

3.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed project as it relates to cultural resources, including built historical resources and archaeological resources. The analysis in this section is based in part on information contained in the Historic Resource Assessment Report (Architectural Resources Group (ARG)(2020) and Extended Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (AECOM 2020) prepared for the proposed project and provided in Appendices A and B of this Supplemental EIR, respectively.

The section is intended to supplement the 2008 EIR and evaluate the proposed project's potential impacts to cultural resources based on project modifications, changed circumstances, and/or new information that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the prior document was certified. At the time the 2008 Campus Master Plan was prepared, the existing Hillside Office/Commons building did not meet the age threshold for a potential historical resource. The building, which is proposed to be demolished, is now 50 years old and, therefore, requires evaluation pursuant to CEQA. In addition, potential impacts on known significant archaeological sites located in the vicinity of the proposed project are evaluated. The analysis contained herein incorporates the required programmatic mitigation measures from the 2008 EIR, which includes previous consideration of archaeological resources. Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-5 described below in Section 3.1.4, Mitigation Measures, are derived from the 2008 EIR and applicable to the proposed project. Project-specific mitigation measures, Mitigation Measures CR-6 through CR-10 are also provided below to supplement the required mitigation measures from the 2008 EIR.

3.1.1 Environmental Setting

The project is located on the CSULB campus in coastal Los Angeles County, within the campus's Hillside College residence hall complex (Hillside College complex). The Hillside College complex encompasses a 21-acre area and is bound by the campus border with the Veterans Affairs (VA) property to the south, Earl Warren Drive to the west, the campus's Parking Lot G4 and the Los Cerritos Channel to the north, and Merriam Way and Student Health Services to the east. The project site includes the existing Hillside Office/Commons building, which fronts Earl Warren Drive, a two-lane road that provides primary north-south vehicular access to and through the campus. The building is generally bound by a surface parking lot (Lot G2) to the west, Hillside residence halls to the north and south, and the Hillside Dining Hall to the east.

Archival Research

Archival research for the entire CSULB campus and within a 0.5-mile-radius of the campus was conducted on March 6, 2019, at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) housed at California State University, Fullerton. The SCCIC is the Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), which maintains information about Ventura and Los Angeles Counties. This search included their collections of mapped prehistoric, historic, and built environment resources; Department of Parks and Recreation Site Records; technical reports; and ethnographic references. Additional sources included historical maps of the proposed project site, the NRHP, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR or California Register), the California Historic Property Data File, and the lists of California State Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility.

Results of the cultural resources records search indicated that 39 previous cultural resource studies have been conducted within 0.5-mile (800 meters) of the project site between 1974 and 2011. Of these 39 studies, 20 overlap all or a portion of the project site. A summary of all 39 of the previous cultural resource studies can be found in Appendix B of this Supplemental EIR.

Site CA-LAN-235 (P-19-000235) overlaps the western boundary of the project area, encompassing Earl Warren Drive and a portion of the western lawns in front of the existing Hillside Office/Commons building. The site is a contributor to the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District, which is a complex of three sites listed in the NRHP, also known as the 22 acres. The other two sites in the district are located in the vicinity of CA-LAN-235. CA-LAN-234 is located to the south of the project site overlapping the CSULB campus and the Veterans Administration campus. The third site, CA-LAN-306 is located to the southeast in the vicinity of Bixby Ranch. However, the CA-LAN-235 has never been evaluated for NRHP eligibility as an individual property. Site records and other studies, initially prepared in 1960, indicate this site extended from the surface to a depth of up to approximately 1 meter below ground surface. The detailed historic overview and cultural setting of CSULB, the Hillside College residence hall complex, and the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District are included in Appendices A and B of this Supplemental EIR.

Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

A total of 27 previously recorded built and archaeological cultural resources are located within 0.5 mile of the project site. The project site partially overlaps one of these 27 resources, site CA-LAN-235 (Puvunga Indian Village Historic District). The remaining 26 resources are located outside the project site but within the 0.5-mile records search area, and include the following: two historic buildings, Long Beach Veterans Medical Center (P-19-187656) and Olan and Aida Hafley House (P-19-189991); one historic site, Navy Hospital Refuse Deposit (CA-LAN-4797/H); two multi-component sites, CSULB Isabel Patterson Child Development Center Site (CA-LAN-705) and CSULB Swimming Pool Site (CA-LAN-2630/H); and 21 prehistoric sites (CA-LAN-234, CA-LAN-703, CA-LAN-704, CA-LAN-1000, CA-LAN-1002, CA-LAN-1003, CA-LAN-1004, CA-LAN-1005, CA-LAN-1006, CA-LAN-2616, CA-LAN-2629, P-19-120040, P-19-120041, P-19-120042, P-19-120043, P-19-120044, P-19-120045, P-19-120046, P-19-120047, P-19-120052, and P-19-120053).

3.1.1.1 Built Historical Resources

Hillside College is a residential complex comprising eleven buildings: Buildings A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H, Los Alamitos Hall, Los Cerritos Hall, and International House. Within the complex, comprises eight detached buildings that share a cohesive architectural vocabulary. Buildings A, B, D, and E, which are residence halls, are large, dumbbell-shaped buildings with bilateral symmetry. Buildings C (also called Naomi Rainey House) and F are also used as residence halls but have smaller, asymmetrical footprints. They anchor the north and south ends of the complex. Buildings G and H are located at the center of the complex and have irregular footprints. Building G, referred to as the existing Hillside Office/Commons building in this Supplemental EIR, is occupied by offices and common spaces. Building H is used as a dining hall. All eight of the buildings in Hillside College that share a cohesive architectural vocabulary are oriented around a central designed landscape that transects the complex and provides it with visual cohesion.

The Hillside Office/Commons building is located near the center of the Hillside College Residence Hall Complex and anchors its western edge. The building's primary elevation faces west toward Earl Warren Drive and represents the public face of the residential complex, as shown in Figure 2-4a in Chapter 2, Project Description, of this Draft EIR. The Hillside Office/Commons

building is a symmetrical building fronted by a shallow, landscaped entrance court. It has an irregular footprint, is constructed of cast concrete, and sits on a poured concrete foundation, though it is smaller in size than the other buildings and is one story instead of two. The existing building was constructed in 1969 in a Mid-Century Modern style, which is characterized by wood or steel framing, rectilinear building forms, open interior planning, flat or low-pitched roofs, and integration of building and landscape. It is capped by a flat roof and a concrete cornice, and exterior walls are clad with a combination of Norman brick veneer and painted concrete. Appended to the rear/east elevation of the Hillside Office/Commons building is a sheltered breezeway pedestrian connection between the building and the adjacent Dining Hall (Building H), which together constitute the social core of Hillside College.

Hillside College is extensively landscaped. All eight of its buildings open onto a central designed landscape that transects the complex and responds to its subtle changes in grade. The landscape is defined by wide expanses of grass, mature trees, and shrubs and groundcover around the perimeters of buildings and along the contours of small hills, resulting in an exceptionally lush, parklike setting and a prevailing sense of visual cohesion. The landscape is bisected by a network of curvilinear footpaths that are finished in concrete and facilitate pedestrian circulation throughout the complex. Landscape features around the existing Hillside Office/Commons building are shown in Figures 2-4b and 2-4c in Chapter 2, Project Description.

Historic Context

The essential physical characteristics that define the Hillside College Residence Hall complex – notably, its general location, site plan, architectural vocabulary, and the relationship between buildings and landscape – reflect concerted efforts at campus master planning for CSULB that were implemented in the 1950s and substantially amended in the 1960s. These master planning efforts laid the blueprint for subsequent development at CSULB and played a significant role in shaping the campus's built environment.

