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CHUMASH VILLAGE SITES AT TIME OF EUROPEAN CONTACT 1542 AD
HISTORICAL PERIODS

Spanish Period
1542-1822

Mexican Period
1822-1848

American Period
1848 - Present
WHAT’S THE DIFFERENCE?

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- All physical sites such as villages and cemeteries
- All artifacts and midden
- Sacred ceremonial sites and landscapes, including areas of origin
- Hunting, fishing, gathering, and economic locations
- Plants and wildlife
- Participation in historical activities

IN OTHERWORDS, ALL aspects of Native American history up to the present are of cultural significance

HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Sites and artifacts associated with all human histories
- 50 years or older is a general guideline
- Sites and artifacts are evaluated based on “scientific” and “in situ” value
SETTING UP THE CULTURAL HISTORIC GROUP (CHG)

• Contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for list of local Tribes
• Contacted State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
• Contacted listed Tribes and archeologists
• Developed rate sheets and set up contracts between Tribes and OSROs or RP *
• Evaluated HAZWOPER status *
THE CHG

- One Group Leader from OSPR
- 50 Chumash Cultural Monitors and Supervisors from 5 separate bands *
- 11 Archeologists including the Historic Preservation Specialist (HPS)
FIELD MONITORING

• Inspection of contaminated strata for C/H resources
  ➢ Most cultural artifacts were made from native stone

• Observation of cleanup operations
  ➢ Cultural Monitors were imbedded with work crews at an approximate 1 to 20 ratio
  ➢ Approximately 1 archeologist per 5 monitors to evaluate and document discovered resources
FIELD MONITORING

- Cultural Monitors were imbedded with Shoreline Cleanup Assessment Teams (SCAT) when surface disturbance was planned.
- Archeologists oversaw operations involving historic resources.
- Bones were evaluated by an osteologist to determine species:
  - No human remains were identified.
ARTIFACT DISPOSITION

- Artifacts and new sites were photographed and documented by archeologists.
- Artifacts were then:
  - Left in place
  - Reburied
  - Placed in the ocean
  - Collected and stored for later disposition
- Data was compiled by the HPS for Section 106 National Historic Preservation Act compliance report.
STR REVIEW and SCHEDULING

• Nightly review and signoff of Shoreline Treatment Recommendations (STRs) to evaluate:
  ➢ Impact to artifacts and sites by new and existing treatment methods
  ➢ Access routes to protect known sites

• Tribal supervisors would review work crew assignments with planning for following day and schedule monitors
OTHER CHG LEADER DUTIES

- C/H group logistical needs
- Tribal Elder and Dignitary visit coordination
- Review of Ceremony requests
- Working with PIOs to ensure cultural desires of Tribes and resource sensitivity were respected
- Working with Volunteer Coordinator to identify project locations and access
CHALLENGES

• Only 10 CMs and Archs had HAZWOPER training
  ➢ Delayed field deployment
  ➢ 4 Hr site specific HazCom training was provided to approximately 100 CMs and 15 Archs

• CMs and Archs had no previous ICS training or experience
  ➢ CMs cultural traditions did not always recognize group leader’s authority
  ➢ Cultural matters often required Elder review
  ➢ CMs routinely operated outside chain of command
CHALLENGES

- STR and Treatment Method reviews
  - CMs routinely denied plans as detrimental to cultural resources
  - CHGL and EUL negotiated with CMs to ensure plans were approved
  - IAP production delayed during early response
CHALLENGES

• Generational intertribal friction between 5 Chumash Bands
  ➢ Top heavy CM supervision
  ➢ Multiple contracts with different OSROs
  ➢ Differing views of resource protection and artifact disposition
  ➢ Separate facilities
  ➢ Lack of communication between CMs
  ➢ CHGL struggled to mitigate these differences to ensure operational efficiency
CHALLENGES

• After Action Report completed and recommendations made
• Many were implemented and successful during 2016 Grove Incident
  ➢ Single OSRO for contracting
  ➢ CM scheduling was handled by planning and operations
• Work in progress
  ➢ Cultural traditions vs ICS
  ➢ Intertribal friction
QUESTIONS?