

3.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section evaluates the potential impacts related to cultural resources, including built historical resources and archaeological resources, that would result from implementation of the Master Plan Update. Specifically, this section contains a summary of the federal, state, and local regulations related to cultural resources; a description of the existing setting as it pertains to built historical resources and archaeological resources on campus; and an analysis of the potential impacts related to cultural resources associated with implementation of the Master Plan Update as well as identification of mitigation measures for those impacts determined to be significant. The analysis in this section is based, in part, on the information contained in the Historical Resources Technical Report and the Confidential Archaeological Resources Technical Report included as Appendix E and Confidential Appendix F, respectively.

No comments related to cultural resources were received in response to the NOP. For a complete list of public comments received during the public scoping period, refer to Appendix A.

3.4.1 Regulatory Setting

Cultural resources in California are protected by a number of federal, state, and local regulations, statutes, and ordinances. Cultural resources are defined as buildings, sites, structures, or objects, each of which may have historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, and/or scientific importance. State and federal laws use different terms for cultural resources. California state law discusses significant cultural resources as “historical resources,” whereas federal law uses the terms “historic properties” and “historic resources.” In all instances where the term “resource” or “resources” is used, it is intended to convey the sense of both state and federal law.

Federal

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) 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” (36 CFR 60.2).¹ 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. As noted above, a resource that is listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register is considered “historic property” under Section 106 of the NHPA.

To be eligible for listing in the National Register, a property must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Properties of potential significance must meet one or more of the following four established criteria:

- 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

¹ Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 60.2.

- 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.

In addition to meeting one or more of the criteria of significance, a property must have integrity. Integrity is best described as a resource's "authenticity" as expressed through its physical features and extant characteristics. Generally, if a resource is recognizable as such in its present state, it is said to retain integrity, but if it has been extensively altered then it does not. Whether a resource retains sufficient integrity for listing is determined by evaluating the seven aspects of integrity defined by the National Park Service:

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

Integrity is evaluated by weighing all seven of these aspects together and is ultimately a "yes or no" determination – that is, a resource either retains sufficient integrity, or it does not.² Some aspects of integrity may be weighed more heavily than others depending on the type of resource being evaluated and the reason(s) for the resource's significance. Since integrity depends on a resource's placement within a historic context, integrity can be assessed only after it has been concluded that the resource is in fact significant.

State

California Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5

Section 21084.1 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC) states that for purposes of CEQA, "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."³

This necessitates a two-part inquiry: first, it must be determined whether a given project involves a historical resource, and if it does, a determination must be made as to whether the project may result in a "substantial adverse change in the significance" of that historical resource.

To answer these questions, guidance relating to historical resources has been formally codified as Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, which define a "historical resource" as any one of

² National Park Service, Revised 1995, *National Register Bulletin 15, Section VIII: How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property*.

³ California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15064.5.

the following, for purposes of CEQA compliance:⁴

- A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing in, the CRHR.
- A resource included in a local register of historical resources, or identified as significant in a qualified historical resource survey, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrate that it is not historically or culturally significant.
- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the CRHR.

Once it has been determined that a historical resource is present, it must then be determined whether the project may result in a "substantial adverse change" to that resource. Substantial adverse change is defined as "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource will be materially impaired."⁵ The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

- a. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resources that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, the CRHR; or
- b. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the PRC, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project established by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- c. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR as determined by a lead agency for the purposes of CEQA.

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify measures to mitigate significant adverse impacts to historical resources. The CEQA Guidelines state that "the lead agency shall ensure that any adopted measures to mitigate or avoid significant adverse changes are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures" deemed prudent and feasible."⁶

California Register of Historical Resources

The 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" (PRC Section 5024.1[a]). The criteria for eligibility for the California

⁴ California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15064.5.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

Register are based upon National Register criteria (PRC Section 5024.1[b]). Certain resources are determined by the statute to be automatically included in the California Register, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register.

1. To be eligible for the California Register, a prehistoric or historic-period property must be significant at the local, state, and/or federal level under one or more of the following four criteria:
2. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
3. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
4. 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
5. 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;
- California Registered Historical Landmarks from No. 770 onward; and,
- Those California Points of Historical Interest that have been evaluated by the OHP and have been recommended to the State Historical Commission for inclusion on the California Register.

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

- 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.

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, and PRC Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98 outline procedures to be followed in the event human remains are discovered during the course

of California projects. If human remains are encountered, all work must stop at that location and the County Coroner must be immediately notified and advised of the finding. The County Coroner would investigate “the manner and cause of any death” and make recommendations concerning treatment of the human remains. The County Coroner must make their determination within two working days of being notified. If the human remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. The Commission would in turn “...immediately notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American.” The descendants would then inspect the site and make recommendations for the disposition of the discovered human remains. This recommendation from the most likely descendants may include the scientific analysis of the remains and associated items.

California Public Resources Code Sections 5097.5 and 5097.7

California PRC Section 5097.5 as amended, and PRC Section 5097.7, strengthens existing State law regarding criminal penalties and restitution for crimes of archaeological site vandalism, theft of archaeological materials or artifacts in curation facilities, and damages to historic buildings and other cultural properties on State and local government lands. The amendment and new section closely follow federal law, specifically the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979.

California State University, Settlement Agreement, Declaration of Restrictive Covenant, and Conservation Easement – Puvungna⁷

On September 16, 2021, the CSU Board of Trustees entered into a Settlement Agreement to resolve litigation filed by the Juaneño Band of Mission Indians, Acjachemen Nation-Belardes, a Tribal Nation (“Tribe”), and California Cultural Resources Preservation Alliance, Inc. (“CCRPA”). The Settlement Agreement required the CSU to record a Declaration of Restrictive Covenant (“Declaration”) over the northwestern portion of the CSULB campus, of which a portion is the tribal and historic site commonly known as “Puvungna” (Restricted Parcel). The Declaration prohibits certain uses on the Restricted Parcel, including the construction or installation of new structures or improvements, to protect tribal and historic resources. The Declaration also permits certain uses on the Restricted Parcel, including passive use by California Native American tribes and affiliated groups, maintenance, and emergency actions. The Declaration may be terminated if and when the CSU establishes a Conservation Easement over the Restricted Parcel.

The Settlement Agreement further requires the CSU to make a good faith effort to establish a perpetual Conservation Easement over the Restricted Parcel within two years. The Conservation Easement will be granted to a qualified grantee and may be managed by a qualified easement manager. The Conservation Easement will be subject to a long-term maintenance and management plan to be prepared in the future. The prohibited and permitted uses will be the same as under the Declaration.

3.4.2 Environmental Setting

The CSULB main campus and Beachside Village property are located in coastal Los Angeles County in the City of Long Beach, north of the Port of Long Beach. The CSULB main campus encompasses 322 acres and Beachside Village is a CSU-owned student housing complex that encompasses approximately 5 acres. The majority of the university’s uses occur on the CSULB main campus, which comprises 84 buildings housing eight colleges and totaling approximately

⁷ Variants of the name include Pubuna, Pubugna, Puvu, Puvungna, Puvunga, Puvu-ngna, and Povuu’ngna. The ethnographic village is referred to as “Puvungna” while the archaeological district NRHP-listing is referred to as “Puvunga.”

5.8 million gross square feet of buildings. The CSULB main campus hosts an assemblage of mid-century modern architecture and site and landscape features.

Built Historical Resources

Summary of University History and Development

CSULB originated within a context of steady institutional expansion in California. In 1950, college officials settled on a 320-acre swath of land in the eastern section of Long Beach, and in October 1950, noted Long Beach architect Hugh Gibbs was selected to develop the institution's first-ever master plan. The Gibbs master plan, approved in 1953, laid the groundwork for the physical form of the CSULB campus as it exists today. Construction of the campus's first permanent buildings began shortly thereafter, with several completed in 1955; others were subsequently added as resources permitted.

In 1962 the noted local architectural firm of Killingsworth-Brady-Smith and Associates was selected to serve as consulting campus architect – a role that the firm, and specifically Killingsworth, continuously filled until he eventually retired in 2001. Killingsworth's lengthy tenure provided the Long Beach campus with a cohesive aesthetic that is not found at many other campuses within the CSU system. A new master plan developed by Killingsworth was adopted in January 1963. The symbiotic relationship between buildings, landscapes, and site features was a resonant theme in Killingsworth's master plan. Additionally, Killingsworth's master plan addressed student housing, and specifically called for the construction of a new dormitory complex to the northwest of the academic core, next to two existing dormitory buildings (Los Cerritos and Los Alamitos halls, both constructed 1959) and where Hillside College is located today. This lent impetus to the eventual development of two residential colleges on campus: Hillside College (1969) and Parkside College (1985), as well as the International House (1987). By the 1970s, the campus continued to witness additional growth and development during declining enrollment and economic recession, but at a somewhat slower pace and in a less cohesive manner than before. The campus continued to expand in the 1980s and 1990s, and it was during this time that several of its iconic buildings and sites were completed, including the Earl Burns Miller Japanese Garden and Walter Pyramid. In the 2000s and 2010s, CSULB experienced steady increases in student enrollment. With this growth came the construction of several new signature buildings for the campus.

Most of the buildings at CSULB ascribe to a common institutional derivative of the Mid-Century Modern style, which was applied to new buildings across the campus during its formative years. "Mid-Century Modern" is a broad term that is used to describe the various derivatives of Modern architecture that flourished in the post-World War II period. Southern California was a locus of innovation with respect to Modernism. The style was favored by large-scale institutional properties like colleges and universities, which were tasked with developing large, dense, multimodal campuses to accommodate the droves of incoming students seeking higher education in the postwar period. Mid-Century Modernism's emphasis on rational, economic buildings that could be produced *en masse* was well suited to these institutions, which needed to expand quickly and within the confines of public funding sources and finite capital construction budgets. Generally, the Mid-Century Modern style, expressed in the context of public institutional architecture, exhibits the following character-defining features:

- Simple, geometric building forms
- Concrete, steel, and glass construction (larger buildings); wood construction (smaller buildings)
- Direct expression of the structural system

- Flat roofs, with or without eaves
- Flush-mounted metal frame windows (often expressed as curtain walls in larger buildings)
- Metal window screens (*brise soleil*), often comprising geometric patterns or motifs
- Minimal surface ornament and decorative details
- Integrated landscapes, often in the form of courtyards or plazas

By the late 1960s, some architects designed buildings that were still firmly rooted in the Mid-Century Modern movement but also exhibited a derivative of Mid-Century Modern architecture is known as the New Formalist style. Character-defining features of New Formalism include the following:

- Strict symmetry and formality
- Buildings are often monumental in size and appearance
- Flat roof, often with a heavy, projecting overhang, emulating a simplified cornice
- Smooth wall surfaces
- Colonnades comprising full-height columnar supports
- Incorporation of arches and rounded openings
- Minimal surface ornament and decorative details
- Integrated landscapes, often in the form of interior courtyards or plazas

Refer to Historical Resources Technical Report (Appendix E) for the detailed overview of the university's history and development.

