

4.3 Cultural Resources

This Section of the EIR evaluates potential impacts to cultural resources, including archaeological resources, as well as the inadvertent discovery of human remains, that could result from implementation of the Project and identifies measures to reduce or avoid significant impacts. The evaluation of cultural resources is based on the Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by BCR Consulting LLC on May 23, 2024 contained in **Appendix C, Cultural Resources Assessment**.

4.3.1 Regulatory Setting

Federal

Preservation Act and National Register of Historic Places

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA)(16 U.S.C. ch. 1A, subch. II; § 470), established the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) as “an authoritative guide to be used by federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s historic resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.” The National Register recognizes a broad range of cultural resources that are significant at the national, State, and local levels and can include districts, buildings, structures, objects, prehistoric archaeological sites, historic-period archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and cultural landscapes. A resource that is listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register is considered “historic property” under Section 106 of the NHPA. Section 106 of the NHPA also requires federal agencies to consult with State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) and Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) if their projects have the potential to affect a historic resource eligible for or listed on the National Register. The National Register identifies more than 98,000 properties as possessing exceptional national significance in American history and culture.

Criteria

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a resource must be at least 50 years of age, unless it is of exceptional importance as defined in Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), part 60, section 60.4(g). The resource must also be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. The following four criteria for evaluation of eligibility for listing have been established to determine the significance of a resource. A property is eligible for listing if:

- A. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B. It is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- C. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;
or
- D. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Context

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must be significant within a historic context. National Register Bulletin #15 states that the significance of a historic property can be judged only when it is evaluated within its historic context. Historic contexts are “those patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific...property or site is understood and its meaning...is made clear.” A property must represent an important aspect of the area’s history or prehistory and possess the requisite integrity to qualify for the National Register.

Integrity

In addition to meeting one or more of the criteria of significance, a property must have integrity, which is defined as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.” The National Register recognizes seven qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. The seven factors that define integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain historic integrity a property must possess several, and usually most, of these seven aspects. Thus, the retention of the specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. In general, the National Register has a higher integrity threshold than state or local registers.

Criteria Considerations

Certain types of properties, including religious properties, moved properties, birthplaces or graves, cemeteries, reconstructed properties, commemorative properties, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years are not considered eligible for the National Register unless they meet one of the seven categories of Criteria Considerations A through G, in addition to meeting at least one of the four significance criteria and possess integrity, as defined above. Criteria Consideration G is intended to prevent the listing of properties for which insufficient time may have passed to allow the proper evaluation of their historical importance. The full list of Criteria Considerations is provided below:

- A. A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or
- B. A building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
- C. A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance, if there is no other appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life; or
- D. A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
- E. A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
- F. A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own historical significance; or
- G. A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards

The National Park Service (NPS) issued the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Secretary's Standards) with accompanying guidelines for four types of treatments for historic resources: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. The most applicable guidelines should be used when evaluating a project for compliance with the Secretary's Standards. Although none of the four treatments, as a whole, apply specifically to new construction in the vicinity of historic resources, Standards #9 and #10 of the Secretary's Standards provides relevant guidance for such projects. The Standards for Rehabilitation are as follows:

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

It is important to note that the Secretary's Standards are not intended to be prescriptive but, instead, provide general guidance. They are intended to be flexible and adaptable to specific project conditions to balance continuity and change, while retaining materials and features to the maximum extent feasible. Their interpretation requires exercising professional judgment and balancing the various opportunities and constraints of any given project. Not every Standard

necessarily applies to every aspect of a project, and it is not necessary for a project to comply with every Standard to achieve compliance.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)(25 U.S.C. ch. 32 § 3001 *et seq.*) provides for the protection of Native American human remains and funerary and cultural objects and requires federal agencies to return Native American cultural items to the appropriate federally recognized Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian groups with which they are associated.¹

Archaeological Resources Protection Act

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA)(16 U.S.C. §§ 470aa - 470mm) governs the excavation, removal, and disposition of archaeological sites and collections on federal and Native American lands. The ARPA defines archaeological resources as any material remains of human life or activities that are at least 100 years of age, and which are of archeological interest. The ARPA makes it illegal for anyone to excavate, remove, sell, purchase, exchange, or transport an archaeological resource from federal or Native American lands without a proper permit.²

Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974

The Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (AHPA)(54 U.S.C. §§ 312501-312508) requires agencies to report any perceived project impacts on archaeological, historical, and scientific data and requires them to recover such data or assist the Secretary of the Interior in recovering the data.

