

IV. Environmental Impact Analysis

C. Cultural Resources—Archaeological Resources

1. Introduction

This section evaluates potential impacts to archaeological resources that could result from implementation of the Project. Archaeological resources include artifacts, structural remains, and human remains belonging to an era of history or prehistory. This section is based on information provided in the *Archaeological Resources Assessment for the 6000 Hollywood Boulevard Project* (Archaeological Resources Assessment) prepared by SWCA Consultants (June 2024), included in Appendix C of this Draft EIR.¹

The Project’s potential impacts related to the remaining cultural resources topics (historical resources and human remains) were fully evaluated in the Initial Study prepared for the Project, which is included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR, and such impacts were determined to be less than significant. A summary of the findings of the Initial Study is provided below.

2. Environmental Setting

a. Regulatory Framework

Cultural resources fall within the jurisdiction of several levels of government. The framework for the identification and, in certain instances, protection of cultural resources, including archaeological 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 cultural resources of national, State, regional, and local significance include:

- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended

¹ SWCA, *Archaeological Resources Assessment for the 6000 Hollywood Boulevard Project, Los Angeles California, June 2024.*

- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act
- Archaeological Data Preservation Act
- California Environmental Quality Act
- California Register of Historical Resources
- California Health and Safety Code
- California Public Resources Code
- City of Los Angeles General Plan
- City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance (Los Angeles Administrative Code, Section 22.171)

(1) Federal

(a) National Historic Preservation Act and National Register of Historic Places

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 established the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) as “an authoritative guide to be used by federal, state, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s historic resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.”² The National Register recognizes a broad range of cultural resources that are significant at the national, state, and local levels and can include districts, buildings, structures, objects, prehistoric archaeological sites, historic-period archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and cultural landscapes. Within the National Register, approximately 2,500 (3 percent) of the more than 90,000 districts, buildings, structures, objects, and sites are recognized as National Historic Landmarks or National Historic Landmark Districts as possessing exceptional national significance in American history and culture.³

A resource that is listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register is considered “historic property” under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. As set forth under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, historic property means any

² 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 60.

³ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Historic Landmarks, Frequently Asked Questions*, www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalhistoriclandmarks/faqs.htm, accessed July 6, 2023.

prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places maintained by the Secretary of the Interior. This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization and that meet the National Register criteria.

(i) Criteria

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

- A. Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- 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.⁴

(ii) Context

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must be significant within a historic context. National Register Bulletin #15 states that the significance of a historic property can be judged only when it is evaluated within its historic context. Historic contexts are “those patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific ... property or site is understood and its meaning ... is made clear.”⁵ 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.

⁴ U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 1997, p. 8.

⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 1997, pp. 7–8.

(iii) Integrity

In addition to meeting one or more of the criteria of significance, a property must have integrity, which is defined as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.”⁶ The National Register recognizes seven qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. The seven factors that define integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain historic integrity a property must possess several, and usually most, of these seven aspects. Thus, the retention of the specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. In general, the National Register has a higher integrity threshold than State or local registers.

(iv) Criteria Considerations

Certain types of properties, including religious properties, moved properties, birthplaces or graves, cemeteries, reconstructed properties, commemorative properties, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years are not considered eligible for the National Register unless they meet one of the seven categories of Criteria Considerations A through G, in addition to meeting at least one of the four significance criteria discussed above, and possess integrity as defined above.⁷ Criteria Consideration G is intended to prevent the listing of properties for which insufficient time may have passed to allow the proper evaluation of their historical importance.⁸ The full list of Criteria Considerations is provided below:

- A. A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or
- B. A building or structure removed from its original location but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
- C. A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance, if there is no other appropriate site or building directly associated with his or her productive life; or

⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 1997, p. 44.

⁷ U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 1997, p. 25.

⁸ U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin #15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, 1997, p. 41.

- D. A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
- E. A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
- F. A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own historical significance; or
- G. A property achieving significance within the past 50 years, if it is of exceptional importance.

(b) Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) requires federal agencies to return Native American cultural items to the appropriate Federally recognized Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian groups with which they are associated.⁹

(c) Archaeological Resources Protection Act

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 governs the excavation, removal, and disposition of archaeological sites and collections on federal and Native American lands. This act was most recently amended in 1988. The ARPA defines archaeological resources as any material remains of human life or activities that are at least 100 years of age, and which are of archeological interest. The ARPA makes it illegal for anyone to excavate, remove, sell, purchase, exchange, or transport an archaeological resource from federal or Native American lands without a proper permit.¹⁰

(d) Archaeological Data Preservation Act

The Archaeological Data Preservation Act (ADPA) requires agencies to report any perceived project impacts on archaeological, historical, and scientific data and requires them to recover such data or assist the Secretary of the Interior in recovering the data.