Archaeological Resources

The following discussion is prepared based on archaeological reconstructions and published ethnographic and historical research; no original ethnographic research or oral historic research was conducted.

Cultural Setting

As represented in the archaeological record, California, like the rest of North America, was occupied by the terminal Pleistocene and earliest Holocene. Key indicators of early material cultures, known as Paleoindian cultures, are fluted points, which have been reported at a number of locations in Southern California. By the Millingstone Period or Millingstone Cultural Horizon, permanent settlements were established in Southern California. These settlements were established along the coast and near estuaries, lagoons, rivers, and marshes, which provided rich natural resources including numerous varieties of seeds, shellfish, fish, birds, and small mammals. The Millingstone Period takes its name from the millingstones (metates) and hand stones (manos) which were used to process plant materials and which first appear during this time.

The way of life characterized by the Millingstone artifact assemblages persisted for millennia. But by 3,500 B.P., increased population size led to intensified exploitation of the natural environment and greater social complexity. The period during which these changes are observed in the archaeological record is known as the Intermediate Horizon. Technological innovations first seen in the Intermediate Horizon include the dart and atlatl (spear-thrower), the mortar and pestle to process acorns, and use of the circular shell fishhook on the coast. After about 5,000 B.P., mortars and pestles to exploit acorns appear in the archaeological record. The earliest radiocarbon dates and diagnostic artifacts so far recorded at the CSULB main campus date to the Intermediate

Horizon.

The majority of the archaeological sites documented at the CSULB main campus date to what is generally called the Late Prehistoric Period, which spans from approximately 1,500 years B.P. until the Spanish mission period. The Late Prehistoric Period is notable for the florescence of the Native American groups encountered by the Spanish.

Historic Overview

The following discussion provides a brief overview of the history of the City of Long Beach and the development of CSULB and the vicinity. Refer to the Confidential Archaeological Resources Technical Report (Confidential Appendix F) for the detailed historic overview of the development of southern California.

The City of Long Beach emerged out of the 1880s land boom after the Southern Pacific Railroad connecting San Francisco to Los Angeles was completed. The first subdivision within what became Long Beach was conducted in 1882, and the American Colony was founded. In 1887, the Long Beach Land and Water Company was organized, and the official map of Long Beach was filed on July 30, 1887. Over the course of the last quarter of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, the City of Long Beach followed much the same course of rapid development as the rest of Los Angeles County.

In 1919, the United States Navy divided its forces into Atlantic and Pacific Fleets. Long Beach was made home port of the Pacific Fleet, and over the next few decades infrastructure was constructed to support the Navy's mission. In 1940, as war raged in Asia, the Navy began major infrastructure improvements in Long Beach that continued after the United States entered World War II in December 1941. In 1943, with the war at its height, the Navy constructed a large new Long Beach Naval Hospital immediately west and south of today's CSULB main campus. By 1949, the Long Beach Naval Hospital consisted of 88 buildings and could house 1,791 patients. In 1950, the Navy vacated the hospital which was transferred to the Veterans Affairs, which continued to renovate, build, and expand upon the premises, which is today the Veterans Affairs Long Beach Healthcare System. Initial construction, management, and subsequent improvements to the hospital (including building demolitions and replacements) required massive amounts of earth-moving, and some soil from that activity is believed to have been transported and used as fill on what is today the CSULB main campus.

In 1949, Governor Earl Warren signed Assembly Bill 8 establishing Los Angeles-Orange County State College, and today the college has attained university status and is known as California State University, Long Beach. During the 1950s through the 1970s, most of the remaining undeveloped land on and surrounding the campus was developed. Mostly in the 1960s, housing tracts were established on privately held land adjacent to CSULB. Both the Veterans Affairs Long Beach Healthcare System and CSULB developed their land holdings and have active building programs.

Ethnographic Overview

The CSULB main campus is located in a region traditionally important to multiple Native American groups. In particular, these include the Gabrielino (including the Tongva and Kizh), the Juaneño--Acjachemen, and the Luiseño. The terms Tongva, Kizh, and Acjachemen are preferred by many descendant groups over the Spanish words that have historically been used to describe them, while the Luiseño are typically identified by their band (including La Jolla, Pala, Pauma, Pechanga, Rincon, Soboba, and San Luis Rey). Refer to Section 3.12, Tribal Cultural Resources,

for a detailed overview of tribal cultural resources.

The following description is a brief summary of the ethnographic information regarding the CSULB main campus. The Long Beach area was heavily settled by the Gabrielino due to its estuaries and protected bays and inlets and as evidenced by ethnography about the area, mission registers and archaeological sites. There were a number of villages and hamlets settled in the Long Beach area.

Puvungna was a Gabrielino Rancheria located near Alamitos Bay, and ethnographic accounts and baptism records from the San Gabriel Mission indicated that at the time of Spanish contact it was a large and thriving community. During the rancho era, the village of Puvungna was located on Rancho Los Alamitos, originally part of a much larger land grant by Manuel Nieto that encompassed the former village. Nieto established the land, which was over 200,000 acres, as Rancho Los Nieto and began building adobes on Bixby Hill in approximately 1804. In 1833, Rancho Los Alamitos was established at 28,612 acres, and encompassed the western half of Long Beach, southern half of Signal Hill, Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Cypress, Garden Grove, Stanton, and Westminster.

Native American informants pointed out a shell midden beside the spring near the old Rancho Los Alamitos ranch house and local historians also regarded this as the site of Puvungna. The site was later recorded as P-19-000306 (also known as CA-LAN-306), and until the 1970s, this was generally regarded as the site of Puvungna, even appearing labeled as such in historical maps. Archaeologists in the 1970s began to suggest that other sites in the Signal Hill region could be associated with Puvungna.

The CSULB main campus is located on what was Rancho Los Nietos, the largest and one of the earliest Spanish land grants in California. In 1804, the rancho was divided into five separate ranchos. The land within the CSULB main campus became a part of Rancho Los Alamitos. In about 1806, an adobe house was built on a hilltop near a spring approximately 0.9 miles southeast of the CSULB main campus. This house, enlarged several times, still stands.

Over the course of the 1970s, CSULB and the surrounding community developed most of the remaining undeveloped land on and surrounding the campus. The Rancho Los Alamitos Adobe was eventually completely surrounded by a gated community. While visitors can still visit site P-19-00306 next to the adobe, they can only do so during specific times and under conditions set by Rancho Los Alamitos and the surrounding gated community.

In 1974, the Keeper of the National Register found that three sites (P-19-000234, -235, and -306) qualified for the Register as contributors to the Puvunga Indian Village Sites Archaeological District as three undeveloped archaeological sites in Long Beach that are representative of the ancient village of Puvungna. The village of Puvungna and its sphere of influence, which would have included resource procurement areas and likely also dependent hamlets and even dependent villages, is generally considered to have occupied the region surrounding the historic Rancho Los Alamitos Ranch House and the CSULB main campus. Site P-19-00035, encompassing approximately 22.4 acres within the northwest portion of the CSULB main campus, west of Determination Drive, is considered by some tribes as the only part of Puvungna that remains undeveloped. On May 22, 1982, the NRHP listed an increased boundary for P-19-000235.

A restrictive covenant prohibiting development was established in 2021 on a large portion of the undeveloped land near the northwest border of the CSULB main campus, and it is held in reserve

for the future establishment of a permanent conservation easement for its perpetual protection and management.

3.4.3 Methodology

As discussed above under 3.1.2 Regulatory Setting, California PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 serve as the basis for this analysis, which necessitates a two-part inquiry: first, it must be determined whether a given project involves a historical resource, and if it does, a determination must be made as to whether the project may result in a “substantial adverse change in the significance” of that historical resource.

Built Historical Resources

The Historical Resources Technical Report (Appendix E) prepared for the Master Plan Update included research, documentation, and field visits. Site visits to CSULB main campus were conducted in August 2019, March 2020, and August 2022, to document and photograph buildings and other site features. Previous studies and existing documentation were reviewed related to historical resources on the CSULB campus, including the 2019 Historic Resource Survey. Additionally, historical resource data included in the State of California’s Built Environment Resource Directory (BERD)⁸ was reviewed. Supplemental research was conducted on the history and development of the CSULB campus.

Research conducted as part of this report was informed by various primary and secondary source materials obtained from the following sources: the CSULB Library, including its Special Collections and University Archives; the Long Beach Public Library; the Los Angeles Public Library; the archives of the *Press-Telegram*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and other periodicals; archival building records and construction documents provided by the CSULB Beach Building Services Department; technical assistance bulletins and materials published by the National Park Service and the California Office of Historic Preservation; various online repositories; and ARG’s in-house collection of architectural books and reference materials.

Based on the Historical Resources Technical Report, no built historical resources on the CSULB campus are listed in the National Register or California Register, or on a local historic resource register. A Historic Resource Survey conducted in 2019 identified and inventoried built historical resources on the CSULB campus that were constructed through 1980, which identified four individual buildings and two historic districts. Resources that were identified in the survey as appearing eligible for federal (NRHP) and/or state (CRHR) listing are treated as “historical resources” as per Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Table 3.4-1 shows the four buildings identified as individually eligible for listing in the National Register and California Register including the McIntosh Humanities Building, the Psychology Building, the Theatre Arts Building, and the University Student Union (USU). The four buildings were found to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register and California Register under Criterion C/3, in the area of Architecture and Design. For a description of the character-defining features of the buildings, refer to the Historical Resources Technical Report (Appendix E).

⁸ The Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD) database provides information about non-archaeological resources in the California Office of Historic Preservation’s inventory.

Table 3.4-1: Individually Eligible Resources Documented on the CSULB Main Campus

| Resource Name | Year Built | Architect | Eligible for NHRP | Eligible for CRHR |
|------------------------------|------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| McIntosh Humanities Building | 1967 | California State Division of Architecture | X | X |
| Psychology Building | 1970 | Gibbs and Gibbs | X | X |
| Theatre Arts Building | 1972 | Frank Homolka and Associates | X | X |
| University Student Union | 1972 | Killingsworth-Brady and Associates | X | X |

Two historic districts were identified as eligible for listing in the National Register and California Register: the Hillside College Historic District and the Upper Campus Historic District. However, as of 2020, the Hillside College Historic District is no longer an eligible resource and is no longer considered to be a historical resource for purposes of CEQA because of diminished integrity of the district resulting from development of the Housing Expansion Phase 1 - Housing Administration and Commons Building Project.

