

### 3.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section describes existing cultural resources conditions on the proposed Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan (GCSP; Proposed Project) site and vicinity, identifies associated regulatory requirements, and analyzes the Proposed Project's impacts to cultural resources. The following discussion focuses on the existing cultural resources in the City of Long Beach (City) and more specifically, the Plan Area.

The Initial Study (IS) and Notice of Preparation (NOP) are contained in Appendix A-1, Initial Study; and Appendix A-2, Notice of Preparation, respectively. Comments received in response to the NOP (see Appendix A-3, Notice of Preparation Comment Letters) included a letter from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) describing tribal consultation requirements and listing recommendations for cultural resources assessments. Recommendations included: conducting a search of the California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS); conducting a field survey (if determined necessary based on the CHRIS records search results); preparing a professional report detailing the findings of the field survey and records search; conducting a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search; consultation with California Native American tribes in compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18; and including provisions for the inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during construction and the protection of such resources. As demonstrated in this section, a cultural resources assessment at the programmatic level has been conducted for the Proposed Project, and this assessment adheres to these recommendations as appropriate.

The IS found that the Proposed Project would have a potentially significant impact as it relates to cultural resources (Appendix A-1). As such, all impacts will be addressed further in this Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)/Draft Program Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS).

#### 3.3.1 Existing Conditions

##### Cultural (Archaeological and Built Environment) Resources

###### *CHRIS Record Search*

Dudek conducted a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) on September 5, 2018, for the Plan Area and a 0.5-mile radius study area. This search included their collection of mapped prehistoric, historical, and built-environment resources; Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site records; technical reports; and archival resources. Additional consulted sources included historical maps of the Plan Area, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the California Historic Property Data File, and the lists of California State Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility.

### *Previously Conducted Cultural Resource Studies*

The SCCIC records indicate that 25 previous cultural resources technical investigations have been conducted within 0.5-mile of the Plan Area between 1976 and 2014. Of these 25 investigations, seven overlap the Plan Area (Table 3.3-1). Approximately 50 percent of the Plan Area has been previously investigated.

**Table 3.3-1  
Previously Conducted Technical Studies Within 0.5-Mile of the Plan Area**

Report Number LA-	Author	Year	Report Title	Proximity to Plan Area
01672	Galvin, Kathleen F.	1987	Spring Street-Long Beach Boulevard to Cherry Avenue Archaeological/Historical Survey	Overlaps
02887	Demcak, Carol R.	1993	Cultural Resource Assessment for Proposed Project for Lakewood Boulevard (rte. 19) in the City of Long Beach, California	Outside
03651	Cottrell, Marie G.	1976	Record Search for Area No. 1 in the City of Signal Hill	Overlaps
04354	Anonymous	1977	Historic Property Survey for the Proposed Heartwell Park Bike Route	Outside
04632	Duke, Curt	1999	Cultural Resource Assessment for Pacific Bell Mobile Services Facility La 621-01, County of Los Angeles, California	Overlaps
04750	Duke, Curt	1999	Cultural Resource Assessment for the AT&T Wireless Services Facility Number C574, County of Los Angeles, California	Outside
05121	Duke, Curt	2000	Cultural Resource Assessment for Pacific Bell Mobile Services Facility LA 629-03, County of Los Angeles, Ca	Outside
05215	McKenna, Jeanette A.	2001	A Cultural Resources Investigation of the Proposed Long Beach Ocean Desalination Project, Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California	Outside
05405	McKenna, Jeanette A.	2000	A Phase I Cultural Resource Investigation of the City of Signal Hill Home Depot Commercial Center Project Area, Signal Hill, Los Angeles County, California	Outside
05406	Maki, Mary K.	2001	Negative Phase I Archaeological Survey of 5.6 Acres for the Las Brisas Neighborhood Redevelopment Project City of Signal Hill, Los Angeles County, Ca	Outside
05879	Duke, Curt	2002	Cultural Resource Assessment AT&T Wireless Services Facility No. 05087a-01 Los Angeles County, California	Outside
06176	Unknown	2001	Nextel Communications CA-7809a/Kessler 3770 Cherry Avenue Lakewood, California	Outside
06827	Strudwick, Ivan H.	1999	Results of the Cultural Resources Records Search and Survey for the Long Beach Sports Park Project Located Near Signal Hill in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California	Overlaps
07181	Maki, Mary K.	2005	CDC – Las Brisas II Housing Development	Outside

**Table 3.3-1  
Previously Conducted Technical Studies Within 0.5-Mile of the Plan Area**

Report Number LA-	Author	Year	Report Title	Proximity to Plan Area
08434	Bonner, Wayne H.	2004	Cultural Resource Records Search Results and Site Visit for Nextek Communications Site Candidate Ca7747-c (new Dolphin), 2875 Junipero Avenue, Signal Hill, Los Angeles County, California	Outside
08477	Billat, Lorna	2005	Orange 405/CA-7745b, Cellular Antenna Installation on an Historic Property, 3401 Orange Avenue, Long Beach, Ca	Outside
08898	Baker, Cindy and Mary L. Maniery	2007	Cultural Resource Inventory and Evaluation of United States Army Reserve 63d Regional Readiness Command Facilities	Outside
09145	Bonner, Wayne H.	2007	Direct APE Historic Architectural Assessment for Royal Street Communications, LLC Candidate LA2892C (SCE Hinson Harbor), 2377 West Willow Street, Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California	Outside
09568	Wlodarski, Robert J.	2009	Proposed Bechtel Wireless Telecommunications Site LA0115 (Hartley Medical Building), 2888 Long Beach Blvd, Long Beach, California 90806	Outside
09574	Bonner, Wanye H., Sarah A. Williams, and Kathleen A. Crawford	2009	Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile USA Candidate LA33750A (Golf Center) 2550 Orange Avenue, Signal Hill, Los Angeles County, CA	Outside
09695	Onken, Jill, Ellen Chapman, William Hayden, Ken Becker, Christopher Doolittle, and Jeffrey H. Altschul	2006	Archaeological Testing in Support of the Douglas Park Project, Long Beach, California; Statistical Research, Inc. Technical Report 06-71	Outside
10771	Feldman, Jessica B.	2005	Historical Assessment and Impacts Discussion for the Proposed Terminal Improvements, Long Beach Airport	Overlaps
11429	McKenna, Jeanette A.	2011	Archaeological/Cultural Resources Records Search, City of Lakewood Overview	Overlaps
12056	Bonner, Wayne	2012	Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for T-Mobile West, LLC Candidate LA02621A (Extra Space Storage), 2101 East Carson Street, Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California	Overlaps
13153	Brunzell, David	2014	Cultural Resources Assessment of the Long Beach Airport Project, Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California (BCR Consulting Project No. TRF1412)	Outside

### ***Previously Recorded Cultural Resources***

A total of eight (8) previously recorded sites or properties were identified within the 0.5-mile search buffer, summarized in Table 3.3-2, SCCIC Results: Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within 0.5-Mile of the Plan Area. Of these resources, six are built-environment

resources, two of which are located within the Plan Area. The other two resources, P-19-000838/CA-LAN-838 and P-19-000839/CA-LAN-839, are prehistoric sites comprised of shell midden deposits that were recorded in 1971, 1973, and 1987; however, these prehistoric sites were identified outside the Plan Area. The two built-environment resources that overlap the Plan Area are the Lomita Gas Company/Petrolane Compressor House (P-19-187156) and the Storage USA Building (P-190082). These two properties are discussed in detail in the Built Environment section, below.

