

## 4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section discusses the existing setting regarding the cultural history (precontact and Euro-American) of the region, including the Project Site, and assesses the Project's potential impacts related to cultural resources from these periods in history.

The following analysis is derived from the *Phase I Archaeological Cultural Resources Study for the Self-Storage/RV Parking at 3701 North Pacific Place in Long Beach, Los Angeles, California (LSA Project No. ISP2002)* prepared by LSA, dated April 2, 2020 (LSA 2020, included as Appendix E-2), and an updated 2023 literature review and records search at the SCCIC for the Project (included as Appendix E-1).

### 4.4.1 SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

#### MND for the Pacific Place Project

The Cultural Resources analysis for the MND for the Prior Project determined that implementation of the Prior Project would have less than significant impacts related to cultural resources after implementation of mitigation.

According to the MND, the Prior Project would not impact cultural resources listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Historical Landmarks, or California Points of Historical Interest lists. Additionally, the Project would not impact cultural resources included in a Local Register of Historical Resources; on a map of Historical Resources; or on a map of Historic Districts. The results of the South-Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) literature review and records search confirmed there were no cultural resources located within the previously analyzed Project Site.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, a review of archival material about the history of the built-environment resources from the Built Environment Resource Database (BERD) did not identify any historic structures or potential historic structures within the Site.

The 2020 SCCIC literature review and records search, conducted by LSA (Appendix E-2), revealed that eight cultural resources studies were conducted within ½-mile of the Project Site. While several of the studies occurred proximate to the Project Site, none of the studies occurred within the Project Site. The 2020 literature review and records search also identified three historic-era archaeological sites within ½-mile of the previously analyzed Project Site. These resources included P-19-179268 (Jennie A. Reeve House), P-19-189246 (Light Hope Long Beach Tower #M5/T2), and P-19-192309 (Southern California Edison transmission line). Of these three, none were recorded on the Project Site. Therefore, due to the distance between these three cultural resources and the Project Site, the MND determined that the Prior Project would not impact these resources.

Furthermore, no archaeological resources from the precontact period (before arrival of Europeans or Historic-era) were observed during the 2020 survey of the Project Site. Due to the level of past disturbance on the previously analyzed Project Site, it was not anticipated that human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries, would be encountered during grading activities at the Project Site. Nevertheless, as noted in the MND, there is always a possibility archaeological

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the currently analyzed Project, the MND also analyzed a proposed 77,000 sf building for warehouse and office uses to be constructed on four parcels (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 7140-014-021, -22, -23, and -27) at 3916-4021 Ambeco Road (referred to in the MND as the McDonald Trust Parcels), which are adjacent to the Project Site. This additional area encompassed 5.46 acres to the east of the Project Site. The 2020 study included both the current Project Site and the aforementioned area.

resources may be present beneath the surface. Therefore, the following mitigation measure was identified in the MND.

### ***MND Mitigation Measures***

**MM CUL-1** In the event that cultural (archaeological) resources are inadvertently unearthed during excavation activities, the contractor shall immediately cease all earth-disturbing activities within a 100-foot radius of the area of discovery. The Project Applicant/Developer shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist, subject to approval by the lead agency, to evaluate the significance of the find and determine an appropriate course of action. If avoidance of the resource(s) is not feasible, salvage operation requirements pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines shall be followed. After the find has been appropriately avoided or mitigated, work in the area may resume.

As set forth below, the DEIR analysis confirms that there are no new impacts and no increase in the severity of previously identified impacts beyond those identified in the MND.

## **4.4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

### **A. Existing Conditions**

#### **Cultural Resources Chronology**

##### ***Precontact Setting***

Southern California has a long history of human occupation, with dates of the earliest evidence of human occupation during the late Pleistocene, circa (ca.) 11,000 years B.C. Precontact material culture in the State's southern region has been categorized according to periods or patterns that define technological, economic, social, and ideological elements. Within these periods, archaeologists have defined cultural patterns or complexes specific to prehistory within the State's southern region, including the Project Site. (Glassow et al. 2007)

The following text illustrates the chronological framework developed for Southern California. This framework is divided into four major periods: Paleoindian period (ca. 11,000–7000 B.C.), Milling Stone Period (7000 B.C.–3000 B.C.), Intermediate Period (3000 B.C.–A.D. 500), and Late Precontact Period (A.D. 500–Historic Contact). Within these broad temporal periods are variations in the timing and nomenclature of cultural complexes for the region. The timescales referenced in the following discussion are presented as calendar dates (years B.C./A.D.). (Glassow et al. 2007)

##### ***Paleoindian Period (11,000–7000 B.C.)***

Recent data from coastal and inland sites during this period indicate that the economy was a diverse mixture of hunting and gathering, with a major emphasis on aquatic resources in many coastal areas and on Pleistocene lakeshores in Southern California. Although few Clovis-like or Folsom-like fluted points have been found in Southern California, it is widely thought that there was a greater emphasis on hunting at nearcoastal and inland sites during the Paleoindian Period than in later periods. Subsistence patterns shifted around 6000 B.C., coincident with the gradual desiccation associated with the onset of the Altithermal, a warm and dry period that lasted for about 3,000 years. As the climate changed, a greater emphasis was placed on plant foods and small animals. (Moratto 1984, Erlandson et al. 1987, Jones et al. 2001, Dillon 2002)