One eligible historic district, the Upper Campus Historic District, remains on campus. The Upper Campus Historic District currently comprises 27 buildings including 24 contributors (89 percent the district) and three non-contributors (11 percent of the district), as well as various site and landscape features. Tables 3.4-2 and 3.4-3 show a summary of the district and its contributing/non-contributing buildings. The Upper Campus Historic District was found to be eligible for listing in the National Register and California Register under Criteria A/1 and C/3 in the areas of Institutional Development, Campus Planning, and Architecture and Design. For a statement of significance for the Upper Campus Historic District, refer to the Historical Resources Technical Report (Appendix E).

Table 3.4-2: Historic District Documented Within the CSULB Main Campus

| District Name | Period of Significance | No. of Contributing Resources | Eligible for NHRP | Eligible for CRHR |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| Upper Campus Historic District | 1953-1972 | 27 buildings (24 contributors); site and landscape features | X | X |

Table 3.4-3: Contributors and Non-Contributors to the Upper Campus Historic District Within the CSULB Main Campus

| Building Name | Year Built | Architect | Status |
|--|------------|---|-------------|
| Academic Services (AS) | 1955 | Hugh Gibbs | Contributor |
| Bookstore (BKS) | 1955 | Hugh Gibbs | Contributor |
| College of Liberal Arts Administration (CLA) | 1954 | Hugh Gibbs | Contributor |
| Education 2 (ED2) | 1961 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Ellis Education Building (EED) | 1957 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |

Table 3.4-3: Contributors and Non-Contributors to the Upper Campus Historic District Within the CSULB Main Campus

| Building Name | Year Built | Architect | Status |
|--|-------------------|---|-----------------|
| Faculty Office 2 (FO2) | 1957 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Faculty Office 3 (FO3) | 1959 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Fine Arts 1 (FA1) | 1954 | Hugh Gibbs | Contributor |
| Fine Arts 2 (FA2) | 1954 | Hugh Gibbs | Contributor |
| Fine Arts 3 (FA3) | 1958 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Fine Arts 4 (FA4) | 1962 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Language Arts Building (LAB) | 1967 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Lecture Hall 150-151 (LH) | 1955 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Liberal Arts 1 (LA1) | 1962 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Liberal Arts 2 (LA2) | 1954 | Hugh Gibbs | Non-contributor |
| Liberal Arts 3 (LA3) | 1954 | Hugh Gibbs | Non-contributor |
| Liberal Arts 4 (LA4) | 1955 | Hugh Gibbs | Non-contributor |
| Liberal Arts 5 (LA5) | 1962 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Library (LIB) | 1971 | Joint Venture Architects | Contributor |
| *McIntosh Humanities Building (MHB) | 1967 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| Multi-Media Center (MMC) | 1971 | Joint Venture Architects | Contributor |
| *Psychology Building (PSY) | 1970 | Gibbs and Gibbs | Contributor |
| *Theatre Arts (TA) | 1972 | Frank Homolka and Associates | Contributor |
| University Dining Plaza (UDP) | 1957 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| *University Student Union (USU) | 1972 | Killingsworth-Brady and Associates | Contributor |
| University Telecommunications Center (UTC) | 1958 | California State Division of Architecture | Contributor |
| University Theatre (UT) | 1955 | Hugh Gibbs | Contributor |

Archaeological Resources

The Confidential Archaeological Resources Technical Report (Confidential Appendix F) prepared for the Master Plan Update included archival research, and review of monitoring reports, published reports, books, and articles. The archaeological resources records search of the CSULB main campus and Beachside Village property was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) housed at California State University, Fullerton on March 18, 2022. Results of the records search indicated that 72 previous cultural resource studies have been conducted within the CSULB main campus or a 0.5-mile of the CSULB main campus between 1972 and 2017 and are on file at the SCCIC. Of these 72 studies, 39 are located entirely or partially within the boundary of the CSULB main campus. The records search did not identify any studies within the Beachside Village property or a 0.5 mile of the Beachside Village property.

The archival research was supplemented with research of monitoring reports archived on campus, as well as published reports, books, and articles.

A total of 28 resources have been documented on the CSULB main campus. Of those 28 resources, 16 have been analyzed and found not to be potentially significant resources and three have been subsumed within other large archaeological sites. The remaining nine resources are considered historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. Table 3.4-4 shows the listed and potentially eligible archaeological resources documented within the CSULB main campus.

Table 3.4-4: Listed and Potentially Eligible Archaeological Resources Documented Within the CSULB Main Campus

| Primary Number (P-19-) | Permanent Trinomial (CA-LAN-) | District | CRHR Eligibility Determination / Recommendation |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| 001000 | 001000 | Central East North | Potentially eligible |
| 002616 | 002616 | Central East | Potentially eligible |
| 120042 | None | Central | Potentially eligible |
| 120041 | None | East | Potentially eligible as part of P-19-002616 |
| 002630 | 002630 | North | Potentially eligible |
| 120044 | Part of P-19-002630 | North | Potentially eligible as part of P-19-002630 |
| 120052 | Part of P-19-002630 | North | Potentially eligible as part of P-19-002630 |
| 000234 | 000234 | West | Contributor to a district listed in the NRHP by the Keeper; listed in the CRHR |
| 000235 | 000235 | West | Contributor to a district listed in the NRHP by the Keeper; listed in the CRHR |
| 000705 | 000705 | West | Potentially eligible |
| 002629 | 002629 | West | Potentially eligible |
| 120043 | None | West | Potentially eligible |

As shown in Table 3.4-4, two resources located on the CSULB main campus, P-19-000234 and P-19-000235, are listed on the NRHP as contributing resources to the Puvunga Indian Village Sites Archaeological District. A restrictive covenant prohibiting development has been established on a large portion of this site and it is held in reserve for the future establishment of a permanent conservation easement for its perpetual protection and management. Resources that are listed in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR and are historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

Archaeological sites are assumed to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR until they are formally evaluated under the four criteria for designation and determined by the lead agency not to be significant. Therefore, the remaining seven archaeological resources are treated as historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. Of the seven resources that are treated as eligible, five resources located on the CSULB main campus have yielded significant information regarding the prehistory of California and appear to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR. They are: P-19-000705, P-19-001000, P-19-002616, P-19-002629, and P-19-002630. The resources have not been formally evaluated but are potentially eligible for inclusion in the CRHR under Criterion 4. For a statement of eligibility, refer to the Confidential Archaeological Resources Technical Report (Confidential Appendix F).

Finally, two resources, P-19-120042 and P-19-120043, located on the CSULB main campus were documented as midden traces but have not been investigated to determine their potential eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR. The resources have not been formally evaluated but are potentially eligible for inclusion in the CRHR under Criterion 4. They are treated as potentially eligible for inclusion in the CRHR for purposes of this analysis. For a statement of eligibility, refer to the Confidential Archaeological Resources Technical Report (Confidential Appendix F).

As shown in Table 3.4-4, two resources, P-19-1000 and P-19-002616, overlap multiple districts; one resource, P-19-120042, is located in the Central District; one resource, P-19-120041, is located in the East District but subsumed by P-19-002616; one resource, P-19-002630, is located in the North District while the other two resources, P-19-120044 and P-19-120052, in the North District have been subsumed by P-19-2630; and five resources (P-19-000234, P-19-000234, P-19-000705, P-19-002629, and P-19-120043) are located in the West District. The South District contains no documented historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

Thresholds of Significance

The significance thresholds used to evaluate the impacts of the Master Plan Update related to cultural resources are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Based on Appendix G, a project would have a significant impact related to cultural resources if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5; or
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

3.4.4 Impact Analysis

The impact analysis below is organized into a program-level analysis and a project-level analysis. For the program-level analysis, the Master Plan Update is evaluated as an overall program of development over a multi-year planning horizon for the CSULB campus. For the project-level analysis, near- and mid-term development projects that would be implemented under the Master Plan Update are analyzed.

CUL-1 Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Program-Level Analysis for Master Plan Update

Construction

Implementation of the Master Plan Update would include renovation of existing buildings (renovation), demolition and replacement of existing buildings in the same physical locations (replacement), construction of new buildings (new construction), and leaving buildings in their existing location and configuration (building to remain). Renovation, replacement, or new construction projects impacting affecting individually eligible historic resources, or the historic district, including its contributors, have the potential to impact the historical significance of these resources.

Renovation projects implemented under the Master Plan Update that have the potential to impact individually eligible resources and/or the historic district may include, but are not necessarily

limited to, the following: retrofitting teaching and research spaces to meet contemporary standards; infrastructure systems upgrades; Americans With Disabilities Act-related improvements; energy efficiency improvements (including window replacements); change in use of space (e.g., classroom converted to group learning area); repurposing of an existing building to accommodate a new use; additions to an existing building; removal of additions or modifications that occurred outside of the building's period of significance; structural or seismic retrofitting; and improvements to landscape or hardscape features that are considered to be character-defining features of an eligible or designated historical building.

Renovation projects have the potential to impact historical resources by altering or removing character-defining features and spaces that characterize a resource may be altered or removed; through extensive alterations to a resource may be needed to accommodate a change of use; or through new additions to a resource may be incompatible with its bulk, scale, massing, height, or style. If the extent of alterations is such that a historical resource is no longer eligible for inclusion in the National Register and/or California Register, then the project would "materially impair" the historical resource and impacts would be significant.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HR-A and HR-F and Mitigation Measures HR-C and HR-D, as applicable, would be required to reduce impacts to individually eligible resources. Mitigation Measure HR-A would require review of the project by a qualified architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards and compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the Standards) to conduct an assessment of whether the proposed treatment of the historical resource complies with the Standards. If a project meets the applicable Standards, then Mitigation Measure HR-F, which requires additional project review for individually eligible historical resources during design development and construction. If the project does not meet the Standards, then the university, in consultation with the architectural historian, shall explore if impacts can be lessened by redesigning the project to eliminate its "objectionable or damaging aspects" (e.g., retaining instead of removing a character-defining feature, or reducing the size/massing of a proposed addition). If the architectural historian concludes that compliance with the Standards is not feasible and the proposed scope of work does not meet the Standards, then Mitigation Measures HR-C and HR-D would apply for documentation of the historical resource and interpretation which would implement an interpretive program for the historical resource. Mitigation Measures HR-A, HR-B and potentially Mitigation Measures HR-C and HR-D would be required to reduce impacts to the historic district. Mitigation Measures HR-A, HR-C, and HR-D are the same as for individually eligible resources; Mitigation Measure HR-B would require the university to develop an Adaptive Mitigation Management Program for the historic district. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to individually eligible resources and the historic district related to renovation would be less than significant.