⁹ *United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 1990.*

¹⁰ *U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Technical Brief #20: Archeological Damage Assessment: Legal Basis and Methods, 2007.*

(2) State

(a) California Environmental Quality Act

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

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

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

If an archaeological site meets the criteria for a unique archaeological resource as defined in PRC Section 21083.2, then the site is to be treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083.2, which state that if the lead agency determines that a project would have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state.¹¹ If preservation in place is not feasible, mitigation measures shall be required. The CEQA Guidelines note that if an archaeological

¹¹ *California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(b)*.

resource is neither a unique archaeological nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment.¹²

A significant effect under CEQA would occur if a project results in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). Substantial adverse change is defined as “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.”¹³ According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2), the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that:

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

(b) California Register of Historical Resources

The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is “an authoritative listing and guide to be used by State and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the State and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.”¹⁴ The California Register was enacted in 1992, and its regulations became official on January 1, 1998. The California Register is administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). The criteria for eligibility for the California Register are based upon National Register criteria.¹⁵ Certain resources are determined to be automatically included in the California Register, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register. To be eligible for the California Register, a prehistoric

¹² *State CEQA Statute and Guidelines, Section 15064.5(c)(4).*

¹³ *State CEQA Statute and Guidelines, Section 15064.5(b).*

¹⁴ *California Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1[a]*

¹⁵ *California Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1[b].*

or historic-period property must be significant at the local, State, and/or federal level under one or more of the following four criteria:

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

A resource eligible for the California Register must meet one of the criteria of significance described above, and retain enough of its historic character or appearance—integrity—to be recognizable as a historical resource and to convey the reason for its significance. It is possible that a historic resource may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but it may still be eligible for listing in the California Register.

Additionally, the California Register consists of resources that are listed automatically and those that must be nominated through an application and public hearing process. The California Register automatically includes the following:

- California properties listed on the National Register and those formally determined eligible for the National Register;¹⁶
- California Registered Historical Landmarks from No. 770 onward;¹⁷ and,
- Those California Points of Historical Interest that have been evaluated by OHP and have been recommended to the State Historical Resources Commission for inclusion on the California Register.

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

¹⁶ California State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation, *What is the California Register and What Does it Have to Do With CEQA*, https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21724, accessed September 12, 2023.

¹⁷ California State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation, *California Historical Landmarks Registration*, https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21747, accessed September 12, 2023.

- Historical resources with a significance rating of Category 3 through 5 (those properties identified as eligible for listing in the National Register, the California Register, and/or a local jurisdiction register);
- Individual historical resources;
- Historic districts; and,
- Historical resources designated or listed as local landmarks, or designated under any local ordinance, such as an historic preservation overlay zone.¹⁸

(c) 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 PRC Sections), and the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites. These regulations protect such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction, and establish procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction of a project, including treatment of the remains prior to, during, and after evaluation, and reburial procedures.

(d) California Public Resources Code

California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98, as amended by Assembly Bill 2641, provides procedures in the event human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project implementation. PRC Section 5097.98 requires that upon discovery, the landowner ensure that the immediate vicinity of the discovery is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until communications have been made as described in the section, that the discovery is adequately protected according to generally accepted cultural and archaeological standards, and that further activities take into account the possibility of multiple burials. PRC Section 5097.98 further requires the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), upon notification by a County Coroner, designate and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) regarding the discovery of Native American human remains. Once the MLD has been granted access to the site by the landowner and inspected the discovery, the MLD then has 48 hours to provide recommendations to the landowner for the treatment of the human remains and any associated grave goods. In the event that no descendant is identified, or the descendant fails to make a recommendation for disposition, or if the landowner rejects the recommendation of the descendant, the landowner may, with

¹⁸ *California State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation, What is the California Register and What Does it Have to Do With CEQA, https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21724, accessed September 12, 2023.*

appropriate dignity, reinter the remains and burial items on the property in a location that will not be subject to further disturbance.

(3) Local

(a) *City of Los Angeles General Plan*

(i) *Conservation Element*

The City of Los Angeles General Plan includes a Conservation Element. Section 3 of the Conservation Element, adopted in September 2001, includes policies for the protection of archaeological resources. As stated therein, it is the City's policy that archaeological resources be protected for research and/or educational purposes. Section 5 of the Conservation Element recognizes the City's responsibility for identifying and protecting its cultural and historical heritage. The Conservation Element establishes the policy to continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition, or property modification activities, with the related objective to protect important cultural and historical sites and resources for historical, cultural, research, and community educational purposes.¹⁹

In addition to the National Register and the California Register, the Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) historic designation may apply at the local (City) level.

(ii) *Hollywood Community Plan*

The Land Use Element of the City's General Plan includes 35 community plans. Community plans are intended to provide an official guide for future development and propose approximate locations and dimensions for land use. The community plans establish standards and criteria for the development of housing, commercial uses, and industrial uses, as well as circulation and service systems. The community plans implement the City's General Plan Framework at the local level and consist of both text and an accompanying generalized land use map. The community plans' texts express goals, objectives, policies, and programs to address growth in the community, including those that relate to utilities and service systems required to support such growth. The community plans' maps depict the desired arrangement of land uses as well as street classifications and the locations and characteristics of public service facilities.