CSULB was conceived of in 1949 to serve the residents of southeast Los Angeles and Orange counties, and was established as a permanent campus in 1950. From 1950 to the early 1960s, noted Long Beach architect Hugh Gibbs developed the institution's first-ever master plan. Construction of the first permanent buildings began after approval of Gibb's master plan in 1953, with several completed in 1955. While a few of the early buildings were designed by Gibbs himself, most were designed by staff architects employed by the State Division of Architecture, using standardized designs that were replicated across the CSU system as a way of keeping construction costs down. However, problems with the Gibbs master plan became evident not long after it was implemented. Most pressing were issues related to capacity. Per the direction of administrators, Gibbs had developed the master plan to accommodate 5,000 full-time students, but student enrollment significantly surpassed early projections and swelled to 10,000 by the fall of 1960. Additionally, administrators and students expressed dissatisfaction with the buildings designed by the State Division of Architecture, with many grouching that these buildings were bland and ubiquitous. In 1961, the Board of Trustees for the CSU system had grown so dissatisfied with the quality of design at its campuses that it decided to discontinue using the State Division of Architecture and instead recruit private practice architects to oversee matters related to design and construction.

In 1962 the noted local architectural firm of Killingsworth-Brady-Smith and Associates was retained to serve as consulting campus architect – a role that the firm, and specifically Killingsworth continuously filled until he eventually retired in 2001. Killingsworth's long tenure provided the Long Beach campus with a characteristically cohesive aesthetic that is not found at

many other campuses within the CSU system. Killingsworth's master plan was adopted in 1963, which included the construction of a new dormitory complex to the northwest of the academic core, where Hillside College is located today. In 1965, campus administrators announced plans to construct a new residence hall complex at the west end of Lower Campus and adjacent to Los Alamitos and Los Cerritos Halls, in the approximate location that Killingsworth had specified in the master plan. Conceptual plans for the buildings and landscape features were developed in 1966, and state funding for construction of the complex was appropriated shortly thereafter, in 1967-1968. Architectural firm, Neptune and Thomas and Associates, was hired to design the complex in consultation with Killingsworth. Neptune and Thomas's design deviated from the master plan with respect to scale. However, with respect to concept, Neptune and Thomas's design reflected essential tenets of the master plan. Specifically, it was located at the west end of the Lower Campus, was geographically removed from the academic core, directly interacted with the two existing dormitory buildings, was oriented around an internal circulation network with a residential character and evinced a sense of community. It also embodied the integral relationship between buildings and site that was such a pivotal tenet of the plan. Their design consisted of six residence halls, a central commons/office, and a dining hall, all of which were oriented around a central landscape that was designed by consulting campus landscape architect Ed Lovell.⁴ Construction of the complex began in 1967 and was completed by 1969. In 1971, the American Institute of Architects gave Donald Neptune and Joseph Thomas a Triennial Honor Award for their design of Hillside College.

Generally, Hillside College and its requisite buildings and landscape/site features have experienced few alterations over time. Exterior alterations to the six residence halls (Buildings A through F) are relatively minor in scope, are limited to the replacement of original windows and light fixtures, and have not resulted in substantial changes to these buildings' appearance. To date, most exterior alterations at the complex have been confined to Building H. Most notably, this building has experienced three additions – one on the east elevation (2001), and two on the west elevation (2015). These additions have substantially augmented the square footage of this building and have modified its original plan and configuration. These additions have also changed the way in which Building H spatially relates to the other buildings and site features at Hillside College, particularly with the adjacent Hillside Office/Commons building.

Mid-Century Modern Architecture

The Hillside College Residence Hall complex is designed in an institutional derivative of the Mid-Century Modern style unique to the CSULB campus, which was applied throughout the campus during its formative years. Conceived by Hugh Gibbs and honed by Ed Killingsworth and the private practice architects with whom he collaborated, this dialect of Modernism provided the campus with a strong sense of aesthetic cohesion and a discernible architectural identity that is rooted in the tenets of the Modern movement.

“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. These include post-war adaptations of the chaste and machined International Style, the rational aesthetic associated with post-and-beam construction, and more organic and expressive interpretations of the Modern architectural movement. Mid-Century Modernism was popular between the mid-1940s and early 1970s. It proved to be a remarkably versatile idiom that was expressed through a wide variety of property types ranging from single residences, to large-scale housing tracts, to commercial buildings, and

⁴ Lovell's involvement in the project was gleaned from construction documents dated 1966 and accessed Sept. 2019 via the CSULB Office of Physical Planning and Sustainability

to institutional properties and college campuses. Its aesthetic was deftly incorporated into both high-style buildings and the local vernacular, and was employed by architects, developer-builders, and lay contractors alike.

The group of architects who shaped and melded the CSULB campus during its formative years developed a variant of Modernism that was applied across the campus and provided it with its characteristically unified aesthetic. This visual vocabulary was set into motion by original master plan architect Hugh Gibbs, who in 1953 established the prevailing scale and dominant material types for all new campus buildings. In the 1960s, Killingsworth took these design principles a step further, transposing them into a codified architectural vocabulary that was intended to bridge existing buildings with new construction and ensure that all development on campus was orderly and cohesive. Per Killingsworth, all buildings were to be constructed of concrete; roofs were to be flat; exterior walls were to be finished in slender Norman bricks, painted concrete, and/or textured plaster; windows were to be metal sash and, when applicable, covered with aluminum sunscreens finished in bronze tones; and building and site features would ascribe to a neutral color palette based on the Plochere Color System (ARG 2020).

Generally, the Mid-Century Modern style, expressed in the context of public institutional architecture and the architecture of CSULB, 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; and
- Integrated landscapes, often in the form of courtyards or plazas.

3.1.1.2 Archaeological Resources

The following section summarizes the prehistoric and historic overview related to the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District and CSULB (AECOM 2020). A portion of the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District known as “the 22 acres,” located to the west of Earl Warren Drive, is actively used for ceremonies by Native American groups.

Cultural Setting

Important archaeological sites are documented on and around CSULB campus; however, many of the archaeological sites documented in the records search were recorded by Keith Dixon in the 1970s. Those archaeological sites were subsequently reexamined and tested by multiple archaeologists and found not to be archaeological sites, or to consist only of sediment containing archaeological material which was redeposited from elsewhere. These resources consist primarily of dark-colored soil with some shell, potentially dug up elsewhere and brought to its current location by landscaping or construction. In many cases, no artifacts were located in these deposits, and they may represent natural sediment and not valid archaeological resources. Redeposited archaeological material generally has diminished data potential because its original context has been lost. However, displaced artifacts and even soils may still retain their cultural significance, particularly for descendant Native American communities. Fifteen locations where

archaeological sites were at one time recorded, have been found to consist only of redeposited soils.

A complete study of the history of archaeological exploration at CA LAN-235 from the time it was first documented in 1960 until 1994 was prepared by Jeffrey H. Altschul. No major field studies have been conducted on the portion of CA-LAN-235 located on CSULB property since 1994. Altschul had access to all the studies housed at the SCCIC, as well as the results of field school excavations that are documented in reports presumably housed at CSULB but not available at the SCCIC.

Puvungna

Puvungna⁵ is often associated by today's Juaneño with the place of creation and the scene of important activities by several culture heroes or gods. According to a Spanish priest based at Mission San Juan Capistrano named Geronimo Boscana, an "invisible and all-powerful being called Nocuma made the world, the sea, and all that there is" (Boscana 1978). Eventually, a descendant of these first people, named Quiot, rose to prominence at Puvungna. Quiot came to power through kindness and generosity, and thereby came to rule not only Puvungna but also the surrounding villages. But over time, Quiot began to persecute his subjects, and the people came to resent his heavy-handed rule. The people poisoned and killed him and then cremated him. This was not universally said to have happened at Puvungna, however; different tribes sang that the god was cremated in different places.