Replacement projects implemented under the Master Plan Update that have the potential to impact individually eligible resources and/or the historic district may include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following: demolition or removal of a district contributor or non-contributor; demolition or removal of an associated site or landscape feature – such as a designed landscape, hardscape element, or public art installation – within the historic district; construction of a new building within the historic district or in the vicinity of a historical resource. Replacement projects have the potential to impact historical resources by removing one or more district contributors, which compromise the integrity of the district and its ability to remain eligible for listing in the National Register and/or California Register. New construction implemented under the Master Plan Update that have the potential to impact individually eligible resources and/or the historic district may include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following: new construction in

the vicinity of an individually eligible resource may be incompatible with the historical resource in terms of bulk, scale, massing, height, and/or style; and new construction within a historic district may be incompatible with the district's prevailing scale, shape, form, material composition, and general aesthetic qualities, which may interrupt the district's important spatial relationships, dwarf district contributors, compromise important viewsheds, or detract from the district's characteristic aesthetic and spatial qualities. If the extent of demolition or new construction is such that a historical resource is no longer eligible for inclusion in the National Register and/or California Register, then the project would "materially impair" the historical resource, and impacts would be significant.

No individually eligible resources are identified as sites for demolition in the Master Plan Update. However, if a replacement or new construction project is proposed for a site in the vicinity of an individually eligible historical resource, Mitigation Measure HR-A, Secretary Standards Compliance, would be required. Similar to the analysis of renovation projects, if the project would meet the Standards, then Mitigation Measure HR-F would apply to individually eligible historical resources requiring additional project review during design and construction. However, if the project does not meet the Standards, then the university, in consultation with the architectural historian, shall explore if impacts can be lessened by redesigning the project to eliminate its "objectionable or damaging aspects" (e.g., retaining instead of removing a character-defining feature, or reducing the size/massing of a proposed addition). With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to individually eligible resources related to replacement and new construction would be less than significant.

To reduce impacts to the historical district from replacement or new construction projects, Mitigation Measure HR-B, requiring the university to develop an Adaptive Mitigation Management Program for the historic district, would be implemented. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to the historic district related to replacement or new construction projects would be less than significant.

Operation

Operation of the improvements associated with the Master Plan Update would include routine maintenance and landscaping that would not require renovation, replacement, or new construction that have the potential to impact built historical resources. Therefore, no impacts associated with operation of the Master Plan Update would occur.

Project-Level Analysis for Near- and Mid-Term Development Projects

Construction

Of the near- and mid-term individual development projects included in Table 2-11 in Chapter 2, Project Description, two renovation projects have the potential to impact individually eligible resources: the Theatre Arts Renovation and the USU Renovation/Addition and Cafeteria Replacement. Renovations to the Theatre Arts building and the USU building could result in alterations to these resources through the removal or modification of either interior or exterior character-defining features to the extent that one or both of these resources are no longer eligible for listing in the National Register and/or California Register, constituting a significant impact. Moreover, additions to the USU building could compromise the integrity of this resource by introducing new massing and materials that are incompatible with historic fabric, thereby compromising the integrity of the USU building to the extent that it is no longer eligible for listing in the National Register and/or California Register.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HR-A and HR-F and HR-C, HR-D, as applicable, would

be required to reduce potential impacts to the Theatre Arts building and USU building. Mitigation Measure HR-A would require review of the project by a qualified architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards and compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the Standards). If the project would meet the Standards, then Mitigation Measure HR-F would apply to individually eligible historical resources requiring additional project review during design and construction. If the project would not meet the Standards, then the university, in consultation with the architectural historian, shall explore if impacts can be lessened by redesigning the individual development project to eliminate its "objectionable or damaging aspects" (e.g., retaining instead of removing a character-defining feature, or reducing the size/massing of a proposed addition). If the architectural historian concludes that compliance with the Standards is not feasible and the proposed scope of work does not meet the Standards, then Mitigation Measures HR-C and HR-D would apply for documentation of the historical resource and interpretation which would implement an interpretive program for the historical resource. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to individually eligible resources related to renovation would be less than significant.

Of the near- and mid-term individual development projects included in Table 2-11 in Chapter 2, Project Description, one new construction project has the potential to impact individually eligible resources: the 7th Street Community Outreach Facility. The construction of the 7th Street Community Outreach Facility would occupy a site adjacent to an individually eligible resource, the McIntosh Humanities Building, which could introduce architectural or other design features that are visually incompatible with the historical resource. Similar to the renovation projects discussed above, implementation of Mitigation Measures HR-A and HR-F and Mitigation Measures HR-C and HR-D, as applicable, would be required to reduce potential impacts to the McIntosh Humanities Building. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to individually eligible resources related to replacement and new construction would be less than significant.

Of the near- and mid-term individual development projects included in Table 2-11 in Chapter 2, Project Description, the following renovation projects have the potential to impact contributors to the historic district: Fine Arts 1 / 2 Renovation; Fine Arts 4 Renovation; Lecture Hall 150-151 (LH) Renovation; Liberal Arts 5 Renovation; Theatre Arts Renovation; USU Renovation / Addition and Cafeteria Replacement; and University Theatre Renovation. Most of these renovation projects are limited to interior spaces and would not affect building exteriors. Interior renovation projects would not alter or remove character-defining features of the district, which are generally limited to building exteriors, site and landscape features, circulation patterns, and spatial relationships among the district's contributing elements. Specifically, interior renovations to the Fine Arts 1 / 2, Fine Arts 4, Lecture Hall 150-151, Theatre Arts, and University Theatre buildings would not result in impacts to the district, provided that the scope of work is limited to building interiors and would not modify the form or appearance of exterior façades. No impacts to the district are anticipated with these projects.

However, exterior renovations are proposed for two district contributions: Liberal Arts 5 and USU. Exterior renovations to district contributors could result in the removal or modification of character-defining features of the district, depending on the scopes of work and the importance of the building(s) in conveying the significance of the district. Moreover, the construction of an addition to the USU building could result in the removal or alteration of character-defining features that are important to the district, and could also result in changes to the bulk, massing, form, and spatial relationships that define these buildings and their relationship to the district. Additionally, the proposed addition to the USU building would require the demolition of the University Dining Plaza, which is a contributor to the district. The demolition of the University Dining Plaza could potentially result in material impairment of the district by compromising the visual continuity that

currently exists between the USU, which anchors the north end of the district, and the rest of the district, most of which is located to the south of the University Dining Plaza.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HR-B and HR-F and Mitigation Measures HR-C, HR-D, and HR-E, as applicable, would be required to reduce impacts to the historic district. Mitigation Measures HR-B, HR-C, HR-D, and HR-F are the same as described for the program-level analysis. Mitigation Measure HR-E would be implemented if the University Dining Plaza is demolished to accommodate the addition to the USU, and would require salvage of character-defining features and materials from the historical resource for educational and interpretive purposes on campus, or for reuse in new construction on campus. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to the historic district related to renovation would be less than significant.

Of the near- and mid-term individual development projects included in Table 2-11 in Chapter 2, Project Description, two replacement and new construction projects have the potential to impact contributors to the historic district: 7th Street Community Outreach Facility and College of the Arts Replacement Building. The construction of these individual development projects would require the demolition of three district contributors: Education 2, Ellis Education Building, and Fine Arts 3. Demolition of a historical resource is typically considered to be a significant and unavoidable impact that cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant. However, when applied to a historic district, this principle is applied to the district in its entirety, rather to an individual building or specific feature within its boundaries. It is possible for limited demolition to occur within a district without adversely affecting the overall integrity of the district, provided that the district's character and significance remain unimpaired.

There is no prescribed threshold of contributing elements needed to constitute a historic district; eligibility is a holistic assessment based on whether a district retains enough of its historic character and integrity to convey its significance. One measure of impact is to calculate the percentage of contributors to a district following implementation of a project. In accordance with best professional practices, a district should retain, at minimum, 60 percent of its contributors to be eligible for the California Register. As noted, there are 27 buildings within the district, of which 24 (89 percent) are contributors. If all three of the above-listed district contributors (Education 2, Ellis Education Building, and Fine Arts 3) are demolished, and the two replacement buildings are constructed in their place, then the district would have a total of 26 buildings and 21 contributors, or 80 percent contributing buildings. This exceeds the professional standard of 60 percent. When this metric is applied to the district, the demolition of all five contributors would not, and in of itself, result in a significant impact to the district.

Nonetheless, potential significant impacts to the historic district would occur with implementation of the replacement and new construction projects. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HR-B, and HR-F and Mitigation Measures HR-C, HR-D, and HR-E, as applicable, would be required to reduce impacts to the historic district. The mitigation measures are the same as described above. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to the historic district related to replacement and new construction would be less than significant.

Operation

Operation of the improvements associated with the Master Plan Update would include routine maintenance and landscaping that would not require renovation, replacement, or new construction that have the potential to impact built historical resources. Therefore, no impacts associated with operation of the Master Plan Update would occur.

CUL-2 Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**Program-Level Analysis for Master Plan Update***Construction*

Implementation of the Master Plan Update would include renovation of existing buildings (renovation), demolition and replacement of existing buildings in the same physical locations (replacement), construction of new buildings (new construction), and leaving buildings in their existing location and configuration (building to remain). Any renovation, replacement, or new construction project that would require ground-disturbing activities within the boundary of a known or unknown archaeological resource could result in a potentially significant impact to the resource. Examples of such “ground-disturbing activities” are defined for the purposes of this analysis to include the following: equipment and materials staging, stockpiling, storage, placement of temporary structures including construction trailers, gravelling, geotechnical boring, clearing and grubbing including vegetation or tree removal, grading, project-specific exploratory ground-disturbance, compaction, boring, excavating including hydrovac, digging, trenching, rig anchor installation, drilling, tunneling, auguring, blasting, topsoil stripping, land leveling, driving a ground rod, and installing fence posts. Impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K, which are summarized below.