¹⁹ *City of Los Angeles, Conservation Element of the General Plan, pp. II-3 to II-5.*

The Project Site is located within the planning boundary of the Hollywood Community Plan. The Hollywood Community Plan does not specifically address archaeological resources.

On May 3, 2023, the City Council adopted the Hollywood Community Plan Update (HCPU). Following adoption of the updated Hollywood Community Plan, the implementing ordinances will be reviewed and finalized by the City Attorney, to ensure clarity of regulations and consistency with state law. After this process is complete, the updated Hollywood Community Plan will be brought into effect by the City Council. The HCPU does not specifically address archaeological resources.

(b) City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance

The Los Angeles City Council adopted the Cultural Heritage Ordinance in 1962 and most recently amended it in 2018 (Sections 22.171 et seq. of the Administrative Code). The Cultural Heritage Ordinance created a Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and criteria for designating an HCM. The CHC is comprised of five citizens, appointed by the Mayor, who have exhibited knowledge of Los Angeles history, culture, and architecture. The City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance states that a HCM designation is reserved for those resources that have a special aesthetic, architectural, or engineering interest or value of a historic nature and meet one of the following criteria. A historical or cultural monument is any site, building, or structure of particular historical or cultural significance to the City of Los Angeles. The criteria for HCM designation are stated below:

- The proposed HCM is identified with important events of national, state, or local history or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, economic, or social history of the nation, state, city, or community is reflected or exemplified; or
- The proposed HCM is associated with the lives of historic personages important to national, state, city, or local history; or
- The proposed HCM embodies the distinct characteristics of style, type, period, or method of construction, or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder, or architect whose individual genius influenced his or her age.²⁰

A proposed resource may be eligible for designation if it meets at least one of the criteria above. When determining historic significance and evaluating a resource against the Cultural Heritage Ordinance criteria above, the CHC and Office of Historic Resources (OHR) staff often ask the following questions:

²⁰ *City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Administrative Code, Section 22.171.7.*

- Is the site or structure an outstanding example of past architectural styles or craftsmanship?
- Was the site or structure created by a “master” architect, builder, or designer?
- Did the architect, engineer, or owner have historical associations that either influenced architecture in the City or had a role in the development or history of Los Angeles?
- Has the building retained “integrity”? Does it still convey its historic significance through the retention of its original design and materials?
- Is the site or structure associated with important historic events or historic personages that shaped the growth, development, or evolution of Los Angeles or its communities?
- Is the site or structure associated with important movements or trends that shaped the social and cultural history of Los Angeles or its communities?

Unlike the National and California Registers, the Cultural Heritage Ordinance makes no mention of concepts such as physical integrity or period of significance. However, in practice, the seven aspects of integrity from the National Register and California Register are applied similarly and the threshold of integrity for individual eligibility is similar. It is common for the CHC to consider alterations to nominated properties in making its recommendations on designations. Moreover, properties do not have to reach a minimum age requirement, such as 50 years, to be designated as HCMs. In addition, the LAMC Section 91.106.4.5 states that the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety “shall not issue a permit to demolish, alter or remove a building or structure of historical, archaeological or architectural consequence if such building or structure has been officially designated, or has been determined by state or federal action to be eligible for designation, on the National Register of Historic Places, or has been included on the City of Los Angeles list of HCMs, without the department having first determined whether the demolition, alteration or removal may result in the loss of or serious damage to a significant historical or cultural asset. If the department determines that such loss or damage may occur, the applicant shall file an application and pay all fees for the CEQA Initial Study and Checklist, as specified in Section 19.05 of the LAMC. If the Initial Study and Checklist identifies the historical or cultural asset as significant, the permit shall not be issued without the department first finding that specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the preservation of the building or structure.”²¹

²¹ *City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Municipal Code, Section 91.106.4.5.1.*

(c) City of Los Angeles Historic Resources Survey

The City of Los Angeles Historic Resources Survey (SurveyLA) is a Citywide survey that identifies and documents potentially significant historical resources representing important themes in the City's history. The survey and resource evaluations were completed by consultant teams under contract to the City and under the supervision of the Department of City Planning's OHR. The program was managed by OHR, which maintains a website for SurveyLA. The field surveys cumulatively covered broad periods of significance, from approximately 1850 to 1980 depending on the location, and included individual resources such as buildings, structures, objects, natural features and cultural landscapes as well as areas and districts (archaeological resources are planned to be included in future survey phases). The survey identified a wide variety of potentially significant resources that reflect important themes in the City's growth and development in various areas including architecture, city planning, social history, ethnic heritage, politics, industry, transportation, commerce, entertainment, and others. Field surveys, conducted from 2010–2017, were completed in three phases by Community Plan area. However, SurveyLA did not survey areas already designated as HPOZs or areas already surveyed by the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles. All tools, methods, and criteria developed for SurveyLA were created to meet state and federal professional standards for survey work.

