also included the Sea of Kizh with its four islands: Santa Catalina, San Nicolas, San Clemente, and Santa Barbara (McCawley 1996, 75-87; cf. Johnston 1962, 112-113; Bean and Smith 1978, 538). Within the Tribal territory our ancestors created a remarkable and beautiful culture in an outstanding environment. Our homeland was life-sustaining and beautiful to all who looked upon it, from the diving dolphins and breaching great whales who circled Pimu’na (Catalina Island), to the deer, big horn sheep, and grizzly bears who roamed our hills and mountains. It was a marvelous world filled with wonders. We strive today to preserve what precious little of it remains within the vast urban sprawls of the greater Los Angeles basin area. Thus, we are committed to the preservation of the Burro Flats site (CA-VEN 1072) and our other sacred sites located on the present property of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (Teutimes, Salas, Swindall-Martinez and Stickel 2013).

Our people lived in villages comprised of a number of thatched-roofed domiciles, called a Kizh (pronounced Keech) (McCawley 1996, 10). A Chief led the village residents in their daily activities. Because we had a hunting-gathering culture, the tasks were divided as follows; the men hunted large game such as deer, small game like rabbits, sea mammals, and fished the pacific ocean. The women collected plant foods such as chia and acorns, that provided a sustained subsistence system (McCawley 1996, 118-123, 128-131; Teutimes 2013). Our people ranged far and wide throughout our occupied lands, from the mountains to the valleys, and we traveled to and from our channel islands in planked boats, called Ti’ats (Te’aat, McCawley 1996, 128) that, along with the similar
Chumash boats (Tomols), were unique in the Americas. We traded between the islands and the mainland and our trade network extended far to the east. For example, our abalone and other shell pieces were utilized and prized as jewelry by other cultures such as the Hopi and other Pueblo Indians (Keoke and Porterfield 2005, 50).

Our social organization was as follows; the administrative leader of each village was a Chief who was from an elite lineage or class. We also had a middle class of boat captains and similar status individuals and a third class of everyone else. When our ancestors married, the couples came from nearly equal social rank but from different lineages (i.e. lineage exogamy). After the woman was married, the wife would reside at her husband’s home in his village (i.e. patrilocal residence). When married couples had children, they were treated in an exceptional way:

*Children were treated with such love, devotion and fondness by their parents that the Spanish missionaries were astonished and commented that the children were treated like 'little idols' (Johnston 1962; Bean and Smith 1978, 545).

We had an exceptional belief system which we call today the Yovaar Religion. The Yovaar was a large circular enclosure within which we would worship. Our religion was a sacred belief system that provided us with a bond between ourselves and the Spirit world, a bond between us and our natural world, a bond between our different communities (villages), and a bond between our peoples and other peoples. The bonds were sustaining and long lasting. We worshiped a Great Spirit - a principal Creator God, named “Quaoar” the giver of life, and recognized another manifestation of the Creator named Chingichngish (Bean and Smith 1978, 548; McCawley 1996, 144). Other supernaturals that were recognized were Tamet (Sun Father also called ‘Ta’ a met) and Chukit (Earth Mother). Each village had one or more spiritual leaders or Shamans who conducted all religious ceremonies and events. Our most famous shaman was a young woman named Toypurina. She is unique in American History as she is the only Native American woman to have led a revolt. We published an acclaimed book about her entitled *Toypurina: the Joan of Arc of California* (Teutimes, Salas, Swindall-Martinez and Stickel 2013). “The Gabrielino Shaman possessed an extensive knowledge of Astronomy and Cosmology which he used to predict the future and to schedule the proper dates on which to celebrate religious festivals” (McCawley 1996, 100). A major sacred site of our people is called Burro Flats which has both a Winter and Summer Solstice Monument within the Santa Susana Field Laboratory property (Krupp 1983).

Altogether our culture was outstanding and has been acknowledged by renowned anthropologists and scholars:

> The Gabrielino…seem to have been the most advanced group south of Tehachapi, except perhaps the Chumash. They certainly were the wealthiest and most thoughtful of all the Shoshoneans of the State, and dominated these civilizationally wherever contacts occurred (Kroeber 1925, 621).

A similar opinion was expressed by authors Lowell Bean and Charles Smith in their important article on us in the volume “California” published as part of the landmark twenty volume series on the American Indian by our National Museum, the Smithsonian Institution. They have said of us:

> The Gabrielino (Gabrieleno) are, in many ways, one of the most interesting - yet least known of Native California peoples. At the time of Spanish contact in 1769, they occupied the most richly endowed coastal section in southern California…With the possible exception of the Chumash, the Gabrielino were the wealthiest, most populous, and most powerful ethnic nationality in aboriginal southern California…(Bean and Smith 1978, 538).
And more recently William McCawley, in his most comprehensive book on us to date entitled *The First Angelinos: the Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles* (1996), has said of us:

…the Gabrielino are revealed by the ethnographic and the ethnohistorical records as a people of material wealth and cultural sophistication…They maintained a maritime trade network…The prestige and political strength of the Gabrielino were enhanced by impressive achievement in pre-industrial technology and economics as well as religion and oral literature (McCawley 1996, 3).

