

# **IV. Environmental Impact Analysis**

---

## **C. Cultural Resources**

### **1. Introduction**

This section of the Draft EIR analyzes the Project's potential impacts on cultural resources, including historic, archaeological, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources. This section is based in part on the *Historical Resource Evaluation Report* (Historic Resources Report) prepared by GPA Consulting (November 2014), included as Appendix C of this Draft EIR. In addition, the analysis of potential impacts with regard to archaeological and paleontological resources is based on records searches, included as Appendices D and E of this Draft EIR, respectively; a previous archaeological and paleontological resources assessment entitled *Addendum Report: Results of Archaeological and Paleontological Assessment of the Proposed Second and PCH Project* (Archaeological/Paleontological Report) prepared for the Project Site by PCR Services Corporation (March 2010), included as Appendix F; and a review of existing conditions within the Project Site.<sup>1</sup> Potential impacts to tribal cultural resources have been determined through consultation with various California Native American tribes; Appendix G contains correspondence between the City of Long Beach (City) and relevant tribes.

### **2. Environmental Setting**

#### **a. Regulatory Framework**

##### **(1) Historic Resources**

Historic resources fall within the jurisdiction of several levels of government. The framework for the identification and, in certain instances, protection of historic resources is established at the federal level, while the identification, documentation, and protection of such resources are often undertaken by state and local governments. As described below, the principal federal, state, and local laws governing and influencing the preservation of historic resources of national, state, regional, and local significance include the National

---

<sup>1</sup> *The March 2010 Archaeological/Paleontological Report was originally presented in Appendix D of the 2011 Draft EIR for the Second+PCH Development (SCH No. 2009101014), a previous development proposal at the Project Site. Information in that report remains relevant to the Project Site and is referenced herein.*

Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended; the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); and the City of Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC; Section 2.63.050), all of which are summarized below.

(a) *National Register of Historic Places*

Authorized under the NHPA, as amended, the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) is “an authoritative guide to be used by federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the nation’s cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.”<sup>2</sup> The National Register recognizes properties that are significant at the national, State, and local levels.

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must be at least 50 years of age (unless the property is of “exceptional importance”) and possess significance in American history and culture, architecture, or archaeology. A property of potential significance must meet one or more of the following criteria for listing in the National Register:

- (a) Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- (b) 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) Yield, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to meeting any or all of the criteria listed above, a property nominated for listing on the National Register must have integrity. As defined in the *National Register Bulletin 15*, integrity is “the ability of a property to convey its significance.”<sup>4</sup> The National

---

<sup>2</sup> 36 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Section 60.2.

<sup>3</sup> 36 Code of Federal Regulations 60, Section 60.3.

<sup>4</sup> *National Register Bulletin 15, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, Washington DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1997.*

Park Service recognizes seven aspects or qualities of integrity: feeling, association, workmanship, location, design, setting, and materials. The following is excerpted from the *National Register Bulletin, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, which provides guidance on the interpretation and application of these factors:

- *Feeling* is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
- *Association* is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.
- *Workmanship* is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- *Location* is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event took place.
- *Design* is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- *Setting* is the physical environment of a historic property.
- *Materials* are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.<sup>5</sup>

In assessing a property's integrity, the National Park Service also recognizes that properties change over time. Therefore, as described in the *National Register Bulletin 15*, "it is not necessary for a property to retain all of its historic physical features or characteristics. The property must retain, however, the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic identity."

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must also be significant within a historic context. According to the *National Register Bulletin 15*, historic contexts are "those patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific...property or site is understood and its meaning...is made clear." A property must represent an important aspect of the area's history or prehistory and possess the requisite integrity to qualify for the National Register.

---

<sup>5</sup> *National Register Bulletin 15, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, Washington DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1997.*

Additionally, the National Park Service defines the period of significance as “the length of time when a property was associated with important events, activities or persons, or attained the characteristics which qualify it for...listing” in national, state, or local registers. A period of significance can be “as brief as a single year... [or] span many years.” It is based on “specific events directly related to the significance of the property,” for example, the date of construction, years of ownership, or length of operation as a particular entity.<sup>6</sup>

*(b) California Register of Historic Resources*

The California Register was enacted in 1992, and its regulations became official on January 1, 1998. The California Register is an authoritative guide used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the State’s historic resources and indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.<sup>7</sup> The criteria for eligibility for listing in the California Register are based on National Register criteria. To be eligible for listing in the California Register, a property generally must be at least 50 years of age and must possess significance at the local, state, or national level, under one or more of the following criteria:

- (1) Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
- (2) Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history.
- (3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.
- (4) Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

Historic resources eligible for listing in the California Register may include buildings, sites, structures, objects, and historic districts. Resources less than 50 years of age may be eligible if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance. While the enabling legislation for the California Register is less

---

<sup>6</sup> *National Register Bulletin 16A, How to Complete the National Register Registration Form, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1997.*

<sup>7</sup> *California Public Resources Code, Section 5023.1(a).*

rigorous with regard to the issue of integrity, there is an expectation that properties reflect their appearance during their period of significance.<sup>8</sup>

A historic resource eligible for listing in the California Register must meet one or more of the significance criteria described above and retain enough of its historic character or appearance to be recognizable as a historic resource and to convey the reasons for its significance. As described above, integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The resource must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which it is proposed for eligibility. California Register regulations contained in California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 11.5 include Section 4852(c), which states “it is possible that historical resources may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but they may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.”