Los Angeles' Citywide Historic Context Statement (HCS) was designed for use by SurveyLA field surveyors and by all agencies, organizations, and professionals completing historical resources surveys in the City of Los Angeles. The context statement was organized using the Multiple Property Documentation (MPD) format developed by the National Park Service for use in nominating properties to the National Register. This format provided a consistent framework for evaluating historical resources. It was adapted for local use to evaluate the eligibility of properties for city, state, and federal designation programs. The HCS used Eligibility Standards to identify the character defining, associative features and integrity aspects a property must retain to be a significant example of a type within a defined theme. Eligibility Standards also indicated the general geographic location, area of significance, applicable criteria, and period of significance associated with that type. These Eligibility Standards are guidelines based on knowledge of known significant examples of property types; properties do not need to meet all of the Eligibility Standards in order to be eligible. Moreover, there are many variables to consider in assessing integrity depending on why a resource is significant under the National Register, California Register or City of Los Angeles HCM eligibility criteria. SurveyLA findings are subject to change over time as properties age, additional information is uncovered, and more detailed analyses are completed. Resources identified through SurveyLA are not designated resources. Designation by the City of Los Angeles and nominations to the California or National Registers are separate processes that include property owner notification and public hearings.

b. Existing Conditions

The Project Site is generally bounded by Hollywood Boulevard to the north, Bronson Avenue to the east, Carlton Way to the south, and Gower Street to the west. The Project Site is currently occupied primarily by an automotive dealership that includes a showroom, parts storage structure, auto repair facility with five service bays, and surface parking.

Archaeology is the recovery and study of material evidence of human life and culture of past ages. As discussed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, the Project Site is located within the Los Angeles Basin between the northernmost portion of the Peninsular Ranges and the south end of the Transverse Ranges. The Project Site is within the northernmost Central Block of the Los Angeles Basin, which includes the low portions of the Los Angeles coastal plain from Beverly Hills to the Downey Plain within central Orange County. More specifically, the Central Block is bounded by the Hollywood, Santa Monica, and Whittier faults to the north; the Whittier and Elsinore faults and Elysian and Repetto hills to the east; the San Joaquin Hills and Huntington and Newport mesas to the south; and the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone and Dominguez and Baldwin Hills to the west. Surficial geology in the Project vicinity is characterized by deposits of late Pleistocene old fan deposits, Unit 4 (Qof₄).

As determined in the Preliminary Geotechnical Report prepared for the Project by Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc. (see Appendix IS-3 of the Initial Study, which is included as Appendix A of this Draft EIR), up to 11 feet of undocumented fill is present within the Project Site beneath the asphalt pavement. As discussed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, there may be variations in the depth and extent of the fill between the boring sample locations across the Project Site; however, the Preliminary Geotechnical Report provides a representative sample of subsurface conditions. Notably, fragments of brick and concrete were identified within the first six feet of fill in two of the seven borings. The bore logs also indicate some variation in the composition of the fill stratum and are distinguished as various substrata.

c. City of Los Angeles Ethnographic Context

The Archaeological Resources Assessment prepared for the Project, included in Appendix C of this Draft EIR, includes a detailed description of the cultural history of the Project Site and surrounding area. The information below summarizes the discussion included in the Archaeological Resources Assessment.

As discussed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, the Project Site is located in an area historically occupied by the Gabrielino. The name “Gabrielino” (also spelled Gabrieleno and Gabrieleño) denotes those people who were associated with Mission San Gabriel, whereas those who were associated with the Mission San Fernando were referred

to as Fernandño. Based on the Archaeological Resources Assessment, there is little evidence that the people we call Gabrielino had a broad term for their group. Instead, it appears that people identified themselves as inhabitants of a specific community with locational suffixes. For example, a resident of a Yaanga was called a Yabit. Native words suggested as labels for the broader group of Native Americans in the Los Angeles region include Tongva and Kizh, and many present-day descendants have taken on their preferred group name. As noted in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, the term Gabrielino is used herein to designate native people of the Los Angeles Basin and their descendants.

The Gabrielino subsistence economy was centered on gathering and hunting. The Gabrielino used a variety of tools and implements to gather food and collect food resources. These included the bow and arrow, traps, nets, blinds, throwing sticks and slings, spears, harpoons, and hooks. Gabrielino people processed food with a variety of tools, including hammer stones and anvils, mortars and pestles, manos and metates, strainers, leaching baskets and bowls, knives, bone saws, and wooden drying racks.

Deceased Gabrielino were either buried or cremated, with inhumation common on the Channel Islands and the neighboring mainland coast, and cremation predominating on the remainder of the coast and the interior. Remains were buried in distinct burial areas, either directly associated with villages or without apparent village association. Cremation ashes have been found in archaeological contexts buried within stone bowls and in shell dishes, as well as scattered among broken ground stone implements. Related archaeological data correspond with ethnographic depictions of an elaborate mourning ceremony that included a variety of offerings, including seeds, stone grinding tools, otter skins, baskets, wooden tools, shell beads, bone and shell ornaments, and projectile points and knives.