After the cremation, the people came together to discuss "the collecting of grain or seeds of the fields, and flesh to eat, for up to this time they had fed upon a kind of clay" (Boscana 1978). At this time, a mysterious figure named Attajen, which means "man" or "rational being," appeared at the council, selected various elders, and gave their lineages different powers: to create rain, cause various plants to grow, or create animals. But according to the inland people, Chinichnich appeared in the smoke of the cremation fire at this time and created modern people from the clay of a nearby lake. Where this happened, Boscana does not say, but many people conflate the two versions and state that this creation of modern humans from clay also happened at Puvungna.

The Chinichnich religion is generally considered relatively young. Beginning among the Gabrielino, it spread to the Luiseño, Juaneño, and Kumeyaay. It was intensely studied by twentieth-century anthropologists, many of whom believed it developed as a response to the illnesses and social disruption caused by European contact. Harrington believed Chinichnich was a prophet born at Puvungna who came to be divinized, but whether there was a historical Chinichnich is an unanswerable question by the modern historical method.

California State University, Long Beach

The village of Puvungna was located on Rancho los Alamitos, and is generally believed to have existed within the vicinity of CSULB. Native American informants pointed out a shell midden beside the spring near the old Rancho Los Alamitos ranch house and informed Bernice Eastman Johnston this was the site of Puvungna. Both Harrington and local historians regarded this as the site of Puvungna as described by Boscana and Reid. The site was later recorded as CA-LAN-306. From Harrington's time until the 1970s, this was generally regarded as the site of Puvungna, even appearing labeled as such in historical maps.

⁵ Variants of the name include Puvungna, Puvunga, Puvu-ngna, and Povuu'ngna. The ethnographic village is referred to as "Puvungna" while the historic district NRHP-listing is referred to as "Puvunga."

Over the course of the 1970s, CSULB and the surrounding community developed most of the remaining undeveloped land on and surrounding the university campus. The Rancho Los Alamitos Adobe became completely surrounded by a gated community. While visitors can still visit site CA-LAN-306 next to the adobe, they can only do so during specific times and under conditions set by Rancho Los Alamitos and the gated community that surrounds it. The 22 acres of site CA-LAN-235 west of Earl Warren Drive is therefore often seen as the only part of Puvungna that remains undeveloped.

By 1993, CA-LAN-235 was listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and the 22-acre undeveloped portion of the site was considered a center of religious devotion. However, in that year, CSULB initiated plans to develop the property. A Juaneño woman named Lillian Valenzuela Robles became one of the leaders in the opposition to construction on the 22 acres. CSULB abandoned plans to develop the 22 acres in 1995. Robles shaped ceremonial practice at Puvungna as it exists today. In 1997, Robles initiated the Ancestor Walk—a multi-county vehicular pilgrimage visiting several sites in San Diego, Orange, and Los Angeles Counties culminating at the 22-acre site. Later, she invited Bear Dancers to perform the Bear Dance at the conclusion of the Ancestor Walk. The Ancestor Walk was held at CA-LAN-235 for the 22nd consecutive year in 2019. Today, those who take part in the Ancestor Walk pilgrimage and the Bear Dance include not only Juaneño and Gabrielino, but also many Native Americans from other tribal backgrounds. Their numbers even include those whose tribal origins lay outside California. An estimated 500 people attended the Ancestor Walk and Bear Dance in 2019.

Previous Archaeological Investigations at CA-LAN-234 and CA-LAN-235

As described above, the western portion of the project site is within the mapped boundary of site CA-LAN-235, which in turn is a contributor to the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District, currently listed on the NRHP. The following discussion provides a summary of the previously recorded investigations on the boundaries and vertical extent of CA-LAN-234 and CA-LAN-235 as it relates to the project site.

Archaeological sites CA-LAN-234 and CA-LAN-235 were initially recorded as two discrete and separate archaeological sites by CSULB archaeologist Keith Dixon in 1960. Dixon did not excavate at the sites but rather documented what he could see on the ground's surface. Dixon's locational descriptions are based on buildings and infrastructure that existed at CSULB in 1960. At that time, little was developed in the portion of the university where the project site is located. Site CA LAN-234 was recorded as a scatter of shell and chipped stone south of today's Beach Drive. Site CA LAN-235 consisted of another scatter of shell and chipped west of existing residence halls and north of Beach Drive, encompassing just over 1.11 acres at the time it was recorded.

In 1972, a human burial was uncovered at CA-LAN-235. Excavations indicate that the archaeological deposit is less than 60 cm deep in that location. Dixon's site map shows the burial beside Earl Warren Drive north of its intersection with what is now Beach Drive. This would place the original burial location south of today's Parking Lot G2 (formerly Parking Lot 20) and directly west of Earl Warren Drive from Building A, within 20 meters of the southwest corner of the project site.

Subsequent studies have led to expanding the boundaries of both CA-LAN-234 and CA-LAN-235 such that they are practically a single large site separated only by Beach Drive. In 1974, Dixon nominated it to the NRHP as contributors to a historic district, and the two have subsequently often been treated as a single archaeological site, CA-LAN-234/235. Neither site was evaluated

for their NRHP eligibility as individual properties. Dixon's original nomination did not include a detailed application of the four criteria evaluation under the NRHP. However, a page in the updated site forms for CA-LAN-234 headed "Puvunga Indian Village Sites" gives the following rationale for listing the district on the National Register under all four criteria:

National Register Criteria of Evaluation: (Opinion)

- *Item 1 (A) – EVENTS – Moderate: development of Gabrielino religion*
- *Item 2 (B) – PERSONS – Minor: legendary deities [sic]*
- *Item 3 (C) – TYPE AND PERIOD – Moderate: Indian village site*
- *Item 4 (D) – INFORMATION YIELD – Strong potential*

In 1974, archaeologist N. Nelson Leonard expanded the site boundary of CA-LAN-234 to the south, extending it into the VA property. In 1977, Dixon mapped CA-LAN-235 once more, with the boundaries of the archaeological site area encompassing approximately 27.55 acres.

However, subsurface archaeological testing and monitoring between 1978 and 1986 have further refined the subsurface site boundaries of CA-LAN-234 and CA-LAN-235, and generally decreased the known site boundary. CA-LAN-235 was encountered at the location of a CSULB field school, described by Altschul, and he mentions they dug through the buried surface of the 1960s-era parking lot and encountered intact shell midden deposits (Altschul 1994). This appears to indicate that soil was imported to the site and the 1960s parking lot was buried rather than removed. One area in the northeast portion of the Bellflower Parcel was found not to have any archaeological deposits and was removed from the site boundary as recorded in the NRHP.

In 2000, archaeologists Matthew Boxt and Mark Raab published radiocarbon dates obtained from four shells during SRS's excavations in 1980. All four samples were obtained at depths of 30 to 80 cm. The dates range over a very broad period from cal. 1,640 B.C. to cal. 70 A.D. However, these are just four very widely spaced dates from one unit at a large archaeological site, and whether these dates accurately represent occupation in that part of the archaeological site remains to be seen. Additionally, it is unknown whether that location is representative of the rest of the archaeological site.

Very few archaeological studies have been conducted at CA-LAN-234 after 1986. The only archaeological work that has been conducted on CSULB property within the boundaries of CA-LAN-234 between 1986 and 2019 is a study conducted by Carl Lipo, CSULB Professor of Anthropology, for the construction of a vault for the reburial of human remains. The reinterred remains were recovered from the Los Altos Site (CA-LAN-270), a Late Prehistoric village site with associated burials encountered near the intersection of Bellflower Boulevard and Los Coyotes Diagonal, south of Beach Drive. CSULB is in the process of updating the district record for CA-LAN-234 based on Lipo's findings.