State

California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)(Pub. Res. Code § 21000 *et seq.*) is the principal statute governing environmental review of projects occurring in the State. CEQA requires lead agencies to determine if a Project would have a significant effect on the environment, including significant effects on historical or unique archaeological resources. Under CEQA Section 21084.1, a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines a “historic resource” as including the following:

- (1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 *et seq.*).
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the

¹ NPS, Native American Graves Protection And Repatriation Act, 1990.

² NPS, Technical Brief # 20: Archeological Damage Assessment: Legal Basis and Methods, February 2007, https://www.nps.gov/subjects/archeology/upload/tchBrf20_508.pdf. Accessed August 1, 2024.

preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

(3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses

high artistic values; or

(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

If a lead agency determines that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 apply. If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria for a historical resource contained in the CEQA Guidelines, then the site may be treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083 if it meets the criteria of a unique archaeological resource. As defined in PRC Section 21083.2, a unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site, about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

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

If an archaeological site meets the criteria for a unique archaeological resource as defined in PRC Section 21083.2, then the site is to be treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083.2, which state that if the lead agency determines that a project would have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place.³ If preservation in place is not feasible, mitigation measures shall be required. The CEQA Guidelines note that if an

³ California Public Resources Code Section 21083.1(a).

archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment.⁴

A significant effect under CEQA would occur if a project results in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). Substantial adverse change is defined as “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.”⁵ According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2), the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that:

- A. Convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or
- B. Account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to PRC Section 5020.1(k) or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g) Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- C. Convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a Lead Agency for purposes of CEQA.

In general, a project that complies with the Secretary’s Standards is considered to have impacts that are less than significant.⁶

California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register)(Pub. Res. Code § 5024.1) is “an authoritative listing and guide to be used by State and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the State and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” The California Register was established in 1993, and its regulations became effective on January 1, 1998. The California Register is administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). The criteria for eligibility for the California Register are based upon National Register criteria. Certain resources are determined to be automatically included in the California Register, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in the National Register. To be eligible for the California Register, a prehistoric or historic-period property must be significant at the local, State, and/or federal level under one or more of the following four criteria:

- 1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
- 2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- 3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- 4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

⁴ State CEQA Statute and Guidelines, Section 15064.5(c)(4).

⁵ State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(b)(1).

⁶ State CEQA Guidelines, 15064.5(b)(3).

A resource eligible for the California Register must meet one of the criteria of significance described above and retain enough of its historic character or appearance (integrity) to be recognizable as a historical resource and to convey the reason for its significance. It is possible that a historic resource may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but it may still be eligible for listing in the California Register. Additionally, the California Register consists of resources that are listed automatically and those that must be nominated through an application and public hearing process. The California Register automatically includes the following:

- California properties listed on the National Register and those formally determined eligible for the National Register;
- California Registered Historical Landmarks from No. 770 onward; and,
- Those California Points of Historical Interest that have been evaluated by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and have been recommended to the State Historical Resources Commission for inclusion on the California Register.

Other resources that may be nominated to the California Register include:

- Historical resources with a significance rating of Category 3 through 5 (those properties identified as eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, and/or a local jurisdiction register);
- Individual historical resources;
- Historic districts; and,
- Historical resources designated or listed as local landmarks, or designated under any local ordinance, such as an historic preservation overlay zone.

California Health and Safety Code

California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5, 7051, and 7054 address the illegality of interference with human burial remains (except as allowed under applicable sections of the Public Resources Code), and the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites. These regulations protect such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction, and establish procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction of a project, including treatment of the remains prior to, during, and after evaluation, and reburial procedures.

California Public Resources Code

Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, as amended by Assembly Bill 2641, provides procedures in the event human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project implementation. Section 5097.98 requires that no further disturbances occur in the immediate vicinity of the discovery, that the discovery is adequately protected according to generally accepted cultural and archaeological standards, and that further activities consider the possibility of multiple burials. Section 5097.98 further requires the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), upon notification by a County Coroner, designate and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) regarding the discovery of Native American human remains. Once the MLD has been granted access to the site by the landowner and inspected the discovery, the MLD then has 48 hours to provide recommendations to the landowner for the treatment of the human remains and any associated grave goods. In the event that no descendant is identified, or the descendant fails

to make a recommendation for disposition, or if the landowner rejects the recommendation of the descendant, the landowner may, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains and burial items on the property in a location that will not be subject to further disturbance.