**Table 3.3-2**  
**SCCIC Results: Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within 0.5-Mile of the Plan Area**

Primary Number P-19-	Trinomial CA-LAN-	Description	Recorded By/Year	Eligibility Status	Proximity to Plan Area
000838	838	Small shell midden that was identified on the western side of Signal Hill and was destroyed in March of 1976	Fenenga, G. (1971; Updated 1973)	-	Outside
000839	839	Shell midden eroding out of covering of crude asphaltum that was identified within sandy-covered tar amongst oil wells	Fenenga, G. (1971); Galvin (Updated 1987)	-	Outside
187112	-	Lomita Gasoline Company/Petrolane Office Building at 2901 Orange Avenue; HRI #066945	Woodward, Lucinda (Evaluator) (1989)	2S2: Eligible for NRHP through Section 106; Listed in CRHR	Outside
187156	-	Lomita Gas Company/Petrolane Compressor House; HRI #066945	Gualtieri, Kathryn (State Historic Preservation Officer) (1989)	2S2: Eligible for NRHP through Section 106; Listed in CRHR	Overlaps
187639	-	One-story commercial building located at 3401 Orange Avenue that was constructed in 1934 in the Art Deco Style of architecture. Additions and modifications to this building occurred between 1936 and 2004; HRI #155875	Brady, Jon L. (2005)	Ineligible	Outside
187956	-	Schroeder Hall USAR Center (historic name) or Long Beach USAR Center, Facility No. CA022 is a Contemporary style building constructed in 1960 by the Directorate of Facility Engineers, For MacArthur on behalf of the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) as a training and administrative facility	PAR Environmental Services, Inc. (2006)	3S: Appears eligible for NRHP as individual property	Outside
188438	-	Orange-Carson Plaza consists of a one-story, masonry strip-mall or suburban plaza style plaza consisting of five buildings that was developed from 1955 through 1987.	Supernowicz, Dana (2009)	6Y2: Ineligible for NRHP through Section 106	Outside

**Table 3.3-2**  
**SCCIC Results: Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within 0.5-Mile of the Plan Area**

Primary Number P-19-	Trinomial CA-LAN-	Description	Recorded By/Year	Eligibility Status	Proximity to Plan Area
190082	-	Storage USA Building is a commercial building that is two- and three-stories high in Modern Style architecture that was constructed in 1956 and altered in 1985-1987 and in 2004	Crawford, K.A. (2012)	6Z: Found ineligible for NR, CR or Local designation through survey evaluation.	Overlaps

### ***NAHC Sacred Lands File Search***

Dudek contacted the NAHC on November 18, 2018, to request a search of the SLF for the Proposed Project. The NAHC responded via email on January 3, 2019, indicating that the search did not identify any Native American resources near the Plan Area. Because the SLF search does not include an exhaustive list of Native American cultural resources, the NAHC suggested contacting Native American individuals and/or tribal organizations who may have direct knowledge of cultural resources in or near the Plan Area. The City received one request for consultation from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. The city completed consultation with the tribe on July 8, 2020. See Section 3.12, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS, for further details on tribal consultation.

### **Built Environment**

As stated above, two (2) previously recorded built environment properties, located within the Plan Area, were identified through the records search (summarized in Table 3.3-2, SCCIC Results: Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within 0.5-Mile of the Plan Area). These resources consist of a compressor house associated with the Lomita Gas Company (P-19-187156) at the corner of Orange Avenue and E. Spring Street and a commercial storage building west of the E. Carson Street and Cherry Avenue (P-19-190082). They are briefly summarized below:

#### ***P-19-187156***

This resource consists of the Lomita Gas Company compressor house building, on the west side of Orange Street between 29<sup>th</sup> and E. Spring Streets. The building was determined eligible for the NRHP through Section 106 and is listed in the CRHR under Criterion A for its contribution to the history of gas and petroleum industry in Long Beach. Desktop analysis through Google Earth and review of historic aerials indicates that this resource was demolished or removed between

November 2009 and March 2011. The Lomita Gas Company compressor house building is no longer extant, and as such, it is not considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

***P-19-190082***

This resource consists of a commercial storage building located at 2102 E. Carson Street (APN 7151-001-015), just east of the E. Carson Street and Cherry Avenue intersection. The building, constructed in 1956, is a two-and three-story asymmetrical, Modern-style commercial building with a stucco exterior and flat roof. Now a Storage USA building, it was recommended ineligible for the NRHP and CRHR in 2012. This property is not considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA.

**Additional Background Research**

Dudek conducted additional background research to identify the presence of other historic-era built environment properties that were not identified through the CHRIS records search sited within and adjacent to the Plan Area. The research included identifying any previously recorded, NRHP and/or CRHR eligible, or locally designated CEQA historical resources. Research was also undertaken at the programmatic level to document the presence of properties within or adjacent to the Plan Area that contain properties with buildings 45 years old or older. This group of properties are not known to be significant but could require further study and analysis in the future if project-level activities result in potential impacts. This additional research also assisted in the preparation of the historical context for the Plan Area, contributing to a larger understanding of the historic era development of the region.

Specifically, the Long Beach Historic Resource Inventory (HRI), the City of Long Beach Landmarks, Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, and aerial photograph collections were consulted. A summary of the findings is documented below.

***Historic Resource Inventory (HRI)***

In addition to the SCCIC Record search, the Long Beach Historic Resource Inventory (HRI) Data File records indicates that thirty-eight resources have been previously recorded or evaluated, and are documented in the HRI results, within a 0.5-mile radius of the Plan Area (Table 3.3-3). Of the 38 properties found within the 0.5-mile records search buffer, only one of the properties is located in the Plan Area: the Lomita Gas Company Compressor House; P-19-187156. As noted above, the Lomita Gas Company Compressor House (P-19-187156) has been demolished and is no longer a CEQA historical resource.

**Table 3.3-3  
HRI Results Within 0.5-Mile of the Plan Area**

Primary Number, P-19-	Address	Name	Date	Status Code	Proximity to the Plan Area
179178	1318 37 <sup>th</sup> Street	--	1925	5D2 -- Contributor to a district that is eligible for local listing or designation	Outside
179170	3451 Brayton Ave	--	1930	5D2	Outside
179171	3459 Brayton Ave	--	1929	5D2	Outside
179189	3475 Brayton Ave	--	1925	5D2	Outside
179197	3535 Brayton Ave	--	1925	5D2	Outside
179183	3609 Brayton Ave	--	1933	5D2	Outside
179198	3643 Brayton Ave	--	1936	5D2	Outside
179199	3645 Brayton Ave	--	1930	5D2	Outside
179179	3735 Brayton Ave	--	1925	5D2	Outside
179200	3739 Brayton Ave	--	1932	5D2	Outside
179184	3759 Brayton Ave	--	1935	5D2	Outside
179172	3767 Brayton Ave	--	1927	5D2	Outside
179173	3502 California Ave	--	1930	5D2	Outside
--	1095 E Willow St	Sunnyside Cemetery	1906	6Y – Determined ineligible for NR by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for CR or Local Listing.	Outside
187956	3800 E Willow St	Schroeder Hall USAR Center	1960	2S2 – Eligible for NRHP through Section 106; Listed in CRHR: Criterion C	Outside
187956	3800 E Willow St	Schroeder Hall USAR Center/Organ	1960	2S2 – Eligible for NRHP through Section 106; Listed in CRHR: Criterion C	Outside
179180	3428 Falcon Ave	--	1929	5D2	Outside
179194	3602 Falcon Ave	--	1927	5D2	Outside
179195	3606 Falcon Ave	--	1927	5D2	Outside
179196	3610 Falcon Ave	--	1927	5D2	Outside
179175	3622 Falcon Ave	--	1931	5D2	Outside
179181	3625 Falcon Ave	--	1929	5D2	Outside
179211	3746 Falcon Ave	--	1912	7N – Needs to be re-evaluated (Formerly NR Status Code 4)	Outside
179212	3756 Falcon Ave	--	1912	5D2	Outside
179182	3757 Falcon Ave	--	1925	5D2	Outside
--	3530 Gaviota Ave	--	1938	6Y	Outside
--	3762 Gaviota Ave	--	--	6Y	Outside
179202	3610 Gundry Ave	--	1930	5D2	Outside
--	3621 Gundry Ave	--		6Y	Outside
--	3645 Gundry Ave	--	1924	6Y	Outside
--	2468 Olive Ave	--	1920	6Y	Outside

**Table 3.3-3  
HRI Results Within 0.5-Mile of the Plan Area**

Primary Number, P-19-	Address	Name	Date	Status Code	Proximity to the Plan Area
187112	2901 Orange Ave	Lomita Gas Company / Petrolane Co. -- Office		2S2 – Eligible for NRHP through Section 106; Listed in CRHR: Criteria A and C	Outside
187156	0 Orange Ave	Lomita Gas Company /Petrolane Compressor House		2S2 – Eligible for NRHP through Section 106; Listed in CRHR: Criterion A	Within (No longer extant)
--	3401 Orange Ave	--	1934	6Y	Outside
179191	3419 Orange Ave	--	1933	5D2	Outside
--	3307 Walnut Ave	--	1926	6Y	Outside
--	3349 Walnut Ave	--	1926	6Y	Outside
179216	3717 Walnut Ave	--	1915	5D2	Outside
179192	3741 Walnut Ave	--	1929	5D2	Outside

### *City of Long Beach Historical Resources*

A search of locally designated resources, including individual properties and historic districts, revealed that one Long Beach Historical Landmark is located within the Proposed Project corridor along Cherry Avenue: The Termo Company Building (3275 Cherry Avenue). This CEQA historical resource is significant as a City of Long Beach Landmark, under City of Long Beach Criterion A, for its association with oil-related businesses and for its architectural uniqueness among other contemporaneous oil-industry buildings. According to City of Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 16.52.290, the Termo Company Building city landmark consists of an irregular-shaped plan, one story office building, with distinctive brick and stone cladding, chimneys and a wrapping porch, built in 1935 (City of Long Beach 16.52.290).