Geoarchaeological Analysis

The landform on which CSULB was established is a hill that rises over the surrounding landscape to a maximum elevation of approximately 80 feet above mean sea level. The project area partially overlaps the extreme northwestern edge of this hill. The Geologic Map of California designation dates the surface geology to the Pleistocene epoch, which typically predates human activity on the North American continent. The California Geologic Survey Map of the Long Beach 30' x 60' Quadrangle indicates that the project area is situated on old shallow marine deposits (Qom). The Qom landform is described as "poorly sorted, moderately permeable, reddish-brown, interfingered

strandline, beach, estuarine and colluvial deposits composed of siltstone, sandstone, and conglomerate. These deposits rest on the now emergent wave cut abrasion platforms preserved by regional uplift” along the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone (Saucedo et al. 2016). North of the landform, the flatlands surrounding Bouton Creek are mapped as Quaternary alluvium of the San Gabriel River watershed. Quaternary alluvium is among the most recent geologic deposits in the Long Beach area, and consists of river- and creek-born gravels, sand, silt, and clay. These deposits are typically less than 10,000 years in age, dating to the Holocene epoch.

Both the soils and geologic mapping point to the conclusion that the landform that the project area is located on predates human occupation of California and, therefore, is too old to reasonably contain deeply buried archaeological deposits (i.e., the project area has low geoarchaeological sensitivity). This suggests that shell and other artifacts (both historic and prehistoric), consistently noted by prior archaeological surveys at the surface across much of the CSULB campus, are associated with imported sediments (fill) and are not necessarily the result of manufacture and discard of artifacts at the location where they were recorded. However, the surface of the buried native landform (i.e., the 2B horizon) below the fill horizons does have the potential for harboring buried archaeological deposits. Given the age of the landform, these buried deposits, if present, would not be expected to extend to any significant depth. The soils series description for the project area notes that the maximum depth of the surficial fill sediments is approximately 50 centimeters (cm).

Based on a review of existing geologic, soils, geotechnical, and archaeological reports, it is not possible to define the specific stratigraphic profile and evolution of the current project site. However, a general stratigraphic profile and landform evolutionary history is apparent for the project area, which informs the potential for encountering intact archaeological deposits. All evidence suggests that the project area is situated on an uplifted Pleistocene marine landform with substantial soil development at the surface. This landform is capped with imported fill and disturbed/redeposited native sediments of variable depths, but generally between 30 and 100 cm deep. These disturbed upper deposits contain variable amounts of marine shell, the source of which has not been adequately demonstrated. Naturally occurring shell is associated with the estuarine deposits located in the flatlands to the north (downslope) of the project area and the Pleistocene marine deposits underlying the project area. In addition, the various archaeological sites that have been recorded around the CSULB campus have been documented as containing human-processed shell.

3.1.2 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 of 1966 established the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) to recognize resources associated with the country’s history and heritage. The

NRHP is the nation's master inventory of known historic resources. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service (NPS) and includes buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level. Eligibility for in the NRHP is addressed in National Register Bulletin (NRB) 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. NRB 15 states that in order to be eligible for the National Register, a resource must both: (1) be historically significant, and (2) retain sufficient integrity to adequately convey its significance.

Significance is assessed by evaluating a resource against established eligibility criteria. A resource is considered significant if it satisfies any one of the following four NRHP criteria:⁶

- Criterion A (events): associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- Criterion B (persons): associated with the lives of significant persons in our past;
- Criterion C (architecture): embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represents the work of a master, or that possesses high artistic values, or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;
- Criterion D (information potential): has yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Once significance has been established, it must then be demonstrated that a resource retains enough of its physical and associative qualities – or *integrity* – to convey the reason(s) for its significance. 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 NPS:

- 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);

⁶ Some resources may meet multiple criteria, though only one criterion needs to be satisfied for NRHP eligibility.

- 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.⁷ 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”⁸

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 the following, for purposes of CEQA compliance:⁹

- 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

⁷ Derived from NRB 15, Section VIII: “How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property.”

⁸ California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15064.5.

⁹ California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15064.5.

resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource will be materially impaired.”¹⁰ 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 of 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.”¹¹

California Public Resources Code Section 5024.5

PRC 5024.5 states: “(a) No state agency shall alter the original or significant historical features or fabric, or transfer, relocate, or demolish historical resources on the [agency’s] master list...” This law also obligates State agencies to adopt prudent and feasible measures that will eliminate or mitigate any potential adverse effects a proposed project may have upon a listed historical resource.

PRC 5024 further states:

- f) Each state agency shall submit to the State Historic Preservation Officer for comment documentation for any project having the potential to affect historical resources listed in or potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places or registered as or eligible or registration as a state historical landmark.

California Register of Historical Resources

The CRHR is an authoritative guide used to identify, inventory, and protect historical resources in California. Established by an act of the State Legislature in 1998, the CRHR program encourages public recognition and protection of significant architectural, historical, archaeological, and cultural resources; identifies these resources for state and local planning purposes; determines eligibility for state historic preservation grant funding; and affords certain protections under the CEQA.

The structure of the CRHR program is similar to that of the NRHP, though the former more heavily emphasizes resources that have contributed specifically to the development of California. To be

¹⁰ California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15064.5.

¹¹ California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15064.5.

eligible for the CRHR, a resource must first be deemed significant under one of the following four criteria, which are modeled after the NRHP criteria listed above:

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

Mirroring the NRHP, the CRHR also requires that resources retain sufficient integrity to be eligible for listing. A resource's integrity is assessed using the same seven aspects of integrity used for the NRHP. However, since integrity thresholds associated with the CRHR are generally less rigid than those associated with the NRHP, it is possible that a resource may lack the integrity required for the NRHP but still be eligible for listing in the CRHR.

Certain properties are automatically listed in the CRHR, as follows:¹²

- All California properties that are listed in the NRHP;
- All California properties that have formally been determined eligible for the NRHP (by the State Office of Historic Preservation);
- All California Historical Landmarks numbered 770 and above; and
- California Points of Historical Interest which have been reviewed by the State Office of Historic Preservation and recommended for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission.

Resources may be nominated directly to the CRHR. State Historic Landmarks #770 and forward are also automatically listed in the CRHR. There is no prescribed age limit for listing in the California Register, although guidelines state that sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with a resource.

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

¹² California Public Resources Code, Division 5, Chapter 1, Article 2, Section 5024.1

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

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.

Local

The City of Long Beach administers a local historic preservation program for historic and cultural resources within the city limits. This program includes mechanisms for designating individual properties (Historic Landmarks) and concentrations of resources (Historic Districts) at the local level. While CSULB is located within the Long Beach city limits, it is an entity of the CSU, which is a constitutionally created state agency, and is therefore not subject to local government planning and land use plans, policies, or regulations. For this reason, the campus is not subject to local criteria or designations pertaining to historical resources, if any. Notwithstanding, there are no local historic landmarks or districts located within the boundaries of the CSULB campus (City of Long Beach n.d.-a; n.d.-b).

3.1.3 Environmental Impact Analysis

3.1.3.1 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

At the time the 2008 Campus Master Plan Update was prepared, Hillside College, including the Hillside Office/Commons building, did not meet the age threshold for a potential historic resource, and, therefore, was not evaluated for historical significance at the time the 2008 EIR was prepared. It is not listed in the California Historical Resource Inventory database. The building, which is proposed to be demolished as part of the project, is now 50 years old and was therefore evaluated in terms of its potential historical significance for the current proposed project.