### ***Milling Stone Period (7000–3000 B.C.)***

The Milling Stone Period is the earliest well-established period of occupation in Southern California. This period is characterized by an ecological adaptation to collecting, accompanied by a dependence on ground stone implements associated with the horizontal motion of grinding small seeds: milling stones (i.e., metates, slabs) and hand stones (i.e., manos, mullers). Milling stones are found in large numbers for the first time and become more numerous toward the end of this period. As evidenced by their tool kits and shell middens in coastal sites, people during this period practiced a mixed food-procurement strategy. Subsistence patterns became more specialized as groups became better adapted to their regional or local environments. Projectile points from the period are relatively rare, but are large and generally leaf-shaped, and were probably employed with darts or spears thrown with atlatls (spear throwing technology that gives additional velocity and thrust). Bone tools, such as awls, and items made from shell, including beads, pendants, and abalone dishes, are also quite uncommon. Evidence of weaving or basketry is present at a few sites. The mortar and pestle, associated with the vertical motion of pounding foods such as acorns, were introduced during the Milling Stone Period but did not become common until the Intermediate Period. (Wallace 1955, Glassow et al. 2007)

### ***Intermediate Period (3000 B.C.–A.D. 500)***

The Intermediate Period is characterized by a shift toward a hunting and maritime subsistence strategy, along with a wider use of plant foods. During this period, a pronounced trend toward greater adaptation to regional or local resources can be observed. For example, the remains of fish, land mammals, and marine mammals are increasingly abundant and diverse in sites along the Southern California coast. Chipped stone tools suitable for hunting are more common and both stylistically and technologically varied. Projectile points include large side-notched, stemmed, and lanceolate or leaf-shaped forms. (Koerper and Drover 1983)

Archaeologists consider Gypsum Cave and Elko series projectile points, which have a wide distribution in the Great Basin and Mojave Deserts between ca. 2000 B.C.–A.D. 500, diagnostic of this period. Larger knives, a variety of stone flake scrapers, and drill-like implements are common during this period. Shell fishhooks become an integral part of the tool kit. Bone tools, including awls, are more numerous than in the preceding period; and the use of asphaltum adhesive becomes more common. (Koerper and Drover 1983)

### ***Late Precontact Period (A.D. 500–1769)***

During the Late Precontact Period, use of plant food resources increased in conjunction with land and marine mammal hunting. The variety and complexity of material culture also increased during this period, demonstrated by more diverse classes of artifacts. The recovery of many small, finely-chipped projectile points, usually stemless with convex or concave bases, suggests an increased utilization of the bow and arrow for hunting rather than the atlatl and dart. (Wallace 1955)

During this period, an increase in population size is accompanied by the advent of larger, more permanent villages with greater numbers of inhabitants. Some coastal and nearby coastal settlements were occupied by as many as 1,500 people. Many of these larger settlements were permanent villages where at least some people resided year-round. The populations of these villages may have also increased seasonally. (Wallace 1955)

## **Ethnographic Setting**

### **Gabrielino**

At the time of European contact, Los Angeles County, in which the Project Site is located, most of Orange County, and portions of San Bernadino and Riverside Counties was the ancestral home of the Gabrielino. Please see Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources, for more information regarding tribal cultural resources or the possibility of tribal cultural resources within the Project Site. The Gabrielino and their descendants are those people who became associated with Mission San Gabriel Arcángel, which was established in south-central Los Angeles County on September 8, 1771, in what has ever since been called the San Gabriel Valley. Today, these people are sometimes referred to as the Tongva, although the term originally (i.e., before the arrival of Euro-Americans) referred to the inhabitants of the San Gabriel Valley only. Today, Gabrielino ancestry also refers to the occupants of the San Fernando Valley (Fernandeño). The Eastern Gabrielino refers to those who lived south of the San Gabriel Mountains, mainly in the San Gabriel Valley, while the Western Gabrielino refers to those who lived along the western coast of Los Angeles County, from Malibu to Palos Verdes, and includes the people living in the San Fernando Valley. (Kroeber 1925 and Bean and Smith 1978)

The ancestral Gabrielino arrived in the Los Angeles Basin probably 500 Before the Common Era (BCE). Large, permanent villages were established in the fertile lowlands along rivers and streams and in sheltered areas along the coast. Eventually, Gabrielino territory encompassed the watersheds of the Los Angeles, San Gabriel, Rio Hondo, and Santa Ana Rivers (which includes the greater Los Angeles Basin) to perhaps as far south as Aliso Creek, as well as portions of the San Fernando, San Gabriel, and San Bernardino Valleys. Gabrielino territory also included the islands of San Clemente, San Nicholas, and Santa Catalina. Recent studies suggest the population may have numbered as many as 10,000 individuals at their peak in the Pre-contact Period. (Kroeber 1925 and Bean and Smith 1978)

The subsistence economy of Gabrielino was one of hunting and gathering. The surrounding environment was rich and varied, and the natives were able to exploit mountains, foothills, valleys, deserts, and coasts. As was the case for most native Californians, acorns were the staple food (by the Intermediate Horizon), supplemented by the roots, leaves, seeds, and fruit of a wide variety of flora (i.e., cactus, yucca, sage, and agave). Fresh and saltwater fish, shellfish, birds, insects, and large and small mammals were exploited. (Kroeber 1925 and Bean and Smith 1978)