As described in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, the traditional way of life for Indigenous people was dramatically altered by the Spanish mission system and later Mexican and American settlement in this part of Southern California. The dissolution of cultural practices alienated Native Americans from their traditional subsistence patterns, social customs, and marriage networks. European diseases, against which they had no immunity, reached epidemic proportions, and Gabrielino populations were rapidly decimated. The increase in agriculture and the spread of grazing livestock into their collecting and hunting areas made maintaining traditional lifeways increasingly difficult. Although many Gabrielino were eventually subsumed by the mission system, some refused to give up their traditional existence and escaped into the interior regions of the state, where they survived as refugees living with other tribes.

It is estimated that several thousand Gabrielino descendants currently live in the Los Angeles area, although no reservation or rancherias were ever set aside and tribal organizations have not been federally recognized. Gabrielino descendants are represented by the following tribal organizations who actively strive to maintain their cultural legacy:

Gabrielino-Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, the Gabrielino-Tongva Indian Tribe, the Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, the Gabrielino/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, and the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation.

d. Native American Communities in Los Angeles

As discussed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, in general, it has proven difficult to establish the precise location of Native American settlements occupied immediately preceding and following Spanish arrival in California approximately 250 years ago. Many of the settlements and so-called villages had long since been abandoned by the time ethnographers, anthropologists, and historians attempted to document any of their locations, at which point Native American lifeways had been irrevocably changed. Additionally, Native American placenames recorded in historic records and reported in oral histories did not necessarily represent a continually occupied settlement within a discrete location, which is how the term “village” is commonly understood today. Instead, in at least some cases, the settlements were represented by several smaller camps scattered throughout an approximate geography, shaped by natural features that were subject to change over generations. The more generic terms of settlement and site are used herein and refer to places where Native American communities were once gathered. Native American sites may also refer to locations where archaeological materials, including human remains, have been discovered. Such locations may consist of one or more known archaeological resources or a general area in which an archaeological resource could exist.

The villages or placenames described in ethnographic literature that are nearest to the Project Site include Geveronga, Maawnga, and Yaanga to the east southeast in the downtown Los Angeles area, Kuruvungna to the west-southwest near Santa Monica, and Guaspeta (also named Waachnga) in the Ballona area near Marina del Rey to the southwest. The nearest of these settlements is Kaweenga, which is located approximately 3.6 miles northwest of the Project Site. Other notable sites that have archaeological components from the region have been recorded at the Fern Dell recreation area (LAN-196) to the northwest, the LA Brea Tar Pits (LAN-159/H) to the southwest, and several sites along Ballona Creek and around the Baldwin Hills to the southwest. The Project Site is situated somewhat equidistant from the three nearest named Native American settlements, Kaweenga, Maawnga, and Geveronga. These settlements are estimated to have been between 3.6 and 5 miles from the Project Site. Refer to the Archaeological Resources Assessment, included as Appendix C of this Draft EIR, as well as Section IV.K, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, for a detailed discussion of Native American settlements in the vicinity of the Project Site.

e. Period History and Local History

The history of the State of California after European colonialization can be divided either into two periods: the Mission and Rancho period (1769-1848) and the American period (1848-present); or into three periods: the Spanish period (1769-1822), Mexican period (1822-1848), and American period (1848-present).

As discussed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, while Spanish, Russian, and British explorers visited the area for brief periods between 1529 and 1769, the Mission period in California begins with the establishment in 1769 of a Spanish settlement at San Diego and the founding of Mission San Diego de Alcalá, the first of 21 missions constructed between 1769 and 1823. Independence from Spain in 1821 marks the beginning of the Mexican era of governance with California, and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, ending the Mexican American War, signals the beginning of the American period, when California became a territory of the United States.

A major emphasis during the Spanish period in California was the construction of missions and associated presidios to integrate the Native American population into Christianity and communal enterprise.

As described in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, California's American period began in 1848 after the end of the Mexican American war, which resulted in the annexation of California and much of the present-day Southwest. California officially became a state with the Compromise of 1850, which also designated Utah and New Mexico (with present-day Arizona) as U.S. territories. On April 4, 1850, only two years after the Mexican American War and five months prior to California earning statehood, the City of Los Angeles was formally incorporated. Los Angeles maintained its role as a regional business center in the early American period. The transition of many former rancho lands to agriculture, as well as the development of citriculture in the late 1800s, further strengthened this status.

As detailed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, the Project Site is located just outside of the boundaries of the northeastern-most extent of Rancho La-Brea, originally a Spanish period land grant given to Antonio Jose Rocha in 1828. Land ownership of the property changed hands several times between 1828 and 1883, at which point Ida Hancock took over the property and began operating the rancho. Up to this point, there had not been extensive development in the northern portion of Rancho La Brea and within the Project Site. During the 1880s, the northern parts of Rancho La Brea began to see a development boom, spurred by the subdivision of tracts and the facilitation of better transportation in the area. As the northern portions of Rancho La Brea were sold to eager real estate investors, who in turn subdivided and improved the land, the area became very desirable for settlement and eventually led to the development of what is now Hollywood.