The Historical Resource Assessment (Appendix A) conducted for the proposed project included research, documentation, and field visits. Field visits to Hillside College were conducted on July 18, 2019 and August 13, 2019 to assess existing conditions and document all buildings and site/landscape features with digital photographs. Research materials were culled 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 local periodicals; archived building records and construction documents provided by the CSULB Office of Physical Planning and Sustainability; technical bulletins published by the NPS and the California Office of Historic Preservation; and various online repositories, architectural books and reference materials.

The Historical Resource Assessment conducted for the proposed project focuses on a specific area of Hillside College, originally called Residence Hall Development Program Phase II, because this area was identified as a potentially eligible historic district in a campus-wide historic resources survey (ARG 2020). The district consists of Residence Halls A, B, C, D, E, F, and G (the existing Hillside Office/Commons building), and the dining hall. Hillside College, as evaluated in the Historic Resource Assessment, includes the portion of the complex that was planned, designed, and constructed as a singular unit between 1966 and 1969. Los Cerritos Hall and Los Alamitos Hall are dormitory buildings that sit adjacent to the district, but these two buildings were constructed well before the rest of the district and do not share the same architectural and contextual characteristics from which the district's significance is derived. Moreover, they do not appear to be eligible for listing in the National Register or California Register.

International House (1987) is also adjacent to the district, but its construction significantly postdates the district. Like Los Cerritos and Los Alamitos Halls, International House was planned, designed, and built independently of the historic district and reads as such. It has a relatively late construction date (1987), and there is insufficient evidence to indicate that it has "exceptional importance" as enumerated by National Register Criterion Consideration G. It is also not a part of the district, and does not appear to be eligible for listing in the National Register or California Register.

Archaeological Resources

A pedestrian archaeological field survey was conducted on October 18, 2019, to determine whether any archaeological resources are present in the project site. The field survey covered the entire project area that would be subject to ground-disturbing activities, including that portion of CA-LAN-235 which extends into the project area. No evidence of CA-LAN-235 was observed on the ground surface where the archaeological site overlaps with the project site. A small amount of fragmentary marine shell was observed on the east lawn outside the recorded boundary of CA-LAN-235, but no artifacts were observed. However, because the ground surface was obscured by paving, buildings, and lawns, the field survey was deemed inconclusive.

Because the field survey was inconclusive, limited subsurface probes using a combination of shovel test pits and augers, were conducted within the project site between November 5 and November 8, 2019. The intent of the probes was to identify the locations of possibly intact subsurface archaeological deposits within unpaved portions of the project area that were not visible on the surface due to the extensive landscaping. The test probes were set out in a rough grid pattern meant to encompass the entire project area, including but not limited to CA-LAN-235. Locations which were believed least likely to have been previously impacted by either utilities or other construction were deliberately selected to be tested. The test probes were excavated to a depth below which previous investigations indicate the site should have been found, if it were preserved within the project area. A total of 15 such probes were opened within the project area, nine of which were also located within the recorded boundary of CA-LAN-235. All work was conducted in the presence of Edgar Perez, who is a qualified Gabrielino-Tongva Native American

monitor under contract with CSULB, as required by mitigation measure 2 in Section 3.7 of the 2008 EIR.

Non-destructive methods of subsurface investigation such as ground-penetrating radar were considered for areas that could not be sampled during the Extended Phase I study because they are built or paved over. However, these methods are limited in their detail and unlikely to yield unambiguous data regarding subsurface features, and would provide no data regarding stratigraphy.

3.1.3.2 Thresholds of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the project would normally have a significant impact on cultural resources if it would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5;¹³
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; or,
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

3.1.3.3 Impact Analysis

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

Significant and Unavoidable. The project would result in demolition of the existing 5,700-SF Hillside Office/Commons building and removal of original hardscape including concrete paths immediately adjacent to the Hillside Office/Commons building. Based on the findings of the Historical Resource Assessment, further described below, the Hillside College Residence Hall Complex Historic District (excluding Los Cerritos and Los Alamitos Halls) is eligible for listing in the NRHP and the CRHR under Criterion C/3 at the local level of significance. A resource is considered significant under Criterion C/3 if it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represents the work of a master, or that possesses high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

Together, the eight buildings, site features, and landscape features comprising Hillside College are considered an excellent example of the Mid-Century Modern architectural and planning principles that dictated the built form of the CSULB campus amid its formative period of development. Its buildings, site features, and landscape features have a synergistic relationship with one another, working in tandem to create a cohesive environment whose whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Through its physical features – including its architectural attributes and its site and landscape feature – the complex is an excellent example of the relationship between architecture and site planning that defined the essence of planning and construction at CSULB, and lent impetus to its physical form and distinctive sense of place.

¹³ See the Regulatory Setting (California Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5) in this section of the Draft EIR for the definitions of “historical resources” and “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource” under CEQA.

Buildings within the Hillside College Residence Hall Complex Historic District embody the distinctive dialect of Mid-Century Modern architecture that was codified as the prevailing architectural vocabulary of the CSULB campus in the 1963 master plan. This architectural vocabulary was developed by master plan architect Killingsworth to ensure that new development on campus was carried out in a manner that was orderly and cohesive, with the broad goal of creating and nurturing a sense of place. Character-defining features of this dialect of Mid-Century Modern architecture that are expressed in the buildings at the Hillside College Residence Hall Complex include concrete construction; flat roofs; exterior walls composed of Norman face brick, painted concrete, and textured plaster; metal sash windows; covered breezeways between buildings with squared columns and flat roofs (between the existing Hillside Office/Commons building and Building H/Dining Hall); and adherence to a neutral color palette defined by muted shades of cream and red.

All of the buildings open onto a central designed landscape, designed by Edward Lovell, which complements their essential scale, massing, form, and materials. This landscape is a harmonizing element that creates a sense of aesthetic continuity throughout the complex. As such, it underscores the inextricable relationship between buildings and landscape that so strongly characterized Mid-Century Modern architecture and planning, and played a central role in the 1963 campus master plan. It bears mentioning that while the landscape is supportive of the overall setting of the district, it does not, in and of itself, appear to merit consideration as a developed cultural landscape. Its significance is derived from its supporting role in the larger context of the district, not as a resource of significance in its own right.

Finally, the district is notable as a successful example of the collaboration between three notable practitioners/firms – Neptune and Thomas and Associates (project architect), Killingsworth-Brady and Associates (consulting architect), and Edward Lovell (landscape architect). The architectural and landscape features that define the district represent a meeting of the minds between these three practitioners/firms, showing how they demonstrated mastery in their respective practice areas and created an environment that satisfied the key objectives of the 1963 master plan and embodied the aesthetic values of Mid-Century Modern architecture and planning. The complex also won recognition from others within the architectural profession, speaking to the quality of its design. In 1971, shortly after the completion of Hillside College, project architects Donald Neptune and Joseph Thomas were awarded the American Institute of Architects' prestigious Triennial Honor Award for excellence of design for their contributions to the design of Hillside College.

For the above-stated reasons, the Hillside College Residence Hall Complex Historic District is a strong example of a period and type, as a cohesive collection of buildings and landscape features that express the values underpinning Mid-Century Modern architecture and planning. Therefore, the district meets National/California Register Criterion C/3.

Demolition of a single contributor in a historic district does not always constitute a significant and unavoidable impact to a historical resource. A district may contain non-contributing features and elements and still convey its significance, as long as the integrity of the district as a whole is uncompromised. However, in this instance, the demolition of the Hillside Office/Commons building represents the removal of a unique and prominent contributor to the district that is essential in conveying its significance. The district comprises eight contributing buildings. Six of these buildings, Buildings A, B, C, D, E, and F, are nearly identical in appearance and share the same program as residence halls. As discussed previously, the Hillside Office/Commons and dining hall buildings are irregularly shaped one-story buildings and sit at the center of the complex, providing services to residents of the complex. The Hillside Office/Commons building in particular is centrally and prominently located at the front of the district, facing Earl Warren Drive, and in this

way serves as the face of the complex. It is a symmetrical building fronted by a shallow, landscaped entrance court.