Mitigation Measure AR-A would apply to any campus project, including at Beachside Village, that would require ground-disturbing activities, and requires the retention of a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (48 Federal Register 44738) for an initial project review. The qualified archaeologist would review the Confidential Archaeological Resources Technical Report (Confidential Appendix F), subsequent archaeological studies, location-specific archaeological studies covering the project area, available geotechnical studies or boring logs, and the mapped locations of archaeological sites, prior to the start of construction to determine whether ground-disturbing activities have the potential to impact archaeological resources. Additionally, the qualified archaeologist would review the designated staging and stockpiling areas identified for an individual development project, as required by Mitigation Measure AR-B.

If the qualified archaeologist determines that a project has the potential to impact unknown and/or ineligible archaeological resources, then at their discretion, the qualified archaeologist may require Mitigation Measure AR-C for a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) prior to the start of construction, or a combination of Mitigation Measures AR-C and AR-G for archaeological monitoring during construction. If a resource is found during ground-disturbing activities, then work would stop, and the resource would be evaluated in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-H, as further described below. Mitigation Measures AR-C and AR-G would minimize the potential to impact unknown and/or ineligible archaeological resources to less than significant.

If the qualified archaeologist determines that a project has the potential to impact a known listed or potentially eligible archaeological resource, or the project site is within a 25-foot radius of a known archaeological site boundary, but its three-dimensional limits (i.e., areal extent and depth) are unknown, then Mitigation Measure AR-E would apply and an Extended Phase I (XPI) may be implemented in order to identify the presence or absence of the site within project boundaries. The qualified archaeologist retains the discretion to reduce the 25-foot radius on a case-by-case basis based on their expert judgment. Additionally, if the qualified archaeologist determines that

the project has the potential to impact known significant archaeological resources, then avoidance and preservation-in-place are the preferred treatments. The qualified archaeologist would work with the Engineer of Record to identify means of avoidance wherever avoidance is feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, or if the project has the potential to impact unknown resources, then Mitigation Measure AR-F would require an archaeological resources monitoring and discovery plan (ARMDP) to be prepared.

If an unanticipated archaeological resource is unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, Mitigation Measure AR-H would be implemented. Mitigation Measure AR-H requires that work be halted immediately, and the discovery be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. As required by Mitigation Measure AR-H, depending on the nature of the find, the determination of significance may require additional excavation, potentially including the preparation and execution of a Phase II Archaeological Testing Plan. The results of testing would be presented in an appropriate memorandum or report and communicated to the SCCIC. If the resource is determined to be significant and avoidance is not feasible, then Mitigation Measure AR-I would apply and requires a resource-specific Archaeological Resources Treatment Plan to be prepared and executed prior to recommencing ground-disturbing activities that may impact the resource.

If a significant resource is identified within a project site, an archaeological resources treatment plan would be developed that will govern the treatment of the resource, as required by Mitigation Measure AR-I. Mitigation Measure AR-I would also require a Phase III investigation (Data Recovery) if disturbance to the resource cannot be avoided. The Phase III investigation would generally consist of a limited scale program of archaeological excavation, radiocarbon dating of organic materials, such as shell midden and faunal remains, laboratory analysis, and report writing designed to assess the importance of the resource in question. Any resources recovered would be properly curated, as appropriate.

Additionally, in the event of an unanticipated find of human remains, Mitigation Measure AR-D would be required to suspend work and notify the Los Angeles County Coroner's Office.

Mitigation would be considered complete upon implementation of Mitigation Measure AR-J, which would require documentation of findings and filing of the documentation with the SCCIC, as described in Section 8, Recommendations, below. All archaeological material collected during ground-disturbing activities for the project would be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards, as required by Mitigation Measure AR-K.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K would reduce impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level.

Operation

There are nine archaeological sites on campus that meet, or potentially meet, the criteria for inclusion in the CRHR. Operation of the improvements associated with the Master Plan Update would include routine landscape maintenance and other maintenance and operational activities (i.e., mowing; above-ground tree trimming and tree maintenance; aerating turf fields; setting up bleachers on the athletic fields; repairing existing irrigation lines; parking, staging, and stockpiling on paved surfaces; and pest and rodent control activities) that would not require ground-disturbing activities that have the potential to impact buried archaeological resources. Therefore, no impacts associated with operation of the Master Plan Update would occur.

Project-Level Analysis for Near- and Mid-Term Development Projects

Construction

Of the near- and mid-term individual development projects included in Table 2-11 in Chapter 2, Project Description, eight projects overlap significant or potentially significant archaeological resources. The individual development projects that overlap significant or potentially significant archaeological resources are listed below in Table 3.4-5.

Table 3.4-5: Individual Development Projects that Overlap with Known Potentially Significant Archaeological Resources

| Project Name | Type of Project | Overlapping Potentially Significant Resources | Phase |
|--|-----------------|---|-------|
| East | | | |
| Engineering Replacement Building | Replacement | P-19-002616 | Near |
| Faculty and Staff Housing | New | P-19-002616 | Near |
| North | | | |
| Aquatics Center and Pool Renovation | Replacement | P-19-001000 | Near |
| Jack Rose Track/Commencement Facilities | Renovation | P-19-002630 | Mid |
| Baseball Field Conversion to Multi-Use Field | Renovation | P-19-002630 | Mid |
| West | | | |
| Hillside College Renovations/Addition | Renovation | P-19-120043; P-19-002629; P-19-000234/235 | Near |
| Improved Campus Entrance and Gateway | Renovation | P-19-000234/235 | Near |
| Central/West/South | | | |
| Pedestrian/Bike Lane Improvements | Renovation | P-19-000234/235 | Mid |

As shown in Table 3.4-5, no impacts to resources P-19-000705 and P-19-120042 would occur as the Master Plan Update does not include individual development projects requiring ground-disturbing activities in these locations.

As shown in Table 3.4-5, the Hillside College Renovations/Addition, Improved Campus Entrance and Gateway, and Pedestrian/Bike Lane Improvements would occur within the boundaries of the NRHP-listed Puvunga Indian Village Sites Archaeological District. However, a large portion of the site has a restrictive covenant prohibiting development (Restricted Parcel) and it is held in reserve for the future establishment of a permanent conservation easement for its perpetual protection and management. The Hillside College Renovations/Addition, Improved Campus Entrance and Gateway, and Pedestrian/Bike Lane Improvements would occur outside the boundaries of the Restricted Parcel, and would be limited to interior renovations outside the boundaries of the archaeological district for the Hillside College Renovations/Addition project; replacement of existing pavement, changing out the letters on the existing entrance sign, and landscaping for the

Improved Campus Entrance and Gateway; and replacement of existing pavement for the Pedestrian and Bike Lane Improvements project. To minimize and/or avoid impacts to the Puvunga Indian Village Sites Archaeological District (Resources P-19-000234 and P-19-000235), Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K would be required. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts to Resources P-19-000234 and P-19-000235 would be less than significant.

Additionally, the remaining individual development projects listed in Table 3.4-5 have the potential to include ground-disturbing activities. Any ground-disturbing activities that impact previously undisturbed sediments at these individual project site locations have the potential to impact buried significant archaeological resources, reduce the data potential of these resources, and reduce the resource's eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR. Therefore, the impact of the individual development projects requiring ground-disturbing activities within known potentially significant archaeological resources would result in a significant impact. Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K would be required. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts to potentially significant archaeological resources would be less than significant.

For individual development projects requiring ground-disturbing activities that would occur outside of the boundaries of known archaeological resources, Mitigation Measures AR-A, AR-B, and AR-C would apply. Mitigation Measure AR-G, requiring archaeological monitoring, would apply at the discretion of the qualified archaeologist. Mitigation Measures AR-D, AR-H, AR-I, AR-J, AR-K, and AR-K would apply if resources are found. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts to potentially significant archaeological resources would be less than significant.

As concluded in the program-level analysis, impacts to known significant archaeological resources resulting from the near-term and mid-term projects would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K.

Operation

Similar to under the program-level analysis, operation of individual development projects would not require any additional ground-disturbing activities beyond routine landscape maintenance and other maintenance and operational activities (i.e., mowing; above-ground tree trimming and tree maintenance; aerating turf fields; setting up bleachers on the athletic fields; repairing existing irrigation lines; parking, staging, and stockpiling on paved surfaces; and pest and rodent control activities) that could impact known or unknown archaeological resources on the CSULB main campus. Therefore, no impact to archaeological resources would occur as the result of project operation.

CUL-3 Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Program-Level Analysis for Master Plan Update

Construction

The CSULB main campus includes one formal cemetery, two prehistoric burials, and an archaeological site where a single deciduous tooth and other fragmentary human remains were recovered. The formal cemetery and burial location would not be impacted by improvements associated with the proposed Master Plan Update. The deciduous tooth and other fragmentary remains have already been removed from their original location. None of these known human remains would be disturbed by implementation of the Master Plan Update. Additionally, no formal cemeteries are located on the Beachside Village property.

Although not anticipated, ground-disturbing activities may have the potential to disturb human remains, especially within the known significant archaeological sites. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AR-D, which would halt work and require notification to the Los Angeles County Coroner's Office if human remains are found, and compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California PRC Section 5097, would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Operation

As documented above, the CSULB main campus includes one formal cemetery, two prehistoric burials, and an archaeological site where a single deciduous tooth and other fragmentary human remains were recovered. Improvements associated with the Master Plan Update would not increase activity in the locations of the formal cemeteries or burials, nor would it impede access to these locations by Native American descendant communities. Operations would not require ground-disturbing activities that have the potential to impact unknown, buried human remains outside of dedicated cemeteries. As such, no impacts associated with operation of the Master Plan Update would occur related to known or unknown human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

Project-Level Analysis for Near- and Mid-Term Development Projects

Construction

No known human remains would be impacted by the individual development projects associated with the Master Plan Update. As discussed, the CSULB main campus includes one formal cemetery, two prehistoric burials, and the location where a single deciduous tooth and other fragmentary human remains were recovered. The formal cemetery and burial locations, which are all within the boundaries of the Puvunga Indian Village Sites Archaeological District, would not be impacted by any of the individual development projects, including the Hillside College Renovations/Addition, Improved Campus Entrance and Gateway, and Pedestrian/Bike Lane Improvements. The deciduous tooth and fragmentary human remains have already been removed from their original locations as the result of controlled archaeological excavations.

Although not anticipated, ground-disturbing activities associated with individual development projects may have the potential to disturb human remains, especially within the known significant archaeological sites identified above. This would be a significant impact. Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California PRC Section 5097 and implementation of Mitigation Measure AR-D, which would require work to be halted and notification provided to the Los Angeles County Coroner's Office if human remains are found, would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Operation

As under the program-level analysis, operations of the facilities to be constructed under the Master Plan Update would not require any ground-disturbing activities, and thus, do not have the potential to impact human remains that could impact unknown, buried human remains outside of dedicated cemeteries. No impact would occur.