In addition to Rancho La Brea, the Project Site is located just west of the southwestern-most portion of Rancho Los Feliz—originally designated as a Spanish land concession given in 1795 by the Spanish Governor Pedro Fages to José Vicente Feliz. In 1882, the land was acquired by Colonel Griffith Jenkins Griffith, who would later donate nearly half the original land to the City of Los Angeles, which would become Griffith Park, the largest park owned by the City. The donation consisted of 3,015 acres with the specific provision that it would never be developed. The southern and western parts of the Rancho Los Feliz would eventually become part of Hollywood.

f. Previously Conducted Studies

As provided in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) issued the results of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search on May 2, 2023. Results of the records search indicate 28 cultural resources studies have been conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Site. Only one of the previous studies is mapped within a portion of the Project Site. This previous study included a historic resources survey report prepared in February 2010 by Chattel Architecture, Planning, and Preservation for the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area, which addressed historical resources in the area and not archaeological resources. An update to this historic survey report was prepared in January 2020 by Architectural Resources Group, Consulting GPA, and Historic Resources Group. However, this report was not included in the results from SCCIC. The 2020 report also addressed historical resources in the area and not archaeological resources. No archaeological resources were identified in the records search or survey conducted for this study. Refer to Table 1 of the Archaeological Resources Assessment, included as Appendix C of this Draft EIR, for a detailed listing of the 28 cultural resources studies identified.

The CHRIS records search identified a total of one previously documented cultural resource within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Site, which does not intersect the Project Site. The resource identified includes a historic site dating between the 1910s and 1980s (P-19-003545) which was identified during construction of a nearby development. The site included the remnants of various structures such as a cellar, septic tanks, and a wall segment of a former building. The residential materials included items such as food and beverage containers, eating and drinking vessels, flowerpots, cosmetic containers, and animal bones. Building materials included bricks, tile, and poured concrete. Historical archaeological components were found beneath what had been developed with paved lots or buildings. Some materials were recorded directly beneath paved surfaces and others extended to depths of approximately three to seven feet below surface. The historic resources identified appeared to have been associated with residential developments which had existed within the site in the early twentieth century and were demolished in phases between the 1930s and 1970s.

Other historic archaeological sites have been recorded in the vicinity of the Project Site, including a site recorded approximately one mile to the west and one recorded approximately 0.6-mile to the east of the Project Site. These sites were composed of historical refuse dating between the late eighteenth and middle twentieth centuries that were identified below grounding during construction monitoring. Some of the refuse was documented as having been found in a concentration that was likely a residential trash pit, and some materials were more loosely scattered, and residential items were intermixed with more utilitarian items like building materials. Although these sites were not identified in the 0.5-mile radius used for the current CHRIS search, they are mentioned here because they are representative of the types of historical archaeological sites commonly found in the Los Angeles Basin and serve to underline the potential for these types of sites within the general vicinity of the Project Site.

As discussed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, no Native American sites were identified within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project Site. As previously discussed, the nearest Native American archaeological site to the Project Site is LAN-1096 (Fern Dell). The archaeological site at the La Brea Tar Pits (LAN-159/H) is the next closest Native American archaeological site, which is located more than one mile southwest of the Project Site. Aside from these two sites, very few Native American archaeological sites are recorded in the Hollywood area or adjacent neighborhoods in this part of the Los Angeles Basin.

g. Sacred Lands File Search

As provided in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, on April 18, 2023, the NAHC submitted the results of a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search. The results of the SLF search were negative.

4. Project Impacts

a. Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, the Project would have a significant impact related to cultural resources if it would:

Threshold (a): Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Threshold (b): Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Threshold (c): Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

For this analysis, the Appendix G Thresholds listed above are relied upon. The analysis utilizes factors and considerations identified in the City's 2006 L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, as appropriate, to assist in answering the Appendix G Threshold questions.

The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* identifies the following criteria to evaluate impacts to archaeological resources:

- If the project would disturb, damage, or degrade an archaeological resource or its setting that is found to be important under the criteria of CEQA because it:
 - Is associated with an event or person of recognized importance in California or American prehistory or of recognized scientific importance in prehistory;
 - Can provide information which is both of demonstrable public interest and useful in addressing scientifically consequential and reasonable archaeological research questions;
 - Has a special or particular quality, such as the oldest, best, largest, or last surviving example of its kind;
 - Is at least 100 years old²² and possesses substantial stratigraphic integrity; or
 - Involves important research questions that historical research has shown can be answered only with archaeological methods.

b. Methodology

The evaluation of the Project's potential impacts to archaeological resources is based on the Archaeological Resources Assessment prepared by SWCA and included in Appendix C of this Draft EIR. As detailed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, SWCA's archival research consulted the following publicly available sources: OHR (SurveyLA); David Rumsey Historical Map Collection; Early California Cultural Atlas (Native American villages and placenames); Huntington Library Digital Archives; Library of Congress; Los Angeles Public Library Map Collection; Sanborn Fire Insurance Company maps (Sanborn maps); USGS historical topographic maps; University of California, Santa Barbara Digital Library (aerial photographs); and University of Southern California Digital Library. SWCA also considered archaeological, ethnographic, historical, environmental, and other archival data sources. Archaeological site data include those identified in the CHRIS records search and