A wide variety of tools and implements were employed by the Gabrielino to gather, collect, and process food resources. The most important hunting tool was the bow and arrow. Traps, nets, blinds, throwing sticks, and slings were also employed. Fish were an important resource and nets, traps, spears, harpoons, hooks, and poisons were utilized to catch them. Ocean-going plank canoes and tule balsa canoes were used for fishing and for travel by those groups residing near the Pacific Ocean. (Kroeber 1925 and Bean and Smith 1978)

The processing of food resources was accomplished in a variety of ways: nuts were cracked with hammer stone and anvil; acorns were ground with mortar and pestle; and seeds and berries were ground with mano and metate. Yucca, a valuable resource in many areas, was eaten by the natives and exploited for its fibers. Strainers, leaching baskets and bowls, knives, bone saws, and wooden drying racks were also employed. Food was consumed from a variety of vessels. Catalina Island steatite was used to make ollas and cooking vessels. (Kroeber 1925 and Bean and Smith 1978)

Gabrielino houses were circular domed structures of willow poles thatched with tule. They were quite large and could, in some cases, hold 50 individuals. Other structures served as sweatshops, and ceremonial enclosures. (Kroeber 1925 and Bean and Smith 1978)

## **Phase I Cultural Resources Study (LSA)**

### ***2020 South Central Coastal Information Center Literature Review and Records Search***

The results of the 2020 South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) literature review (conducted for the Prior Project) identified eight previous studies within the ½-mile search radius. Two of the eight previous cultural resources studies have included the Project Site: LA-03102 (an Environmental Impact Report [EIR] prepared by Greenwood and Associates in 1994) and LA-11993 (a Finding of No Adverse Effect report prepared by Galvin Preservation Associates in 2012). Neither of these studies identified cultural resources within the Project Site. Six additional reports have included areas within the ½-mile radius around the Project Site: four surveys, one EIR, and one Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR). The record search conducted for the Prior Project indicated that no cultural resources (archaeological and built environment) have been recorded in the Project Site. As detailed below, this record search was updated for the Project. As of 2020, three cultural resources had been recorded within ½-mile of the Project Site, all of which are historic period-built environment resources: P-19-179268 (the Jennie A Reeve House), P-19-189246 (the Light Hope Long Beach Tower #M5/T2), and P-19-192309 (a Southern California Edison transmission line). (LSA 2020)

### ***Aerial Photographs and Historic Maps***

The oldest available aerial photograph dates back to 1953, at which time the Project Site was not in its natural state; it appears to have been used as an oil sump hole. Between 1963 and 1972, construction of Interstate 405 (I-405; south of the Project Site) was completed, but the use of the Project Site was maintained as an oil sump hole. By 1980 the oil sump hole appears to have been filled in with dirt. A driving range was constructed between 1994 and 2002. (LSA 2020)

The earliest available topographic quadrangle reviewed by LSA dates to 1896 and depicts no buildings on the Project Site, as well as the Los Angeles River running its natural course. The 1899, 1902, 1906, 1911, 1916, 1923, 1924, and 1926 maps show the same. The 1939 map depicts a railroad to the east of the Project Site, and the 1951 map depicts the Project Site with the label “Oil Sumps.” The map dated to 1966 shows I-405 as developed and the Project Site as an oil sump. LSA (2020) also noted the Project Site continues to be labeled as an oil sump up through the map dated to 1987 listed on the National Environmental Title Research (NETR) website. By 1994, the Project Site was used as a driving range until 2002 (LSA 2020). The maps listed on the NETR and dated to 2012 and later do not have the Project Site labeled as an oil sump. (LSA 2020)

### ***Native American Heritage Commission***

Steven Quinn, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Cultural Resources Analyst, responded to the Sacred Lands File (SLF) search request on March 11, 2020 (in conjunction with the Prior Project), stating that results were negative and that no Native American cultural resources were known in the area. The NAHC also provided a suggested list of Native American individuals to contact for information regarding the Project Site. (LSA 2020) The tribal consultation results are discussed in Section 4.17, Tribal Cultural Resources.

**Cultural Resources Field Survey**

The results from the LSA 2020 pedestrian field survey conducted at the Project Site in conjunction with the Prior Project were negative for cultural resources. (LSA 2020)

**Updated Literature Review and Records Search (Psomas)****2023 South Central Coastal Information Center Literature Review and Records Search**

The results from the updated 2023 literature review and records search conducted by Psomas for the Project Site revealed that 14 previous cultural resource studies (Table 4.4-1) have been conducted within ½-mile of the Project Site and one of those studies (LA-03102) included the Project Site (an Environmental Impact Report [EIR] prepared by Greenwood and Associates in 1994). One of the previous studies - LA-11993 – identified from the 2020 literature review as within the Prior Project Site was identified from the 2023 updated literature search as being slightly outside of the Project Site. The remaining studies consisted primarily of archaeological surveys and one Cultural Resources Monitoring Report. No cultural resources were identified within the Project Site from the previous study LA-03102 or the nearby study LA-11993. (SCCIC 2023)