**Project Area Connections**

The Santa Susana Field Laboratory area is located in the Simi Hills west of the San Fernando Valley. This area was the borderlands between our Kizh/Gabrieleno People and the Chumash People. The most prominent archaeological site known on the property is known as the Burro Flats (State of California site number: CA-VEN-1072). The former Curator of Archaeology for the Los Angeles Natural History Museum, Charles Rozaire, published the site in 1959. The site was first formally investigated and reported upon for the U.S. Government in 1973 by Professor Frank Fenenga who was assisted by our present Tribal Archeologist Dr. Gary Stickel, both of whom were on the faculty of California State University, Long Beach, at the time. In addition to the solstice monuments at the site mentioned in the previous section, the site is remarkable for its main rock shelter which has a large panel of striking pictographs (i.e. cave paintings). A landmark book entitled, *The Rock Paintings of the Chumash* was published by Campbell Grant in 1965. It discussed the many pictograph and petroglyph sites throughout the Chumash territory. Campbell Grant was not a professional Anthropologist or Archaeologist, but an inspired artist. In his book, he mistakenly included the Burro Flats site as a Chumash pictograph site. However, his only comment on the site was that “There are many unusual elements here - the two comets in the upper right, figures with “rake” hands and feet, and people with feathered headdresses at right” (Campbell 1965, Plate 25). The reason those designs were “unusual” to him is that they were not Chumash but Kizh/Gabrieleno in origin. The evidence for that interpretation is presented in an article by Bob Edberg (1985, 65-92). Although he tries to consider the ethnography of the Chumash to interpret the paintings, he states: “Therefore I have, of necessity, sought out corresponding ethnographic information from such groups as the southern Gabrielino, Luiseno, Kitanemuk, and Yokuts (Edberg 1985, 70). Consequently, he interprets the five concentric circles motif involved with the Winter Solstice as representing the “Five Worlds of the Universe” as possibly relating to the mythologies of the Chumash and Gabrielino (Teutimes, Salas, Martinez and Stickel 2013, 16-19). In addition, the two comet motifs he says are Gabrieleno which are supported by the two tall stalk-like designs which he properly interprets as “Kutu-mit poles (monuments) of the Gabrielino mourning ceremony” (Edberg 1985, 75). Further emphasizing the Gabrieleno connection to the site, Edberg mentions “There are other pole motifs in the main panel which may depict poles other than Kutu-mit poles, but also used by the Gabrieleno” (Edberg 1985, 84). Edberg also mentioned “centipede motifs”, but he was uncertain about their possible meaning. Edberg was apparently unaware that there was a great centipede that was one of the “avengers” of Chingichngish who would punish the Gabrielenos who were not faithful to his laws (Harrington 1933, 129-135; McCawley 1996, 146). Therefore, since Edberg ascribes most of his identified images at Burro Flats to the Gabrieleno, the weight of the evidence supports the interpretation that the site belongs to our people.
There is an oral legend of our people with another strong connection to a recorded archeological site on the Santa Susana Field Laboratory property. This is the Kizh/Gabrieleno legend of Sparrow Hawk and his wife which is similar to the Greek legend of Orpheus and Euridice. An excerpted version is as follows:

Koo-neet’s (Sparrow Hawk’s) beloved wife died. They burned the girl’s body on a pyre. As the corpse was consumed by the flames, Sparrow Hawk noticed a small whirlwind of ashes swirl and move away. Sparrow Hawk knew that this was the spirit of his departed wife, so he followed it across the sea to the land of the dead. Sparrow Hawk cried out in sorrow. The girl took pity on her grieving husband and agreed to return to him to the land of the living if he agreed to hold a ceremony when they arrived back home. She explained that the ceremony must last for nine days, and while it’s being celebrated he must not touch her (have sex) or she would leave him forever. Sparrow Hawk promised to follow all of her instructions. For eight nights he kept his word, but finally on the last night he could not restrain himself any longer. He took hold of her to make love. Suddenly she turned and barked at him in anger “What do you want with me?” she demanded, “Is this what you want?”, she then pulled out her vulva and flung it at him. The organ struck a rock and imprinted itself on a stone. The woman disappeared forever, but her genital remained imprinted in the stone in the hills above Chatsworth. (Harrington 1986, R106 F233-240; McCawley 1996, 178).