4.3.2 Environmental Setting

The Cultural Resources Assessment prepared for the Project Site was completed on May 23, 2024 by BCR Consulting, LLC, and is included in **Appendix C**. The following sections include a summary of description of the environmental setting.

Existing Conditions

The Project Site is currently developed with a seven-story office building and three levels of subterranean parking built in 1981. The existing office building is approximately 120,000 sf of which 109,600 sf is currently leased (as of January 2024). The western side of the Project Site adjacent to Clark Avenue includes a surface parking lot, driveway, and landscaping. The Project Site is bounded by the Pacific Coast Highway to the north and east, East Anaheim Street to the south, and Clark Avenue to the west. There is signage for the existing office building on the northern corner of the Project Site along Pacific Coast Highway. The Project Site is surrounded by commercial, office, residential, and religious uses to the north and east past the Pacific Coast Highway; Recreational Park Golf Course 18 to the south; and commercial and residential uses to the west.

Natural Setting

The local geologic region coincides with the physiographic area known as the Los Angeles Basin. It is characterized as a transverse-oriented lowland basin and coastal plain approximately 50 miles long and 20 miles wide. The basin originated as a deep marine trough during the Pliocene (7-2 million years ago) that eventually filled with shallow water fossil bearing sediments. By the beginning of the Pleistocene (after 2 million years ago), uplifting created the series of plains and mesas along the coast that now characterize the area. Local rainfall ranges from 5 to 15 inches annually. Local vegetation communities are naturally dominated by coastal sage scrub and riparian vegetation, although urbanization prevents its proliferation in much of the Project area.

Historic Setting

The Project Site is located within the traditional boundaries of the Gabrielino (or Tongva) Native Americans. The Gabrielino name has been attributed by association with the Spanish mission of San Gabriel and refers to a subset of people sharing speech and customs with other Cupan speakers (such as the Juaneño/Ajachemem) from the greater Takic branch of the Uto-Aztecan language family. The Gabrielino were semi-nomadic hunter-gatherers who subsisted by exploitation of seasonably available plant and animal resources.

Spanish Period

The area that would become Long Beach was first explored by Europeans in the late 18th century, with the arrival of Spanish explorers and missionaries. The Mission San Gabriel was set up in 1771 in what today is the City of San Gabriel, located approximately 21 miles north of the Project Site.

Mexican Period

In 1821, Mexico overthrew Spanish rule and the missions began to decline. By 1833, the Mexican government passed the Secularization Act, and the missions, reorganized as parish churches, lost their vast land holdings, and released their neophytes.

American Period

The American Period, beginning in 1848 and extending to the present day, began with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. In 1850, California was accepted into the Union of the United States primarily due to the population increase created by the Gold Rush of 1849. The cattle industry reached its greatest prosperity during the first years of the American Period. Mexican Period land grants had created large pastoral estates in California, and demand for beef during the Gold Rush led to a cattle boom that lasted from 1849 to 1855. However, beginning about 1855, the demand for beef began to decline due to imports of sheep from New Mexico and cattle from the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys. When the beef market collapsed, many California ranchers lost their ranchos through foreclosure. A series of disastrous floods in 1861 and 1862, followed by a significant drought further diminished the economic impact of local ranching. This decline combined with ubiquitous agricultural and real estate developments of the late 19th century, set the stage for diversified economic pursuits that continue to this day.

Local Sequence

The Long Beach area was part of the Spanish-era Rancho Los Nietos (originally called La Zanja) granted in 1784 to Jose Manuel Nieto, a soldier from San Diego. The property included 300,000 acres of land that stretched south from the present-day City of Whittier to the Pacific Ocean. It was eventually cut in half due to claims by the priests of San Gabriel that it encroached on Mission lands. Nieto retired from the Spanish Military in 1795 to focus on ranching activities until his death in 1804. His widow and five children inherited the property, and it was managed by his oldest son Juan Jose. When Mexico gained independence, Rancho Los Nietos was divided among the family into five smaller ranchos: Santa Gertrudes, Las Bolsas, Los Alamitos, Los Cerritos, and Los Coyotes. Within the next 10 years all had been sold outside the Nieto family. In 1844 Los Cerritos (which contained the project area) was sold to John “Don Juan” Temple, a successful American merchant who came to California and married a Spanish-Californian wife. Temple retained the ranch when California was ceded to the U.S. and continued to manage operations on the property until the drought of the 1860s decimated his herd. He sold the property to an American firm called Flint, Bixby, & Co. in 1866 and Jotham Bixby purchased it from the firm for his family in 1869. The Bixbys initially raised sheep, but in the late 19th century they began to sell parcels to the growing American immigrant population. Four thousand acres were purchased by William E. Willmore, who attempted to develop a farm community named Willmore City. Willmore failed and the land was subsequently purchased by the Long Beach Land and Water Company, who named the community Long Beach.