The California Register also includes properties that: (1) have been formally determined eligible for listing in, or are listed in, the National Register; (2) are registered State Historical Landmark Number 770 and all consecutively numbered landmarks above Number 770; or (3) are points of historical interest, which have been reviewed by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and recommended for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission. Resources that may be nominated for listing in the California Register include: individual historic resources; historic resources contributing to the significance of a historic district; historic resources identified as significant in historic resources surveys; historic resources and historic districts designated or listed as city or county landmarks or historic properties or districts; and local landmarks.

*(c) California Environmental Quality Act*

CEQA requires a lead agency to analyze whether historic and/or archaeological resources may be adversely impacted by a project. Under CEQA, Public Resources Code Section 21084.1, a “project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” This statutory standard involves a two-part inquiry. The first involves a determination of whether the project involves a historic resource. If so, the lead agency must determine whether the project may involve a “substantial adverse change in the significance” of the resource. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 provides, for the purposes of CEQA compliance, the term “historical resources” shall include the following:

---

<sup>8</sup> *California Code of Regulations, Section 4852.*

- A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.<sup>9</sup>
- A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k) or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(g), shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat such resources as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be 'historically significant' if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources.<sup>10</sup>

The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(g)) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

*(d) City of Long Beach Municipal Code*

The Cultural Heritage Commission Ordinance was enacted in 1973 and created the City's Cultural Heritage Commission and criteria for the designation of City Historic Landmarks. Based on the ordinance, historic landmarks are defined as any sites, buildings, or structures of particular historic or cultural significance to the City of Long Beach in which the broad cultural, economic, political, or social history of the nation, state, or city is reflected or exemplified. Historic landmarks are regulated by the City's Cultural Heritage Commission, which reviews permits to alter, relocate, or demolish such landmarks.

---

<sup>9</sup> Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 4850 et seq.

<sup>10</sup> Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 4852.

---

LBMC Section 2.63.050 establishes criteria for designating local historic landmarks and landmark districts. A cultural resource may be recommended for designation as a landmark if it retains integrity and manifests one 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.<sup>11</sup>

Similarly, a group of cultural resources may qualify for designation as a landmark district if it retains integrity as a whole and meets the following criteria:

- (E) The grouping represents a significant and distinguishable entity that is significant within a historic context.
- (F) A minimum of sixty percent (60%) of the properties within the boundaries of the proposed landmark district qualify as a contributing property.<sup>12</sup>

*(e) City of Long Beach Historic Preservation Element*

The Historic Preservation Element of the Long Beach 2030 General Plan was adopted by the City Council in June 2010. The Historic Preservation Element outlines a vision for future historic preservation efforts and the actions needed to achieve that vision. Primary goals of the Historic Preservation Element are to better integrate historic preservation into City procedures and interdepartmental decisions and to create a meaningful partnership with the community in order to implement the historic preservation program.

---

<sup>11</sup> Long Beach Municipal Code Section 2.63.050.

<sup>12</sup> Long Beach Municipal Code Section 2.63.050.

## (2) Archaeological and Paleontological Resources

Federal, state, and local governments have developed laws and regulations designed to protect significant cultural resources that may be affected by actions that they undertake or regulate. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), NHPA, and CEQA are the basic federal and state laws governing the preservation of historic and archaeological resources of national, regional, state, and local significance. As archaeological resources are also considered historic resources, regulations applicable to historic resources are also applicable to archaeological resources.

### (a) *California Environmental Quality Act*

State archaeological regulations affecting the Project include the statutes and guidelines contained in CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and Section 21084.1) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 15064.5). CEQA requires lead agencies to carefully consider the potential effects of a project on archaeological resources. Several agency publications, such as the series produced by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, provide guidance regarding procedures to identify such resources, evaluate their importance, and estimate potential effects.

CEQA recognizes that archaeological resources are part of the environment, and a project that "may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource [including archaeological resources] is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment".<sup>13</sup> For purposes of CEQA, a historical resource is any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register.<sup>14</sup> Refer to the previous discussion regarding the California Register for a list of the criteria used to determine whether a resource is eligible for listing in the California Register and is therefore considered a historical resource under CEQA.

Archaeologists assess sites based on all four criteria but usually focus on the fourth criterion previously provided, which is whether the resource "[h]as yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history." The California Code of Regulations also provides that cultural resources of local significance are eligible for listing in the California Register.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> *California Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1.*

<sup>14</sup> *California Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1.*

<sup>15</sup> *California Code of Regulations Title 14, Section 4852.*

In addition to historic resources, CEQA considers project impacts to “a unique archaeological resource.” In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g), a unique archaeological resource is defined 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 of meeting any of the following criteria:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; or
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
- Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.<sup>16</sup>

In addition to having significance in accordance with the applicable criteria, resources must have integrity for the period of significance. The period of significance is the date or span of time within which notable events transpired at a site or the period during which notable individuals made their important contributions to a site. Integrity is the ability of that property to convey its significance.