²² Although the CEQA criteria state that "important archaeological resources" are those which are at least 100- years-old, the California Register provides that any site found eligible for nomination to the National Register will automatically be included within the California Register and subject to all protections thereof. The National Register requires that a site or structure be at least 50-years-old.

supplemental background research. This analysis also included other relevant information such as the Preliminary Geotechnical Report prepared for the Project by Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc (see Appendix IS-3 of the Initial Study).

c. Project Design Features

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

d. Analysis of Project Impacts

Threshold (a): Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

As discussed in Section VI, Other CEQA Considerations, of this Draft EIR, and evaluated in the Initial Study prepared for the Project, included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, and/or as a local (City of Los Angeles) Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) or Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ).²³ The Project would be constructed within the boundaries of the Project Site, which does not include any historical resources and as such would not directly affect any onsite historical resources. In addition, the historical resources located in the vicinity of the Project Site would retain their current status and would not be affected by the Project in a manner that would alter their significance and designation as historical resources. Therefore, the Project would not directly impact any historical resources located in the vicinity of the Project Site. Overall, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. **As such, as concluded in the Initial Study, impacts with respect to Threshold (a) would be less than significant.**

Threshold (b): Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

(1) Impact Analysis

(a) Native American Archaeological Sensitivity

As detailed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, no known archaeological sites or resources associated with Native Americans have been identified within the Project Site. Historical maps and ecological reconstructions indicate that natural resources

²³ *The Los Angeles City Council adopted the ordinance enabling the creation of Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) in 1979, most recently amended in 2017. An HPOZ is a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.*

important to Native American communities were once near the Project Site; however, no such resource overlapped or was adjacent to the Project Site. Specifically, as described above, the closest Native American site is the Kaweenga Village, located approximately 3.6 miles northwest of the Project Site. Additionally, the extensive development of the Project Site throughout the twentieth century, as indicated by the fill soils present throughout the Project Site, suggests poor preservation conditions within the Project Site and a decreased likelihood that any Native American archaeological resources are likely to be encountered below the surface during ground-disturbing activities for the Project. Accordingly, as concluded in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, the Project Site has low sensitivity for archaeological resources affiliated with Native Americans.

(b) Historical Archaeological Sensitivity

As discussed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, historical archaeological sites have been identified beneath existing developments in the general vicinity of the Project Site. Within the Project Site, portions of the extant surface parking lot may be capping historical features, such as refuse pits, foundations, or other structural remains that are associated with early to middle twentieth century residential and commercial land uses. These areas are designated as having moderate to high levels of sensitivity for historical archaeological resources. The high sensitivity area is limited to the Carlton Lot and is designated as such because the area was originally developed as a single-family home in the early twentieth century and remained unchanged until being paved. It is also possible that fill soils in these areas contain individual artifacts associated with domestic life in the early twentieth century or any of the businesses operating at the time, especially automotive repair.

Historical archaeological sensitivity is low in the footprint of former and extant buildings where construction-demolition appears more likely to have removed or otherwise displaced any archaeological resources that may have once been located there. This includes the former auto sales, showroom, and service buildings that formed the North American headquarters for Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., beginning in the 1950s. These buildings were demolished in 1970 when some of the extant buildings on the Project Site were constructed. Overall, as concluded in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, the Project Site contains areas of low, moderate, and high sensitivity for historical archaeological resources. All sensitivity for historical archaeological resources is limited to sediments designated in the geotechnical investigation as undocumented artificial fill. The types of resources most likely to occur as buried deposits are refuse pits from domestic or commercial land uses, and foundations and construction materials from former buildings and structures used between 1900 and 1950. These are more likely to be encountered outside the footprint of current and former buildings used for auto-related sales and repairs. Individual pieces of refuse and other historical artifacts are also likely to be present within the fill sediments.

Based on the demolition and construction sequences, there is likely to be substantial variation in the integrity of archaeological features and artifacts.

(c) Significance Determination

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, the Project would require grading and excavation for the subterranean parking, which would extend to a depth of approximately 40 feet below ground surface. The proposed excavation would involve removal of fill and the underlying alluvial sediments below the current grade. As discussed in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, no previously recorded archaeological resources in the CHRIS were identified within the Project Site and the NAHC's search of SLF search was negative. One previously recorded historic archaeological resource has been recorded within 0.5 mile of the Project Site. The potential for as-yet unidentified archaeological resources within the Project Site is assessed as having areas of low, moderate, and high sensitivity for historical archaeological resources, and low sensitivity for Native American archaeological resources with the areas of high sensitivity limited to the Carlton Lot. **Therefore, as determined in the Archaeological Resources Assessment, given the moderate to high potential for historical archaeological resources associated with the Carlton Lot, construction activities associated with the Project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, and impacts to archaeological resources would be potentially significant.**