The City of Long beach was incorporated in 1897 and a modern economy began to take shape. During the early 20th century local commerce was led by resort-based businesses and farming, but by the 1940s the oil industry, Navy facilities, and port dominated the scene. The development of these industries between 1921 and 1936 tripled the Long Beach population and highlighted the need for major infrastructure improvements to the Port of Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles. Flood control efforts during the 1930s rerouted the Los Angeles River from one-half east to its current location along the Project Site’s western boundary, enabling development of land previously prone to flooding. In 1933, a 6.4 earthquake destroyed many of the City’s masonry buildings and disabled local natural gas utilities. The damage prompted Long Beach to adopt stricter construction codes, and the revitalization efforts resulted in many new Art Deco or

Streamline Moderne style buildings which remain visible in much of today's cityscape. More ubiquitous local trends of the 1930s brought housing shortages which, in combination with the Great Depression, prompted the County of Los Angeles to create a housing authority. This new organization was responsible for Southern California's first affordable housing complex in Long Beach, known as the Carmelitos Housing Project. The project was completed in 1939 and included 67 buildings on 50 acres, all of which were inhabited within a year. This initial success led to the development of the Ramona Gardens and Harbor Hills complexes, both completed in 1941. Like many port cities, World War II brought a bustling military industry to Long Beach which caused significant economic boosts, as well as ethnic upheaval. A large Japanese population on Terminal Island was subject to internment during the war and despite the efforts mentioned above, the continuing housing shortage displaced many Greek and Portuguese immigrants. At the same time the African American population of Long Beach expanded considerably as part of the most consequential years of the Great Migration from the rural south. After the war, many veterans moved to Long Beach prompting privately-funded development of new residential neighborhoods as well as corresponding infrastructure and expanded City services. These population pressures served to erase most traces of orchards, dairies, and other agricultural developments from the early part of the century. The trends, markedly visible throughout much of California, were decidedly magnified in Long Beach. As the population continued to grow and diversify, civil rights activists and lawmakers teamed up to enact legislation and policies to encourage more fair access to housing and services. Expansion into the Bixby Knolls and North Long Beach areas followed along with 9.8 square miles of land annexation, most of which was allotted for new subdivisions and residential in-fill throughout the City. Expansion included more intensive use and development of municipal City properties evidenced by a master plan for parks, shoreline, and city beautification (adopted in 1954) and by more utilitarian developments such as municipal facilities, including the subject property. Growth slowed during the 1960s and did not resume significantly until the 1980s. By this time new residents from Southeast Asia, Mexico, and Central and Latin America immigrated to Long Beach expanding the population from 361,344 in 1980 to 461,257 in 2010. The accompanying redevelopment again began to reshape the City's appearance and six blocks in downtown were demolished for new construction projects. Late-century developments include the construction of the Aquarium of the Pacific, and adaptive reuse of many old buildings and structures for commercial and residential purposes that continues today. The local economy has gone from an oil and military emphasis during World War II, diversifying to include aerospace and other industries after the war. In spite of significant reductions, Boeing remains the largest private employer in the City. In the last 20 years, electronics, health care, and entertainment businesses have added to the diversifying economy.

4.3.3 Impact Analysis

Methodology

Research conducted for the Cultural Resources Assessment was completed pursuant to CEQA, the Public Resources Code (PRC) Chapter 2.6, Section 21083.2, and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5.

Records Search

BCR Consulting LLC completed the cultural resources records search on March 11, 2024, at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) using information on file at California State University, Fullerton. This archival research reviewed the status of all recorded historic and prehistoric cultural resources and survey and excavation reports completed within 0.5-mile of the Project Site. Additional resources reviewed include the Built Environment Resources Directory

(BERD) which consists of properties evaluated for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), lists of California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and the Inventory of Historic Structures.