The California Heights Landmark District (CHLD), which is a City of Long Beach Landmark District, is located immediately adjacent to the Plan Area, just west of Cherry Avenue. The California Heights Landmark District boundaries are the west side of Gaviota Avenue, the south side of Bixby Road, the east side of Gardenia Avenue, and a variable southern boundary between Wardlow Road and 35<sup>th</sup> Street. The district is eligible, under City of Long Beach Criterion A, for reflecting the economic development of Long Beach and the creation of new housing subdivisions to serve expanding employment opportunities, beginning with the oil boom of the 1920s and lasting until 1950. The California Heights Historic District was surveyed and recorded in 1981. The Historic District was first established in February 1990 and expanded in May 2000 (City of Long Beach 16.52.290). As a formally designated local historic district, the CHLD and its contributing buildings qualify as historical resources under CEQA.

In response to the Notice of Preparation, the California Heights Neighborhood Association (CHNA), a nonprofit organization promoting preservation of the California Heights Historic District, sent the City of Long Beach Development Services and Planning Bureau a comment letter on October 11, 2018 regarding environmental concerns related to Proposed Project implementation. In this letter, CHNA suggested that twelve (12) properties, listed below, have potential association with the California Heights Historic District, as they were constructed within the historic district's period of significance (1924-1950) and are related to the historic district's development. These properties are not currently within the boundary of the CHLD and have not been formally evaluated under applicable eligibility criteria. The CHNA requested consideration of this group of properties, including further study and analysis should future project-level activities result in potential impacts (CNHA 2018):

- Fire Station No. 14, 1838 E. Wardlow Road (APN: 7148-020-024), constructed in 1941
- 3341 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7148-020-021), constructed in 1933
- 3275 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7148-020-009), constructed in 1929
- 3249 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7148-020-010), constructed in 1929
- 3170 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-047), constructed in 1940
- 3204 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-045), constructed in 1933
- 3252 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-042), constructed in 1937
- 3254 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-062), constructed in 1937
- 3366 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-035), constructed in 1937
- 3431 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7147-026-017), constructed in 1947
- Inglesia Católica Santísimo Sacramento, 1900 E. Carson Street (APN: 7137-013-001), constructed in 1942
- California Heights Baptist Church, 4110 Gardenia Avenue (APN: 7137-012-009), constructed in 1947

### ***City of Long Beach Historic Context Statement***

Some of the commercial/industrial properties in the Plan Area may meet the registration requirements outlined by the City of Long Beach Historic Context Statement for their association with the Oil Industry Subtheme (1921-1945) (Sapphos 2009: 82-87), or the Aerospace Industry Subtheme (Sapphos 2009: 87-90), either as individual resources or as contributors to a historic district.

Many buildings in the proposed Business Park Zone meet the 45-year age thresholds, and may meet the registration requirements outlined by the City of Long Beach Historic Context Statement for their association with the Oil Industry Subtheme (1921-1945) (Sapphos 2009: 82-87), or the Aerospace Industry Subtheme (Sapphos 2009: 87-90), and as a result of their clustering and density, may be eligible for a historic district of such buildings.

In the proposed General Industrial Zone, north of the I-405 freeway, building dates tended to cluster between 1929 and 1941, 1955 and 1965, and a few buildings built after 1979 (LA County Assessor 2018). Many buildings in this proposed Zone, which meet the 45-year age thresholds, may meet the registration requirements outlined by the City of Long Beach Historic Context Statement for their association with the Oil Industry Subtheme (1921-1945) (Sapphos 2009: 82-87), and as a result of the building clustering and density, may be eligible for a historic district of such buildings. In the proposed General Industrial Zone south of the I-405 freeway, building dates clustered between 1956 and 1965 and between 1970 and 1976, with some of the larger warehouses and buildings built after 1985 (LA County Assessor 2018). These industrial buildings are likely too recent for the period of significance for either the Oil Industry Subtheme (1921-1945) (Sapphos 2009: 82-87), or the Aerospace Industry Subtheme (Sapphos 2009: 87-90), identified in the City of Long Beach Historic Context Statement.

#### ***Los Angeles County Assessor Data***

Based on Los Angeles County Assessor building data, within the proposed Business Park Zone, there is the Boeing Building (APN 7149-003-018, 2401 E. Wardlow Road), built in 1967; the C-17 Globemaster warehouse (APN 7149-006-053, 2400 E. Wardlow Road), built in 1970; and the Globemaster Fire Station (APN 7149-006-053, 2400 E. Wardlow Road), built in 1970. These buildings meet the 45-year age thresholds for evaluation, and may meet the registration requirements outlined by the City of Long Beach Historic Context Statement for their association with the Aerospace Industry Subtheme (Sapphos 2009: 87-90), and as a result of their clustering and density, may be eligible for a historic district of such buildings.

There are also numerous warehouses, machine shops, manufacturing plants, offices, ancillary buildings or structures, or company workers' housing built between 1931 and 2006, with built dates clustering between 1931 and 1937, and between 1954 and 1958 (LA County Assessor 2018). The Business Park Zone designated south of Spring Street in the southeastern portion of the Plan Area has a similar condition, as the buildings associated with the airport in this area are built prior to 1947 (FAS 1947; Sanborn 1950a, 1950b).

Furthermore, in the proposed Community Commercial Zone in the northern portion of the Plan Area, retail, commercial, and automotive related buildings range in age from 1949 to 2007, with the majority of the buildings built between 1950 and 1955 and between 1970 and 1973. In the

Community Commercial Zone in the central portion of the Plan Area (centered on Cherry Avenue and East Wardlow Road), structures tended to be built between either between 1950 and 1955 or between 1997 and 2006 (LA County Assessor 2018). In the proposed Industrial Commercial Zone, north and south of Spring Street, commercial industrial buildings tended to have construction dates between 1952 and 2002, with dates clustering between 1952 and 1956 and between 1965 and 1969 (LA County Assessor 2018).

### ***Historic Aerial and Map Analysis***

The following historic-era maps and aerial photographs were analyzed to understand the historic development of the area.

### ***Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps***

Dudek researched the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps held by the Los Angeles Public Library's online Sanborn Map Collection on November 8, 2018. Sanborn maps are available for the City of Long Beach as early as 1888. Sanborn maps do not show the Plan Area, however until 1914. The Plan Area in 1914 is just a few blocks within the 1914 city limits of Long Beach and Sanborn Maps did not include detailed block maps for the Plan Area. In 1923, the Southern Area (defined in Chapter 2.3. Environmental Setting) along Spring Street has detailed maps between Walnut Avenue, E. 29<sup>th</sup> Street, Junipero Avenue, and E. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street. In 1923, this area is characterized by large, mostly empty lots with oil storage, oil derricks, machine shops, refineries, aircraft manufacturing, military, and airplane storage buildings around the southern portion of the Daugherty Field Airport. Visibly winding its way through all available Sanborn maps for this area is the Union Pacific railroad line, which makes an S-curve near Cherry Avenue between Carson and Spring Streets (Sanborn 1914, 1923).

The next series of Sanborn maps from 1950 show nearly the entire Plan Area, along Cherry Avenue from E. Carson Street to E. Wardlow Road and Cherry Avenue from E. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street to E. 29<sup>th</sup> Street. While there is little difference in Southern Area since the 1923 map, in the northern area, along Cherry Avenue south of Carson Street, the west side of Cherry Avenue is dominated by single family homes on evenly sized lots from E. Carson Street to E. Wardlow Road. The east side of the road, is not depicted in Sanborn maps, likely due to this being largely empty Long Beach Airport land (Sanborn 1950a, 1950b).