CEQA requires the lead agency to consider whether a project would have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources or resources eligible for listing in the California Register and to avoid these resources when feasible or mitigate any effects to less than significant levels.<sup>17</sup> CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c)(4) notes that if an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological resource nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e) provides procedures to be followed in the event of the accidental discovery of human remains. If remains are discovered, the county coroner shall examine the remains to determine the nature of the remains and cause of death. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the county coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which would then identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent(s) of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations for the excavation work and for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the

---

<sup>16</sup> *California Public Resources Code, Section 21083.2(g).*

<sup>17</sup> *California Public Resources Code, Section 21083.2 and Section 21084.1.*

human remains and any associated grave goods. Under certain conditions, the landowner or his authorized representative may rebury the human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance. Native American burials in California are protected by Public Resources Code Sections 5097.9 through 5097.991 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.

Paleontological resources are also afforded protection under CEQA. CEQA Guidelines Appendix G provides guidance relative to significant impacts on paleontological resources and states “a project will normally result in a significant impact on the environment if it will... disrupt or adversely affect a paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, except as part of a scientific study.” Public Resources Code Section 5097.5 also specifies that any unauthorized removal of paleontological remains is a misdemeanor. Further, California Penal Code Section 622.5 sets the penalties for the unauthorized damage or removal of paleontological resources.

*(b) California Health and Safety Code*

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

### (3) Tribal Cultural Resources

Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) requires local governments to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the California Native American Heritage Commission prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or specific plan. In addition, California law protects Native American burials, skeletal remains, and associated grave goods regardless of the antiquity and provides for the sensitive treatment and disposition of those remains.

On September 25, 2014, Governor Brown signed into law Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), which amended Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 and added Sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, and 21084.3 to establish that an analysis of a project's impact on cultural resources include whether the project would impact “tribal cultural resources.” Public Resources Code Section 21074 defines tribal cultural resources as follows:

(a) “Tribal cultural resources” are either of the following:

- (1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
  - (A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.
  - (B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.<sup>18</sup>
- (2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1.<sup>19</sup> In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.
  - (b) A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape.
  - (c) A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2,<sup>20</sup> or a “nonunique archaeological resource” as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2<sup>21</sup> may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

---

<sup>18</sup> Per subdivision (k) of Public Resources Code Section 5020.1, “local register of historical resources” means a list of properties officially designated or recognized as historically significant by a local government pursuant to a local ordinance or resolution.

<sup>19</sup> Subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 provides the National Register criteria for listing of historical resources in the California Register.

<sup>20</sup> Per subdivision (g) of Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, a unique archaeological resource means 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; or (2) has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or (3) is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

<sup>21</sup> Per subdivision (h) of Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, a nonunique archaeological resource means an archaeological artifact, object, or site which does not meet the criteria in subdivision (g). A nonunique archaeological resource need be given no further consideration, other than the simple recording of its existence by the lead agency if it so elects.

For a project for which a Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR was filed on or after July 1, 2015, the lead agency is required to consult with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if: (1) the tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects in that geographic area; and (2) the tribe requests consultation, prior to the release of a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report for the project. The consultation procedures set forth in AB 52 largely parallel those of SB 18. Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(b) defines consultation with a cross-reference to Government Code Section 65352.4, which applies when local governments consult with tribes on certain planning documents and states the following:

*“Consultation” means the meaningful and timely process of seeking, discussing, and considering carefully the views of others, in a manner that is cognizant of all parties’ cultural values and, where feasible, seeking agreement. Consultation between government agencies and Native American tribes shall be conducted in a way that is mutually respectful of each party’s sovereignty. Consultation shall also recognize the tribes’ potential needs for confidentiality with respect to places that have traditional tribal cultural significance.*

The new provisions in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.2(a) enumerate topics that may be addressed during consultation, including identification of the significance of tribal cultural resources, determination of the potential significance of project impacts on tribal cultural resources and the type of environmental document that should be prepared, and identification of possible mitigation measures and project alternatives.

Public Resources Code Section 21084.3 also states that public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. This section further includes examples of mitigation measures that may be considered to avoid or minimize the significant adverse effects, such as the following:

- Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to, planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context, or planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
- Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
  - Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.

- Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
- Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
- Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
- Protecting the resource.

Consultation ends when either of the following occurs prior to the release of the environmental document:<sup>22</sup>

- (1) Both parties agree to measures to avoid or mitigate a significant effect on a tribal cultural resource. Agreed upon mitigation measures shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document,<sup>23</sup> or
- (2) A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached.<sup>24</sup>

## **b. Existing Conditions**

### **(1) Historic Resources**

The following discussion is based on the Historic Resources Report prepared by GPA Consulting and included as Appendix C of this Draft EIR.