3.4.5 Mitigation Measures

Historic Resources

HR-A For all instances in which a project involves an individually eligible resource, the University shall engage the services of a qualified architectural historian meeting the

Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards to conduct an assessment of whether the proposed treatment of the historical resource complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation ("the Standards"). If the proposed project is found to not be in compliance with the Standards, then the architectural historian shall provide recommendations for how to modify the project design so as to bring it into compliance. The professional shall prepare a memorandum or equivalent level of documentation conveying the findings of the assessment.

HR-B To ensure that historic buildings and other contributing features within the Upper Campus Historic District are appropriately renovated and maintained, and that the impact of new construction within the district is mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the University shall develop an Adaptive Mitigation Management Program for the historic district. This Adaptive Mitigation Management Program shall be produced following adoption of the Master Plan Update. This will act as a rehabilitation and maintenance plan for the district, and will ensure that projects undertaken within the district are compatible with its historic character. The plan shall include:

- Historic overview and context of the district
- Identification of contributing buildings and their character-defining features
- In-depth assessment of the designed landscape within the district, including identification of character-defining site features, hardscape, and softscape
- Definitions of applicable historic preservation terms
- Guidelines for building rehabilitation and maintenance
- Guidelines for compatible new construction
- Guidelines for landscape preservation and maintenance

HR-C The University shall have Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II documentation or the equivalent completed for the historical resource and its setting. This documentation shall include drawings, photographs, and a historical narrative. Documentation shall be undertaken prior to the commencement of construction. To ensure public access, the University shall submit copies of the documentation to the Special Collections and University Archives at the CSULB Library, and other interested parties to be identified.

- Drawings: Existing historic drawings of the historical resource, if available, shall be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar. In the absence of existing drawings, full-measured existing conditions drawings of the building's floorplans and exterior elevations should be prepared.
- Photographs: Photo-documentation of the historical resource shall be prepared to HABS standards (or the equivalent) for archival photography. HABS standards require large-format black-and-white photography, with the original negatives having a minimum size of 4"x5". Digital photography, roll film, film packs, and electronic manipulation of images are not acceptable. All film prints, a minimum of 4"x5", must be hand-processed according to the manufacturer's specifications and printed on fiber base single weight paper and dried to a full gloss finish. A minimum of twelve photographs must be taken. Photographs must be identified and labeled using HABS standards.

- **Historical Narrative:** A professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in Architectural History or History shall compile historical background information relevant to the historical resource and prepare a narrative.

HR-D The University shall prepare and implement an interpretative program for the historical resource. The interpretive program shall focus on the resource's architectural and historical significance and shall incorporate all of the following materials/media.

- On-site display of historic documentation, which may include historic photographs, historic architectural plans and drawings, and other applicable materials that convey the significance of the historical resource. These materials shall be displayed in a visible and accessible location.
- Online display of historic documentation, including historic photographs, historic architectural plans and drawings, and other applicable materials that convey the significance of the historical resource. These materials shall be published on the CSULB website and available to the public.
- Incorporation of commemorative materials and historical information into on-campus orientation and tours for educational purposes.

HR-E Under the guidance of a historic architect or architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, and through careful methods of deconstruction to avoid damage and loss, the University shall salvage character-defining features and materials from a historical resource for educational and interpretive purposes on campus, or for reuse in new construction on campus.

HR-F For all instances in which a project involves an individually eligible resource, the University shall engage the services of a qualified architectural historian or historic architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards to review milestone drawing sets and generally be available to the design team during design and construction. The architectural historian/historic architect shall review Design Development (DD) and Construction Documentation (CD) drawing sets at 50% and 100% completion and provide a brief memo regarding ongoing project compliance with the Standards. Project review during construction shall occur once a month and reporting in memo format. Memos shall be submitted to CSULB Design and Construction Services.

Archaeological Resources

The following mitigation measures would reduce impacts to known and unknown archaeological resources and apply to projects on campus that would require ground-disturbing activities. Examples of such ground-disturbing activities include the following:

- Equipment and materials staging
- Stockpiling
- Storage
- Placement of temporary structures including construction trailers
- Graveling
- Geotechnical boring
- Clearing and grubbing, including vegetation or tree removal
- Grading
- Project-specific exploratory ground-disturbance
- Compaction
- Boring
- Excavating, including hydrovac
- Digging
- Trenching
- Rig anchor installation
- Drilling
- Tunneling
- Auguring
- Blasting
- Topsoil stripping
- Land leveling
- Driving a ground rod
- Installing fence post

The following mitigation measures would not be applicable to routine landscape maintenance and other maintenance and operational activities. Examples of excluded maintenance and operational activities include the following:

- Mowing
- Above-ground tree trimming and tree maintenance
- Aerating turf fields
- Setting up bleachers on the athletic fields
- Repairing existing irrigation lines
- Parking, staging, and stockpiling on paved surfaces
- Pest and rodent control activities

For projects on-campus with ground-disturbing activities, the following mitigation measures would apply (AR-A, AR-B, AR-C, and AR-D).

AR-A Initial Project Review

This mitigation measure shall apply to projects on-campus with ground-disturbing activities. Prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities, CSULB shall consult with a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (48 Federal Register 44738). The qualified archaeologist shall determine to what degree ground-disturbing activities have the potential to impact archaeological resources through the review of plans against the data and the analysis in the Archaeological Resources Technical Report prepared for the CSULB Master Plan Update Environmental Impact Report, any subsequent archaeological studies, location-specific archaeological studies covering the project area, designated equipment and materials staging/stockpile areas, available

geotechnical studies or boring logs, and the mapped locations of archaeological sites.

If the qualified archaeologist determines the project has the potential to impact unknown and/or ineligible archaeological resources:

- At their discretion, the qualified archaeologist may require Mitigation Measure AR-C (WEAP) or a combination of Mitigation Measures AR-C (WEAP) and AR-G (Archaeological Monitoring).

If the qualified archaeologist determines the project has the potential to impact known listed/potentially eligible archaeological resources:

- The qualified archaeologist shall determine whether an Extended Phase I (XPI) should be implemented in order to identify the presence or absence of a known site within project boundaries in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-E.
- Avoidance and preservation-in-place are the preferred treatments for significant archaeological resources. If the project has the potential to impact known archaeological resources, then the qualified archaeologist shall work with the Engineer of Record to identify means of avoidance wherever avoidance is feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, or if the project has the potential to impact unknown archaeological resources, then an archaeological resources Treatment Plan shall be prepared in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-I.
- The qualified archaeologist retains the discretion to reduce the 25-foot radius on a case-by-case basis based on their expert judgment.

AR-B Designated Staging and Stockpiling Areas

This mitigation measure shall apply to projects on-campus with ground-disturbing activities. Prior to the commencement of projects involving ground-disturbing activities, CSULB shall clearly identify a construction staging and soils stockpiling area for the project. CSULB shall prohibit the placement of earthwork spoils, construction materials, and equipment anywhere other than the specified construction staging and soils stockpile area(s) for that project unless on paved surfaces.

No staging areas or stockpiles shall be established on unpaved surfaces within a 25-foot radius of the boundaries of known potentially eligible archaeological sites without compliance with Mitigation Measure AR-A (Initial Project Review) and potential additional mitigation.

AR-C Worker Environmental Awareness Program for Archaeological Resources

Due to the potential to encounter unanticipated resources, prior to the beginning of ground-disturbing activities by the construction crew, the construction crew associated with ground-disturbing activities shall be informed of the archaeological resource's value involved and of the regulatory protections afforded those resources. The crew shall also be informed of procedures relating to the discovery of unanticipated archaeological resources. The crew shall be cautioned not to collect artifacts, and directed to inform a construction supervisor and the onsite archaeological monitor in the event that archaeological remains are discovered during the course of construction.

The initial training shall be conducted by the on-site archaeological monitor and can be

incorporated into the project's construction safety training. A supplemental briefing shall be provided to all new construction personnel that are associated with ground-disturbing activities prior to their commencement of ground-disturbing activities, and may consist of reviewing presentation slides or viewing a recording.

AR-D Treatment of Unanticipated Finds of Human Remains

If human skeletal remains are found at any project site during ground-disturbing activities, work shall be suspended and the Los Angeles County Coroner's Office shall be notified. Standard guidelines set by California law provide for the treatment of skeletal material of Native American origin (California Public Resources Code, Sections 5097.98 et seq.; Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5). If the remains are found to be archaeological, then after the coroner releases the site, the qualified professional archaeologist, in consultation with the most likely descendant, shall prepare an archaeological resources Treatment Plan in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-I that also incorporates the guidance in "A Professional Guide for the Preservation and Protection of Native American Remains and Associated Grave Goods," published by the California Native American Heritage Commission. The plan shall follow the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act/CalNAGPRA rules, and include the terms of any reburial or final disposition and any necessary CSULB assistance required for the reburial or associated ceremonies. Human remains recovered and awaiting repatriation shall be held in a secure location unless otherwise determined by the CSU in consultation with the Most Likely Descendent.

At the discretion of the qualified archaeologist pursuant to Mitigation Measure AR-A, the following mitigation measures may apply.

AR-E Extended Phase I Investigations

This mitigation measure shall apply to projects located within known listed/potentially eligible archaeological sites on campus and/or a 25-foot radius of the known archaeological site boundary. If determined to be required as the result of implementation of Mitigation Measure AR-A (Initial Project Review), an Extended Phase I (XPI) Plan shall be devised and implemented at the advice of the qualified archaeologist and at the discretion of CSULB, if not enough information is available to identify the three-dimensional limits of intact archaeological resources within a known archaeological site. The purpose of the XPI is to identify the three-dimensional spatial boundaries of undisturbed archaeological resources within or in proximity to the proposed project site.

The XPI Plan shall include, at a minimum:

- An introduction;
- Site context and stratigraphy;
- Decision thresholds;
- Scope of work;
- Timetable;
- Curation plan;

- References cited; and
- Appropriate maps.

The XPI shall be completed, and results documented in a memo summarizing the XPI methods and findings prepared by the qualified archaeologist, prior to the beginning of ground-disturbing activities associated with the project so that the results may be used in project planning. The memo reporting either positive or negative results shall also be communicated to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC).

If no subsurface or potentially significant archaeological resources are identified during the XPI:

- An Archaeological Resources Monitoring and Discovery Plan (ARMDP) shall be prepared in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-F.
- Upon the start of ground-disturbing activities, Mitigation Measures AR-C (WEAP) and AR-G (Archaeological Monitoring) shall apply.
- Mitigation shall be considered complete when documentation is completed in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-J (Reporting).

If potentially significant subsurface archaeological resources are identified during the XPI:

- If feasible, the identified subsurface site location shall be avoided by planned construction. If avoidance is not feasible, then a Treatment Plan and Phase III data recovery in accordance with Mitigation Measures AR-I shall be implemented. Following implementation of AR-I, ground-disturbing activities may commence with implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-C (WEAP) and AR-G (Archaeological Monitoring).
- Mitigation shall be considered complete when documentation is completed in accordance with Mitigation Measures AR-J (Reporting).

AR-F Archaeological Resources Monitoring and Discovery Plan

This mitigation measure shall apply to projects located within known listed/potentially eligible archaeological sites on campus and/or a 25-foot radius of the known archaeological site boundary. If determined to be required following implementation of Mitigation Measure AR-A (Initial Project Review), an Archaeological Resources Monitoring and Discovery Plan (ARMDP) shall be prepared for projects with the potential to impact known listed/potentially eligible archaeological sites. The ARMDP shall clearly specify the steps to be taken to mitigate impacts to archaeological resources. The ARMDP shall specify monitoring methods, personnel, and procedures to be followed in the event of a discovery. All work shall be conducted under the direction of a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (48 Federal Register 44738). ARMDPs for previous projects on campus may be utilized if applicable as determined by the qualified archaeologist.

The ARMDP shall include, at a minimum:

- An introduction;
- Project description;

- Statement of archaeological sensitivity and rationale for the monitoring program;
- Archaeological context and research design;
- Statement of methods and identification of what activities require monitoring;
- Description of monitoring procedures;
- Outline the protocol to be followed in the event of a find;
- Terms of the final disposition of any non-funerary artifacts;
- Criteria and triggers identified when further consultation is required for the evaluation and treatment of a find;
- Key staff, including Native American monitors, shall be identified, and the process of notification and consultation shall be specified in the event of a potentially significant find; and
- A curation plan.

Once the ARMDP is prepared, ground-disturbing activities may commence with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-C (WEAP) and AR-G (Archaeological Monitoring).

If no subsurface or potentially significant archaeological resources are identified:

- Mitigation shall be considered complete when documentation is completed in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-J (Reporting).

If potentially significant subsurface archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities:

- Work shall stop immediately and Mitigation Measure AR-H (Evaluation of Unanticipated Finds) shall apply.

AR-G Archaeological Resources Monitoring

At the discretion of the qualified archaeologist pursuant to Mitigation Measure AR-A, for projects located within known listed/potentially eligible archaeological sites on campus and/or a 25-foot radius of the known archaeological site boundary, this mitigation measure shall apply following implementation of an ARMDP developed pursuant to Mitigation Measure AR-F, or implementation of an archaeological resources Treatment Plan developed pursuant to Mitigation Measure AR-I.

This mitigation measure shall also apply, at the discretion of the qualified archaeologist pursuant to Mitigation Measure AR-A (Initial Project Review), for projects located in unknown/ineligible archaeological sites on campus requiring ground-disturbing activities.

Due to the potential to encounter archaeological resources, archaeological monitoring shall be conducted by an archaeological monitor who is working under the guidance of a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (48 Federal Register 44738).

To preserve the integrity of the tribal consultation process, archaeological support

services, including monitoring, shall be provided by an entity separate and distinct from that providing Native American support services. The archaeological monitor shall observe ground-disturbing activities. If discoveries are made during ground-disturbing activities, additional work may be required in compliance with Mitigation Measure AR-H (Evaluation of Unanticipated Finds).

If no subsurface or potentially significant archaeological resources are identified:

- Mitigation shall be considered complete when documentation is completed in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-J (Reporting).

If potentially significant subsurface archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities:

- Work shall stop immediately and Mitigation Measure AR-H (Evaluation of Unanticipated Finds) shall apply.

AR-H Evaluation of Unanticipated Finds; Phase II Testing

In the event an unanticipated archaeological resource is unearthed during ground-disturbing activities associated with any campus project, work shall stop immediately and the discovery shall be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (48 Federal Register 44738), pursuant to the procedures set forth at CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Depending on the nature of the find, the determination of significance may require additional excavation, potentially including the preparation and execution of a Phase II Archaeological Testing Plan. As the lead agency, CSULB shall make a determination of significance on the basis of the recommendations of the qualified archaeologist and submit this determination of significance to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for review and comment. The results of testing shall be presented in an appropriate memorandum or report and communicated to the SCCIC.

If the resource is determined not to be significant:

- Resource-specific work is complete, and Mitigation Measure AR-I (Archaeological Resources Treatment Plan) does not apply.
- Archaeological monitoring in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-G shall still apply unless otherwise stipulated in the ARMDP.
- Mitigation shall be considered complete when documentation is completed in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-J (Reporting).

If the resource is determined to be significant and avoidance is not feasible:

- Mitigation Measure AR-I is required, in which a resource-specific Archaeological Resources Treatment Plan shall be prepared and executed prior to recommencing ground-disturbing activities that may impact the resource.
- Archaeological monitoring in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-G shall still apply unless otherwise stipulated in the ARMDP.

AR-I Archaeological Resources Treatment Plan; Phase III Data Recovery

As determined by a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (48 Federal Register 44738), if a significant resource is identified within the project site, an archaeological resources Treatment Plan shall be developed that will govern the treatment of the resource if it is encountered. CSULB shall provide via e-mail a copy of the Treatment Plan to the tribe or tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the CSULB main campus as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission and tribes shall be given 7 days to provide comments.

Avoidance and preservation-in-place are the preferred treatment for archaeological resources, and the Treatment Plan shall detail plans for avoidance, if possible, such as restricting work to disturbed soil or limiting the depth of excavations to avoid archaeological resources.

If disturbance to resources cannot be avoided, a Phase III (data recovery) investigation shall be required, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The Phase III data recovery plan shall be prepared in consultation with SHPO. The Phase III data recovery plan shall generally consist of:

- A limited scale program of archaeological excavation;
- Radiocarbon dating of organic materials, such as shell midden and faunal remains;
- Laboratory analysis; and
- Report writing designed to assess the importance of the resource in question.
- Any resources recovered shall be properly curated, as appropriate.

Once the Treatment Plan is prepared and, if applicable, the Phase III data recovery is conducted, ground-disturbing activities may commence or continue with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-C (WEAP) and AR-G (Archaeological Monitoring).

All bone recovered as a result of Phase III excavations shall be analyzed by a qualified osteologist or physical anthropologist at minimum on a weekly basis while excavations are underway in order to identify whether any human remains are included in the collection so that they may be appropriately treated in compliance with Mitigation Measure AR-D (Treatment of Human Remains).

Phase III work shall be considered complete and ground-disturbing activities may commence when:

- Archaeological excavations are completed in accordance with the Phase III data recovery plan and to the satisfaction of CSULB and the qualified archaeologist.
- Documentation is completed in accordance with Mitigation Measure AR-J (Reporting). The report shall be completed and presented to CSULB for comment within 18 months of the completion of Phase III excavations.

AR-J Reporting

If a mitigation measure is implemented that requires documentation or reporting, then mitigation shall be considered complete when documentation of findings is completed to a level satisfactory to the qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (48 Federal Register 44738), in coordination with CSULB, and filed with the SCCIC of the California Historical Resources Information System. Specific reporting requirements shall be detailed in the ARMDP, Treatment Plan, and other plans created in the course of the Master Plan Update or in compliance with the above mitigation measures.

A monitoring technical report documenting activities monitored, monitoring actions taken, and a description of finds shall be submitted to the SCCIC after approval by CSULB.

If the results of monitoring for significant resources are negative, or only non-significant finds or isolates are encountered, then the report shall take the form of a memorandum, and shall include, at minimum:

- Undertaking information;
- Appropriate maps of the project area;
- Qualifications of monitoring staff;
- Monitoring locations and methods;
- Dates of monitoring; and
- As necessary, management considerations and recommendations for future work.
- The memorandum shall be submitted to CSULB for comment within 8 weeks of the completion of project fieldwork and communicated to the SCCIC when completed to the satisfaction of CSULB.

If the results of monitoring are positive for significant resources, then the report shall be prepared in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation's "Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format", and shall include:

- A management summary;
- Undertaking information;
- Appropriate maps of both the project area and impacted resources;
- An environmental setting;
- Prehistoric, ethnographic, and historic contexts;
- Research design;
- Methods;
- A thorough report of findings;
- A discussion of the data obtained and the resource's significance in reference to the historic, ethnographic, and prehistoric contexts;

- A record of the final disposition of excavated artifacts and any intact archaeological resources;
- Management considerations and recommendations for future work that may impact the resource; and
- References.
- Other report sections may also be required as determined by CSULB with the recommendations of the qualified archaeologist.
- The report shall be submitted to CSULB for comment within 18 months of the completion of project fieldwork, and shall be communicated to the SCCIC when completed to the satisfaction of CSULB.

Appropriate DPR 523 series forms shall also be prepared as appropriate for newly-identified resources or resources that, in the estimation of the qualified archaeologist, require updated forms and submitted to the SCCIC. Minimal documentation of previously unknown isolated finds shall consist of a sufficient description of the find to prepare a DPR 523a Primary Form (including photographs) and appropriate maps.

Minimum documentation of previously unknown archaeological sites shall consist of a:

- Sufficient description of the find to prepare a DPR 523a Primary Form (including photographs);
- DPR 523c Archaeological Site Record;
- DPR 523j Location Map; and
- DPR 523k Sketch Map.

Updated forms may be required for documented resources if:

- There has been a substantial change to the significance of the resource (e.g., if it is found to be destroyed),
- Newly identified archaeological features or attributes of the site are identified that are not otherwise documented in the existing DPR forms, or
- For any reason the qualified archaeologist finds the existing forms to be inadequate.

Minimum documentation of known resources shall consist of a DPR 523L Update form if considered necessary by the qualified archaeologist. Additional forms may also be required to appropriately document resources at the discretion of CSULB and the qualified archaeologist.

AR-K Curation and Final Disposition of Archaeological Materials

Archaeological material collected during ground-disturbing activities for projects shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards unless otherwise determined by the lead agency as the result of consultation. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Final disposition of resources of Native American origin shall be determined in accordance with the ARMDP in Mitigation Measure AR-F or Treatment Plan in Mitigation

Measure AR-I.

Minimum documentation before any final disposition of the artifacts shall consist of:

- Count;
- Weight;
- A basic description of all artifacts; and
- Include photographic documentation of any diagnostic artifacts and a representative sample of non-diagnostic artifacts.