**TABLE 4.4-1  
CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES WITHIN ½-MILE OF THE PROJECT AREA**

Report No.	Author(s) (Year)	Title
LA-02882	McKenna, Jeanette A. (1993)	Cultural Resources Investigations, Site Inventory, and Evaluations, the Cajon Pipeline Project Corridor, Los Angeles and San Bernadino Counties, California
LA-02970	Chamberlaine, Pat and Jean Rivers-Council (1992)	Cajon Pipeline Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Impact Report
LA-03102	McCawley, William, John Romani, and Dana Slawson (1994)	The Los Angeles County Drainage Area Subsequent Environmental Impact Report
LA-04512	Eggers, A.V. (1977)	Cultural Resources Inventory of the City of Carson, California
LA-05399	Storey, Noelle	Negative Archaeological Survey Report:01-la-405-kp41.27/1.29-07-173-4g4101, Raising the Profile Connector from Southbound Interstate 405 to Southbound Interstate 710
LA-05404	Sylvia, Barbara (2000)	Negative Archaeological Survey Report:07-la-405-s/b at N/b710-07-174-4g4101
LA-06047	Duke, Curt (2002)	Cultural Resource Assessment AT&T Wireless Services Facility No. 05265 Los Angeles County, California
LA-06051	Duke, Curt (2002)	Cultural Resource Assessment AT&T Wireless Services Facility No. 05311a Los Angeles County, California
LA-06060	Duke, Curt (2002)	Cultural Resource Assessment AT&T Wireless Services Facility No. D185b Los Angeles County, California
LA-07907	Wlodarski, Robert J. (2006)	Record Search and Field Reconnaissance for the Proposed Royal Street Communications LLC, Wireless Telecommunications Site La0541a (SCE Wireless) Located at 1435 West Wardlow Road, Long Beach, California 90810
LA-07971	Tang, Bai "Tom" and Josh Smallwood (2006)	Seismic Retrofit of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) Bridge Over Santa Fe Avenue (state Bridge No. 53c0458), on the Boundary Between the Cities of Long Beach and Carson, Los Angeles County
LA-09214	Bonner, Wayne H. (2007)	Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for Royal Street Communications, LLC Candidate LA2887C (Sylar-SCE Tower), North of Carson Street/East of 710 Freeway, Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California

**TABLE 4.4-1  
CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES WITHIN ½-MILE OF THE PROJECT AREA**

Report No.	Author(s) (Year)	Title
LA-11993	O'Neill, Laura (2012)	Finding of No Adverse Effect for the Proposed Interstate 710 Corridor Project Between Ocean Boulevard and the State Route 60 Interchange
LA-12330	Slawson, Dana and Kay, Michael (2013)	Rancho Los Cerritos Visitor Center and Arroyo Restoration Project Cultural Resources Monitoring Report
Source: SCCIC 2023.		

As noted above, the results of the updated SCCIC records search confirm that no previous research relating to the Project Site has identified cultural resources located within the Project Site. However, three resources are located within a half-mile of the Project Site as shown in Table 4.4-2. As discussed above, none of the three resources are located at the Project Site. These resources include P-19-179268 (Jennie A Reeve House), P-19-187942 (Bridge #53C0458), and P-19-189450. (SCCIC 2023)

**TABLE 4.4-2  
CULTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN ½-MILE OF THE PROJECT SITE**

Trinomial/ Primary Number	Recorder (Year)	Description
P-19-179268	R. Makinson, School of Architecture, USC (1983)	California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Property Number – 029956; Resource Name – Jennie A Reeve House; Other - Reeve/Townsend House
P-19-187942	J. Smallwood, CRM Tech (2006)	Resource Name – Bridge #53C0458
P-19-189450	Unknown (2011)	OHP Property Number – 174435; Resource Name - Killingsworth, Brady & Smith
Source: SCCIC 2023.		

As noted above in the discussion on aerial photographs and historical maps, the Project Site was used as a driving range from 1994 until 2002. No standing buildings or extant structures are located on the Project Site. (LSA 2020)

## **B. Regulatory Framework**

### **Federal**

#### ***National Historic Preservation Act***

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, promotes the preservation, enhancement, and productive use of historic resources. The NHPA established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and provided procedures for the ACHP and federal agencies in promoting historic preservation. (NPS 1990)

Section 106 of the NHPA, which is codified as 36 CFR Part 800, requires that federal actions and the use of federal funds consider their potential effects on historic properties or those listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP (National Register). (NPS 1990)

---

## **National Register of Historic Places**

The NHPA of 1966 established the 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” (NPS 1990). The National Register recognizes a broad range of historical and cultural resources that are significant at the national, state, and local levels and can include districts, buildings, structures, objects, precontact 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. (NPS 1990)

Whereas individual historic properties derive their significance from one or more of the criteria discussed in the subsequent section, a historic district derives its importance from being a unified entity, even though it is often composed of a variety of resources. With a historic district, the historic resource is the district itself. The identity of a district results from the interrelationship of its resources, which can be an arrangement of historically or functionally related properties. A district is defined as a geographic area of land containing a significant concentration of buildings, sites, structures, or objects united by historic events, architecture, aesthetic, character, and/or physical development. A district’s significance and historic integrity determine its boundaries. (NPS 1990)