The demolition of the Hillside Office/Commons building and construction in its place of two larger buildings would remove a prominent contributor that is visually and programmatically unique among the other contributors of the Hillside College Residence Hall Complex Historic District, while also visually and architecturally congruent. In addition, the proposed project would construct a new two-story, commons building and a new one-story HRL office building. This would effectively create a new, contemporary face of the complex fulfilling the programmatic needs for residential life within Hillside College.

The existing Hillside Office/Commons building is a relatively low-lying building (17 feet tall at its highest point) characterized by its symmetrical massing of a taller central volume flanked by two slightly shorter and set back wings. It has the same brick and plaster material palette as all other contributors in the district. The proposed project would replace the single building with two new buildings, one at a maximum of 38 feet tall (proposed commons building) and the other at 26 feet tall (proposed HRL office building). The entrances to the proposed buildings would face one another within a central courtyard that would be covered with a canopy that extends from the eave line of the proposed commons building, at a height of approximately 25 feet.

The construction of these two new buildings in place of the existing Hillside Office/Commons building materially impairs the significance of the historic district by introducing larger and visually incompatible buildings at the front and center of the complex. The orientation of the proposed buildings, consisting of two buildings facing a central courtyard, changes the spatial qualities and circulation patterns of the original complex. The massing of the proposed buildings is asymmetrical, with a two-story building next to a one-story building with a canopy connecting them, changing the axial symmetry of the complex. Furthermore, the materials of the new buildings, consisting most visibly of steel, glass, and rainscreen cladding, are contemporary in appearance and do not maintain the brick and plaster palette of the rest of the complex.

For these reasons, demolition of the existing Hillside Office/Commons building would diminish the integrity of the historic district in such a way that the district would no longer be eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR. The historic district would no longer retain its overall integrity of design, setting, feeling, or association, thus causing material impairment to the significance of the historic district. This would be a significant impact on a historic resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Implementation of project-specific Mitigation Measures CR-6 and CR-7, which includes archival documentation and digital photographic recordation consistent with the standards of the National Park Service's Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation as well as preparation and implementation of an interpretive program for the Hillside College Historic District, would be required to mitigate the significant impact. Nonetheless, demolition of the Hillside Office/Commons building would result in a significant unavoidable impact to a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

CR-2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The western portion of the project site, including all of the project site within Earl Warren Drive and its median and most of the lawn west of the existing Hillside Office/Commons building, is within the mapped boundary of site CA-LAN-235. As part of

the proposed project, pedestrian and vehicular access in the area would be modified within the portion of the project site that overlaps with site CA-LAN-235 as it is currently mapped. The concrete pathways surrounding the existing Hillside Office/Commons building would be removed and replaced to appropriately serve the new buildings. Additionally, construction activities on Earl Warren Drive would require clearing and grubbing, demolition of existing concrete pavement, excavation of up to two feet in depth below ground surface, grading, and paving. Approximately 0.75 acres of area within Earl Warren Drive would be disturbed. Limited utility trenching for a reclaimed water line would require excavation of 4 to 6 feet in depth below ground surface along the northern section of the northbound lanes of Earl Warren Drive for approximately 270 linear feet.

Site CA-LAN-235 has never been independently evaluated for inclusion in either the CRHR or NRHP. However, Site CA-LA-235 is a contributor to the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District, which is currently listed on the NRHP, and as such, was automatically listed in the CRHR. As discussed above in Section 3.1.1.2, Archaeological Resources, Dixon's original nomination did not include a detailed application of the four criteria evaluation under the NRHP. The following analysis considers the project's potential impacts to the eligibility of the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District through its potential impacts to CA-LAN-235. Potential impacts of the proposed project to the eligibility of the district for inclusion in the NRHP and CRHR are considered related to the district's significance under each criterion, followed by a consideration of the potential impacts of the project on the site and district's integrity.

Under Criterion A/1 (events), CA-LAN-235 is a contributor to the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District, which is "associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history", because of Puvungna's importance to the development of Gabrielino religion. The 22-acre undeveloped portion west of Earl Warren Drive has become important to the development of Gabrielino and Juaneño religion over the past approximately 48 years since human remains were discovered on the property in 1972, and particularly in the 40 years since those remains were reinterred within the boundaries of CA-LAN-234. The 22-acre location was the site of further cultural innovation and development in 1995 with the introduction of the Ancestor Walk, a completely new religious ritual but one that is rooted in veneration of the ancestors. Finally, the site is important in the recent introduction of the Bear Dance from northern California to the Los Angeles area.

The project would not impact the significance of CA-LAN-235 as a contributor or the continued eligibility of the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District under Criterion A/1. Construction would be limited to the portion of the site that was previously disturbed for the construction of Earl Warren Drive and the existing Hillside Office/Commons building in 1969 to 1970, before the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District was nominated and added to the NRHP. Implementation of the proposed project would not reduce the importance the site has and has had for Native American religious development. Moreover, the undeveloped 22-acre portion of the site west of Earl Warren Drive would not be temporarily or permanently impacted by the proposed project. Project improvements would be restricted to the portion of the site that is already developed, within and east of Earl Warren Drive. At the end of construction, CA-LAN-235 would be restored to approximately its current state; Earl Warren Drive would be replaced and two new buildings would sit atop the approximate location of the existing Hillside Office/Commons building. The unpaved and undeveloped part of CA-LAN-235 west of Earl Warren Drive would not be paved, built upon, used to stage equipment or materials, or otherwise temporarily or permanently modified. Ceremonial features that exist at the site (such as, but not limited to, fire pits, ancestor poles, dance floor, and decorated trees) would not be impacted. The public's and the tribes' ability to access the property and conduct ceremonies likewise would not be infringed by the project during

construction or operation. Implementation of the proposed project would have no impact to the eligibility of CA-LAN-235 individually or the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District as a whole under Criterion A/1.

Under Criterion B/2 (persons), the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District is listed in the NRHP because it is “associated with the lives of persons significant in our past,” in this case, Native American deities and culture heroes. The Puvunga Indian Village Historic District is important in the collective consciousness as the area where Ouiot was cremated and Chinichnich taught, and the site is a symbolic contributor to that district. Moreover, the site has added importance in its connection to latter-day prophets such as Lillian Valenzuela Robles, who, like Chinichnich, took an existing traditional religion and revitalized it by changing it. A human burial was found at CA-LAN-235, which increases its importance to the Native American community, and Lillian Roble’s struggle to prevent development of the 22 acres further contributes to the site’s contribution to the historic district. During and after project construction, CA-LAN-235 would retain its importance in its connection to gods or culture heroes such as Ouiot and Chinichnich. Project implementation would not impact the site’s association with Ouiot, Chinichnich, Robles, or any of the other supernatural beings and prophets who made their careers there. Implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on CA-LAN-235’s status as a contributor to the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District, or to the continued eligibility of the Historic District, under Criterion B/2.

For Criterion C/3 (type and period), it has been determined that the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District displays “distinctive characteristics of a type [and] period” as an ethnohistoric Native American village. No portion of the ethnohistoric village that embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction has yet been documented at CA-LAN-235. Archaeological work may (or may not) reveal features that embody distinctive characteristics of Gabrielino villages or ceremonial sites of the ethnohistoric era. The relatively new religious structures now found on the site (such as ancestor poles and the dance floor) post-date the 1974 NRHP nomination and are therefore not evaluated or cited for their contribution to the site’s eligibility. However, discussions of the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District generally do not discuss buildings, structures, or objects at the three archaeological sites that comprise the district. Instead, such discussions generally revolve around the undeveloped nature of these sites, as contrasted against the urbanized nature of surrounding Long Beach. The proposed project would be limited to the portion of the site that is already disturbed and built upon, and would not impact the undeveloped 22 acres which contribute most strongly to this undeveloped feeling. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on the eligibility of CA-LAN-235 as a contributor to the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District, or on the continued eligibility of that historic district under Criterion C/3.

