

[Reply](#) [Reply All](#) [Forward](#) [Chat](#)

Comment 2-1

Proposed Language for Tribal resources update to Appendix G.

Martz, Patricia [pmartz@calstatela.edu]

To: [CEQA Guidelines@CNRA](mailto:CEQA.Guidelines@CNRA)

Cc: tattnlaw@gmail.com

Saturday, June 04, 2016 1:05 PM

Dear Heather Baugh,

I have reviewed the above mentioned update and am concerned that the proposed language does not meet the intent and letter of AB 52 in that the guidance does not include tribal cultural resources, sacred places, and Native American traditions that have been overlooked or marginalized under CEQA. The language should not delete language mentioning and defining tribal cultural resources as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe. An archaeological site that does not meet scientific criteria for significance may still hold spiritual value for Native Americans and this should be taken into consideration.

Sincerely,

Patricia Martz, Ph.D.
Professor Emerita
Dept of Anthropology
California State University, Los Angeles

[Reply](#) [Reply All](#) [Forward](#) [Chat](#)

Proposed Language for Tribal cultural Resources Update to Appendix G

Martz, Patricia [pmartz@calstatela.edu]

To: [CEQA Guidelines@CNRA](mailto:CEQA.Guidelines@CNRA)

Cc: tattnlaw@gmail.com

Saturday, June 04, 2016 2:09 PM

Dear Heather,

I wish to clarify my previous comment. My concern is the requirement that the site be listed in the California Register of historic Resources, or in a local register as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1, which refers to a local register by a local government. It should also include the Sacred Lands Inventory kept by the Native American Heritage Commission and sites that are considered by a reliable tribal representative as a Traditional Cultural Property or Landscape.

2-1.1

Sincerely,

Patricia Martz, Ph.D.