A resource that is listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register is considered “historic property” under Section 106 of the NHPA. (NPS 1990)

### Criteria

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a resource must be at least 50 years of age (NPS 1990), unless it is of exceptional importance as defined in Title 36 CFR, Part 60, Section 60.4(g). In addition, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. 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. (NPS 1990)

### Historic Districts

The National Park Service defines a historic district as “a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development”. A district must be “a definable geographic area that can be distinguished from surrounding properties by changes such as density, scale, type, age, style of sites, buildings, structures, and objects, or by documented differences in patterns of historic development or associations”. Boundaries must be based upon a shared relationship among the properties constituting the district. (NPS 1990)



Within a historic district, a building, structure, or feature is considered a contributor if it was constructed during the period of significance, contributes to the property's historic significance and character, and retains sufficient integrity to convey that significance. Non-contributors are those buildings that were constructed outside of the period of significance, do not contribute to the property's historic significance and character, and/or do not retain sufficient integrity. (NPS 1990)

### Period of Significance

According to the National Park Service, in addition to the above criteria, significance is defined by the area of history in which the property made important contributions and by the period of time when these contributions were made. This is referred to as the period of significance (NPS 1990). The period of significance is the length of time when a property was associated with important events, activities or persons, or attained the characteristics which qualify it for listing. The period of significance usually begins with the date when significant activities or events began giving the property its historic significance; this is often a date of construction. The period of significance can be as brief as a single year; many, however, span many years and consist of beginning and closing dates. Identification and definition of the period of significance 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. (NPS 1990)

### 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" (NPS 1990). 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. (NPS 1990)

The National Register recognizes seven aspects or qualities that comprise integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. These qualities are defined as follows:

- *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.
- *Workmanship* is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
- *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. (NPS 1990)

---

## **Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation**

The Secretary of the Interior (SOI) Standards were codified in 1995 (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 68) to establish professional standards that apply to all proposed development grant-in-aid projects assisted through the National Historic Preservation Fund and to serve as general guidance for work on any other historic building. The SOI Standards apply to historic properties of all periods, styles, types, materials, and sizes (NPS 1990). The ten Standards for Rehabilitation are:

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. (NPS 1990)

### **State**

#### ***Historical Resources Under California Environmental Quality Act***

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. (PRC 2011 and CCR 2024)

CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines provide that historical resources are: (1) resources listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the CRHR; (2) resources included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k) or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); and (3) any objects, buildings, structures, sites, areas, places, records, or manuscripts 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 by the lead agency, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. (PRC 2011 and CCR 2024)

### **California Register of Historical Resources**

The CRHR is “an authoritative listing and guide to be used by State and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the State and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” The CRHR was enacted in 1992, and its regulations became official on January 1, 1998. The CRHR is administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). The criteria for eligibility in the CRHR are based upon National Register criteria. Certain resources are determined to be automatically included in the CRHR, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register. To be eligible for the CRHR, a precontact or historic-period property must be significant at the local, State, and/or federal level under one or more of the following four criteria:

- A. It is 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; or
- B. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history; or
- C. It 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; or
- D. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation. (PRC 2011 and CCR 2024)

A resource eligible for the CRHR 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 (CRHR). PRC 2011 and CCR 2024)

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

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

Other resources that may be nominated to the CRHR include:

- Historical resources with a significance rating of Category 3 through 5 (those properties identified as eligible for listing in the National Register, the CRHR, 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. (PRC 2011 and CCR 2024)

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

Sections 7050.5, 7051, and 7054 of the California Health and Safety Code collectively address the illegality of interference with human burial remains (except as allowed under applicable sections of the PRC). These sections also address the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites and protect such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction. Procedures to be implemented are established for (1) the discovery of Native American skeletal remains during construction of a project; (2) the treatment of the remains prior to, during, and after evaluation; and (3) reburial. (HSC 2023)

Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code specifically provides for the disposition of accidentally discovered human remains. It states that if human remains are found, no further excavation or disturbance of the Site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County Coroner determines the remains are likely Native American, the Coroner contacts the Native American Heritage Commission. (HSC 2023)

### **PRC Section 5097.98**

Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98, when the NAHC receives notice from a County Coroner pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, the NAHC notifies those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendants, with permission of the landowner, may inspect the Site of the discovery and, within 48 hours of being granted access to the Site, recommend means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. Upon the discovery of Native American remains, the landowner must ensure the immediate vicinity is not damaged or disturbed by further development until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the most likely descendants regarding their recommendations. (PRC 2010)

### **Senate Bill 18**

SB 18 (Government Code Section 65352.3) incorporates the protection of California traditional tribal cultural places into land use planning for cities, counties, and other public agencies by requiring local governments to contact, refer plans to and consult with California Native American tribes identified by the NAHC for the purpose of protecting and/or mitigation impacts to cultural places as part of the adoption or amendment of any general or specific plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005. SB 18 stipulates that, "Prior to the adoption or any amendment of a general or specific plan, a local government must notify the appropriate tribes (on the contact list maintained by the NAHC) of the opportunity to conduct consultations for the purposes of preserving, or mitigating, impacts to cultural places located on land within the local government's jurisdiction that is affected by the proposed plan adoption or amendment..." (OPR 2017b). SB 18 requires public notice to be sent to tribes listed on the NAHC SB 18 Tribal Consultation list within the geographical areas affected by the proposed changes. Tribes must respond to a local government notice within

90 days (unless a shorter time frame has been agreed upon by the tribe), indicating whether or not they want to consult with the local government. Consultations are for the purpose of preserving or mitigating impacts to places, features, and objects described in Sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 of the Public Resources Code that may be affected by the proposed adoption or amendment to a general or specific plan.