Criterion D/4 applies to locations that “have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.” It has been determined that the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District has the potential to yield significant archaeological data. Portions of CA-LAN-235 that contain undisturbed archaeological deposits have the potential to contribute archaeological data that, in the context of the historic district, are important to prehistory.

The boundaries of CA-LAN-235 were arbitrarily mapped by Dixon in 1960, 1974, and 1978 based solely on what was visible on the ground surface and what he believed may exist underground. Each time Dixon described the site, he drew a larger site boundary, gradually increasing the site size from 1.11 acres in 1960 to 27.5 acres in 1978. Dixon’s most recent recordation appears to have been made after soil was imported to the site to bury an existing parking lot and during the

period when the area was used as an organic garden. Subsequent research has indicated that these boundaries are not only imprecise but are also inaccurate.

Archaeological testing has shown that the soils of the CSULB campus have been disturbed so extensively and for so long that the surface is a poor indication of what lies beneath. Investigations of the various archaeological sites documented across the CSULB campus revealed that at least 15 of the 27 archaeological sites documented within 0.5 mile of the project area are in fact not archaeological sites, but rather are redeposited soil, probably taken from wetlands or archaeological sites, and used as topsoil.

In one particularly notable example, that of CA-LAN-1005, a test unit was excavated in the dark soil which was previously recorded as a midden deposit. Marine shell was encountered, but no artifacts were recovered. Beneath the dark soil, archaeologists found a soil change and a utilities trench, indicating that the utilities trench was dug before the dark soil was deposited on the location. Such soil redeposition destroys the archaeological context of any site it impacts, reducing its data potential.

As discussed in Section 3.1.3.1, Methodology, fifteen limited subsurface probes were opened within the project site. Thirteen probes revealed historic refuse or active utilities to depths of up to 50 cm. A small amount of very fragmentary shell was found in 14 of the 15 probes. One small fragment of what may be chipped stone waste was recovered alongside recent refuse from the top 10 cm of one probe. No other cultural materials were observed in the probes. The top 50 cm of soil throughout most of the project area appeared to be heavily disturbed. It included recent refuse and was very compact, and may have been excavated and recompactd during the construction of Hillside College.

A single isolated artifact alongside recent refuse in a disturbed deposit outside the mapped boundary of the archaeological site was found during the course of the Extended Phase I study that was conducted for the proposed project. Shell found across the entire project site, both within and outside the mapped boundary of the archaeological site, does not appear to be indicative of an archaeological site, and is consistent with redeposited shell found in fill sediments by prior investigations elsewhere in the vicinity. One isolated artifact, but no evidence of an archaeological site, was observed during the probings within the project area. These findings correlate with the tentative profile established in the desktop geoarchaeological study, which indicated that a layer of disturbed, redeposited soil including a small quantity of contemporary artifacts and possibly some prehistoric artifacts, overlies the Pleistocene terrace that predates human occupation of the site. No intact cultural deposits were identified, and the archaeological probing for this study did not indicate that archaeological deposits exist within that portion of the site that overlaps the project area.

The test probes were excavated to a depth below which previous investigations indicate the site should have been found, if it were preserved within the project area. The site form for CA-LAN-235 indicates that the burial that was encountered in 1972 is located approximately 20 meters from the project area. In that excavation, the midden deposits were noted to be within 60 cm (approximately 2 feet) of the ground surface. However, excavations by SRS in the vicinity of the large paved parking lot directly west of Earl Warren Drive, immediately west of the current project site and north of the 1972 burial, did not encounter any archaeological materials. The 1980 excavations extended up to 175 cm below surface and revealed profiles of redeposited sediments with intermixed shell and historic/modern debris, overlying a culturally sterile Pleistocene landform. The archaeological probes conducted for the proposed project also extended well below the 60 cm depth identified in 1972 and did not find intact archaeological deposits. Based on these

findings, it is concluded that no intact archaeological deposits appear to be present within the project site. It is believed that any archaeological deposits that may have existed in the project area were destroyed by the construction of Earl Warren Drive and Hillside College in 1969 to 1970, and their subsequent maintenance. Moreover, it is unclear if an intact archaeological site ever existed within the project area. It is likely that any artifacts and shell were deposited within the project area by historic and contemporary construction and landscaping activities and therefore lack scientific value, although they may retain value for descendant Native American communities. Because no intact archaeological deposits were encountered during the archaeological probing, it is anticipated that no intact deposits exist within the project area. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed project would have no impact to the data potential of CA-LAN-235. Therefore, there would be no impact to the eligibility of the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District under Criterion D/4.

The proposed project is not anticipated to impact the eligibility of site CA-LAN-235 or the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District, under any of the four CRHR or NRHP criteria, nor is it anticipated to have a lasting impact on the district's historic integrity. Although unlikely, given the known disturbances associated with the construction and maintenance of Hillside College and Earl Warren Drive, relict intact portions of site CA-LAN-235 may exist within the project area. Such resources are particularly possible in areas that could not be probed, such as beneath the paved surface of Earl Warren Drive. Any such intact archaeological deposits are likely to be significant. Any impacts to significant archaeological deposits may reduce the significance of that portion of CA-LAN-235 that is impacted and thereby impact the eligibility of the Puvunga Indian Village Historic District. Project excavation have the potential to contact or expose, and thereby affect, previously unidentified archaeological resources. This would be a significant impact on an archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Mitigation measures discussed in Section 3.7, Archaeological Resources, of the 2008 EIR would be applicable to the proposed project. These mitigation measures are outlined below in Section 3.1.5 and include archaeological and Native American monitoring during earth-moving construction activities; construction crew training; stop work if an inadvertent discovery of archaeological resource occurs; Phase III data recovery, if required; and stop work and notification of the Los Angeles County Coroner's Office if any human skeletal remains are found.

Additionally, due to the sensitivity of the project area and project site overlapping with a NRHP-listed archaeological site, project-specific mitigation measures would be implemented to avoid potential adverse effects on subsurface archaeological deposits. Mitigation Measure CR-8 would require archaeological and Native American monitoring. Mitigation Measure CR-9 would require development of a project-specific cultural resources monitoring and discovery plan in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Mitigation Measure CR-10 would require a limited geoarchaeological trenching program to be implemented after the demolition of the existing buildings and hardscaping, but before construction of the new proposed facilities, in order to (1) confirm that no archaeological deposits are present within the existing building footprints where testing was not possible; and (2) create a master stratigraphy of the project area to verify the stratigraphic conclusions drawn in this report, regarding the redeposition of shell-bearing sediments and emplacement over a culturally sterile Pleistocene landform.

With implementation of the specified Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-5 from the 2008 EIR and Mitigation Measures CR-8, CR-9, and CR-10 specific to this project, impacts to archaeological resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines would be less than significant.

CR-3: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The project site includes the existing Hillside Office/ Commons building, which fronts Earl Warren Drive, a two-lane road that provides primary north-south vehicular access to and through the campus. Construction-related disturbance would encompass an area of approximately two acres and be excavated to a maximum depth of ten feet for the proposed commons and HRL buildings, two feet for Earl Warren Drive, and six feet for the reclaimed water line.

In 1972, a human burial was uncovered at CA-LAN-235, south of today's Parking Lot G2 (formerly Parking Lot 20) and directly west of Earl Warren Drive from Building A, within 20 meters of the southwest corner of the project site. Although not anticipated, project-related excavation activities may have the potential to disturb human remains. This would be a significant impact.