### ***Aerial Photographs***

A review of historic maps and aerial photographs was conducted as part of the archival research effort for the Plan Area via Nationwide Environmental Title Research LLC (NETR) from the years 1953, 1963, 1972, 1994, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012, and 2014. Aerial imagery was also available from the Map and Imagery Laboratory (MIL) at the University of California, Santa

Barbara from the years 1927, 1933, 1947, 1952, 1956, 1960, 1968, 1970, 1976, 1981, 1994, and 2007. The information obtained from the historic and recent aerial photographs were used in the preparation of the historic context for the project (FAS 1927, 1933, 1947, 1956, 1960; NETR 2018a; PAI 1952; Teledyne Geotronics 1968, 1970, 1976, 1981; Skyview 2007; USGS 1994).

The earliest photograph from 1927 shows that Cherry Avenue was very sparsely developed in the 1920s, consisting mostly of a scattering of residential buildings, and large, manufacturing or oil industry warehouses, Daugherty Field consists of a single row of hangars with small single engine planes on the small paved area just to the north. South of where the Union Pacific rail line crosses, Cherry Avenue is lined with large oil refineries, round footprint storage tanks, and more large warehouses. Photos from 1933 clearly show the Southern Area of the Proposed Project, along Spring Street, in detail multiple oil derricks south of Spring Street in Signal Hill are present as well as some small refineries and storage containers along Spring Street. Notably, Spring Street was paved east of Cherry Avenue, and unpaved west of Cherry Avenue (FAS 1927, 1933).

By the 1947 photograph the California Heights neighborhood, west of Cherry Avenue, had completely filled with residential buildings. Daugherty Field had formalized its airport with hangars along the north side of Spring Street, and an entrance building on N. Lakewood Boulevard. South of E. Wardlow Road, Cherry Avenue is characterized by warehouses and storage buildings, though south of Spring Street there are still plenty of oil and gas industry-related buildings. By 1947, the Union Pacific tracks appeared to not cross major roads, perhaps signaling disuse of this line. Between 1947 and 1956, a drive-in theater appeared at the corner of Carson and Cherry Avenue, and the storage building and medical center located north of Carson Avenue, just east of Cherry Avenue, appeared. (FAS 1947, 1956; PAI 1953).

In the 1960s aerial photographs, the most notable change was on the east side of Cherry Avenue, with the construction of new retail buildings between the Union Pacific rail right-of-way and Cherry Avenue, replacing manufacturing plants and warehouses. Around Spring Street, in the Southern Area and Southeastern Area of the Proposed Project, there were fewer oil derricks, and more storage structures, indicating that the oil industry is moving on to newer oil fields. Between the 1960 and 1965 aerial photographs, Interstate 405 was constructed, bisecting Cherry Avenue near the intersection with E. Spring Street. (Curtis 1965; FAS 1960; Teledyne Geotronics 1968).

The Plan Area remained relatively unchanged through the 1970s and 1980s according to available aerial photographs. Between 1981 and 1994, the drive-in theater at Carson and Cherry Avenue has been abandoned and is growing over with vegetation. In the Southern Area of the Proposed Project, oil and gas storage structures, and warehouses have completely replaced the oil derricks. Retail shopping centers now dominate several street corners along (Teledyne Geotronics 1970, 1976, 1981; USGS 1994).

With the exception of the Lomita Gas Company properties, the major changes in the 2000s are the removal of gas and oil industry storage structures in the Southern Area as early as 2002. They are replaced with mostly retail shopping areas. Retail shopping also replaces buildings in the Northern Area of the Proposed Project, along Cherry Avenue just south of Carson Street (NETR 2018a; Skyview 2007).

### **Development History for the Cherry Avenue and E. Spring Street Areas**

The Plan Area was part of land annexed to Long Beach between 1920 and 1929. Prior to this, the Plan Area originally belonged to the land grant Spanish governor Pedro Fages awarded to Manuel Nieto in 1784. His heirs split Nieto's land grant into six parcels and Manuela Cota, Nieto's daughter, inherited Rancho Los Cerritos, which encompasses much of modern Long Beach. In 1882, the Willmore City was founded and named for land developer William Willmore. By 1888, citizens voted to rename the city Long Beach. Originally, Cherry Avenue was a winding, unpaved road that roughly followed the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and went to the towns of Bixby and Clearwater. The street was originally known as Independence or Independencia Avenue, and eventually became known as Cherry Avenue in roughly 1905 when the land was annexed to the City of Long Beach. According to early topographical maps, the intersection of the Bixby Road and Cherry Avenue, the landscape had few settlements and was dominated by swamp and wetlands. Bouton Lake (formerly Bouton Well), supplied by a large aquifer that still provides City of Lakewood with water today (NETR 2018b; Norton 2017; Polk's 1909, 1914-15; RLCHS 2017; Sapphos 2009).

The Plan Area portion of Cherry Avenue, north of Spring Street was not developed until the 1920s. This coincided with the discovery of oil at Signal Hill in 1921 and the subsequent population and building boom of the 1920s. Because of the discovery of the Long Beach Oil Fields, the ownership, production, and sale of oil became the City's primary economic industry. Although Signal Hill was an unincorporated area within greater Long Beach, most of the benefit went to Long Beach entrepreneurs, which in turn created building booms in downtown and along the shoreline where oil money was reinvested. More oil strikes at Dominguez Hills (1923), and Wilmington Oil Field (1937) spread this wealth around, but oil would remain a major industry in Long Beach for decades to come. (Sapphos 2009).

Development soon stretched north, beyond Signal Hill into the Plan Area. During the early 1920s Cherry Avenue was re-aligned from a winding dirt path to the paved north-south corridor that exists today. While derricks dominated unincorporated Signal Hill, refineries, storage, office spaces, and support industries (derrick manufacturers, welders, vehicles and shipping centers) established along Spring Street and Cherry Avenue that had been annexed to Long Beach. In 1921, the Jotham Bixby Company subdivided a portion of Rancho Los Cerritos to resell as residential lots. Lots in the new California Heights tract came with oil rights, prompting their

swift development in the 1920s and 1930s. In 1923, the City of Long Beach set aside 150 acres at Spring Street and Cherry Avenue for an airfield. This field, named for Earl Daugherty, was developed into the Long Beach Municipal Airport, used both by private and contract pilots as well as the military. In 1928, the City leased more land to build hangars and administrative facilities for the Naval and Army Corps along Spring Street east of Cherry Avenue. In 1929, one of the largest industrial tracts was acquired by the Janss Investment Company of Los Angeles. The property bordered the 380-acre Long Beach Municipal Airport Tract. Immediately a portion of the Janss-owned tract was planned for the development of a large aircraft manufacturer, setting the stage for future aircraft manufacturers such as the Douglas Aircraft Company, to move to Long Beach (Long Beach Airport 2017; NETR 2018b; Norton 2017; Polk’s 1914-1915, 1920, 1921, 1923; Sapphos 2009).

The oil boom and the robust 1920s economy caused a great deal of growth and economical security in Long Beach. The Great Depression’s effect was felt by 1932, as the demand for oil sharply dropped. The effects of the Depression were short-lived. In March 1933, a 6.4-magnitude earthquake destroyed much of the masonry structures in Long Beach. However, reconstruction using oil money and federal loans and grants lessened the effects of the Depression. By 1935, there were 35 oil manufacturers and oil related manufacturing companies along Cherry Avenue north of Spring Street and South of Carson Street. At nearly the same time, construction of the California Heights residential neighborhood was underway, densely arranged between Wardlow Road and Carson Avenue, west of Cherry Avenue (Polk’s 1923, 1926, 1930, 1935, 1940, 1945, 1951-52, 1960; Sapphos 2009).

The local defense industry surrounding the airport boomed during World War II, after the *USS Arizona*, Long Beach’s homeport battleship, was lost during the attack on Pearl Harbor. Douglas Aircraft Company, which established an office on American Avenue at the airport in 1940, was a designated production center for war effort military planes during World War II. Long Beach Municipal Airport was put under control of the U.S. Army Air Corps, to operate as an aircraft ferrying depot by which the manufactured planes would get to their destinations. In 1943, Douglas was producing 11 planes a day, or approximately one-sixth of the country’s 300,000 new planes, with over half of its workforce consisting of women, known as “Rosie the Riveters.” After World War II, Douglas laid off 4,000 employees, mostly women, as veterans returned to the United States, bought homes, started families and settled into civilian life. The G.I. Bill provided low-interest loans and long-term mortgages, leading to an unprecedented residential growth in Long Beach, both in population and size. New subdivisions appeared in Bixby Knolls northwest of the Plan Area and Lakewood northeast of the Plan Area (Denger 2016; Sapphos 2009).

