

## 4.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The information and analysis presented in this section is based on a Cultural Resources Study prepared for the proposed project by Rincon Consultants, Inc. in June 2015, included as Appendix C of this EIR.

### 4.3.1 Setting

#### a. Historical Background.

Prehistory. The project site is located in the southern coastal region of California (Jones and Klar 2007). Wallace (1955, 1978) devised a prehistoric chronology for the southern California coastal region which has been modified and improved by researchers over recent decades (Byrd and Raab 2007; Koerper and Drover 1983; Koerper et al. 2002; Mason and Peterson 1994). The chronological sequence is generally divided into four periods: Early Man, Milling Stone, Intermediate, and Late Prehistoric. The Early Man Horizon (ca. 10,000-6,000 B.C.) is represented by numerous sites identified along the mainland coast and Channel Islands (c.f., Erlandson 1991; Johnson et al. 2002; Jones and Klar 2007; Moratto 1984; Rick et al. 2001). Early Man Horizon sites are generally associated with a greater emphasis on hunting than later horizons, though recent data indicates that the economy was a diverse mixture of hunting and gathering, including a significant focus on aquatic resources (Jones and Klar 2007). The Millingstone Period, (6000-3000 B.C.), is characterized by an ecological adaptation to collecting suggested by the appearance and abundance of well-made milling implements (Wallace 1955; Jones and Klar 2007). A broad spectrum of food resources were consumed, including small and large terrestrial mammals, sea mammals, birds, shellfish, fishes, and other littoral and estuarine species, yucca, agave, seeds, and other plant products (Reinman 1964; Kowta 1969). The Intermediate Horizon (3000 B.C. - A.D. 500) is characterized by a shift toward a hunting and maritime subsistence strategy. A noticeable trend occurred toward greater adaptation to local resources including a broad variety of fish, land mammal, and sea mammal along the coast. Tool kits for hunting, fishing, and processing food and other resources reflect this increased diversity, with flake scrapers, drills, various projectile points, and shell fishhooks being manufactured. An increase in mortars and pestles became more common, indicating an increasing reliance on acorn (Glassow et al. 1988; True 1993). The Late Prehistoric Horizon (A.D. 500 - Historic Contact) saw further increase in the diversity of food resources (Wallace 1955, 1978). More classes of artifacts were observed during this period and high quality exotic lithic materials were used for small, finely worked projectile points associated with the bow and arrow (Wallace 1955).

Ethnography. The project site lies within an area traditionally occupied by the Native American group known as the Gabrielino. The name Gabrielino was applied by the Spanish to those natives that were attached to Mission San Gabriel (Bean and Smith 1978). Today, most contemporary Gabrielino prefer to identify themselves as Tongva (King 1994). Tongva territory included the Los Angeles basin and southern Channel Islands as well as the coast from Aliso Creek in the south to Topanga Creek in the north (Bean and Smith 1978). The Tongva language belongs to the Takic branch of the Uto-Aztecan language family, which can be traced to the Great Basin region (Mithun 2004).



The Tongva established large permanent villages and smaller satellite camps throughout their territory. Society was organized along patrilineal non-localized clans, a common Takic pattern (O’Neil 2002). Tongva subsistence was oriented around acorns supplemented by roots, leaves, seeds, and fruits of a wide variety of plants. Meat sources included large and small mammals, freshwater and saltwater fish, shellfish, birds, reptiles, and insects (Bean and Smith 1978; Langenwalter et al. 2001; Kroeber 1925; McCawley 1996). Tongva employed a wide variety of tools and implements to gather and hunt food. The digging stick, the bow and arrow, traps, nets, blinds, throwing sticks and slings, spears, harpoons, and hooks were common tools. Like the Chumash, the Tongva made oceangoing plank canoes (known as *ti’at*) capable of holding 6 to 14 people and used for fishing, travel, and trade between the mainland and the Channel Islands (Blackburn 1963; McCawley 1996).

History. Spanish exploration of California began when Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo led the first European expedition into the region in 1542. For more than 200 years after his initial expedition, Spanish, Portuguese, British, and Russian explorers sailed the California coast and made limited inland expeditions, but they did not establish permanent settlements (Bean 1968, Rolle 2003). In 1769, Gaspar de Portolá and Franciscan Father Junipero Serra established the first Spanish settlement in what was then known as Alta (upper) California at Mission San Diego de Alcalá. This was the first of 21 missions erected by the Spanish between 1769 and 1823. It was during this time that initial Spanish settlement of the project vicinity began.

On September 8, 1771, Fathers Pedro Cambón and Angel Somera established the Mission San Gabriel de Arcángel near the present-day city of Montebello (Johnson et al. 1972). In 1775, the mission was moved to its current location in the City of San Gabriel due to better agricultural lands. The establishment of Mission San Gabriel marked the first sustained European occupation of the Los Angeles Basin. The mission, despite a slow start partially due to misconduct by Spanish soldiers, eventually became so prosperous it was known as “The Queen of the Missions” (Johnson et al. 1972).