## **Local**

### ***City of Long Beach General Plan***

The City of Long Beach General Plan is a policy document that establishes the goals, policies, and directions the City will take to achieve the vision of the community and guide the future development of the City. The City of Long Beach General Plan contains twelve elements: Land Use, Transportation (known as the Mobility Element), Housing, Conservation, Noise, Open Space and Recreation, Safety, Air Quality, Historic Preservation, Seismic Safety, Local Coastal Program, and Urban Design.

The City's Historic Preservation element was adopted by the City Council on June 22, 2010. The Element was prepared in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, the publication entitled "Preparing a Historic Preservation Plan" by Bradford J. White and Richard J. Roddewig, and other applicable state standards and guidelines. The Historic Preservation Element outlines a vision for future historic preservation efforts and the actions that need to be taken to achieve it. Development of the Historic Preservation Element was coordinated with the City's 2030 General Plan update. 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. The goals and policies of the Historic Preservation Element that are relevant to the Project, as well as a Project consistency analysis, are provided in Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning. (Long Beach 2010)

### **4.4.3 PROJECT IMPACTS**

#### **A. Thresholds of Significance**

In accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a project would result in a significant biological resources impact if it would:

- Threshold 4.4a***      ***Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?***
- Threshold 4.4b***      ***Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?***
- Threshold 4.4c***      ***Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

## **B. Methodology**

### **Phase I Cultural Resources Study (LSA)**

#### ***2020 South Central Coastal Information Center Literature Review and Records Search***

A literature review and records search for the Project Site and a 0.5-mile radius was conducted on March 13, 2020, by SCCIC staff of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at California State University, Fullerton. The SCCIC, an affiliate of the OHP, is the official repository of cultural resources records and reports for Los Angeles County. Background research also included a review of the following State and Federal inventories:

- Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File (OHP 2012). The directory includes the listings of the NRHP (National Register), National Historic Landmarks, the CRHR (CRHR), California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest;
- California Historical Landmarks (OHP 1996);
- California Points of Historical Interest (OHP 1992);
- Five Views: An Ethnic Historic Site Survey for California (OHP 1988); and
- California Inventory of Historic Resources (OHP 1976).

#### ***Aerial Photographs and Historic Maps***

Additional background research included a review of historic-period United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps and aerial photographs to assess the potential for subsurface historic-period archaeological deposits at the Project Site.

#### ***Native American Heritage Commission***

The NAHC maintains the SLF database and is the official State repository of Native American sacred-site location records in California. On February 28, 2020, LSA submitted a request to the NAHC to request a review of the SLF for the presence of Native American cultural resources that might be impacted by the Prior Project (LSA 2020). Additionally, as detailed in Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources, an updated contact list was requested from the NAHC in 2023, for AB52 and SB18 consultation.

#### ***Cultural Resources Field Survey***

On March 27, 2020, LSA Archaeologist Ivan Strudwick, M.A., RPA, conducted a pedestrian field survey of the Project Site. In accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) standards for archaeology, Mr. Strudwick surveyed the entire Project Site by walking transects spaced 7 to 10 meters apart. A trowel was used to periodically shift surficial soils to examine subsurface sediments. Rodent burrowing holes and back dirt piles were examined for indications of archaeological deposits and/or human remains. The results from the LSA 2020 pedestrian field survey were negative for cultural resources (LSA 2020).

---

## **Updated Literature Review and Records Search (Psomas)**

### ***2023 South Central Coastal Information Center Literature Review and Records Search***

An updated literature review and records search was conducted for the Project Site by Psomas on September 11, 2023.

## **Tribal Cultural Resource Consultation (City)**

Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) consultations was conducted as part of the government-to-government consultations between the City and tribal governments requesting to consult on the Project as required by Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and SB 18. The results from the consultation are presented in Section 4.16, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this DEIR.

## **C. Standard Requirements**

**SR CUL-1** If human remains are found during ground-disturbing activities, no further excavation or disturbance of the Site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The County Coroner shall be notified of the discovery immediately. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are or believed to be Native American, s/he shall notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 24 hours of the discovery. In accordance with Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendants shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the Site by the City. The City would meet and confer with the most likely descendant regarding their recommendations prior to disturbing the Site by further construction activity.