Since World War II, aircraft manufacturers and aircraft related companies have been present on both Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard to the east. In 1941, Douglas Aircraft Company first established a manufacturing plant near the airport, just off Lakewood Boulevard. In 1967,

McDonnell Aircraft Corporation merged with Douglas Aircraft Company to form McDonnell Douglas. After the merger, McDonnell Douglas built a new plant just east of the Cherry Avenue corridor. In 1996, rival manufacturer Boeing purchased the Douglas plant and manufactured commercial planes there until 2006, and manufactured military planes until the plant was closed in 2015. For over 80 years, the company manufactured planes such as the DC-10, MD-80 jetliner, the B-17 bomber, the B-19 bomber, the C-17 Globemaster III, and Boeing 717 (Long Beach Airport 2017; Peterson 2015; Waldie 2013).

Between 1960 and 1963, construction of the Interstate 405 cut across Cherry Avenue, just north of Spring Street, dividing the oil manufacturing industrial area. The west side of Cherry Avenue between Wardlow Street and Carson Street remained firmly residential. On the east side of Cherry Avenue, many of the lots between the Union Pacific right-of-way and Cherry Avenue became commercial/ industrial buildings (mostly automotive sales or repairs) developed between 1955 and 1969 (LBP 2017; NETR 2018a, 2018b; Polk’s 1923, 1960; Sapphos 2009).

### **3.3.2 Regulatory Setting**

#### **Federal**

The NHPA established the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the President’s Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and provided that states may establish State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) to carry out some of the functions of the NHPA. Most significantly for federal agencies responsible for managing cultural resources, Section 106 of the NHPA directs that:

[t]he head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking in any State and the head of any Federal department or independent agency having authority to license any undertaking shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license, as the case may be, take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Section 106 also affords the ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking (16 U.S.C. 470f).

36 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 800 (36 CFR 800) implements Section 106 of the NHPA. It defines the steps necessary to identify historic properties (those cultural resources listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP), including consultation with federally recognized Native American tribes to identify resources with important cultural values; to determine whether or not

they may be adversely affected by a proposed undertaking; and the process for eliminating, reducing, or mitigating the adverse effects.

The content of 36 CFR 60.4 defines criteria for determining eligibility for listing in the NRHP. The significance of cultural resources identified during an inventory must be formally evaluated for historic significance in consultation with the ACHP and the California SHPO to determine if the resources are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Cultural resources may be considered eligible for listing if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Regarding criteria A through D of Section 106, the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, cultural resources, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and that:

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. Embody 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. Have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history [36 CFR 60.4].

The 1992 amendments to the NHPA enhance the recognition of tribal governments' roles in the national historic preservation program, including adding a member of an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization to the ACHP.

The NHPA amendments:

- Clarify that properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization may be determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register
- Reinforce the provisions of the Council's regulations that require the federal agency to consult on properties of religious and cultural importance.

The 1992 amendments also specify that the ACHP can enter into agreement with tribes that permit undertakings on tribal land and that are reviewed under tribal regulations governing Section 106. Regulations implementing the NHPA state that a federal agency must consult with any Indian tribe that attaches religious and cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by an undertaking.

### ***Integrity***

Integrity is defined in NRHP guidance, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria*, as “the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the NRHP, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the NRHP criteria, but it also must have integrity” (NPS 1990). NRHP guidance further asserts that properties be completed at least 50 years ago to be considered for eligibility. Properties completed fewer than 50 years before evaluation must be proven to be “exceptionally important” (criteria consideration G) to be considered for listing.

### ***Antiquities Act of 1906***

The Antiquities Act of 1906 is used as the basis for federal protection of paleontological resources on federal lands. The act authorizes the government to regulate the disturbance of objects of antiquity on federal lands and is the first federal legislative protection of paleontological resources. The act forbids unauthorized damage or removal of such objects and also establishes criminal permissions for unauthorized appropriation or destruction of antiquities.

### ***Federal Land Management and Policy Act***

The Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLMPA) of 1976 recognizes significant paleontological resources as scientific resources and requires Federal agencies to manage public lands in a manner that protects scientific resource quality.

### **State**

#### ***California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)***

In California, the term “historical resource” includes but is not limited to “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.” (PRC section 5020.1(j).) In 1992, the California legislature established the CRHR “to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” (PRC section 5024.1(a).) The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR were expressly developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP, enumerated below. According to PRC Section 5024.1(c)(1–4), a resource is considered historically significant if it (i) retains “substantial integrity,” and (ii) meets at least one 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.
- (4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In order to understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than fifty years old may be considered for listing in the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance (see Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 4852(d)(2)).

The CRHR protects cultural resources by requiring evaluations of the significance of prehistoric and historic resources. The criteria for the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP and properties listed or formally designated as eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR, as are the state landmarks and points of interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

### ***California Environmental Quality Act***

As described further below, the following CEQA statutes and CEQA Guidelines are of relevance to the analysis of archaeological, historic, and tribal cultural resources:

- PRC section 21083.2(g) defines “unique archaeological resource.”
- PRC section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(a) defines “historical resources.” In addition, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(b) defines the phrase “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource;” it also defines the circumstances when a project would materially impair the significance of an historical resource.
- PRC section 21074(a) defines “tribal cultural resources.”
- PRC section 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e): Set forth standards and steps to be employed following the accidental discovery of human remains in any location other than a dedicated ceremony.
- PRC sections 21083.2(b)-(c) and CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4: Provide information regarding the mitigation framework for archaeological and historic resources, including examples of preservation-in-place mitigation measures; preservation-in-place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to significant archaeological sites because it maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archaeological context, and may also help avoid conflict with religious or cultural values of groups associated with the archaeological site(s).

More specifically, under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause "a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource." (PRC section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(b).) If a site is either listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or if it is included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a historical resources survey (meeting the requirements of PRC section 5024.1(q)), it is a "historical resource" and is presumed to be historically or culturally significant for purposes of CEQA. (PRC section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(a).) The lead agency is not precluded from determining that a resource is a historical resource even if it does not fall within this presumption. (PRC section 21084.1; CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(a).)

A "substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource" reflecting a significant effect under CEQA means "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired." (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(b)(1); PR Code section 5020.1(q).) In turn, the significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

- (1) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or
- (2) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, 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
- (3) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that 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.

(CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(b)(2).) Pursuant to these sections, the CEQA inquiry begins with evaluating whether a project site contains any "historical resources," then evaluates whether that project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource such that the resource's historical significance is materially impaired.

If it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be

preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that they cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (Section 21083.2[a], [b], and [c]).

Section 21083.2(g) defines a unique archaeological resource as 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:

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

Impacts to non-unique archaeological resources are generally not considered a significant environmental impact (PRC section 21083.2(a); CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(c)(4).) However, if a non-unique archaeological resource qualifies as tribal cultural resource (PRC 21074(c); 21083.2(h)), further consideration of significant impacts is required.

### ***California Health and Safety Code***

California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods, regardless of their antiquity, and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains. Health and Safety Code section 7050.5 requires that if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area reasonably suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the County coroner has examined the remains (section 7050.5b). PRC Section 5097.98 also outlines the process to be followed in the event that remains are discovered. If the coroner determines or has reason to believe the remains are those of a Native American, the coroner must contact the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours (section 7050.5c). The NAHC will notify the Most Likely Descendant. With the permission of the landowner, the Most Likely Descendant may inspect the site of discovery. The inspection must be completed within 48 hours of notification of the Most Likely Descendant by the NAHC. The Most Likely Descendant may recommend means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native Americans.

## Local

### *Historic Preservation Element (2010)*

The City's General Plan Historic Preservation Element (2010) provides a framework for the review, treatment, and preservation of historic resources in the City. Following are the main strategies and policies from the Historic Preservation Element that are related to cultural resources.

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

**P.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.

**Goal 2:** Protect historic resources from demolition and inappropriate alterations through the use of the City's regulatory framework, technical assistance, and incentives.