In addition to Mission San Gabriel, the Spanish also established a pueblo (town) in the Los Angeles Basin known as El Pueblo de la Reina de los Angeles de la Porciúncula in 1781. This pueblo was one of only three pueblos established in Alta California and eventually became the City of Los Angeles (Robinson 1979). It was also during this period that the Spanish crown began to deed ranchos to prominent citizens and soldiers. To manage and expand their herds of cattle on these large ranchos, colonists enlisted the labor of the surrounding Native American population (Engelhardt 1927a). Native populations were also affected by the missions who were responsible for their administration as well as converting the population to Christianity (Engelhardt 1927b). The increased European presence during this period led to the spread of disease which devastated the native populations (McCawley 1996). In 1784, the Spanish King Carlos III granted Manuel Nieto the Rancho Los Nietos land grant. This grant was one of the first and largest of the land grants and encompassed much of present day Los Angeles and Orange counties (Shumway 2007).

The Mexican Period commenced when news of the success of the Mexican War of Independence (1810-1821) against the Spanish crown reached California in 1822. This period saw the privatization of mission lands in California with the passage of the Secularization Act of 1833. This Act federalized mission lands and enabled Mexican governors in California to distribute former mission lands to individuals in the form of land grants. Successive Mexican



governors made more than 700 land grants between 1822 and 1846, putting most of the state's lands into private ownership for the first time (Shumway 2007). In 1834, Governor Jose Figueroa declared the Rancho Los Nietos grant to be partitioned into six smaller ranchos. The Long Beach area was divided into two land grants, Rancho Los Cerritos and Rancho Los Alamitos, the boundary for these two grants was Signal Hill (Stewart 2013). The Rancho Los Cerritos grant was located on the western side of the boundary and included the current project site. Later in 1834, Jonathon Temple purchased the Los Cerritos land grant. During this time, the population of the pueblo of Los Angeles nearly doubled, rising from 650 to 1,250 between 1822 and 1845 (Weber 1982). In 1842, gold was discovered by Francisco Lopez in Placerita Canyon on a rancho associated with Mission San Fernando (Guinn 1977, Workman 1935).

The Mexican Period for the Los Angeles region ended in early January 1847. Mexican forces fought and lost to combined U.S. Army and Navy forces in the Battle of the San Gabriel River on January 8 and in the Battle of La Mesa on January 9 (Nevin 1978). On January 10, leaders of the pueblo of Los Angeles surrendered peacefully after Mexican General Jose Maria Flores withdrew his forces. Shortly thereafter, newly appointed Mexican Military Commander of California Andrés Pico surrendered all of Alta California to U.S. Army Lieutenant Colonel John C. Fremont in the Treaty of Cahuenga (Nevin 1978).

The American Period officially began with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, in which the United States agreed to pay Mexico \$15 million for conquered territory including California, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Wyoming. Settlement of the Los Angeles region increased dramatically in the early American Period. Los Angeles County was established on February 18, 1850, one of 27 counties established in the months prior to California becoming the 31st state.

The discovery of gold in northern California in 1848 led to the California Gold Rush, despite the aforementioned 1842 discovery in Placerita Canyon (Guinn 1977, Workman 1935). By 1853, the population of California exceeded 300,000. Thousands of settlers and immigrants continued to immigrate to the state, particularly after the completion of the First Transcontinental Railroad in 1869. The U.S. Congress in 1854 agreed to let San Pedro become an official port of entry. By the 1880s, the railroads had established networks from the port and throughout the county, resulting in fast and affordable shipment of goods, as well as a means to transport new residents to the booming region (Dumke 1944). New residents included many health-seekers drawn to the area by the fabled climate in the 1870s-1880s.

Many ranchos in Los Angeles County were sold or otherwise acquired by Americans in the mid-1800s, and most were subdivided into agricultural parcels or towns. Nonetheless, ranching retained its importance and, by the late 1860s, Los Angeles was one of the top dairy production centers in the West (Rolle 2003). By 1876, the county had a population of 30,000 (Dumke 1944). Ranching was supplanted by farming and urban professions during the late nineteenth century due to droughts and increased population growth.

European settlement of what was later to become the City of Long Beach began as early as 1784 as part of a land grant given to Manuel Nieto that became Rancho Los Nietos (Shumway 2007). After Nieto's death in 1804 much of the land grant remained intact and was managed by his heirs. In 1834, however the Governor declared Rancho Los Nietos should be divided into six smaller ranchos. Two of these ranchos form the majority of what is now the City of Long Beach.