#### *(a) Project Site Development History*

The SeaPort Marina Hotel, previously known as the Edgewater Inn Marina Hotel, was designed by Roy Anthony Sealey and constructed in 1961 by the Martin Burton Company. The hotel was owned by Jim Stockman's Garden Hotels and Lodges, a division of Transwestern Hotels, Inc. At the time of construction, the hotel was one of the first new hotels constructed in the Long Beach area in more than 30 years and was completed in anticipation of the Long Beach World's Fair. The hotel remained under the ownership of Jim Stockman's Garden Hotels and Lodges until the Nordon Corporation purchased the hotel in 1965. In 1966, the hotel was sold to Gerald V. Eisenhower. The property changed

<sup>22</sup> Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Supplement to General Plan Guidelines, November 14, 2005.*

<sup>23</sup> *Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(a).*

<sup>24</sup> *Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.2(b)(1)-(2) and 21080.3.1(b)(1).*

ownership again in 1969 to the Hyatt Corporation, who completed numerous alterations to the property. The hotel currently includes a lobby, restaurant, banquet rooms, guest rooms, and an outdoor pool in a two-story building that extends across the entire property. The building is Midcentury Modern in style with a steel frame structure and stucco exteriors. Surface parking lots and landscaping are located around and between the building as it meanders across the Project Site.

*(b) Evaluation of Historic Significance*

Individual properties located adjacent to the Project Site and in the Project vicinity are examined below for the purposes of identifying potential historic resources. Properties that were previously evaluated as a historic resource, meet the 50-year age threshold, or exhibit characteristics or associations known to be significant are reviewed.<sup>25</sup> The context of their previous evaluations, criteria for significance, and integrity issues are considered.

*(i) Known Historic Resources in the Project Vicinity*

No National Register or City of Long Beach landmarks have been identified within a 0.25-mile radius of the Project Site, although a California Register resource is located within 0.25 mile of the site, as discussed below.

Long Beach Marine Stadium

The Long Beach Marine Stadium (Resource 19-186115) is located at 52255 Paoli Way. The Long Beach Marine Stadium was the first manmade watercourse for the 1932 Olympic rowing competition. The Long Beach Marine Stadium was also used for the 1968, 1976, and 1984 United States Olympic Rowing trials and the site for an official United States Olympic Training Center. The Long Beach Marine Stadium is designated as California Historical Landmark No. 1014 and California Point of Historical Interest No. LAN-056 and is listed in the California Register of Historic Resources.

---

<sup>25</sup> *The 50-year age threshold has become standard in historic preservation as a way to delineate potential historic resources. The National Park Service, which provides guidance for the practice of historic preservation, has established that a resource 50 years of age or older may be considered for listing on the National Register. The National Park Service does make exceptions for properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years that are of "exceptional importance." Source: National Register Bulletin 15, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, Washington DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1997.*

---

(ii) *Potential Historic Resources at the Project Site*

The following describes the SeaPort Marina Hotel, previously known as the Edgewater Inn Marina Hotel, which was constructed in 1961 on the Project Site.

Architecture

The SeaPort Marina Hotel includes a two-story lobby, restaurant, and meeting lobby near the corner of Marina Drive and 2nd Street and a grouping of narrow two-story hotel buildings divided by parking lots, landscaping, and a swimming pool. The exterior surface of the building is sheathed in field-stone and stucco, with large expanses of curtain wall windows divided by aluminum mullions. The interior of the main building has been remodeled several times, though some original “fabric” remains, including the suspended cast-concrete stair that connects the first and second floors, the original chandeliers and mirrored walls along the northern lobby, and a one-story entranceway that spans the entire length of the main building and serves as the formal entranceway to the check-in area.

Overall, the hotel has undergone numerous alterations since its purchase by Hyatt Corporation in 1969. Such alterations included an addition to the rear of the kitchen, enclosure of the existing porch for an office, a remodel of the public areas, a two-story 52-room freestanding addition, and construction of a commercial pool and spa, a storage room, a wall between the cocktail lounge and restaurant, and a gazebo in the front courtyard that was later removed.

Integrity

According to the Historic Resources Report, the SeaPort Marina Hotel does not exhibit sufficient integrity to meet the threshold of significance as a potential historical resource. The SeaPort Marina Hotel is an altered example of a common Mid-Century Modern two-story garden motel in which the remaining elements of integrity (design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association) are compromised. Various updates and modifications have resulted in a property that is vaguely recognizable as a Mid-Century Modern design and which does not currently exhibit a strong association with the Mid-Century Modern style.

Although some of the hotel’s original materials remain, modifications including alterations and additions to the property have compromised the integrity of the original design. In addition, the SeaPort Marina Hotel’s workmanship is compromised due to the lack of maintenance, deterioration, and subsequent incompatible tenant alterations. Therefore, the SeaPort Marina Hotel’s architectural character is poorly expressed and is not an example of its early-1960s origins. With regard to association, there is no indication

that the SeaPort Marina Hotel served as a direct link between an important historic event or person.

### Significance

Based on the Historic Resources Report, the SeaPort Marina Hotel does not appear eligible for either individual listing or as a contributor to a historic district under any applicable criteria, as discussed further below.

At the federal level, the SeaPort Marina Hotel meets the 50-year age consideration of the National Register. As described above, the hotel was designed by Roy Anthony Sealey and constructed in 1961 by the Martin Burton Company. While Anthony Roy Sealey was a recognized African American architect, the hotel is not a notable design of Roy Anthony Sealey's, and the hotel was not recognized at the time of its completion or in subsequent years as an important or notable work of the firm in architectural journals. The hotel incorporates design elements used in Mid-Century Modern-style garden motels and some Googie-style features.<sup>26</sup> However, these features were commonplace and widely used in Mid-Century Modern garden hotels in Long Beach and Southern California. Therefore, these features are not architecturally innovative or singularly distinctive and do not stand out in the works of Roy Anthony Sealey or in the context of local or regional architecture. As such, the SeaPort Marina Hotel is not eligible for listing in the National Register.

At the state level, the historical record does not indicate that the subject property is connected with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage associated with Mid-Century Modern garden motels, as required under Criterion 1. In 1961, the hotel was similar to numerous other garden motels built throughout Southern California during the 1960s. Construction of the hotel followed general local development trends and did not make notable contributions to the economic or social history of south Long Beach during that period. Although the hotel was used by the community to host professional and social events; these events are common to all hotels and are not singularly or cumulatively significant, nor do they add to the significance of the hotel. Under Criterion 2, the hotel does not appear to be associated with the productive life of a person important in California history. In addition, under Criterion 3, the hotel does not appear to be singularly innovative or a distinctive design of Roy Anthony Sealey's. Furthermore, the hotel has been altered and does not exhibit the

---

<sup>26</sup> *Googie is an architectural style that first appeared in Los Angeles in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Characteristics of the style include large exaggerated and angled roofs that appear to float over large expanses of plate glass walls, abstracted geometric plans, site or functionally specific themes, and the integration of natural and synthetic materials.*

required integrity or distinctive characteristics of garden motels necessary for eligibility under this criterion. Under Criterion 4, the hotel has not yielded, nor is it likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

At the local level, the hotel does not appear eligible as a City of Long Beach landmark as the hotel does not possess a significant character, interest or value attributable to the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, the Southern California region, the state, or the nation. The hotel does not manifest any of the City of Long Beach Landmark Criteria set forth in LBMC Section 2.63.050 and listed above. Additionally, the hotel was not identified as a historic resource during preparation of the City's Historic Preservation Element in 2010.

### Conclusion

Based on the above, the hotel does not appear eligible as a historic resource under any of the applicable criteria of the National Register, California Register, or as a City of Long Beach landmark. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3), the hotel is not considered a historic resource.

## (2) Archaeological Resources

Archaeology is the recovery and study of material evidence of human life and culture of past ages. The area surrounding the Project Site is highly urbanized and has been subject to disruption throughout the years. A cultural resource records search, included as Appendix D of this Draft EIR, was conducted through the South Central Coastal Information Center located at the California State University, Fullerton on January 21, 2015. No archaeological resources were identified on the Project Site, although two were noted as located within a 0.5-mile radius.

As discussed in the Archaeological/Paleontological Report, a previous cultural resource records search was conducted for the Project Site in 2010 by PCR, which did not identify archaeological sites within the Project Site, but identified four cultural resources within a 0.25-mile and 0.5-mile radii of the Project Site, including two prehistoric resources (CA-LAN-278 and CA-LAN-1821) and two historic resources (CA-LAN-1473 and 19-187657). Resource CA-LAN-278 consists of a camp area/old village with scattered chipping waste. CA-LAN-1821 consists of a shell midden dominated by the presence of oyster shells. Resource CA-LAN-1473 was identified as a large homesite in ruins, including a garage, portable barn and coop, pump house, and holding pond. Resource P-19-187657, located at 6433 Westminster Avenue, is described as the Bixby Ranch field office building that was originally located approximately 0.3 mile southwest of its present location at the Marine Stadium.

Archaeological evidence indicates prehistoric occupation of the general Project area by the Gabrielino. Specifically, prehistoric archaeological site CA-LAN-693, which included human remains, is located approximately 5 miles west of the Project Site and is interpreted as being part of the *Ahwaanga* village, recorded on the east bank of the Los Angeles River near its mouth. Additionally, the shell midden at CA-LAN-1821 located 0.25 mile east of the Project Site suggests former habitation. Based on the presence of archaeological resources in the surrounding vicinity and the ethnographic evidence which suggests prehistoric groups inhabited the area, the potential to encounter prehistoric resources in native soils within the Project Site is considered moderate to high.