Mitigation Measure CR-5, discussed in Section 3.7, Archaeological Resources, of the 2008 EIR and outlined below in Section 3.1.5, would be applicable to the proposed project and is required. Additionally, the proposed project would comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California PRC Section 5097 which requires that work be suspended in the immediate vicinity of the discovery and the Los Angeles County Coroner be contacted. If the remains are deemed Native American in origin, the Coroner will contact the NAHC and identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5. Work may be resumed at the university's discretion but will only commence after consultation and treatment have been concluded. Work may continue on other parts of the project while consultation and treatment are conducted.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-5 required by the 2008 EIR and compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California PRC Section 5097, impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

3.1.4 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures from the 2008 EIR are applicable to the proposed project and are required. Mitigation Measure CR-4 below has been modified slightly for this project (as shown with underlined text).

CR-1: All earth moving construction activity will be monitored by a professional archaeologist and Native American monitor. The archaeological monitor will conduct on-site cultural resources sensitivity training (crew education) as outlined below. If subsurface cultural materials are uncovered, construction work in the immediate vicinity will be halted and the emergency discovery procedures described below will be implemented.

CR-2: Prior to the beginning of the earth moving construction activities (including initial grading of vegetation removal), the construction crew shall be informed of the cultural resources values involved and of the regulatory protections afforded those resources. The crew shall also be informed of procedures relating to the discovery of unanticipated cultural resources (as outlined below). The crew shall be cautioned not to collect artifacts, and asked to inform a construction supervisor and the onsite archaeological monitor in the event that cultural remains are discovered during the course of construction. The onsite archaeological and Native American monitor shall

administer supplement briefing to all new construction personnel, prior to their commencement of earth moving construction activities.

CR-3: In the event an archaeological resource is unearthed during excavation activities associated with the project, work shall be stopped immediately and the discovery shall be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, pursuant to the procedures set forth at CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

CR-4: In an event that a previously unknown archaeological resource is discovered and disturbance to such a resource cannot be avoided, a Phase-III, or "data recovery," phase of investigation will be required, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The Phase-III study will 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 will be properly curated, as appropriate. The Phase III or data recovery plan shall be prepared in consultation with SHPO.

CR-5: If human skeletal remains are found at the project site during earth moving activities such as grading or trenching, work shall be suspended and the Los Angeles County Coroner's Office shall be notified. Standard guidelines set by California law provides 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 and others). Procedures to be employed in the treatment of human remains are found 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.

In addition, the following mitigation measures specific to this project are required to reduce impacts to cultural resources.

CR-6: Prior to project commencement and the demolition of any buildings or site features within the eligible historic district, CSULB shall ensure that documentation of the property is completed in the form of a documentation that shall comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation* (NPS 1990). The documentation shall generally follow the HABS Level III requirements and include digital photographic recordation of the Hillside College Residence Hall Complex, a detailed historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. As part of this process, the as-built plans and associated documents that remain on the property shall be scanned digitally and incorporated into the final documentation package.

Photographic documentation shall include:

- General views of the site and landscape as a whole
- Photographs of each exterior elevation of all eight buildings in the complex
- Photographs of the interior of the building to be demolished (existing Hillside Office/Commons)

The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History (NPS 1983). The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to the following entities: Library of Congress, South Central Coastal Information Center at CSU Fullerton, CSULB Special Collections and University Archives, University of California, Santa Barbara Special Collections, Long Beach Heritage, and the Los Angeles Conservancy. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the lead agency.

CR-7: CSULB shall prepare and implement an interpretive program for the Hillside College Historic District. The interpretive program shall focus on the historic district's architectural and developmental legacy, and shall feature interpretive/commemorative materials:

- On-site display of historic photographs, historic architectural plans and drawings, historic narrative, and other interpretive materials as available and deemed appropriate. These materials will be installed in a publicly-accessible space in the new HRL office or commons building.
- Online display of historic photographs, historic architectural plans and drawings, historic narrative, and other interpretive materials as available and deemed appropriate. These materials will be publicly accessible on the CSULB website, on an existing page dedicated to the history of the University.
- Incorporation of commemorative materials and historical information into regular on-campus orientation and tours for educational purposes.

Completion of this mitigation measure shall be overseen by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History (NPS 1983), and monitored and enforcement by the lead agency.

CR-8: A project-specific cultural resources monitoring and discovery plan (CRMDP) shall be prepared, which shall specify monitoring methods, personnel, and procedures to be followed in the event of a discovery. The monitoring plan shall identify what activities require monitoring, describe monitoring procedures, and outline the protocol to be followed in the event of a find. Criteria shall be outlined, and triggers identified when further consultation is required for the treatment of a find. Key staff shall be identified, and the process of notification and consultation shall be specified within the CRMDP. A curation plan shall also be outlined within the CRMDP. All work shall be conducted under the direction of a qualified archaeological Principal Investigator who meets the Secretary of the Interior's standards for archaeology.

CR-9: Archaeological monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified archaeological monitor who is working under the guidance of an archaeologist who meets the SOI Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology (48 Federal Register 44738). Native American monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified Native American monitor representing the tribe or tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. It is recommended that the tribal cultural monitor maintain logs of all activities monitored, and that this documentation be made available to all consulting Native American parties. Ground-disturbing activities include, but are not

limited to, geotechnical boring, boring, trenching, grading, excavating, and the demolition of building foundations. The archaeological monitor shall observe ground-disturbing activities in all areas with potential to contain significant cultural deposits. If discoveries are made during ground disturbing activities, additional work may be required in accordance with the terms specified in the CRMDP.

CR-10: After demolition of the existing facilities and prior to construction of the proposed facilities, a limited geoarchaeological trenching program shall be prepared and implemented in order to verify the stratigraphy conclusions of the Extended Phase I study (that the project area is situated on an uplifted Pleistocene marine landform with substantial soil development at the surface; this landform is capped with imported fill and disturbed/redeposited native sediments of variable depths, but generally between 30 and 100 cm deep; this disturbed fill includes shell and a small quantity of out-of-context historic and prehistoric artifacts). If intact archaeological deposits are encountered during the geoarchaeological testing, additional work may be required in accordance with the terms specified in the CRMDP.

3.1.5 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Built Historical Resources

Mitigation Measures CR-6 and CR-7 would be implemented to record and document the Hillside College Residence Hall Complex and existing Hillside Office/Commons building. However, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-6 and Mitigation Measure CR-7, demolition of the existing Hillside Office/Commons building would diminish the integrity of the historic district in such a way that it will no longer be eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR, resulting in a substantial adverse change to the historical resource that could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the historical resource.

Archaeological Resources

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-5 from the 2008 EIR and project-specific Mitigation Measures CR-8, CR-9, and CR-10 would ensure that impacts to archaeological resources during construction would be less than significant.

Human Remains

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-5 from the 2008 EIR would ensure that impacts to human remains during construction would be less than significant.

3.1.6 Cumulative Impacts

Table 2-2 in Chapter 2, Project Description, of this Supplemental EIR, includes all the approved or proposed development projects that would occur within the proposed project construction timeframe and located on the CSULB campus or within a one-mile radius of the campus. Construction of the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to a historical resource as the existing Hillside Office/Commons building would be demolished. Development of the proposed project with related projects has the potential to result in a cumulative impact if historical resources are present within related project sites. CSULB is currently undergoing a campus-wide identification of historic resources, and none of the buildings listed in Table 2-2 have been identified as historical resources or did not meet the age threshold

for a potential historical resource. As such, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to historical resources.

As discussed above, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to archaeological resources and human remains with the implementation of mitigation measures. These mitigation measures would ensure that the proposed project's impact 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 cultural resources.