The current project site is within former Rancho Los Cerritos lands, which was inherited by Nieto's daughter Manuela Cota. Following Manuela's death, Rancho Los Cerritos was sold to Jonathan Temple, a Los Angeles entrepreneur (City of Long Beach 2010).

During the 1860s, a massive drought decimated much of the cattle ranching in the Long Beach area causing several ranches to fall into debt (Stewart 2013). In 1866, Temple sold Rancho Los Cerritos to Thomas and Benjamin Flint and Lewellyn Bixby. The Bixby family bought Rancho Los Alamitos, combining the two and forming the Bixby Ranch. Beginning in the 1870s, Flint, Bixby, and Co., began selling the land. By 1884, Long Beach, then known as both the American Colony and Wilmore City, covered the southwestern portion of Rancho Los Cerritos. The failed Wilmore City development was purchased in 1884 by Pomeroy and Mills, a San Francisco real-estate company, and the community began to grow under its new name of Long Beach. Expansion of transportation networks sparked further growth and in 1888 Long Beach was incorporated as a city with a population of 800. Long Beach became a major producer of oil beginning in the 1920s with the drilling of the Signal Hill Oil Field. By 1950 the field produced more than 750 million barrels of crude, averaging more than 500,000 barrels of oil per acre, making it one of the richest oil fields in terms of production per acre in the world (Franks and Lambert 1985). Long Beach also became a tourist destination, transportation center, and shipping industry hub with the construction of the wharf and multiple piers. Today, Long Beach has the busiest port on the West Coast, just east of the former port of San Pedro (now the Port of Los Angeles) and is one of the most populous cities in California (City of Long Beach, 2010).

#### **b. Regulatory Setting.**

##### State.

*California Register of Historical Resources.* The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register, or CRHR) is a guide to cultural resources that must be considered when a government agency undertakes a discretionary action subject to CEQA. The California Register helps government agencies identify, evaluate, and protect California's historical resources, and indicates which properties are to be protected from substantial adverse change (Pub. Resources Code, Section 5024.1(a)). The California Register is administered through the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO), which is part of the California State Parks system.

A cultural resource is evaluated under four California Register criteria to determine its historical significance. A resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level in accordance with one or more of the following criteria set forth in the *CEQA Guidelines* at Section 15064.5(a)(3):

1. *It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of California's history and cultural heritage;*
2. *It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;*
3. *It 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. *It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*



In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, the California Register requires that sufficient time must have passed to allow a “scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource.” Fifty years is used as a general estimate of the time needed to understand the historical importance of a resource according to SHPO publications. The California Register also requires a resource to possess integrity, which is defined as “the authenticity of a historical resource’s physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance. Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.” Archaeological resources can sometimes qualify as “historical resources” [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(c)(1)]. In addition, Public Resources Code Section 5024 requires consultation with SHPO when a project may impact historical resources located on State-owned land.

Two other programs are administered by the state: California Historical Landmarks and California “Points of Historical Interest.” California Historical Landmarks are buildings, sites, features, or events that are of statewide significance and have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other historical value. California Points of Historical Interest are buildings, sites, features, or events that are of local (city or county) significance and have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other historical value.

*Native American Consultation.* Prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005, Government Code Sections 65352.3 and 65352.4 require a city or county to consult with local Native American tribes that are on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission. The purpose is to preserve or mitigate impacts to places, features, and objects described in Public Resources Code Sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 (Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine located on public property) that are located within a city or county’s jurisdiction. The proposed project does not require a general plan amendment.

*Human Remains.* Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered has determined whether or not the remains are subject to the coroner’s authority. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 directs the lead agency (or applicant), under certain circumstances, to develop an agreement with the Native Americans for the treatment and disposition of the remains.

*Public Resources Code Section 5097.5.* California Public Resources Code Section 5097.5 prohibits excavation or removal of any “vertebrate paleontological site...or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands.” Public lands are



defined to include lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of the state or any city, county, district, authority or public corporation, or any agency thereof. Section 5097.5 states that any unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, historical, or paleontological materials or sites located on public lands is a misdemeanor.

*CEQA.* CEQA requires that historical resources and unique archaeological resources be taken into consideration during the CEQA review process (Public Resources Code, Section 21083.2). If feasible, adverse effects to the significance of historical resources must be avoided, or significant effects mitigated [CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(4)].

CEQA requires a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on historical resources (Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21084.1). A *historical resource* is a resource listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the CRHR; a resource included in a local register of historical resources; or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[a][1-3]).

A resource shall be considered historically significant if it meets any of the following 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.

According to CEQA, all buildings constructed over 50 years ago and that possess architectural or historical significance may be considered potential historic resources. Most resources must meet the 50-year threshold for historic significance; however, resources less than 50 years in age may be eligible for listing on the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand their historical importance.

#### Local.

*City of Long Beach General Plan.* The Historic Preservation Element of the Long Beach 2030 General Plan includes goals and policies to protect archaeological and historical resources. The goals and policies applicable to the proposed project are presented below.

Goal 1                      *Maintain and support a comprehensive, citywide historic preservation program to identify and protect Long Beach's historic, cultural, and archaeological resources.*

Policy 1.1                      *The City shall comply with City, State, and Federal historic preservation regulations to ensure adequate protection of the City's cultural, historic, and archaeological resources.*



- Policy 1.2      *The City shall maintain its status as a Certified Local Government (CLG) and ensure that CLG requirements are implemented as the key components of the City's historic preservation program.*
- Policy 1.4      *The City shall use public input to help shape the historic preservation program.*
- Goal 2          *Protect historic resources from demolition and inappropriate alterations through the use of the City's regulatory framework, technical assistance, and incentives.*
- Policy 2.5      *The City shall enforce historic preservation codes and regulations.*
- Policy 2.6      *The City shall implement and promote incentives for historic preservation.*
- Policy 2.7      *The City shall encourage and support public, quasi-public, and private entities in local preservation efforts, including the designation of historic resources and the preservation of designated resources.*
- Goal 5          *Integrate historic preservation policies into City's community development, economic development, and sustainable-city strategies.*
- Policy 5.2      *The City shall consider historic preservation as a basis for neighborhood improvement and community development.*
- Policy 5.3      *The City shall consider historic preservation goals and policies when making community and economic development decisions and determining sustainable-city strategies.*
- Policy 5.7      *The City shall promote historic preservation as a sustainable land use practice.*

**c. Existing Conditions.**

Cultural. A records search was conducted for the project site at the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton. Seven cultural resources have been previously recorded and mapped within 0.25 mile of the project site. One resource is an historic archaeological site and six are historic built environment resources; none of these are located within the project site. As indicated by CHRIS, an additional 48 unmapped properties are located within 0.25 mile of the project site, and consist of historic-era buildings, structures, and objects. Of the 56 total previously recorded cultural resources, three are listed in the NRHP, four have been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and are listed in CRHR, seven appear eligible for listing in the NRHP, one is recommended eligible for the CRHR, and 25 are recognized as historically significant by the City.

Eleven cultural resources studies have been previously conducted within 0.25 mile of the project site. Of these, two were conducted within at least a portion of the project site (LA-02399 and LA-10527); however, neither identified cultural resources within the project site. An additional 14 unmapped studies were also conducted within the Long Beach quadrangle. Most of these studies are overview reports encompassing very large areas and all appear to be located outside of the project site.



Although not identified in the records search, one previously recorded historic resource was identified within the project site: the Old Long Beach Courthouse building constructed in 1960 by architects Francis J. Heusel and Kenneth S. Wing. The Old Courthouse was previously evaluated and found individually eligible for historic significance on two occasions: in 2006, it was found eligible for local listing as a City of Long Beach Historic Landmark and in 2008 the property was found eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The Old Long Beach Courthouse also appears eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 1 for its association with the civic development of Long Beach. Completed in 1960 the Old Courthouse was one of the first projects of the long-awaited Civic Center Master Plan. The Old Long Beach Courthouse also appears eligible for listing in the CRHR as an individual resource under Criterion 3 within the context of the architectural evolution of Long Beach, as one of a limited number of ~~fine~~ examples of the Corporate International Style of architecture remaining in the City. The building embodies the distinctive characteristics of the Corporate International Style, and is a representative example of the style designed by local architects, Francis Heusel and Kenneth S. Wing. Despite having undergone a 60,000 square foot alteration in 1971, the building's exterior appearance still reflects its period of construction and retains a high degree of integrity of location, feeling, association, setting, design, materials and workmanship. The building has retained most of its character-defining features: curtain wall construction and glass windows inset in recliner grids, recessed first floor and use of squared columns, terrazzo floors, and windows and vertical surfaces on the same plane. ~~Completed in 1960 the Old Long Beach Courthouse was one of the first projects of the Civic Center Master Plan.~~ In addition, according to CEQA, all buildings constructed over 50 years ago and that possess architectural or historical significance may be considered potential historic resources. The Old Courthouse is now approximately 55 years in age and therefore would be considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

A Sacred Lands File search by the Native American Heritage Commission did not identify any sacred lands within the project site.

A cultural resources survey was conducted for the proposed project. The survey did not identify any surficial archaeological resources within the project site. Three additional built environment resources requiring survey and historic evaluation were identified within the project site: the City Hall-Library Complex, Lincoln Park, and the Broadway Parking Garage. Although not within the project site, the Public Safety Building located to the northwest of the project site within the Civic Center was also surveyed and evaluated due to its proximity to the project site and association with the remaining Civic Center buildings and structures on the property.

Completed in 1977 by Allied Architects, the Long Beach City Hall-Library Complex is an intact example of Late Modern architecture that retains integrity of design, materials, feeling, workmanship, association and location. The City Hall-Library Complex appears individually eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 1 for its association with the civic development of Long Beach. Designed in fulfillment of the goals of centralization outlined in the 1950s Civic Center Master Plan, the City Hall-Library Complex represents the final completed element of the project. The complex also appears eligible for individual listing ~~as an individual resource~~ under Criterion 3 as a representative example of the Late Modern-style with unique landscape design elements and as the work of a group of local master architects. The complex is one of a limited number of ~~fine~~ examples of the Late Modern Style of architecture remaining in the city.



Designed by a consortium of local architects that consisted of Hugh and Donald Gibbs, Frank Homolka, Ed Killingsworth, Brady and Associates, and Kenneth S. Wing Jr. and Sr., each considered local masters in their own right, the complex is unique for its collaborative design amongst local architects and represents the collective work of a group of masters. The Library rooftop design contributions of master landscape architect Peter Walker also contribute to the significance and eligibility of the complex. ~~Designed in fulfillment of the goals of centralization outlined in the 1950s Civic Center Master Plan, the City Hall-Library Complex represents the final completed element of the project.~~ For the same reasons, the City Hall-Library Complex is also eligible for City of Long Beach Landmark Designation. As noted under section 4.3.1 (b) "Regulatory Setting," most resources must meet the 50-year threshold for historic significance; however, resources less than 50 years in age may be eligible for listing on the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand their historical importance. Although the City Hall-Library Complex is less than 50 years in age (constructed in 1977) it is a representative example of the Late Modern-style with unique landscape design elements and as the work of a group of local master architects is eligible for listing in the CRHR and for City of Long Beach Landmark Designation. Therefore, the City Hall-Library Complex is considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

The Public Safety Building and Lincoln Park have undergone continuous alterations since their construction, significantly reducing their historic integrity. The Broadway Parking Garage is a simple structure, lacking in design and character, constructed outside of the historic district period of significance. The Public Safety Building, Lincoln Park and the Broadway Parking Garage were found to be ineligible for listing in the CRHR as individual resources.

The project site and the adjacent Public Safety Building were also assessed to determine if the buildings and structures were eligible for listing in the CRHR or at the local level as a potential historic district. While the buildings and structures within the Civic Center are all functionally related and were each designed for municipal purposes, the alterations to the Public Safety Building and Lincoln Park and construction of the Broadway Parking Garage have reduced the integrity of the site and weakened its cohesive overall identity, making it ineligible for consideration as a CRHR or locally eligible historic district.

Paleontological. The project site is located in the southwest portion of the Los Angeles Basin in the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province. The Los Angeles Basin is subdivided into the following four structural blocks: the southwestern block, the northwestern block, the central block and the northeastern block. The project site is generally located within the boundary area of the southwestern and central blocks. This boundary area is referred to as the Newport-Inglewood Structural Zone, which can be traced from Beverly Hills to Newport Bay where it trends offshore (Norris and Webb, 1990; Jennings, 1962).

A single sedimentary geologic unit has been mapped underlying the project area (Bedrossian et al. 2012): late to middle Pleistocene aged lacustrine, playa, and estuarine (paralic) sediments (Qol).

*Quaternary Geologic Units.* The Quaternary units mapped within the project site include only Pleistocene aged lacustrine, playa, and estuarine (paralic) sediments. These sediments are known to have produced significant paleontological resources (McLeod 2014). A single vertebrate fossil locality is known from within the project boundaries and three more are



known from similar deposits in the immediate vicinity (McLeod 2014). Together, these three localities produced specimens of sea lion (*Zalophus*), camel (*Camelops*), whale, bison (*Bison*), ground sloth (*Nothrotheriops*), and mammoth (*Mammuthus columbi*). Based on these occurrences and their individual find contexts, surface grading or deeper excavations have the potential to uncover significant vertebrate fossils of middle to late Pleistocene age.

*Paleontological Sensitivity.* Paleontological sensitivity refers to the potential for a geologic unit to produce scientifically significant fossils. Direct impacts to paleontological resources occur when earthwork activities, such as grading or trenching, cut into the geologic deposits (formations) within which fossils are buried and physically destroy the fossils. Since fossils are the remains of prehistoric animal and plant life, they are considered to be nonrenewable. Such impacts have the potential to be significant. Sensitivity is determined by rock type, past history of the geologic unit in producing significant fossils, and fossil localities recorded from that unit. Paleontological sensitivity is derived from the known fossil data collected from the entire geologic unit, not just from a specific survey.

Currently, two generally accepted paleontological sensitivity classifications are used: the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) system outlined in the SVP Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources (SVP, 2010) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) system outlined in the BLM Instruction Memorandum (IM) No. 2008-009 (BLM, 2009). The BLM system allows for a finer level of classification than the more general SVP system. The City of Long Beach General Plan does not provide any specific guidance on paleontological sensitivity; however, based on the geologic units present within the project site, the SVP classification system provides a sufficient level of detail for assessing paleontological sensitivity within the project site. Affected geologic formations are classified based on the relative abundance of vertebrate fossils and significant non-vertebrate fossils using a scale of high, undetermined, low and no paleontological sensitivity, depending upon the resource sensitivity of the impacted geologic formations. The specific criteria applied for each sensitivity category are presented below and extracted directly from the SVP Guidelines (SVP, 2010):

- **High Potential:** *Rock units from which vertebrate or significant invertebrate, plant, or trace fossils have been recovered are considered to have a high potential for containing additional significant paleontological resources. Rocks units classified as having high potential for producing paleontological resources include, but are not limited to, sedimentary formations and some volcanoclastic formations (e. g., ashes or tephtras), and some low-grade metamorphic rocks which contain significant paleontological resources anywhere within their geographical extent, and sedimentary rock units temporally or lithologically suitable for the preservation of fossils (e. g., middle Holocene and older, fine-grained fluvial sandstones, argillaceous and carbonate-rich paleosols, cross-bedded point bar sandstones, fine-grained marine sandstones, etc.). Paleontological potential consists of both (a) the potential for yielding abundant or significant vertebrate fossils or for yielding a few significant fossils, large or small, vertebrate, invertebrate, plant, or trace fossils and (b) the importance of recovered evidence for new and significant taxonomic, phylogenetic, paleoecologic, taphonomic, biochronologic, or stratigraphic data. Rock units which contain potentially datable organic remains older than late Holocene, including deposits associated with animal nests or middens, and rock units which may contain new vertebrate deposits, traces, or trackways are also classified as having high potential.*



- **Undetermined Potential:** Rock units for which little information is available concerning their paleontological content, geologic age, and depositional environment are considered to have undetermined potential. Further study is necessary to determine if these rock units have high or low potential to contain significant paleontological resources. A field survey by a qualified professional paleontologist to specifically determine the paleontological resource potential of these rock units is required before a paleontological resource impact mitigation program can be developed. In cases where no subsurface data are available, paleontological potential can sometimes be determined by strategically located excavations into subsurface stratigraphy.
- **Low Potential:** Reports in the paleontological literature or field surveys by a qualified professional paleontologist may allow determination that some rock units have low potential for yielding significant fossils. Such rock units will be poorly represented by fossil specimens in institutional collections, or based on general scientific consensus only preserve fossils in rare circumstances and the presence of fossils is the exception not the rule, e.g. basalt flows or Recent colluvium. Rock units with low potential typically will not require impact mitigation measures to protect fossils.
- **No Potential:** Some rock units have no potential to contain significant paleontological resources, for instance high-grade metamorphic rocks (such as gneisses and schists) and plutonic igneous rocks (such as granites and diorites). Rock units with no potential require no protection or impact mitigation measures relative to paleontological resources.

In general terms, for geologic units with high sensitivity, full-time monitoring typically is recommended during any project-related ground disturbance. For geologic units with low sensitivity, protection or salvage efforts typically are not required. For geologic units with undetermined sensitivity, field surveys by a qualified paleontologist are usually recommended to specifically determine the paleontological potential of the rock units present within the study area. For geologic units with no sensitivity, a paleontological monitor is not required. Table 4.3-1 shows the mapped geologic units within the project site, their age and paleontological sensitivity.

**Table 4.3-1  
 Geologic Units within the Project Site**

<b>Geologic Unit</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Paleontological Sensitivity (SVP)</b>
Quaternary older lacustrine, playa, and estuarine (paralic) deposits (Qol)	Quaternary	Known to produce significant fossils in southern California	High

Sources: Jennings (1962); Bedrossian et al. (2012); McDougall et al. (2012)

### 4.3.2 Previous Environmental Review

The Long Beach Downtown Plan EIR (the “Downtown Plan EIR”) examined the potentially historic resources in the Downtown Plan area. The Downtown Plan EIR determined that the Downtown Plan would have a significant but mitigable impact on archaeological resources. This determination was due to the fact that no surveys could be conducted prior to onset of demolition or other ground-disturbing activities. The project would be subject to the same general mitigation measures identified and analyzed in the Downtown Plan EIR, specifically CR-2(a) through CR-2(c), which require a qualified project archaeologist or archaeological monitor approved by the City to be present during excavation into native sediments; that the monitor shall also prepare a final report of any cultural resource finds; and that if human



remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities, proper handling procedures shall be implemented, as regulated by the State Health and Safety Code.

The Downtown Plan EIR determined that the Downtown Plan would have a significant and unavoidable impact resulting from the potential redevelopment of properties that are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Places, or that are determined eligible for listing as a City Landmark or Landmark District. The project would be subject to the same general mitigation measures identified in the Downtown Plan EIR, specifically CR-1(b), which outlines procedures to be followed prior to issuance of a demolition permit or building permit for alteration of any property listed in the Historic Survey Report, designated as a Historic Landmark, listed in the Downtown Plan EIR, or other property 45 years of age or older that was not previously determined by the Historic Survey Report to be ineligible for listing as a historic resource.

The project includes the demolition of the former Long Beach Courthouse. The Long Beach Courthouse Demolition Project was studied in a Draft EIR (SCH# 2014051003) that was circulated in October and November of 2014, but was not certified. The Long Beach Courthouse Demolition Project Draft EIR determined that impacts related to the significance of a historical resource would be significant and unavoidable despite implementation of required mitigation involving documentation of the courthouse in accordance with the general guidelines of Historic American Building Survey documentation.

### 4.3.3 Impact Analysis

**a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds.** According to Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, impacts related to cultural resources from the proposed project would be significant if the project would:

- *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;*
- *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;*
- *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature of paleontological or cultural value;*
- *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries*

The following topics were determined to have less than significant impacts in the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project (Appendix A) and are not discussed further in this section:

- *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;*
- *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature of paleontological or cultural value;*
- *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries*

Historical resources are “significantly” affected if there is demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its surroundings. Generally, impacts to historical resources can be mitigated to below a level of significance by following the Secretary of the Interior’s *Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and*



*Reconstructing Historic Buildings* or the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* [13 PRC 15064.5 (b)(3)]. In some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource by way of historic narrative photographs or architectural drawings will not mitigate the impact of demolition below the level of significance [13 PRC 15126.4 (b)(3)].

**b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.**

<i>Threshold</i>	<i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.</i>
------------------	--

**Impact CR-1 Construction of the proposed project would involve the demolition of the Old Courthouse and the Long Beach City Hall-Library Complex, which have been identified as historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. The Downtown Plan EIR determined that buildout of the Downtown Plan would result in Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts. Demolition of the Old Courthouse and the Long Beach City Hall-Library Complex would contribute to this Class I impact and would be a Class I, significant and unavoidable impact.**

According to the Cultural Resources Study prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix C), the project site contains two historical resources: the Long Beach Courthouse and the City Hall-Library Complex, as representative examples of the Corporate and Late Modern styles and their associations with the institutional development of the City. Both resources were found individually eligible for the CRHR and are also eligible for City of Long Beach Landmark Designation. Therefore, the former Long Beach Courthouse and the City Hall-Library Complex are considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. The project would result in the demolition of these buildings and would therefore have a significant direct impact to cultural resources insofar as it entails a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources. Impacts to the Old Courthouse and the Long Beach City Hall-Library Complex would be significant.

As discussed in Section 2, *Project Description*, the project includes the development of History and Cultural Loops, a walking tour that would include historical, cultural, and educational points of interest throughout the project site. Points of interest would include the Carillon Clock Tower and 1915 Lincoln Park statue, as well as the Original Carnegie Library Cornerstone, Marlin Sculpture, time capsules (including the time capsule dedicated in 1976 at the Civic Center), and additional historical and cultural elements. Temporary art exhibits and historical timeline markers would also be present within the walking loops.

The project would be subject to Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure CR-1(b), which outlines procedures to be followed prior to issuance of a demolition permit or building permit for alteration of any property listed in the Historic Survey Report, designated as a Historic Landmark, listed in the Downtown Plan EIR, or other property 45 years of age or older that was not previously determined by the Historic Survey Report to be ineligible for listing as a historic resource. Nonetheless, implementation of Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure CR-1(b) would not reduce impacts to a less than significant level.



**Mitigation Measures.** The following mitigation measures, which would comply with Measure CR-1(b) of the Downtown Plan EIR, would reduce project impacts on historical resources to the degree feasible.

**CR-1(a) Historic Artifact Collection Program.** Impacts resulting from the demolition of the City Hall-Library Complex and Courthouse shall be minimized through development of an archival identification and collections program. The purpose of this program will be to identify the existing historic artifacts, documents and other objects that are currently stored at the Main Library, City Hall and Port of Long Beach facilities, as well as key components of the Old Courthouse and City Hall-Library Complex to be demolished, so that these important relics can be utilized in the future by researchers and the public for educational purposes. As part of the program, the City will itemize, catalogue and rehouse the items, and establish appropriate conservation and storage measures for long-term preservation. One possible location for rehousing items would be as a museum in the proposed project's new Library. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach Development Services Department.