### *City of Long Beach Landmarks and Landmark Districts (Chapter 2.63.050)*

The City of Long Beach adopted their Cultural Heritage Commission Ordinance (Title 2, Chapter 2.63) in 1992 and amended it in 2005, 2009, and most recently in 2015 (ORD-15-0038) (City of Long Beach 2015). The new code condensed the original thirteen criteria down to six criteria for designation of a City Landmark or Landmark District, and closely aligns with NRHP and CRHR Criteria. The City of Long Beach designates local landmarks and landmark districts by nominating a proposed district, and submitting it for review to the Cultural Heritage Commission. The Cultural Heritage Commission shall review and make a recommendation to the City Council based on findings of act pertaining to the designation criteria. The City Council considers the Cultural Heritage Commission's recommendation at a public hearing and will either approve or disapprove the proposed designation by ordinance (2.63.060 subsection A and B).

Landmarks. A cultural resource qualifies for designation as a Landmark if it retains integrity and manifests one (1) or more of the following criteria:

- A. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the City's history; or
- B. It is associated with the lives of persons significant in the City's past; or
- C. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or it represents the work of a master or it possesses high artistic values; or
- D. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Landmark Districts. A group of cultural resources qualify for designation as a Landmark District if it retains integrity as a whole and meets the following criteria:

- A. The grouping represents a significant and distinguishable entity that is significant within a historic context.
- B. A minimum of sixty percent (60%) of the properties within the boundaries of the proposed landmark district qualify as a contributing property.

The City ordinance does not place any specific age or integrity requirements on historic resources. The ordinance also allows for the nomination of churches, cemeteries, and resources that have been moved from their original location.

### **3.3.3 Thresholds of Significance**

The following significance criteria are based on Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), and will be used to determine the significance of potential cultural resource impacts. Impacts related to cultural resources would be significant if the Proposed Project would:

- A. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.
- B. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.
- C. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

The IS found that the Proposed Project would have a potentially significant impact as it relates to cultural resources (Appendix A-1). As such, all impacts will be addressed further in this Draft PEIR/ PEIS.

### **3.3.4 Impacts Analysis**

The City has developed the GCSP as part of a comprehensive transition program in the wake of the closure of the C-17 Globemaster military aircraft production facility owned by the Boeing Corporation (C-17 Site). The GCSP will build upon the previously developed C-17 Transition Master Plan and provide a strategic planning framework for attracting quality industries and improving the character, design, and functionality of the Plan Area. The Proposed Project involves the implementation of the GCSP, which serves as a planning and regulatory framework for the Plan Area and would guide land uses for the approximately 437 acres. The following section outlines potential impacts for cultural resources related to implementation of the Proposed Project.

a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?*

Only one previously recorded historical resource was located within the Plan Area. The Termo Company Building at 3275 Cherry Avenue is a locally designated Long Beach Landmark (City of Long Beach 16.52.290), built in 1935, and as such, it is considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. The Proposed Project will result in rezoning portions of the Plan Area and allow for project-level design plans that will include street improvements to existing roadways and planned neighborhood connectors. The Termo Company Building at 3275 Cherry Avenue is within the area to be rezoned as a “General Industrial” district.” As rezoning the property will not result in a direct or indirect impact to the resource, the Proposed Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Any future project that would potentially result in the modification and/or removal of this locally designated historic landmark would be subject compliance with Chapter 2.63 (Cultural Heritage Commission) and Section 16.52.290 (The Termo Company Building.) of the Municipal Code related to the preservation of designated historic properties. Mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1** would require future project proponents to ensure that potential impacts to historical resources be assessed at the project level, and that properties 45 years old or older be evaluated for historical significance prior to initiation of any project-related activities that could result in the identification of significant impacts to historic properties.

Subsequent future projects that could be implemented as a result of the GCSP could potentially impact previously-recorded CEQA historical resources and those properties that contain buildings and structures 45 years old or older that have not been identified. Types of projects which constitute a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means 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 (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5). Archival research, including historic map and historic aerial overview, county assessor data, and the City of Long Beach Historic Context Statement, indicates that the Plan Area contains many properties that meet the 45-year threshold and these properties should be further studied for potential impacts to historical resources in the event they are included in a future project.

This programmatic project is specifically planning and rezoning for the Plan Area. No ground-disturbing project-level activities are proposed as part of the Proposed Project, and therefore, no impacts to historical resources are anticipated. However, with the re-zoning and design plans proposed for the Plan Area, construction will likely occur in the future.

As summarized above, there are known historical resources in the Plan Area and the potential for more properties that have not been evaluated and could be CEQA historical resources. In particular, the Plan Area includes resources that are recently reaching 45 years or more of age and are associated with periods of Long Beach history and not fully documented in the Historic Context Statement. Preservation of these modern buildings may not be feasible or consistent with the goals of the GCSP. Furthermore, as these resources are not listed, may be eligible for local listing but not the state or national register, impacts under CEQA will differ from NEPA. Consequently, these future activities could result in significant impacts to CEQA historical resources in the Plan Area.

### **CEQA Impact Determination**

Implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1**, requires future project proponents to ensure that potential impacts to historical resources be assessed at the project level. This includes project review by a qualified architectural historian to assess the potential impacts to known and potential CEQA historical resources. If project implementation could result in impacts, than a Historic Resource Evaluation Report will need to be prepared by a qualified architectural historian for the specific project to verify if any CEQA historical resources are could be impacted by the Proposed Project. Development under the proposed GCSP has a potential for demolishing structures that are eligible for historic significance. Preservation of historic-age buildings may not be feasible or consistent with the goals of the GCSP.

In the event, a future development proposal could result in the demolition of a historical resource, the inclusion of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-2** would ensure that the historic structure is documented pursuant to the guidelines of Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-level III. This documentation would be prepared by a qualified professional in the field. Due to the potential loss of historic age structures with implementation of the GCSP, significant impacts would remain after the incorporation of identified mitigation. As such, impacts would be **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA.

### **NEPA Impact Determination**

Implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1**, which requires future project proponents to ensure that potential impacts to historical resources be assessed at the project level, and that properties 45 years old or older be evaluated for historical significance prior to initiation of any project-related activities that could result in the identification of significant impacts to historic properties. The adoption of the GCSP would not result in direct impacts to historic resources, but the implementation of future projects would potentially result in adverse effects on historic-age structures. Project-level analyses

included in mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1** would ensure that historic resources are identified consistent with 36 CFR 60.4, which defines criteria for determining eligibility for listing in the NRHP. The significance of historic resources identified during an inventory must be formally evaluated for historic significance in consultation with the ACHP and the California SHPO to determine if the resources are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Cultural resources may be considered eligible for listing if they possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Preservation of historic-age buildings may not be feasible or consistent with the goals of the GCSP. As noted above, mitigation measure **MM-CUL-2** would ensure that the historic structure is documented pursuant to the guidelines of HABS-level III prior to demolition. The determination of eligibility and treatment of resources would be consistent with the Section 106 process. It is anticipated that due to differences in eligibility criteria, any unlisted resources may be eligible for local listing but not be eligible for the national register, however final determinations will be based project-level analysis. The potential for loss of historic resources under the implementation of the GCSP would potentially result in future **adverse effects** under NEPA.

*b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?*

A CHRIS records search was conducted for the Plan Area and a 0.5-mile radius study area. No archaeological resources were identified within the Plan Area as a result of the CHRIS records search or NAHC SLF search. It is always possible that unanticipated discoveries could be encountered during ground-disturbing activities associated with implementation of future projects under the Proposed Project. If such unanticipated discoveries were encountered, impacts to encountered resources could be potentially significant.

### **CEQA Impact Determination**

With the implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-3**, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of a find would be required to immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology) can evaluate the significance of the find. Additionally, the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TCR-1** through **MM-TCR-9** (see Section 3.12 Tribal Cultural Resources of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), which identifies the City’s standard monitoring guidance for ground disturbance activities, will further ensure impacts to archaeological resources is less than significant. As such, potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels. Impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated** under CEQA.

### NEPA Impact Determination

With the implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-3**, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of a find would be required to immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology) can evaluate the significance of the find. Additionally, the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TCR-1** through **MM-TCR-9** (see Section 3.12 Tribal Cultural Resources of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), which identifies the monitoring guidance for ground disturbance activities, will further ensure impacts to archaeological resources is less than significant. As such, potentially significant effects to archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels. As such, there would be **no adverse effect** under NEPA.

c) *Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?*

No prehistoric or historic burials were identified within the Plan Area as a result of the records search. However, the possibility of encountering human remains within the Plan Area exists. The discovery of human remains would require handling in accordance with PRC 5097.98, which states that in the event that human remains are discovered during construction, construction activity shall be halted and the area shall be protected until consultation and treatment can occur as prescribed by law. In the unexpected event that human remains are unearthed during construction activities, impacts could be potentially significant.