(2) Mitigation Measures

Project-level impacts to archaeological resources would be potentially significant. Therefore, the following mitigation measure would be implemented to address potential impacts to archaeological resources:

Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1: Prior to any ground-disturbing activities on the Project Site associated with the proposed Project, the Project applicant shall retain a Qualified Archaeologist. A Qualified Archaeologist is defined as one who meets the Society for California Archaeology's qualifications for a principal investigator. Ground-disturbing activities include activities such as excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing peat, clearing, driving posts, auguring, backfilling, blasting, stripping topsoil, or a similar activity. An Archaeological Monitor shall monitor ground-disturbing activities to identify, record, and evaluate the significance of any archaeological finds during Project construction. Archaeological monitoring shall occur within soils that have moderate to high potential to contain archaeological resources, as determined by a Qualified

Archaeologist. If the Qualified Archaeologist determines the potential for archaeological resources is sufficiently low, the frequency of monitoring may be reduced.

The Archaeological Monitor shall notify the Project personnel conducting ground-disturbing activities to inform them of archaeological monitoring requirements and the procedures to follow in the event of a discovery, including a prohibition on collecting or moving archaeological materials in accordance with California Penal Code Section 622.5. If an archaeological resource is discovered, work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall temporarily stop until the Qualified Archaeologist evaluates the significance in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) and PRC 21083.2(g). Pursuant to PRC Section 21083.2, preservation in place or leaving in an undisturbed state shall be the preferred manner of treatment. If preservation in place is not feasible, alternative forms of treatment shall be identified by the Qualified Archaeologist, which may include architectural documentation or archaeological data recovery (i.e., controlled excavation, laboratory analysis, and reporting) to obtain an adequate sample of scientifically consequential information. Upon completion of the significance assessment and fieldwork component of treatment measures, ground-disturbing activities may resume in the location of the discovery.

After archaeological monitoring is completed, the Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a technical report describing all work performed. If archaeological materials are identified and collected for laboratory analysis, the results of the analysis shall be included in the technical report, and any recovered archaeological materials shall be curated at a public, nonprofit research institution that shall ensure their long-term preservation and allow access to interested scholars. If there are no institutions who will accept the materials, they shall be donated to an educational institution or historical society. The format and content of the report shall follow the California Office of Historic Preservation's Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format and archaeological resources identified shall be documented on corresponding California Department of Parks and Recreation 523-Series Forms. The timing and content of the final report shall consider the quantity of archaeological materials, level of analysis required, and documentation needed to establish the significance of any identified resources. The draft report shall be submitted to the City for review. The final draft of the report shall be submitted to the SCCIC.

(3) Level of Significance After Mitigation

Project-level impacts related to archaeological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1. Specifically, implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that Project grading and excavation activities are monitored for archaeological resources, and that archaeological resources that are unearthed during Project grading and excavation activities are properly evaluated, collected and curated, as required, in accordance with applicable regulations.

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

As discussed in Section VI, Other CEQA Considerations, of this Draft EIR, and evaluated in the Initial Study prepared for the Project, included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is located within an urbanized area and has been subject to previous grading and development. No known traditional burial sites have been identified on the Project Site. Nevertheless, as the Project would require excavation at depths greater than those that have previously occurred on site, the potential exists to uncover existing but undiscovered human remains. If human remains are discovered during Project construction, work in the immediate vicinity of the construction area would be halted, and the County Coroner, construction manager, and other entities would be notified per California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. In addition, disposition of the human remains and any associated grave goods would occur in accordance with PRC Section 5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e), which requires that work stop near the find until a coroner can determine that no investigation into the cause of death is required and if the remains are Native American. Specifically, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e), if the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission who shall identify the MLD. The MLD may make recommendations regarding the treatment of the remains and any associated grave goods in accordance with PRC Section 5097.98. **As such, as concluded in the Initial Study, impacts with respect to Threshold (c) would be less than significant.**

e. Cumulative Impacts

(1) Impact Analysis

With regard to potential cumulative impacts related to archaeological resources, such potential impacts are generally site-specific as they relate to the particular underlying conditions of a site. Notwithstanding, the Project and the related projects are located within a highly urbanized area that has been substantially disturbed and developed over time. As with the Project, in the event that archaeological resources are uncovered, each related project would be required to comply with applicable regulatory requirements, including CEQA

Guidelines Section 15064.5, Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, and Public Resources Section 5097.9. In addition, as part of the environmental review processes for the related projects, it is expected that mitigation measures could be established as necessary to address the potential for the uncovering of archaeological resources. Furthermore, the Project and the related projects would be subject to the City's standard condition of approval for the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources which has been formulated to avoid significant impacts to such resources should they be unearthed during construction. **Therefore, Project impacts to archaeological resources would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.**

(2) Mitigation Measures

Cumulative impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

(3) Level of Significance After Mitigation

Cumulative impacts to cultural resources were determined to be less than significant without mitigation. Therefore, no mitigation measures were required or included, and the impact level remains less than significant.