**CR-1(b) Building Documentation.** Impacts resulting from the demolition of the City Hall-Library Complex and Old Courthouse shall be minimized through archival documentation of as-built and as-found condition. Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for the project, the lead agency shall ensure that documentation of the building is completed in accordance with the general guidelines of Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation. The documentation shall include large-format photographic recordation, a historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History. The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to repositories that will make it available for current and future generations. Archival copies of the documentation also would be submitted to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department, the downtown branch of the Long Beach Public Library, and the Historical Society of Long Beach where it would be available to local researchers. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach Development Services Department.

In its response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) the SHPO suggests the following as mitigation: 1) additional historic surveys in parts of the City that have not been surveyed; (2) development of design guidelines for future re-use of public buildings; and (3) creation of a Historic Preservation Mitigation Fund. However, although these ideas may mitigate the impacts of potential future projects, they would not mitigate the impact of the currently



proposed project. Consequently, there is no nexus between these suggested measures and the impact associated with the proposed project and these suggestions would not constitute “mitigation” under CEQA. City decisionmakers may, nevertheless, consider including one or more of these suggestions as conditions of project approval.

**Significance After Mitigation.** Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) and CR-1(b), compliance with Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure CR-1(b), and the project’s Cultural and Historic Loops would reduce significant direct and cumulative impacts to the historical resource scheduled for demolition to the degree feasible, but not to below a level of significance.

Additional mitigation is infeasible due to the physical condition and limitations of the Old Courthouse and City Hall-Library complex and the physical limitations of the project site. As discussed in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, there are critical functional and physical deficiencies identified for the former Courthouse by the statewide Task Force on Court Facilities in 1997 and the Administrative Office of the Courts in 2001 that would make additional mitigation, such as rehabilitation of the former Courthouse, infeasible. These deficiencies are described in detail in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, but include Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility issues and seismic deficiencies. Despite a limited retrofit at an estimated cost of \$13.9 million by the County of Los Angeles, the Courthouse is expected to remain standing long enough to evacuate, but would not be capable of being re-occupied following a medium-sized earthquake. RRM Design Group prepared an Adaptive Reuse Study for the former Long Beach Courthouse in September 2014 (Appendix H of the Long Beach Courthouse Demolition Project Draft EIR). The study determined that adaptive reuse of the former Courthouse would require substantial upgrades to the building’s structural, mechanical, plumbing, fire protection, lighting and electrical systems. All levels of the building’s interior would require substantial modernization to comply with the California’s building codes, energy efficiency regulations and disabled access for a government office use. The Study estimated that costs for rehabilitation of the former Courthouse and conversion to municipal office use would range from \$124,650,000 to \$138,500,000. City Hall has seismic deficiencies that would also require rehabilitation costs. Moreover, the project site is largely built out; retaining the former Courthouse and the City Hall-Library Complex would restrict space available to achieve project objectives, such as redeveloping the Civic Center mega-block into a vibrant mix of public and private space with a grand Civic Plaza; improving connections between the new Civic Center and greater Downtown through the reestablishment of the small block grid of the historic downtown street fabric; and private development of housing, office, hotel, and retail, with ten percent of all housing units being affordable to moderate income persons. As additional mitigation is infeasible, demolition of the Old Courthouse and the City Hall-Library Complex would have significant and unavoidable impacts.

### **c. Cumulative Impacts.**

In terms of historical resources, the analysis of cumulative impacts relates to whether impacts of the proposed project and future related projects, considered together, might substantially impact and/or diminish the number of similar historic resources, in terms of context or property type. While the proposed project would result in significant impacts to historic resources, the proposed project would not be expected to result in cumulative adverse impacts to historic resources as it is the only proposed project in the vicinity that involves the demolition



of a historic building. The Cultural Resources Study also assessed the project site and the adjacent Public Safety Building to determine if the buildings and structures were eligible for listing in the CRHR or at the local level as a potential historic district (see Appendix C). The Cultural Resources Study found that while the buildings and structures within the Civic Center are all functionally related and were each designed for municipal purposes, the alterations to the Public Safety Building and Lincoln Park and construction of the Broadway Parking Garage have reduced the integrity of the site and weakened its cohesive overall identity, making it ineligible for consideration as a CRHR or locally eligible historic district; therefore, although the project would result in significant impacts to historic resources (the former Long Beach Courthouse and City Hall-Library Complex), impacts to these historic resources would not result in any cumulative impacts because the Civic Center is ineligible for consideration as a CRHR or locally eligible historic district. Any future projects would need to be analyzed on a case-by-case basis pursuant to CEQA, with a determination made for each project on the significance of indirect impacts to historic resources, as well as any future historic resources that are identified in the vicinity. Therefore, impacts related to historical resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