We believe that legendary site may well be the site on the subject property that Dr. Ray Corbett identifies as “a vulva-form site” known as CA-VEN-1476. These professional anthropological accounts of our ancestor’s sites are corroborated by our oral history.

The Santa Susana Field Laboratory area as well as the adjacent San Fernando Valley were part of our Tribe’s territory (its NW region; see Figure 9–5). The first overview of all the Indian Tribes of California was entitled, Handbook of the Indians of California. That landmark book was published by the renowned Anthropologist A.L. Kroeber in 1925 by the United States Government’s Bureau of American Ethnology. Kroeber noted the terms Gabrielino and “Fernandeno” were Spanish terms for the Indians associated with those missions (Missions San Gabriel and San Fernando). Kroeber understood that the two names referred to one Native culture: “…there is no known point in which the two groups differed in customs. It will be best, therefore, to treat them as a unit…” (Kroeber 1925, 620). Anthropologists have noted that there were dialect differences within the overall Gabrieleno language: “The Gabrielino had four different dialects; Gabrielino, Fernandeno, Santa Catalina Island language, and San Nicolas Island language” (Harrington in Johnston 1962, viii). The first book exclusively about our Tribe, entitled California’s Gabrieleno Indians by Bernice Eastman Johnston, was published in 1962. On her map entitled, “The Gabrielino Indians at the time of the Portola Expedition,” she indicates the villages of “Totogna”, “Pasekngna”, and “Kawengna.” Note that our village of Pasheekwnga was located at San Fernando Mission, and that Kawengna is better known by the spelling, Cahuenga (as in Cahuenga Blvd.). Also, just to the northwest of the valley was our village of Tujungna, which survives as the city of Tujunga today (See Appendix 1-1 for a copy of the Johnston map).

In 1978 a significant article was published by Lowell Bean and Charles Smith that was entitled “Gabrieleno”. It was included in one of the twenty volumes published by our National Museum, the Smithsonian Institution, in the volume entitled California (which covered all the tribes in the state). In this publication they describe the territory of our people which includes the San Fernando Valley and Santa Susana Field Laboratory area (see Appendix 1-2 for a copy of the Bean & Smith 1978 map).
The most recent comprehensive book regarding our culture was entitled, *The First Angelinos - The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles* by William McCawley (1996). In it he says the following, “The western region of the San Fernando Valley is rich in Gabrielino heritage” (McCawley 1996, 35). McCawley presented an overall map of the Gabrieleno territory (p. 22; see Appendix 1-3). McCawley also presented a “map 5” entitled “Gabrielino communities located within the San Fernando Valley” (see Appendix 1-4). On that map he has eleven villages noted including “Burro Flats” (McCawley 1996, 36; see Figure 1 and Appendix 1-4 for a copy of McCawley’s map). The above quoted books are major authoritative academic sources whose information can be trusted. For example, Kroeber conducted his ethnographic research for his book in the early years of the 20th century when he had access to very knowledgeable Gabrielino informants who knew the truth of the matters of which they spoke. A contemporary of Kroeber was J.P. Harrington whose outstanding and extensive notes on the Chumash as well as the 8,000 + pages he wrote on our people are considered accurate and authoritative by both Tribes. Mr. Harrington interviewed our Chief Ernest P. Salas’ great aunt Feliciana Perez, Great uncle Juan Perez, and cousin Felicita Montana as well as other elders of our tribal community. Accurate information was obtained from all of them which supports this narrative (cf. Harrington and Perez 1920-1930). Such information has been used in studies of the locations of the local Indian Tribes of the area (e.g. King 1975; see Appendix 1-5 for King’s map of the tribal border area between the Gabrieleno and the Chumash).

Regarding Harrington, it is important to note that at the United States National Archives, where the original Harrington notes are housed, there is no reference to the alleged “Fernandeno” tribal area. The only reference to the area in question is listed exclusively as “Gabrielino”.

Our Ancestors’ village names (such as Cahuenga, Tujunga, and Passenga [aka Pasheekwnga]) had a suffix of -nga. The “-nga” suffix, in our language, meant “the place of” (Johnston 1962, 9). For example, the village of Topanga, located in Topanga Canyon near the pacific ocean, meant “…the place where mountains run out into the sea” (Johnston 1962, 10). It should also be noted that when the suffix “-bit” is used (e.g. Jucjauybit), it does not refer to a village, but rather the suffix “-bit, -pet, or vit” means that a person derives from a given village (Johnston 1962, 10). That is, if a Kizh/Gabrieleno said “Cahuengabit”, it meant that he or she was saying, “I am from the village of Cahuenga”.

The above information should indicate to the United States government, to the Boeing Company, and to all other objective parties, that the Santa Susana Field Laboratory area was the borderlands between the Kizh/Gabrieleno Tribe and the Chumash Tribe and we thereby maintain our tribal right to preserve and protect our sacred sites such as the Burro Flats site (CA-VEN-1072) in perpetuity.
Figure 9–5  Kizh Tribal Territory (Gabrieleno Indian Lands) Northwestern Region
Appendix 1: Supplemental Material for the Kizh/Gabrieleno
APPENDIX 1: Map 1-2; Bean and Smith 1978 map.

Gabrielino

LOWELL JOHN BEAN AND CHARLES R. SMITH

The Gabrielino (gabrielínta) are, in many ways, one of the most interesting—yet least known—of native California peoples. At the time of Spanish contact in 1769 they occupied the "most richly endowed coastal section in southern California" (Blackburn 1962:1963:6), which is most of present-day Los Angeles and Orange counties, plus several offshore islands (San Clemente, Santa Catalina, San Nicolas). With the possible exception of the Chumash, the Gabrielino were the wealthiest, most populous, and most powerful ethnic nationality in aboriginal southern California, their influence spreading as far north as the San Joaquin valley Yokuts, as far east as the Colorado River, and south into Baja California. Unfortunately, most if not all Gabrielinos were dead long before systematic ethnographic studies were instituted; and, as a result, knowledge of them and their lifeways is meager.

Language, Territory, and Environment

Gabrielino was one of the Cupan languages in the Takic family, which is part of the Uto-Aztecan linguistic stock (Bright 1975).* Internal linguistic differences existed, Harrington (1962:viii) suggesting four dialects and Kroeber (1925), six. Harrington's four-part division includes: Gabrielino proper, spoken mainly in the Los Angeles basin area; Fernandeño, spoken by people north of the Los Angeles basin, mainly in the San Fernando valley region; Santa Catalina Island dialect; and San Nicolas Island dialect—although according to Bright (1975) insufficient data exist to be sure of the Cupan affiliation of the San Nicolas speech. There were probably dialectical differences also between many mainland villages, a result not only of geographical separation but also of social, cultural, and linguistic mixing with neighboring non-Gabrielino speakers.

The names Gabrielino and Fernandeño (fernánédéñtly) refer to the two major Spanish missions established in Gabrielino territory—San Gabriel and San Fernando.

* Italicized Gabrielino words have been written in a phonemic alphabet by Kenneth C. Hill, on the basis of John Peabody Harrington's unpublished field notes. The consonants are: /b, p, t, k, kʰ, ʔ, (fricative), s, ʃ, s, h, (nasal) m, n, g, (approximants) ɹ, ɾ, ŋ, w/. Stressed vowels are /a, ɪ, ʊ, ɔ, ʌ, ʊ/ which may occur long or short; unstressed syllables the vowels are only /i, ɛ, a, and u/.

Fig. 1. Tribal territory.
APPENDIX 1: Map 1-2; Bean and Smith 1978 map.

Fig. 1. Tribal territory.
APPENDIX 1: Map 1-3; McCawley 1996 map.

Map 2. The Gabriélino territory (shaded) and neighboring Indian groups. Tiny Santa Barbara Island (which lies west of Santa Catalina and northeast of San Nicolas) is not shown; the Gabriélino visited Santa Barbara Island but did not occupy the island.
APPENDIX 1: Map 1-4; McCawley 1996 map.

Map 5. Gabrielino communities located within the San Fernando Valley. The scale on this and the following maps is in statute miles.
APPENDIX 1: Map 1-5; King 1975 map.

Map source:
King, Chester

Historic Chumash Villages

122 - Ta'apu; 146 - Huwam; 157 - Humaliwo
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9.6 Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation (TATTN)

John Tommy Rosas

Material submitted by the Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation (TATTN) representing their history and perspective has been included in the SSFL EIS Administrative Record. Documents that will found there consist of the following:


• Depiction of Tongva Territory. Original map source unknown.

Figures 9–6 through 9–11, below, extracted from the material provided by the TATTN and presented in the AR, are various maps related to the historical extent of Tongva territories.
Figure 9–6 Key to Tribal Territories

Figure 9–7 Surface current patterns off southern California


Figure 9–8 Map of Tongva territory showing ethnographic villages and Momonga (red dot)

Figure 9–9 Map from TATTN illustrating Tongva territory
Based on Google Earth Pro image. John Tommy Rosas 2015.

Figure 9–10 Map from TATTN illustrating Tongva territory, including indigenous sea rights
Figure 9–11 Depiction of Tongva Territory. Original map source unknown.