## **D. Impact Analysis**

**Threshold 4.4a** ***Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?***

Based on the SCCIC literature review and records searches from 2020 and 2023, there are no cultural resources within the Project Site listed in the CRHR, the NRHP, California Historical Landmarks, or California Points of Historical Interest lists. Additionally, there are no cultural resources within the Project Site included in a Local Register of Historical Resources; on a map of Historical Resources; or on a map of Historic Districts. There are three built environment cultural resources located within ½-mile of the Project Site. These resources include P-19-179268 (Jennie A Reeve House), P-19-187942 (Bridge #53C0458), and P-19-189450 (Killingsworth, Brady & Smith). However, none of the three resources are located within the Project Site, and due to the Project Site's isolation between the LA River, I-405 Freeway, and Metro tracks and its distance from these resources, the Project would not impact these buildings or structure. Historic plat maps for the area were also reviewed to determine the potential for historic archaeological sites to underlie the Project Site. A review of the 1896 and 1942 maps indicated that, although the Project Site itself was undeveloped it was located in a developed portion of the City during those time periods; there is no indication of historic structures or features at the location of the Project Site. The review of archival material about the history of the built-environment resources did not identify any historic structures or potential historic structures within the Project Site (LSA 2020 and SCCIC 2023).

Therefore, the Project would not result in a significant adverse impact to any identified or eligible historical resources and impacts would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Historical Resources: A less than significant impact would occur and therefore no mitigation is required.

***Impact Comparison Summary:*** The Project would not result in a significant adverse impact to any identified or eligible historical resources and impacts would be less than significant. The Project would result in similar impacts when compared with the impact analysis in the MND, which identified no impact related to historical resources.

### **Threshold 4.4b      *Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?***

No archaeological resources were observed during the 2020 survey conducted for the Project Site. The literature review conducted for the Project revealed that 14 cultural resources studies have been conducted within ½-mile of the Project Site; one of the studies (LA-03102) included the Project Site. The results of the study were negative for cultural resources located at the Project Site (LSA 2020 and SCCIC 2023).

As noted above, the records search review also identified three historic-era built environment cultural resources within ½-mile of the Project Site. Of these, none are recorded on the Project Site and therefore, no archaeological resources associated with these built environment resources are within the Project Site (LSA 2020 and SCCIC 2023). As such, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known archaeological resource associated with these three built environment resources, as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Tribal cultural resources, which are considered a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object which is of cultural value to a California Native American Tribe and is either eligible for the California Register or a local register, are discussed further in Section 4.17, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this EIR. As stated in Section 4.17, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be potentially significant.

Due to the level of past disturbance on the Project Site, including creation of the sump during the Project Site's prior use as an oil sump and subsequent import of cover soils in conjunction with the prior golf driving range, and limited excavation that is planned for the Project, it is not anticipated that archaeological resources would be uncovered during construction of the Project. Nevertheless, there is a potential for undiscovered archaeological resources to be uncovered during grading activities which would result in a potentially significant impact.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**MM CUL-1** In the event that cultural (archaeological) resources are inadvertently unearthed during excavation activities, the contractor shall immediately cease all earth-disturbing activities within a 100-foot radius of the area of discovery. The Project Applicant/Developer shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist,



subject to approval by the lead agency, to evaluate the significance of the find and determine an appropriate course of action. If avoidance of the resource(s) is not feasible, salvage operation requirements pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines shall be followed. After the find has been appropriately avoided or mitigated, work in the area may resume. Upon completion of ground disturbance activities and evaluation, the archaeologist will prepare post-construction findings for the City.

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Archaeological Resources: The Project would implement **MM CUL-1**, which requires a qualified professional archaeologist to evaluate the significance of the find and determine the appropriate action upon the discovery of an archaeological resource. Therefore, with implementation of **MM CUL-1**, impacts related to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

**Impact Comparison Summary:** The DEIR concludes that, with implementation of **MM CUL-1** requiring that any resources that are inadvertently uncovered during grading be evaluated by a qualified Archaeologist to determine their significance and the need to protect in place; salvage and preserve; or other measure(s) to reduce impacts to important cultural resources, potential impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels. The Project would therefore result in similar impacts when compared with the impact analysis in the MND, which identified less than significant with the same mitigation incorporated related to archaeological resource impacts.

#### **Threshold 4.4c      *Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

Due to the level of past disturbance on the Project Site, including creation of the sump during the Project Site's prior use as an oil sump and subsequent import of cover soils in conjunction with the prior golf driving range, and limited excavation that is planned for the Project, it is not anticipated that human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries, would be encountered during grading activities at the Project Site. If human remains are found, the remains would require proper treatment, in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. Sections 7050.5–7055 of the California Health and Safety Code describe the general provisions for the handling of human remains. Specifically, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 describes the protocols to be followed if human remains are accidentally discovered during ground disturbance or excavation. As detailed in **SR CUL-1**, if human remains are found during excavation, construction activities must stop in the vicinity of the find and in any area that is reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the County Coroner has been notified; the remains have been investigated; and appropriate recommendations have been made for the treatment and disposition of the remains. In addition, the requirements and procedures set forth in Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code would have to be implemented. If the Coroner, with the aid of a qualified Archaeologist, determines that the remains are precontact, the coroner will contact the NAHC. The NAHC shall be responsible for designating the most likely descendant (MLD), who will be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains.

With adherence to State law, **SR CUL-1**, in the event human remains are encountered, construction would stop as necessary and any potential human remains would be handled appropriately by the County Coroner and the MLD, if appropriate; as such, potential impacts on human remains if present would be less than significant.

---

## **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

## **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Human Remains: A less than significant impact would occur and therefore no mitigation is required.

***Impact Comparison Summary:*** With adherence to State law which details the appropriate actions necessary in the event human remains are encountered, potential impacts on human remains would be less than significant. The Project would result in similar impacts when compared with the impact analysis in the MND, which identified a less than significant impact related to human remains or burials impacts.

### **4.4.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

A cumulative impact is defined as “the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.” In other words, cumulative impacts are two or more individual effects that are considerable when taken together, or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. Development of related projects can affect historical resources if such projects adversely alter and/or demolish historical resources that may be interrelated, such as historical resources that are part of a historic district or historical resources that are significant within the same historic context, and the Project’s contribution to the impact would be cumulatively considerable.

A significant cumulative impact associated with a project and related projects would occur if the impact would render a historical resource no longer eligible for historic listing or designation. Cumulative impacts have the potential to affect resources with the same level or type of designation or evaluation, resources that are significant within the same historic context, or contributing properties to the same historic district.

The Project—in conjunction with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects in the City and the local area—has the potential to yield archaeological resources, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact.

Additionally, a significant cumulative impact associated with a project and related projects would occur if the impact disturbed human remains outside of formal cemeteries or those interred in Native American sacred sites, constituting a significant impact. As discussed above, with adherence to State law, **SR CUL-1**, in the event human remains are encountered, construction would stop as necessary and any potential human remains would be handled appropriately by the County Coroner and the MLD, if appropriate; as such potential impacts on human remains if present would be less than significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

**MM CUL-1** In the event that cultural (archaeological) resources are inadvertently unearthed during excavation activities, the contractor shall immediately cease all earth-disturbing activities within a 100-foot radius of the area of discovery. The Project Applicant/Developer shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist, subject to approval by the lead agency, to evaluate the significance of the find and

determine an appropriate course of action. If avoidance of the resource(s) is not feasible, salvage operation requirements pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines shall be followed. After the find has been appropriately avoided or mitigated, work in the area may resume. Upon completion of ground disturbance activities and evaluation, the archaeologist will prepare post-construction findings for the City.

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Cumulative Impacts: The Project as well as other cumulative projects in the area would be required to incorporate mitigation in order to reduce potential cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. The Project's contribution of cumulative impacts related to cultural resources would not be significant because Project impacts would be reduced to less than significant after implementation of **MM CUL-1** and adherence to **SR CUL-1**. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation, the Project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable and therefore would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

---

#### 4.4.5 REFERENCES

- Bean, Lowell J., and Charles R. Smith. Gabrielino. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 538-549. *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 8, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- California Health and Safety Code (HSC). 2023. 2023 California Code Health and Safety Code Sections 7050-7054
- California Code of Regulations (CCR). 2024. Title 14 – Natural Resources, Division 6 – Resources Agency, Chapter 3 – Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act [15000-15387]
- Dillon, Brian D. 2002. California Paleo-Indians: Lack of Evidence, or Evidence of a Lack? In *Essays in California Archaeology: A Memorial to Franklin Fenenga*, edited by William J.
- Erlandson J. M., T. C., and R. Carrico. 1987. A Fluted Projectile Point Fragment from the Southern California Coast: Chronology and Context at CA-SBA-1951. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 9:120–128.
- Glassow, M.A., L. Gamble, J.Perry, and G.S. Russell. 2007. Prehistory of the Northern California Bight and the Adjacent Transverse Ranges. In *California Prehistory: Colonization, Culture, and Complexity*, edited by Terry L. Jones and Kathryn A. Klar, pp. 191–213. Alta Mira Press, New York.
- Jones, D.A., C. Young, and W.R. Hildebrandt. 2001. Phase II Archaeological Test Excavation at CA-SLO-832 and CA-SLO-1420, for the James Way/Price Street Road Improvement Project, San Luis Obispo County, California. Far Western Anthropological Research Group, Davis, California. Submitted to California Department of Transportation, San Luis Obispo.
- Kroeber, A. 1925. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78. Washington, D.C.
- Koerper, H. C. and C. Drover. 1983. Chronology Building for Coastal Orange County, The Case from CA ORA-119-A. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 19(2):1–34.
- Long Beach, City of. 2010. General Plan, Historic Preservation Element. Long Beach, CA: City of Long Beach. [https://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbcd/media-library/documents/planning/advance/general-plan/final-long-beach-historic-preservation-element\\_6-22-2010](https://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbcd/media-library/documents/planning/advance/general-plan/final-long-beach-historic-preservation-element_6-22-2010).
- LSA. 2020 (April 2). Phase I Archaeological Cultural Resources Study for the Self-Storage/RV Parking at 3701 North Pacific Place in Long Beach, Los Angeles, California (LSA Project No. ISP2002) (Appendix E-2).
- Moratto, M. 1984. *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.
- National Park Service (NPS). 1990. *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluations*. U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Public Resources Code (PRC). 2010. Division 5. Parks and Monuments, Chapter 1.75 Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites [5097.98-5097.991]

PRC. 2011. Division 13. Environmental Quality [21000-21177]

South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC). (2023). Literature Review and Records Search. Site accessed on September 11, 2023 (Appendix E-1).

Wallace, William J. 1955. A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11(3):214–230.

*This page intentionally left blank*