### (3) Paleontological Resources

Paleontology is the study of fossils, which are the remains of ancient life forms. A paleontological resources records search for the Project Site was commissioned through the Vertebrate Paleontology Section of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (LACM) on January 6, 2015. The results of the paleontological records search, which is included in Appendix E of this Draft EIR, indicate there are no known vertebrate fossil localities within the Project Site. In addition, surficial material identified on-site, which consists of artificial fill on top of younger Quaternary Alluvium from the San Gabriel River, is unlikely to contain vertebrate fossils. However, older Quaternary deposits encountered at depth may contain significant fossil vertebrate materials.

The nearest localities of fossil vertebrates from older Quaternary deposits include LACM 3757, located northwest of the Project Site, south of 7th Street, and east of PCH; LACM 6746, also located northwest of the Project Site along 7th Street, west of PCH; and LACM 2031, LACM 7739, and LACM 1005, located northwest of the Project Site. LACM 3757 produced specimens of eagle rays, skates, sharks, bony fish, turtles, birds, and mammals. LACM 6746 produced fossil mammoth specimens. Localities LACM 2031, LACM 7739, and LACM 1005 have generated marine vertebrate fossils including a variety of shark and fish species, stingray, eagle ray, skate, mammal, fossil mammoth, and ground sloth.

### (4) Tribal Cultural Resources

In compliance with the requirements of AB 52, the City provided formal notification of the Project on October 20, 2016. Letters were sent to the following California Native American tribes that requested notification:

- Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation—Andrew Salas
- Gabrielino-Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council—Robert Dorame

- Gabrielino/Tongva Nation—Sam Dunlap
- Gabrielino/Tongva Nation—Sandonne Goad
- Gabrielino-Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians—Anthony Morales
- Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe—Bernie Acuna
- Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe—Linda Candelaria
- L.A. City/County Native American Indian Commission—Ron Andrade
- Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians—Joseph Ontiveros
- Ti'At Society/Inter-Tribal Council of Pimu—Cindi Alvitre
- Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation—John Tommy Rosas
- Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians—Michael Mirelez

On October 20, 2016, John Tommy Rosas responded on behalf of the Tongva Ancestral Territorial Nation and requested that consultation be initiated for the Project. Mr. Rosas discussed the Project with a City representative on a subsequent phone call on October 27, 2016, and recommended that a qualified archaeologist perform archaeological testing concurrent with geotechnical core testing for building foundations. Mr. Rosas further requested that hollow bits rather than auger bits be used for core testing as auger bits can destroy underground materials.

On October 23, 2016, Andrew Salas, Chairman of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation responded on behalf of that tribe. Chairman Salas noted that the Project Site lies in a highly sensitive area for the tribe and requested that a certified Native American monitor be present during any and all ground disturbing activities. Consultation with Chairman Salas is ongoing.

No communication or request for consultation was received from the other tribes contacted.

In addition, as part of the Archaeological/Paleontological Report, a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search request was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission in August 2009. The NAHC search results indicated the presence of one known Native American cultural resource within 0.5 mile of the Project Site. Per NAHC's suggested procedures, follow-up letters were then sent to the seven Native American individuals and organizations identified by the NAHC (at that time) as being affiliated with the Project area to request

additional information and to provide an opportunity to express any concerns regarding Native American cultural resources that may be affected by the Project.

### **3. Environmental Impacts**

#### **a. Methodology**

The Historic Resources Report provided in Appendix C of this Draft EIR was prepared using primary and secondary sources related to the City's development history. The Historic Resources Report is based in part on historic permits for the Project Site, Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, historic photographs, aerial photos and site plans, local histories, and previous historic resource surveys, as well as information provided in the various national, state, and local registers and inventories. Under CEQA, the evaluation of impacts to historic resources consists of a two-part inquiry: (1) a determination of whether the project site contains or is adjacent to a historically significant resource or resources, and if so; (2) a determination of whether the proposed project will result in a "substantial adverse change" in the significance of the resource(s).

To address potential impacts associated with archaeological and paleontological resources, formal records searches were conducted to assess the archaeological and paleontological sensitivity of the Project Site and vicinity. In addition, an evaluation of existing conditions and previous disturbances within the Project Site, the geology of the Project Site, and the anticipated depths of grading were evaluated to determine the potential for uncovering archaeological and paleontological resources.

Consultation with various California Native American tribes who are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Project area was conducted to address potential impacts associated with tribal cultural resources.

#### **b. Thresholds of Significance**

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides a set of sample questions that address impacts with regard to cultural resources. These questions are as follows:

Would the project:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either: (1) a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or (2) a resource determined by a lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 (c) and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

### **c. Project Design Features**

No specific project design features are proposed with regard to cultural resources.

### **d. Analysis of Project Impacts**

#### **(1) Historic Resources**

As described in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, the Project would involve the removal of the existing SeaPort Marina Hotel to allow for construction of a mixed use commercial shopping center. Based on the evaluation of historic significance discussed above, the existing SeaPort Marina Hotel is not considered eligible as a historic resource under any of the applicable criteria of the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or as a City of Long Beach Landmark. Therefore, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource, and impacts associated with removal of the existing SeaPort Marina Hotel would be less than significant.

Additionally, due to the distance between the Project Site and the nearest historic resource (Long Beach Marine Stadium) as well as intervening development, Project implementation would not materially impair the historic setting of the historic Long Beach Marine Stadium. Therefore, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource, and impacts to off-site historic resources in the Project vicinity would be less than significant.

## (2) Archaeological Resources

As previously discussed, the results of archeological records searches for the Project Site indicate there are no archaeological sites located within the Project Site, but four archaeological sites are located within a 0.5-mile radius. Additionally, extensive disturbance of the ground surface has previously occurred on-site in conjunction with past development activities. According to the 2015 records search, archaeological surface finds would be unlikely on-site. However, based on the presence of archaeological resources in the surrounding vicinity and the ethnographic evidence which suggests prehistoric groups inhabited the area, the potential to encounter prehistoric resources in native soils (i.e., at depth) is considered moderate to high.

While the Project would require limited grading of an estimated 7,582 cubic yards for the placement of building footings and foundations, excavation activities could extend to a maximum depth of approximately 11.5 feet.<sup>27</sup> Thus, there is a possibility of encountering archaeological resources or human remains within native soils. Accordingly, impacts with regard to archaeological resources and the discovery of human remains would be potentially significant. In light of this, the 2015 records search recommended archaeological monitoring of ground-disturbing activities in order to avoid damaging any previously unidentified resources.

## (3) Paleontological Resources

As discussed above, the results of the paleontological records search indicate there are no vertebrate fossil localities within the Project Site. In addition, surficial material identified on the Project Site, which consists of artificial fill on top of younger Quaternary Alluvium, is unlikely to contain vertebrate fossils. Moreover, past development activities have disturbed virtually the entire ground surface within the Project Site. However, deeper excavations within older Quaternary deposits may contain significant fossil vertebrate materials.

Despite limited grading of an estimated 7,582 cubic yards for the placement of building footings and foundations, excavation activities could extend to a maximum depth of approximately 11.5 feet.<sup>28</sup> As such, there is a potential to encounter paleontological resources within deeper excavations, and impacts would be potentially significant. In light

---

<sup>27</sup> *The majority of excavation would extend to an average depth of five to six feet, with utility installations occurring at approximately seven to eight feet below the ground surface.*

<sup>28</sup> *The majority of excavation would extend to an average depth of five to six feet, with utility installations occurring at approximately seven to eight feet below the ground surface.*

of this, the 2015 records search indicated any substantial and deep excavations should be monitored to recover any fossil remains discovered.

#### (4) Tribal Cultural Resources

As previously discussed, on October 20, 2016 the City sent formal notification of the Project to 12 representatives of 10 different Native American tribal groups in compliance with the requirements of AB 52. As noted above, as of January 2017, the City has received responses from John Tommy Rosas of the Tongva Ancestral Territorial Nation and Andrew Salas, Chairman of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation. Mr. Rosas requested archaeological testing be conducted by a qualified archaeologist concurrent with geotechnical core testing for building foundations using hollow bits, and Chairman Salas requested a certified Native American monitor be present during ground disturbing activities.

In addition, although no archaeological sites have been identified on-site, four archaeological sites are located within a 0.5-mile radius, including two prehistoric resources (CA-LAN-278 and CA-LAN-1821). As previously discussed, archaeological evidence indicates prehistoric occupation of the general Project area by the Gabrielino, and as noted above, Chairman Salas has confirmed the Project Site is located in an area where tribal villages were once located.

Based on this information provided by the Tongva Ancestral Territorial Nation and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation, tribal monitoring and archaeological testing will be conducted.

## 4. Cumulative Impacts

As indicated in Section III, Environmental Setting, of this Draft EIR, there are six related projects in the general vicinity of the Project Site. While the majority of the related projects are located a fair distance from the Project Site, as shown in Figure III-1 therein, one related project (Related Project No. 4, the Los Cerritos Wetlands Restoration and Oil Consolidation Project) is located in close proximity to the Project Site.<sup>29</sup> Collectively, the related projects near the Project Site involve primarily residential, retail, restaurant, office, and recreational uses, consistent with existing uses in the Project area.

---

<sup>29</sup> *Related Project No. 4 is made up of four sites located at 6422 East 2nd Street, 6701 East PCH, the northeast corner of Studebaker Road and 2nd Street, and Shopkeeper Road at 2nd Street, southeast of the Project Site.*

Also proposed are an industrial facility, new oil wells, and a wetlands mitigation bank, which are also consistent with existing uses.

Although impacts to historic resources tend to be site-specific, a cumulative impact analysis of historic resources determines whether the impacts of a project and the related projects in the surrounding area, when taken as a whole, would substantially diminish the number of historic resources within the same or similar context or property type. Specifically, cumulative impacts would occur if the Project and related projects affect local resources with the same level or type of designation or evaluation, affect other structures located within the same historic district, or involve resources that are significant within the same context. As previously evaluated, Project-related impacts associated with historic resources adjacent to the Project Site and in the Project vicinity would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with historic resources, and the Project's impacts to historic resources would not be cumulatively considerable. As such cumulative impacts to historic resources would be less than significant.

With regard to potential cumulative impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources, the Project vicinity is located within an urbanized area that has been substantially disturbed and developed over time. In the event that archaeological and paleontological resources are uncovered, each related project would be required to comply with applicable regulatory requirements, such as CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, Public Resources Code Sections 5097.9 and 21083.2, and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. In addition, as part of the environmental review processes for the related projects, it is expected that mitigation measures would be established as necessary to address the potential for uncovering paleontological resources and archaeological resources. Therefore, Project impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources would be less than significant.

With regard to tribal cultural resources, it is expected that the related projects would also comply with regulatory requirements, including required consultation with relevant California Native American tribes and that mitigation measures would be established as necessary to address the potential for uncovering any resources. Thus, impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

## 5. Mitigation Measures

### a. Archaeological Resources

**Mitigation Measure C-1:** An Archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards shall be retained by the Project Applicant and approved by the City to oversee and carry out the archaeological mitigation measures set forth in this EIR. The Archaeologist shall attend a pre-grade meeting and develop an appropriate monitoring program and schedule. As part of this effort, the Archaeologist shall select a qualified archaeological monitor to be retained by the Project Applicant and approved by the City.

**Mitigation Measure C-2:** The qualified archaeological monitor shall monitor excavation and grading activities within native soils on the Project Site that have not been previously disturbed. In the event cultural resource(s) are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, the archaeological monitor shall halt or redirect such activities away from the area of the find to allow evaluation, and work may continue outside the vicinity of the find. Deposits shall be treated in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. In addition, if it is determined that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 shall be implemented.

The Archaeologist shall evaluate the discovered resource(s) and if significant, notify the Project Applicant, the City, and an appropriate Native American representative (if prehistoric or Native American in nature), and then develop an appropriate treatment plan. Treatment plans shall consider preservation of the resource(s) in place as a preferred option. The Archaeologist shall then prepare a report to be reviewed and approved by the City and file it with the Project Applicant, the City, and the South Central Coastal Information Center located at the California State University, Fullerton. The report shall describe any resource(s) unearthed, the treatment of such resource(s), and the evaluation of the resource(s) with respect to the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. If the resource(s) are found to be significant, a separate report detailing the results of the recovery and evaluation process shall be prepared. The City shall designate one or more appropriate repositories for any cultural resource(s) that are uncovered.

**Mitigation Measure C-3:** If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during ground-disturbing activities, work in the affected area and the

immediate vicinity shall be halted immediately. The construction manager at the Project Site shall be contacted and shall notify the County Coroner. If the County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Archaeologist and Native American monitor shall then be contacted, if they are not on-site at the time, as well as the responsible lead agency of the discovery, who in turn shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission. Disposition of the human remains and any associated grave goods shall be in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Sections 5097.91 and 5097.98. The Archaeologist and the Native American monitor, with the concurrence of the City, shall determine the area of potential impact and the timing when construction activities can resume. Preservation of the remains in place shall be considered as a possible course of action by the Project Applicant, the City, and the Most Likely Descendent.

## **b. Paleontological Resources**

**Mitigation Measure C-4:** A qualified paleontologist shall be retained to perform periodic inspections of excavation and grading activities within any older Quaternary deposits at the Project Site. The frequency of inspections shall be based on consultation with the paleontologist and shall depend on the rate of excavation and grading activities, the materials being excavated, and if found, the abundance and type of fossils encountered. If paleontological materials are encountered during ground-disturbing activities associated with Project construction, all further ground disturbance in the immediate area shall be temporarily diverted and the services of a qualified paleontologist shall then be secured. The paleontologist shall assess the discovered material(s) and prepare a survey, study or report evaluating the impact. The paleontologist's survey, study or report shall contain a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource, as appropriate. The Applicant shall then comply with the recommendations of the evaluating paleontologist, and a copy of the paleontological survey report shall be submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum. Ground-disturbing activities may resume once the paleontologist's recommendations have been implemented to the satisfaction of the paleontologist. The fossils and a copy of the report shall be deposited in an accredited curation facility.

### **c. Tribal Cultural Resources**

**Mitigation Measure C-5:** The Project Applicant shall allow access to the Project Site by a certified Native American tribal monitor during all ground-disturbing activities. Discovery of any archaeological resources shall trigger implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3, as applicable.

**Mitigation Measure C-6:** Archaeological testing by a qualified archaeologist shall be conducted concurrently with geotechnical core testing for building foundations using hollow bits. Discovery of any archeological resources shall trigger Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3, as applicable.

## **6. Level of Significance After Mitigation**

As evaluated above, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant. Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-6, set forth above, would fully mitigate impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources. Accordingly, with regulatory compliance and implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-6, Project-level impacts related to archaeological resources including human remains, paleontological resources, and tribal cultural resources would be less than significant. Cumulative impacts on historic, archaeological, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources also would be less than significant.