Field Survey

A pedestrian cultural resources field survey was conducted to locate and document previously recorded or new cultural resources, including archaeological sites, features, isolates, and historic-period buildings, that exceed 45 years in age within the Project Site. An intensive-level cultural resources field survey of the Project Site was conducted on March 25, 2024. The survey was conducted by walking parallel transects spaced approximately 15 meters apart across the entire Project Site, where accessible. Digital photographs were taken at various points within the Project Site. These included overviews as well as detail photographs of all cultural resources.

Thresholds of Significance

The following significance criteria are based on currently adopted guidance provided by Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. For the purposes of this report, an impact would be potentially significant if the Project results in or causes any one of the following:

- A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5.
- A substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5.
- Disturbance to any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

As discussed in the Initial Study, provided in **Appendix A** of this EIR, and in **Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations**, the Project would have no impact related to historical resources. The existing office building is not listed in the National Register or CRHR, and the Project would not have a direct or indirect impact on historical resources. As such, no further analysis of this topic in this section is necessary.

Project Impacts

Threshold CUL-2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Impact CUL-2: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

The Cultural Resources Assessment prepared for the Project Site indicates that the records search and field survey did not yield any cultural resources within the Project Site boundaries. Project Site conditions failed to indicate sensitivity for buried archaeological resources due to the Project Site's severely disturbed state associated with excavation, grading, and construction of the existing office building.

Additionally, a Sacred Lands File Search conducted with the NAHC resulted in positive findings. The NAHC recommended contacting the Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians for more information.

Construction activities for the Project would involve minimal demolition and excavation. However, earthwork activities could uncover previously known or unknown historical or archaeological resources. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1, Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Resource**, would provide a process for treatment of any archaeological resources inadvertently discovered during Project implementation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, requiring a cessation of construction activity, notification to the City, and consultation with a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the site and make the necessary findings, would reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources to less than significant.

Threshold CUL-3: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Impact CUL-3: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

As discussed in Threshold CUL-2 above, the Cultural Resources Assessment indicates that Project Site conditions failed to indicate sensitivity for buried archaeological resources due to the Project Site's severely disturbed state associated with excavation, grading, and construction of the existing office building.

Construction activities for the Project would involve minimal demolition and excavation. However, earthwork activities could uncover previously known or unknown human remains. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-2, Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains**, requiring a cessation of construction activity until the County coroner can evaluate the discovery and made the necessary findings, would provide a process for treatment of any human remains inadvertently discovered during Project implementation. With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

The geographic scope of the cumulative cultural resources analysis is the Project Site and surrounding area. Impacts to cultural resources are generally site-specific because the integrity of any specific cultural resource is often dependent upon the activities occurring in its immediate vicinity. As discussed in the Initial Study of this EIR, and **Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations**, the existing office building is not listed in the National Register or CRHR, and the Project would not have a direct or indirect impact on historical resources. Accordingly, the Project would not contribute cumulatively to impacts to historic resources.

Section 3.3, Cumulative Development, identifies no related projects within an approximately 1-mile radius of the Project Site that are planned, under construction, or have been recently completed. As discussed in discussion of Impact CUL-2 and Impact CUL-3, the Project would implement Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 and comply with applicable regulations pertaining to the inadvertent discovery and proper treatment of these resources. This would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. Likewise, any projects in the City of Long Beach would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations pertaining to these resources. As there are no cumulative projects identified within an approximately 1-mile radius of the Project Site, cumulative impacts related to Cultural Resources are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-1, Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Resources: In the event that any subsurface cultural resources are encountered at the Project Site during construction or the

course of any ground disturbance activities, all such activities within 50 feet of the discovery shall halt immediately. The applicant shall notify the City and consult with a Secretary of Interior qualified archaeologist who shall evaluate the find in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in the California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and shall determine the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant, appropriate avoidance measures recommended by the consultant and approved by the City must be followed unless avoidance is determined to be unnecessary or infeasible by the City. If avoidance is unnecessary or infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery, excavation) shall be instituted. For any resources of Native American origin, the City shall also contact the Tribes that elected to consult on the Project to identify its potential as a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR). Should the resource, in consultation between the City and Tribe(s), be determined a TCR, the City shall also consult with Tribes regarding avoidance, or other measures recommended by the consultant. All identified cultural resources will be recorded on appropriate CA DPR 523 series forms and evaluated for significance. All records will be submitted to the City of Long Beach, Consulting Tribe(s), and South-Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).

Mitigation Measure CUL-2, Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains: If human remains are encountered during the undertaking, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Project-specific and cumulative impacts related to cultural resources would be less than significant with implementation of **MM CUL-1** and **MM CUL-2**.