### CEQA Impact Determination

With the implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-4**, which identifies the guidance and protocol for handling the inadvertent discovery of human remains, impacts would not be significant. Impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated** under CEQA.

### NEPA Impact Determination

With the implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-4**, which identifies the guidance and protocol for handling the inadvertent discovery of human remains, effects would not be significant. As such, there would be **no adverse effects** under NEPA.

## 3.3.5 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts on cultural resources consider whether the impacts of the Proposed Project together with other related projects substantially diminish the number of historic or archeological resources within the same or similar context or property type. However, impacts to cultural

resources, if any exist, tend to be site-specific. There is one documented historic resource within the Plan Area; one documented historic district immediately adjacent to the Plan Area; and several unevaluated resources that meet the 45-year age threshold for CEQA which may be eligible for inclusion on the national, state, or local register as individual resources or as contributors to historic districts, as outlined by the City of Long Beach Historic Context Statement, for their association with the Oil Industry Subtheme (1921-1945) (Sapphos 2009: 82-87), or the Aerospace Industry Subtheme (Sapphos 2009: 87-90).

The cultural resources that are potentially affected by the related projects would also be subject to the same requirements of CEQA as the Proposed Project, and as such, any impacts would be mitigated, as applicable. These determinations would be made on a case-by-case basis, and the effects of cumulative development on historical resources would be mitigated to the extent feasible in accordance with CEQA and other applicable legal requirements. While the potential for demolition of historic-age properties (45 years or older) would occur with buildout of the GCSP, not all structures within the Plan Area over 45 years of age would meet the eligibility requirements for designation as a historic resource. The majority of structures are likely not eligible for listing in the CRHR and/or the NRHP. With the implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1**, property eligibility will be determined on a project-level basis. Therefore, while implementation of the GCSP could result in the potential for demolition of historic-age structures, this impact would not represent a cumulative impact because mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1** requires analysis on a project-level basis and there are few existing designated historic resources within the plan area that would be demolished without further environmental analysis. While the possibility exists for unlisted but eligible for local listing resources to be demolished, there is no historic landmark district or grouping of structures eligible for consideration as a district within the boundaries of the GCSP. Therefore, there is no cumulative impact from the loss of individual resources or any group of resources. Each loss of individual resources is potentially significant and therefore no additional cumulative impact exists beyond those individual impacts. Existing designated historic districts, contributing properties in historic districts, and landmark buildings would be protected under the provisions of the Municipal Code related to historic preservation.

Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce potential impacts related to the unanticipated discovery of archaeological resources and human remains. The cumulative impacts on cultural resources would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated** (mitigation measures **MM-CUL-1** through **MM-CUL-4** and **MM-TCR-1** through **MM-TCR-9** (see Section 3.12, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS).

### **3.3.6 Mitigation Measures**

The following mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts to cultural resources (historic era-built environment and archaeological) and human remains to a less-than-

significant level. Additionally, the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TCR-1** through **MM-TCR-9** (see Section 3.12 Tribal Cultural Resources of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), which identifies monitoring guidance for ground disturbance activities, will further ensure impacts to archaeological resources is less than significant.

**MM-CUL-1 Project Level Analysis of Historic Era Built Environment Resources.**

Implementation of the Proposed Project (re-zoning and design plans within the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan area) will likely result in the development of plans for future project-level activities that involve construction and ground disturbing activities within the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan area. As such, future projects involving these types of activities could constitute a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource by means of 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 (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5). To mitigate the potential impacts of future projects developed under the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan, prospective project developers and/or stakeholders shall be required to ensure that potential impacts to historical resources be assessed as part of planning and environmental clearance for their individual project(s).

Prior to the initiation of any construction and/or ground disturbing activities, the Proposed Project will require review by a qualified architectural historian to assess the potential impacts to known and potential CEQA historical resources. If project implementation could result in impacts, than a Historic Resource Evaluation Report will need to be prepared by a qualified architectural historian for the specific project to verify if any CEQA historical resources could be impacted by the Proposed Project. This subsequent identification and impact analysis, including consideration of previously identified historical resources and evaluation of buildings and structures over 45 years old for historical significance in accordance with the guidance of the State of California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), shall be conducted.

In addition, a historical evaluation of the project level impacts (direct or indirect) at the following sites shall be analyzed in accordance with OHP guidance prior to the approval of future project entitlements:

1. Fire Station No. 14, 1838 E. Wardlow Road (APN: 7148-020-024), constructed in 1941
2. 3341 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7148-020-021), constructed in 1933
3. 3275 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7148-020-009), constructed in 1929

4. 3249 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7148-020-010), constructed in 1929
5. 3170 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-047), constructed in 1940
6. 3204 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-045), constructed in 1933
7. 3252 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-042), constructed in 1937
8. 3254 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-062), constructed in 1937
9. 3366 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-035), constructed in 1937
10. 3431 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7147-026-017), constructed in 1947
11. Iglesia Católica Santísimo Sacramento, 1900 E. Carson Street (APN: 7137-013-001), constructed in 1942
12. California Heights Baptist Church, 4110 Gardenia Avenue (APN: 7137-012-009), constructed in 1947

A qualified architectural historian, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, shall conduct all work related to the preparation of historic resource evaluation reports, impact analyses, mitigation recommendations (if deemed necessary), and/or subsequent technical reports, should the proposed construction and implementation of future individual projects under the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan result in potential impacts to CEQA historical resources. If HRE report results indicate that the project will not result in impacts to CEQA historical resources than no further documentation will be required and the impact for the Proposed Project will likely be no impact or less than significant. If the HRE identifies the presence of CEQA historical resources and impacts cannot be avoided through project redesign or relocation than implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-2** will need to be implemented. It is important to note that demolition of a CEQA historical resource cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant. Still, mitigation measure **MM-CUL-2** would apply.

**MM-CUL-2 Project Level Mitigation Alternatives.** In consultation with the Planning Bureau of the Long Beach Development Services Department, prior to the approval of a project level that will result in a significant and unavoidable impact to a historic resource under CEQA, mitigation will be required. Mitigation should be developed by an historic qualified historic preservation specialist or architectural historian based on individual resource historic significance to help ensure that the mitigation addresses what is significant about the resource. A range of mitigation options are available including but not limited to development of interpretive materials, salvage of historic materials, or documentation of the buildings and structures proposed for

demolition that follows the general guidelines of Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-level III documentation. All mitigation needs to be initiated prior to project construction and completed prior to project completion, HABS documentation, which is a common form of mitigation for CEQA historical resources, shall include high resolution digital photographic recordation, a historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR, Part 61). The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), Billie Jean King Main Library, and Historical Society of Long Beach to make it available for current and future generations. Archival copies of the documentation also would be submitted to the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services, where it would be available to local researchers. The documentation reports shall be completed and approved by the City of Long Beach prior to the issuance of demolition permits

**MM-CUL-3 Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources.** In the event that archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during future construction activities, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, and tribal monitor/consultant approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending upon the significance of the find under CEQA (14 CCR 15064.5(f); PRC Section 21082), work may continue on other parts of the project while evaluation and, if necessary, additional protective mitigation takes place. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work, such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.

**MM-CUL-4 Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains.** In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found during future construction activities, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the Plan Area or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Public Resource Code 5097.98 shall be followed. In

accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

### 3.3.7 Significant After Mitigation

With implementation of mitigation measures **MM-CUL-1** and **MM-CUL-2**, impacts would be reduced but remain significant and unavoidable with the potential for the demolition or loss of properties over 45 years of age. Implementation of mitigation measures **MM-CUL-3** and **MM-CUL-4**, in addition to mitigation measures **MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-9** (see Section 3.12 Tribal Cultural Resources of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), would ensure potential impacts to unanticipated discoveries or tribal cultural resources are **less than significant**.

Implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1** would provide for the preparation of historic resource studies to evaluate impacts of future projects in the Plan Area. However, while mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1** would identify the eligibility of historic-age properties, the City of Long Beach has determined, due to the age of the existing buildings in the Plan Area, most of the built environment is more than 45 years in age and potentially qualify as historic resources under CEQA. The eventual development of the Plan Area would potentially result in a loss of historic-age buildings. Therefore, the potential for this loss cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level by this mitigation alone, and this impact remains significant and unavoidable. Chapter 4.0, Alternatives, considers alternatives, including the No Build Alternative.