3.4.6 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HR-A and HR-F would ensure that impacts to historical resources would be less than significant during construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K would ensure that impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant during construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AR-D and AR-K would ensure that impacts to human remains would be less than significant during construction activities.

3.4.7 Cumulative Impacts

Built Historical Resources

Cumulative impacts to historical resources evaluate whether the cumulative impacts of the proposed project, when considered together, substantially diminish the number of historical resources within the same or similar context or property type. Impacts to historical resources tend to be site-specific. In the context of historical resources, cumulative impacts would involve projects at historical resources with the same level or type of designation or evaluation, projects affecting other structures located within the same historic district, or projects involving resources that are significant within the same historic context as other resources that are impacted by the proposed project.

With respect to implementation of the Master Plan Update, cumulative impacts may include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following scenarios:

- Removal of most historical resources associated with a particular architect who was notable on a local, state and/or national level and made important contributions to the campus and its built environment.
- Removal of most historical resources that exemplify a particular architectural style.
- Removal of most historical resources that represent a significant historic context or theme significant to the campus's developmental history.
- Removal of most contributors within the National Register/California Register-eligible Upper Campus Historic District such that the district is no longer able to convey its historic significance.

Whether cumulative impacts to historical resources would result from implementation of the Master Plan Update is dependent on the cumulative result of impacts associated within the specific individual development projects addressed herein. As discussed, there is no demolition of individually eligible historical resources proposed as part of the Master Plan Update. However,

near-term and mid-term renovation projects proposed as part of the Master Plan Update have the potential to impact two individually eligible resources (Theatre Arts and USU). Renovations to the Theatre Arts and USU could result in alterations to these resources through the removal or modification of either interior or exterior character-defining features to the extent that one or both of these resources are no longer eligible for listing in the National Register and/or California Register. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HR-A and HR-F, and Mitigation Measures HR-C, HR-D, and HR-E, as applicable, would be required to reduce potential impacts to the Theatre Arts building and USU building to less than significant. These resources retain eligibility; therefore, there would not be cumulative impacts resulting from the individual development project.

Also as discussed, the Master Plan Update includes modifications to the Upper Campus Historic District. Specifically, it provides for the renovation of eight district contributors (Fine Arts 1, Fine Arts 2, Fine Arts 4, Lecture Hall 150-151, Liberal Arts 5, Theatre Arts, USU, and University Theatre), and for the removal of four district contributors (Education 1, Education 2, Fine Arts 3, and University Dining Plaza). The renovation or removal of a single district contributor, or a small number of district contributors, is unlikely to comprise the integrity of the district such that its eligibility for the National Register and/or California Register is compromised. However, when analyzed collectively, these projects have the potential to diminish the integrity of the district as a whole such that it is no longer eligible for listing in the National Register and/or California Register. However, as discussed above, the district would retain the majority of its contributing buildings, and projects would be required to implement Mitigation Measures HR-B and HR-F, and Mitigation Measures HR-C, HR-D, and HR-E, as applicable; therefore, implementation of the Master Plan Update as a whole would not result in a significant impact to the district.

Archaeological Resources

Improvements associated with the Master Plan Update would result in less than significant impacts to archaeological resources and human remains with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K. These mitigation measures would ensure that the impact of the improvements associated with the Master Plan Update, in conjunction with the related projects, would not be cumulatively considerable. Additionally, related projects in the vicinity would also be required to comply with applicable state, federal, and local regulations concerning archaeological resources.

The geographic scope of analysis for potential cumulative impacts to archaeological sites and resources includes the Alamitos Bay Region. This geographic scope of analysis is appropriate as the archaeological sites and resources within this area are expected to include both those that occur on the Master Plan Update area, comprised of the CSULB main campus and Beachside Village property, and similar nearby sites. The similar environments, landforms, and hydrology in this vicinity would result in similar land-use and, thus, site types. This is a large enough area to encompass any effects of the individual development projects on archaeological resources that may combine with similar effects caused by other projects, and provides a reasonable context wherein cumulative actions could affect archaeological resources. The temporal scope for cumulative impacts to archaeological sites and resources encompasses the cumulative impacts of implementation of the proposed Master Plan Update, in conjunction with other related projects in the area. Implementation of the Master Plan Update could cause impacts on archaeological sites and resources throughout the span of development of the Master Plan Update.

Cumulative impacts to archaeological sites and resources in the Alamitos Bay Region could occur if other existing or proposed related projects, in conjunction with the proposed Master Plan Update, would have impacts on cultural resources that, when considered together, would be

cumulatively considerable. The Alamitos Bay Region contains a significant archaeological record that, in some cases, has not been well documented or recorded. Thus, there is potential for ongoing and future development projects in the vicinity to disturb landscapes that may contain known or unknown archaeological resources. Many of these resources could provide information that would contribute to the understanding of regional research themes, and could qualify as historical resources or unique archaeological resources. While it is not possible, based on available data, to fully quantify how many archaeological resources have been or could be impacted by past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, it is likely that the cumulative loss of archaeological resources as a result of these projects could result in a loss of important information necessary to a full understanding of the regional history. Direct impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the geographic scope of analysis could, when taken together in combination, contribute to a cumulatively significant impact on historical resources and unique archaeological resources.

Many of the archaeological resources within the geographic scope have already been subjected to impacts as a result of past projects. Projects undertaken before environmental laws such as CEQA were in place may not have considered, or mitigated, significant impacts to archaeological resources, and may have resulted in damage to important archaeological resources. Many coastal archaeological sites have been subject to early looting and relic hunting during the late 1800s through the 1950s. Projects that may occur in the foreseeable future at or near the CSULB campus could impact archaeological sites and resources, and ground-disturbing activities associated with implementation of the Master Plan Update in conjunction with other projects in the area could contribute to the progressive loss of archaeological sites and resources. These projects may also result in visual, auditory, and other environmental impacts that may adversely affect sites in the Alamitos Bay Region.

Implementation of the Master Plan Update would not lead to cumulatively considerable impacts specifically to a potential archaeological district. The CSULB main campus includes two sites, P19-000234 and P-19-000235, that contribute to the Puvunga Indian Village Sites Archaeological District. This district also includes off-campus resource P-19-000306. However, additional sites have not been assessed for inclusion in the district since it was first listed in the NRHP in 1974. Additional archaeological sites both on and around campus may be contributors to an archaeological district that includes these three sites and others, both on and around campus, although without additional documentation to identify their current integrity, it is not possible to identify them as individually significant or include them as contributing resources to the Puvunga Indian Village Sites Archaeological District at this time. However, with the exception of P-19-000235 and that portion of P-19-000234 located on campus, all the archaeological sites located on campus have suffered previous significant impacts to their integrity. The archaeological resources located on campus may or may not retain enough integrity to obtain significant archaeological data.

The resources in the Alamitos Bay Region have lost their *integrity of setting*. “Setting is the physical environment of a historic property,” and “setting refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historical role.”⁹ The Alamitos Bay Region has been substantially altered since the prehistoric period. Swamps have been reclaimed. Native animal and plant species have been eradicated and replaced by foreign species. On the main campus, estuaries have been filled and landforms cut away in order to build upon or landscape. Archaeological sites on the CSULB main campus and Beachside Village property have been so altered in the recent

⁹ National Park Service, Revised 1995, *National Register Bulletin 15, Section VIII: How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property*.

past that they no longer have the same setting as in the prehistoric or ethnohistoric period.

With the exceptions of the listed sites, the archaeological resources on the CSULB main campus, and any that may exist on the Beachside Village property, have lost their *integrity of feeling*. “Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. It results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property's historic character.”¹⁰ With the exceptions of the listed resources, the potentially significant sites that are known or may exist on the CSULB main campus or the Beachside Village property are covered with buildings, hardscaping, landscaping, streets, and athletic fields. They lack surface physical features that would convey the feeling of their historic character.

Moreover, with the exceptions of the listed sites, the archaeological resources on the CSULB main campus, and any that may exist on the Beachside Village property, have lost their *integrity of association*. “Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. A property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. Like feeling, association requires the presence of physical features that convey a property's historic character.”¹¹ The surface conditions of the sites on campus, with the exception of the listed resources, consist of educational, research, and support buildings and athletic fields. They lack the physical features to convey to the observer their importance to the development of Gabriolino religion or their connections to deities.

With the exceptions of the listed archaeological sites, impacts to known or unknown archaeological sites on the CSULB main campus and Beachside Village property would not impact the eligibility of a hypothesized archaeological district. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K, projects planned within the area of the two listed archaeological sites on campus would not substantially impact their eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP and CRHR either individually or as contributors to the NRHP-listed district. Moreover, the third contributing site to that district, P-19-000306, is protected within land owned by the City of Long Beach and administered by the Rancho Los Alamitos Foundation. These three sites would continue to exist substantially unchanged throughout the period of implementation of the Master Plan Update. The Puvunga Indian Village Sites Archaeological District as currently defined would not be substantially impacted by the proposed Master Plan Update.

Any way in which these sites would contribute to a potential archaeological district would relate to their data potential and fall under NRHP Criterion D or CRHR Criterion 4. When considered in combination with the impacts of other projects in the cumulative scenario, implementation of the Master Plan Update would contribute incrementally to impacts on archaeological resources, including historical resources and unique archaeological resources. However, Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K would avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for the significance of the impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level by preserving the data which they preserve. Mitigation identified in Section 3.4.5, Mitigation Measures, would avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for potential direct and indirect impacts to historical resources and unique archaeological resources resulting from the Master Plan Update, and the cumulative projects would also be subject to the CEQA process which would identify resources and include project specific mitigation for impacts to historical and unique archaeological resources. Appropriate collection of data from these sites

¹⁰ National Park Service, Revised 1995, *National Register Bulletin 15, Section VIII: How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property*

¹¹ Ibid.

would mitigate impacts below the level of significance by preserving any existing data which may make them significant.

Furthermore, implementation of Mitigation Measure AR-D, in combination with Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-C and AR-E through AR-K, would mitigate the Master Plan Update's potential to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, by providing qualified professionals, preparation of an Archaeological Resources Monitoring and Discovery Plan, worker sensitivity training, archaeological monitoring, stop-work and avoidance and preservation procedures, and coordination to determine the appropriate disposition of the remains, and cumulative impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

In summary, improvements associated with the Master Plan Update, including to a potential archaeological district including contributing sites within the CSULB main campus or Beachside Village property, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to archaeological resources and human remains with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AR-A through AR-K.