### 3.3.8 References

- CHNA (California Heights Neighborhood Association). 2018. Letter to Craig Chalfant, City of Long Beach Development Services/Planning Bureau. October 11, 2018.
- City of Long Beach. 2015. “Criteria for Designation of Landmarks and Landmark Districts.” Municipal Code, Title 2, Chapter 2.63.050.
- Curtis, I.K. 1965. Aerial photograph. Flight Number AMI-LA-65, Frame 565. 1:36,000 scale. February 2, 1965. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=ami-la-65](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=ami-la-65).
- Denger, Mark. 2016. “Historic California Posts Camps Stations, and Airfields: Long Beach Army Air Field.” Accessed November 12, 2018. <http://www.militarymuseum.org/LongBeachAAF.html>.

- FAS (Fairchild Aerial Surveys). 1927. Aerial photograph. Flight Number C-300, Frames m-172 and m-173. 1:18,000 scale. December 31, 1927. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=c-300](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=c-300).
- FAS. 1933. Aerial photograph. Flight Number C-3005, Frame 3. 1:8,700 scale. December 31, 1933. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=c-3005](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=c-3005).
- FAS. 1947. Aerial photograph. Flight Number C-11351, Frame 7-67. 1:24,000 scale. April 30, 1947. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=c-11351](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=c-11351).
- FAS. 1956. Aerial photograph. Flight Number C-22555, Frame 26-35 and 26-36. 1:14,400 scale. June 30, 1956. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=c-22555](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=c-22555).
- FAS. 1960. Aerial photograph. Flight Number C-23870, Frame 2129. 1:14,400 scale. April 30, 1960. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=c-23870](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=c-23870).
- Fitch, J.E. and R.D. Reimer, 1967. Otoliths and Other Fish Remains from a Long Beach, California Pliocene Deposit. *Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences*,66(2):77-91.
- Google Earth. 2018. Aerial Imagery for 2901 Orange Avenue, Long Beach CA area. Imagery dated between 11/2009 and 5/2011.
- Long Beach Airport. 2017. “Airport History.” Accessed December 11, 2017. [http://www.lgb.org/about/airport\\_history/default.asp](http://www.lgb.org/about/airport_history/default.asp)
- LBP (Long Beach Planning). 2017. “California Heights Historical District: Map.” Accessed December 11, 2017. <http://www.lbds.info/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=5296>.

- L.A. Assessor (Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor). 2018. “Property Assessment Information System.” Interactive Map. Accessed November 30, 2018. [http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/GVH\\_2\\_2/Index.html?configBase=http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/viewers/PAIS\\_hv/virtualdirectory/Resources/Config/Default](http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/GVH_2_2/Index.html?configBase=http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PAIS/viewers/PAIS_hv/virtualdirectory/Resources/Config/Default)
- NETR (Nationwide Environmental Title Research LLC). 2018a. Historic aerial photographs of 3500 Cherry Avenue dating from 1953, 1963, 1972, 1994, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2009, 2010, 2012. Accessed November 13, 2018. <https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer>.
- NETR. 2018b. Historic topographical maps of 3500 Cherry Avenue dating from 1896, 1899, 1902, 1906, 1911, 1916, 1923, 1924, 1926, 1929, 1934, 1942, 1951, 1952, 1955, 1963, 1966, , 1975, 1982, 1987. Accessed November 13, 2018. <https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer>.
- Norton, Mike. 2017. “The History of Long Beach’s Historical District.” Accessed December 11, 2017. <http://www.mikenorton.com/the-history-of-long-beachs-historical-district/>
- Pacific Air Industries, Long Beach, California (PAI). 1953. Aerial photograph. Flight Number AXJ-1952, Frame 14K-94. 1:20,000 scale. November 19, 1953. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=AXJ-1952](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=AXJ-1952).
- Peterson, Melody. 2015. “Boeing auctioning equipment as it closes C-17 plant in Long Beach.” Los Angeles Times. June 13, 2015. Accessed December 11, 2017. <http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-boeing-plant-20150613-story.html>
- Polk’s City Directory.
- 1899-1900. *Directory of Long Beach, Terminal and San Pedro*. No publisher listed.
- 1909-1910. *Directory of Greater Long Beach, California*. Pasadena and Long Beach, CA: Albert G. Thurston.
- 1914-15. *Long Beach City Directory*. Los Angeles, CA: Albert G. Thurston.
1920. *Long Beach City Directory*. Long Beach, CA: Western Directory Company.
1921. *Long Beach City Directory*. Long Beach, CA: Western Directory Company.
1923. *Long Beach City Directory*. Long Beach, CA: Western Directory Company.
1926. *Long Beach City Directory*. Long Beach, CA: Western Directory Company.
1930. *Long Beach City Directory*. Long Beach, CA: Houston L. Walsh.

1935. *Polk's Long Beach California City Directory*. Long Beach, CA: R. L. Polk & Co. of California.
1940. *Polk's Long Beach (California) City Directory*. Long Beach, CA: R. L. Polk & Co.
1945. *Polk's Long Beach (California) City Directory*. Long Beach, CA: R. L. Polk & Co.
- 1951-52. *Long Beach (Los Angeles California) City Directory*. Los Angeles, CA: R. L. Polk & Co.
1960. *Polk's Long Beach (Los Angeles County, Calif.) Directory Including Signal Hill*. Los Angeles, CA: R. L. Polk & Co.
- RLCHS (Rancho Los Cerritos Historical Site). 2017. "History: 1784-1866" Accessed December 11, 2017. <https://www.rancholoscerritos.org/about-hub/history-hub/site-history-hub/1784-1866/>
- Sanborn (Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps). 1914. "Long Beach." Volume 1, Sheet 0b [map].
- Sanborn. 1923. "Long Beach." Volume 2, Sheets 285 and 286 [map].
- Sanborn. 1950a. "Long Beach." Volume 2, Sheets 285, 286, 287, 288 [map].
- Sanborn. 1950b. "Long Beach." Volume 3, Sheets 314, 315, 316 [map].
- Sapphos Environmental, Inc. 2009. City of Long Beach Historic Context Statement. Prepared for the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services, Office of Historic Preservation. Accessed November 12, 2018. <https://www.laconservancy.org/sites/default/files/files/issues/2009%20historic%20context%20for%20city.pdf>.
- Skyview (Skyview Aerial Photo, Inc.). 2007. Aerial photograph. Flight Number EAG-LA-07, Frame 4445. 1:24,000 scale. February 23, 2007. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=eag-la-07](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=eag-la-07).
- Teledyne Geotronics. 1968. Aerial photograph. Flight Number TG-2400, Frame 2-11. 1:28,800 scale. February 29, 1968. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=tg-2400](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=tg-2400).

- Teledyne Geotronics. 1970. Aerial photograph. Flight Number TG-2830, Frame 2-196. 1:14,400 scale. October 25, 1970. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=tg-2830](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=tg-2830).
- Teledyne Geotronics. 1976. Aerial photograph. Flight Number TG-7600, Frame 4-8 1:24,000 scale. January 31, 1976. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=tg-7600](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=tg-7600).
- Teledyne Geotronics. 1981. Aerial photograph. Flight Number TG-3800, Frame 20-7. 1:24,000 scale. March 8, 1981. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=tg-3800](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=tg-3800).
- USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). 1994. Aerial photograph. Flight Number NAPP-2C, Frame 6858-81. 1:40,000 scale. May 30, 1994. Aerial Photograph Collection, Map and Imagery Laboratory, University of California Santa Barbara. Accessed November 9, 2018. [http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed\\_by=napp-2c](http://mil.library.ucsb.edu/apcatalog/report/report.php?filed_by=napp-2c).
- Waldie, D.L. 2013. “This is the End of Building Planes in Long Beach.” KCET. September 20, 2013. Accessed December 11, 2017. <https://www.kcet.org/socal-focus/this-is-the-end-of-building-planes-in-long-beach>.
- Woodbridge, Sally. 2013. “Architectural Narrative ‘Rancho Los Alamitos.’ Accessed December 11, 2017. [https://www.rancholosalamitos.com/aboutus/woodbridge\\_architectural\\_narrative.pdf](https://www.rancholosalamitos.com/aboutus/woodbridge_architectural_narrative.pdf).

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK