

## **4.4 Cultural Resources**

This section addresses potential impacts to cultural resources that could result from the Proposed Oil Development Project. Cultural resources are districts, buildings, sites, structures, areas of traditional use, or objects with historical, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific importance. They include archaeological resources (both prehistoric and historic), historic architectural resources (physical properties, structures, or buildings and hardscape and landscape elements), and traditional cultural resources (those important to living Native Americans for religious, spiritual, ancestral, or traditional reasons). Under CEQA, paleontological resources and unique geological formations are considered alongside cultural resources. A paleontological resource is defined as a locality containing vertebrate, invertebrate, or plant fossils (i.e., fossil location, fossil-bearing formation or a formation with the potential to bear fossils of scientific importance).

In identifying cultural and natural resources and evaluating impacts within the Proposed Project sites, Applied EarthWorks, Inc. (Applied EarthWorks) consulted numerous sources including historical and geological data presented in the E&B Natural Resources and NMG Geotechnical Inc. planning application. Applied EarthWorks staff then reviewed Converse Consultants' Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for 552 11th Place. Staff undertook independent literature and records searches at the California Historical Resources Information System at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), as well as at the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History (LACM). They contacted the City of Hermosa Beach Development Department and reviewed available archival and secondary sources. In evaluating standing structures staff reviewed the City Assessor's records. Staff attempted to contact the Hermosa Beach Historical Society on a number of occasions but was unable to reach archival personnel. Finally, Applied EarthWorks consulted with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and requesting a Sacred Land File search. Using all available information, Applied EarthWorks formulated a historic context for evaluation of cultural resources identified within the Proposed Project areas of potential effect.

### **4.4.1 Environmental Setting**

The Proposed Project sites and three pipelines are located along the coastal portion of the Santa Monica Bay, within the southwestern Los Angeles Basin, approximately 0.4 mile inland from the Pacific Ocean. The Los Angeles Basin is a lowland plain in southern California bounded by the Santa Monica Mountains to the north, the Elysian and Puente hills and on the east, and the Santa Ana Mountains and San Joaquin Hills in the southeast (Norris and Webb 1990). The sites are underlain by Holocene-age dune sands west of the adjacent older alluvial deposits in the Los Angeles Basin to the east. These deposits generally consist of dune and drift sands (NMG Geotechnical 2012:9) and are Holocene coastal sediments that consist of loose dune sand and drift sand that derive from ancient aeolian (wind-born) deposits (Dibblee 1999; NMG Geotechnical 2012:9). Immediately east of the Proposed Project sites, the Holocene deposits grade into stabilized dunes of fine-grained drift sand of Late Pleistocene age. According to Dibblee (1999), it is likely that these surficial deposits shallowly overlie older Quaternary

## 4.4 Cultural Resources

---

deposits known as the San Pedro Sand, a unit within the San Pedro Formation (Woodring et al. 1946). Within the Proposed Project sites, these deposits are covered by extant buildings, paved roads, and asphalt and concrete surfaces. Little of the original surface of the dunes remains exposed.

### 4.4.1.1 Prehistoric Chronology

Several cultural chronologies and archaeological sequences have been proposed for coastal and littoral southern California since the 1920s. These have attempted to track the development of terrestrial hunting-foraging and marine resource exploitation adaptations among populations in the area since at least the beginning of the Holocene. These proposed sequences have generally been based on changes in artifact types rather than linkage to socio-cultural systems in the region. In other words, the archaeological materials show cultural continuity for much of the Holocene, despite population increase, intensification of resource use, and techno-economic innovations in maritime and terrestrial resource exploitation (e.g., circular shell fish hooks, bow and arrow, and mortar and pestle). Lacking unequivocal archaeological evidence for major episodes of cultural change, researchers have proposed a range of different cultural periods for the region. Variants of the southern California prehistoric chronology include those proposed by King (1990) for the Santa Barbara Channel, Koerper and Drover (1983) for coastal Orange County, and Erlandson and Colton (1991) for southern California, and generally reflected the common use of an essentially tripartite division of early, middle, and late development for Holocene cultures in the region. Available evidence based on research for the Santa Barbara Channel region and along the southern California coast suggests that early man occupation of the coastal regions dates to 10,500 Before Present (B.P.) or earlier (Erlandson et al. 2008; Rick and Erlandson 2000).

The chronology used in this assessment identifies three periods of prehistoric occupation in the southern California coastal region and is based on research conducted by Mason and Peterson (1994) and Altschul and others (2007). This information provides the basis for identifying and evaluating prehistoric archaeological deposits occurring within the region of the Proposed Project. The Early period (Millingstone Horizon) is subdivided into three phases: Phase I dates from 10,500+ to 8000/7500 B.P.; Phase II from 8000/7500 B.P. to 5000 B.P.; Phase III from 5000 to 3000 B.P. This early period is followed by the Intermediate Period dating from 3000 to 1300 B.P. The Late Prehistoric Period is divided into two phases: Phase I dates from 1300 to 700 B.P. and the Late Prehistoric Period Phase II from 700 to 240 B.P.

### 4.4.1.2 History of Early California and the Los Angeles Region

In 1542, the Portuguese explorer Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo led a Spanish expedition from Mexico to explore the lands of what is now California. It was during this expedition that Europeans first came in contact with the region's native peoples. This was followed in 1602 with Sebastian Vizcaíno expedition to San Clemente and Santa Catalina islands and the mainland near present-day San Pedro (McCawley 1996:207). Later, in 1769, the Gaspar de Portolá expedition crossed the Gabrielino homeland twice in his exploration for suitable settlement sites.

The ethnographic evidence suggests that several Gabrielino settlements were located on the Los Angeles plain at this time. Mission life was highly regimented and contrasted sharply with the traditional Gabrielino lifeway. As a result, colonization had a dramatic effect on Gabrielino society. The traditional Indian communities were depopulated and epidemics caused by the introduction of European diseases further reduced the local Indian population. Sites dating to this time period could potentially be found in the Proposed Project area.

#### **4.4.1.3 History of Hermosa Beach**

The area encompassing present-day Hermosa Beach was originally part of an 1837 Mexican land grant known as *Rancho Sausal Redondo* issued to Antonio Ygnacio Avila by then-governor Juan Alvarado. The 22,458-acre property included present-day Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Inglewood, Lawndale, Manhattan Beach, and Redondo Beach. In 1855, the United States patented the land grant to Avila, recognizing him as the rightful owner of the property.

When Avila died in 1858, his heirs sold the property to Scotland native Robert Burnett. His combined holdings were used to raise sheep and cattle and in 1873 he leased a portion to Daniel Freeman. In 1885, Freeman purchased all of the land from Burnett and in the late 1800s Freeman sold his property to various real estate developers. Among them was A. E. Pomroy, who eventually owned most of *Rancho Sausal Redondo* and sold 1,500 acres to developers, Moses Hazeltine Sherman and Eli Clark. With this transaction Sherman and Clark gained controlling interest of the Hermosa Beach Land and Water Company (Rhein 1933).

The official survey for the Hermosa Beach boardwalk was completed in 1901, and the construction of the wood plank boardwalk followed shortly along the 2-mile stretch of the Strand. In 1904, the Hermosa Beach Land and Water Company built the City's first pier. Constructed of wood and extending 500 feet into the Pacific waters, it was partially washed away and replaced in 1913. Following the election for city officers on Christmas Eve of 1906, the City of Hermosa Beach was incorporated and chartered on January 14, 1907. During this time, the City acquired its 2-mile stretch of coastal property by deed from the Hermosa Beach Land and Water Company. The deed included a clause to hold the property in perpetuity as a public place for recreation and general enjoyment, as it remains today. In 1914, tides had again washed away portions of the boardwalk; these sections were then replaced with a cement walkway. In 1926, another 2,000 feet of cement walkway was added to the north end of the boardwalk (City of Hermosa Beach 2013).

Development of the City came relatively quickly at the turn of the twentieth century. By the end of the first decade, the City had its first primary school, with plans for another to accommodate third through ninth grades. The Pioneer and Berth hotels were established by 1907, and by the end of the second decade, the City had a fully functioning city hall, police and fire departments, post office, street and sewer maintenance departments, civic club, and library (Rhein 1933). The current civic center was designed and built between 1961 and 1965 by Savo Stoshitch, a native of Indianapolis who made his home in Hermosa Beach following service in the Army Corps of Engineers during World War II. The establishment of a railroad through Hermosa Beach by the Santa Fe Railway and the Los Angeles Railway cemented Hermosa Beach as a popular destination on the Pacific Coast.

## 4.4 Cultural Resources

---

Oil development played a significant role in early City development. In August 1930, California Ventura Oil Company's Well #1 (later Stinnett #1) struck oil, which extended the Torrance Oilfield into Hermosa Beach. This and eight follow-up wells produced over a million barrels of oil. Initial 1930 production peaked 22 months later in May 1932 when 205 barrels of oil were produced per day from a total of five wells (Finken 2013). Following this peak, the rate of oil production declined steadily until the last well was abandoned in 1988. The last producing well in Hermosa Beach, Stinnett #7 (originally California Ventura Oil Company well #2) was shut down in January 1988. By 2005, all Hermosa Beach wells had been plugged and abandoned (Finken 2013).

### 4.4.1.4 Proposed Oil Production Site: 555 6<sup>th</sup> Street

Archival research indicates that this portion of the Proposed Oil Production Project was first developed in the early 1920s. The Los Angeles County Assessor's Map Books from 1900–1960 indicate City ownership or lease of the subject property began in 1920 (Assessor's Map Book 188 p50), and continues until the present day. Cypress Avenue lots, which bound the site to the west, were developed as early as 1925 and residents of medium income occupied the first housing. A review of Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps show that the streets were laid out and residential neighborhoods were platted in the general region by 1927. Few changes in the street pattern have since occurred.

The 1924 topographic map depicts what appears to be a large pit or depression west of the Santa Fe Railroad and within the subject area. By 1927, the Sanborn Map shows the "City Dump and Refuse Burner" with a structure at the southeast corner of 6th Street and East Railroad Avenue; one part of the structure is labeled "Waste Storage 1925." Approximately 100 feet north of this structure is the "City Dumping Grounds." The 1934 topographic map depicts the pit or depression representing the dump, one structure, and one circular feature (probably Stinnett Oil Well No. 1 which struck oil in August 1930).

By 1946, the Sanborn Map depicts the "City Garage & W. Ho." and conversion of the former burner building, at 553 6th Street. A small office is depicted at 541 Sixth Street, in the middle of Bard Street. West of the office, in the lot labeled 601 (Bard), are "2 steel oil tks" and to the north an "oil well" (presumably Stinnett Oil Well No. 1). The City dumping grounds are depicted in the same location as shown on the 1927 Sanborn Map. The 1960 Sanborn Map is largely the same as the 1947 map; however, the office and the dump are no longer depicted and the dump area is labeled "City Service Yard" suggesting that the dump had closed.

### 4.4.1.5 New City Maintenance Yard

Los Angeles County Assessor's Map books show that the proposed City Maintenance Yard relocation site was owned between 1906 and 1920 by Bernard Hiss and from 1920–1927 jointly by Bernard Hiss, the Pacific State Lumber Company, and Olsen Lumber (Map Books 160:2,188:4). In 1925, the City Directory lists Olsen Lumber at 606 Pier Avenue. Between 1927 and 1936, the subject property was owned jointly by Olsen Lumber, the Patten and Davis Lumber Company, and the Patten Blinn Lumber Company (Map Book 188:49). The 1934 topographic map depicts at least one structure in the subject area, as does the 1938 aerial

photograph. By 1946, two structures remained, identified as a silk mill and a “conc, products” structure (Sanborn Map). The railroad spur does not appear to extend onto the Proposed Project site. Aerial photographs between 1953 and 1956 show the building had been expanded to an “L” shaped structure, then a rectangular structure with associated parking lots. The 1960 Sanborn Map identifies the Imperial Mills Upholstery Factory occupying most of the subject property. By 1978, the site had been converted to a self storage facility (Converse Consultants 2005, iii, 8-12).

The Hermosa Beach Civic Center was built across the street from the Imperial Mills Upholstery Factory between 1961 and 1965. This complex included City Hall, the Public Library, the Police Station, and the Fire Station buildings. The library was dedicated on August 10, 1962 and City Hall on January 24, 1965. Construction costs amounted to \$328,390. The library faces Pier Avenue while City Hall is immediate to the north of the Imperial Mills Upholstery Factory. The complex was designed by Savo Stoshitch (1914–1994) who received his graduate degree in architectural design from the University of Illinois in 1935. After relocating to Hermosa Beach, he designed other projects in the Greater Los Angeles area for the Los Angeles Unified School District, Pepperdine College, Los Angeles City public libraries, and Hughes Aircraft. He also designed a number of Lawry’s restaurants including Tam O’Shanter, Mediterrania, and Five Crowns in Corona del Mar (*Los Angeles Times* 1965). The Hermosa Beach Civic Center was constructed in the New Formalist Style and Stoshitch took an innovative approach when using heavy glass in place of iron bars in the Hermosa Beach Jail. He was among the first to do so. He also added pneumatic tubes in City Hall using the newest technology.

#### **4.4.2 Records and Literature Search**

Applied EarthWorks conducted two record searches. Staff requested information on previously recorded archaeological site and cultural resources from the SCCIC at the California State University, Fullerton on October 11, 2013. They also contacted the LACM of Natural History on November 12, 2013.

##### **4.4.2.1 Cultural Resources Record Search**

A records search at the SCCIC identified previous studies and recorded archaeological sites within a one-half-mile radius of the Proposed Project sites (including along the proposed pipeline alignments). In addition, the California Points of Historical Interest (PHI), the California Historical Landmarks (CHL) the California Register of Historic Places (CAL REG), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and the California State Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) were reviewed. The following summarizes those findings.

The HRI lists three properties that have been evaluated for historical significance within the records search area (19-186114, 19-0186751, 19-186927), but no above-ground historic resources were listed within the Proposed Project sites or along the pipelines. The three properties are as follows:

- 19-186114 consists of a plaque located at the southeast corner of Harbor Drive and Yacht Club Way, Redondo Beach. The plaque marks the location of an old salt lake and reads

## 4.4 Cultural Resources

---

“This marker locates the site near which the Indians and early California settlers came to obtain their salt, which at many times was more valuable than gold.” The plaque was erected in 1955 and is located 0.5 mile south of the proposed E&B Oil Production facility.

- 19-186927 is the Hermosa Valley (formerly Valley Vista) School built in the 1950s and located at 1645 Valley Drive, approximately 0.2 mile north of the proposed City Maintenance Yard.
- 19-0186751, is the Hermosa Beach Community Center a Modernistic/Art Deco building originally built in 1911 and located at 710 Pier Avenue, approximately 0.15 mile northeast of the proposed City Maintenance Yard.

The CAL REG lists two historic properties within the records search area. These properties are the Hermosa Beach Community Center (described above), and the Clark Building constructed in 1937 and located at 861 Valley Drive, approximately 0.2 mile north of the proposed E&B Oil Production Project. No other properties are listed on the PHI, NRHP, or CHL.

No previously recorded archaeological sites were identified within the Proposed Project sites and no sites are listed on the Archaeological Determination of Eligibility (DOE) list. One archaeological site (19-001872) was identified approximately 0.3 mile south of the Proposed E&B Oil Production Project. It was first recorded by Greenwood and Associates in 1990. They described the site as a light-density shell scatter containing various chert flakes. A historical component consists of three 1880s commercial structures. Greenwood and Associates noted that the site was severely damaged by later railroad and demolition/construction activities and that the prehistoric component of the site was likely redeposited midden (Greenwood and Associates 1990). This site lies in close proximity to the old Salt Lake (designated an HRI as above) which lies in the AES Redondo Beach Generating Station.

Thirteen cultural resources studies have been conducted within the records search radius. Of these, one was a large survey that included the current Proposed Project sites. This project, the West Basin Water Reclamation Project, resulted in a Phase I Cultural Resources study prepared by ERA in 1993. The ERA survey covered the entire E&B Oil Development Project currently being proposed. ERA concluded that the vast majority of the 42-mile-long pipeline route they were considering was already developed as highways, streets, and urban landscapes. ERA recommended that a formal archaeological survey be completed at only three small, potentially undisturbed parcels.

### 4.4.3 Paleontological Records Search

Applied EarthWorks staff requested a museum records search at LACM which they supplemented through a review of the University of California, Museum of Paleontology’s online database (UCMP). This database contains paleontological records for all of Los Angeles County.

The LACM records show that there are no known localities within the surficial dune and drift sand. However, according to McLeod (2013), it is likely that the young surficial sediments shallowly overlie older Quaternary deposits in the Proposed Project sites. These underlying

older Quaternary deposits have yielded vertebrate fossils at localities east of the Proposed Project sites, sometimes at relatively shallow depth. McLeod (2013) reports three localities within the vicinity of the Proposed Project sites. Locality LACM 4444 to the east near Crenshaw Boulevard and 190<sup>th</sup> Street, yielded fossil specimens of *Equus* (horse), and Cetacea (whale) at a depth of 15 feet below the surface. Southeast of the Proposed Project sites, near Crenshaw Boulevard and 236<sup>th</sup> Street, locality LACM 1839 produced a specimen of *Equus*, recovered from 35 feet below the surface. Near Prairie Avenue and 139<sup>th</sup> Street, northeast of the Proposed Project sites, locality LACM 2035 produced a fossil specimen of *Mammuthus* (mammoth) at an unreported depth.

The UCMP online database for Los Angeles County indicates there are 87 fossil localities within the San Pedro Formation in Los Angeles County. Recovered fossil specimens include horse, camel, saber-tooth cat, rodent, rabbit, bird, sloth, bison, dire wolf, mollusk, and microfossils. The implications of these finds are reported in the technical report prepared for this study (Warren et al.; Appendix G) and summarized below.

#### **4.4.3.1 Sacred Lands Search**

The NAHC was contacted on October 9, 2013, for a review of the *Sacred Lands File* to determine if any known Native American cultural properties (e.g., traditional use or gathering areas, places of religious or sacred activity, etc.) are present within or adjacent to the Proposed Project sites (Appendix C). The NAHC responded on October 11, 2013, stating that no Native American cultural resources are known to exist within the immediate Project vicinity; however, the NAHC indicates that Native American Sacred Land place(s) exist in close proximity to the Proposed Project sites and requested that Native American individuals and organizations be contacted to solicit further information regarding cultural resource issues or traditional concerns related to the Proposed Project.

Ten individuals and organizations were contacted by email and/or letter on October 21, 2013. The Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation responded via email on October 21, 2013, and stated they would review the Proposed Oil Production Project documents. On October 29, 2013, a representative of the Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council reported that they had conducted an independent survey of the Proposed Oil Production site and had observed a bivalve shell and rock that might be culturally modified. These items were located beyond the Proposed Project site boundaries along a pedestrian path, a former railroad grade where the rails have been removed and hence disturbed. Nonetheless, the Gabrieleno Tongva Indians requested monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor of all Project-related ground-disturbing activities.

On November 5, each individual on the NAHC list who had not previously responded was again contacted; this time by telephone; voice messages were left. On November 6, the Gabrieleno Tongva Nation representative responded via email and requested archaeological and Native American monitoring of all project-related excavations. No other responses to the voice messages were received (for further details see Appendix G).

### 4.4.4 Cultural Resources Survey

On October 28, 2013, Applied EarthWorks, Inc. staff conducted a vehicular survey of the Proposed Project sites and pipeline alignments. Both construction sites were found to be in urban areas and heavily built-over, providing zero visibility for the detection of archaeological resources. Proposed pipeline alignments were found to be in urban areas or along existing utility rights-of-way and again afforded zero visibility for the detection of archaeological resources. On October 30, 2013, Applied EarthWorks staff visited the Hermosa Beach Public Works Maintenance Yard (City Yard) located at 555 6<sup>th</sup> Street to evaluate the potential for significant cultural resources to be present on site. Results of this inspection are presented in the technical report appended (Appendix G; Warren et al. 2013) and are summarized below.

#### 4.4.4.1 Archaeological Resources

Archival research demonstrated that the Proposed Oil Production site was utilized as a City Dump and refuse processing area from the 1920s through the 1940s. The 1924 topographic map depicts what appears to be a large pit or depression within this portion of the Proposed Project site. The pit may have been a natural depression, a sand mining pit, or may have resulted from the borrowing of fill. The horizontal dimensions of the dump are unknown and the depth of the deposits, based on available soil boring information appears to be at least 29 feet and possibly as deep as 45 feet (NMG Geotechnical 2012:10). The deposit contains glass, ceramics, brick, metal, and concrete near the base and it is assumed to be the result of municipal refuse collection beginning in the early 1900s. Little information exists about refuse collection in Hermosa Beach, although it is known that a refuse burner was present during the early years of operation (1924 to 1946). The former City dump appears potentially to contain archaeological deposits that may be removed and adversely impacted by the development of the Oil Production site. This section of the Proposed Project Site is therefore considered to have high potential to contain historical archaeological remains.

The 1946 Sanborn Map depicts an oil well (presumably Stinnett Oil Well No. 1), and two rectangular features on the site, presumably above-ground storage tanks. The oil well was plugged and abandoned in 2005 and the tanks and associated pipes and dispenser equipment removed in 1989 and 1998 (Brycon LLC 2012:2). All archaeological remains associated with these oil industrial features (beyond the well shaft) have been removed, so there is low potential for significant oil industry-related archaeological features to be present.

The City Maintenance Yard is the site of the former Olsen Lumber Mill, an unnamed silk mill, and the Imperial Mills Upholstery Factory. In 1978, the mill structures appear to have been demolished when the self-storage facility was added. Subsurface deposits associated with the earlier land use are likely to be limited to structural remains, which, given the early twentieth-century date and light industrial nature of the site, are unlikely to yield any new or significant archaeological data about these operations. The historical archaeological sensitivity of this site is considered low.

The area bordering the proposed pipelines was developed in the early 1900s and the street grid established by the 1920s. Archival research did not indicate prior development in these areas.

Further, the proposed pipelines will be placed below city streets in areas likely to already be disturbed. The archaeological potential, therefore, is considered low.

The records and literature search did not indicate the presence of previously recorded prehistoric resources within the Proposed Project sites or along the proposed pipelines. The only previously recorded site was situated 0.3 miles to the south. It was described as a light scatter of chipped stone flaking debris and shell (Greenwood and Associates 1990). The site was reported to be heavily disturbed by railroad and later-period construction and/or demolition. Most of the Proposed Project is located in an urban environment, which has also been extensively disturbed. However, local Native American groups expressed concern and consider the Proposed Project sites to be within their traditional use area. Among those contacted, two tribes requested monitoring of all Project-related ground-disturbing activities by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor (see Warren et al. 2013: Appendix G).

#### **4.4.4.2 Architectural Reconnaissance Survey**

The Proposed Oil Development site is currently occupied as the City Maintenance Yard. Existing improvements consists of three buildings, two trailers, storage containers, sheds, trash bins, a propane tank, concrete paving and asphalt, fencing, and masonry walls. In addition, within the boundaries of the Proposed Project Oil Development site, there is an asphalt parking area to the south of the Maintenance Yard. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps it would appear that the Maintenance Building, located at 555 6<sup>th</sup> Street, on the northwest corner of the intersection formed by Valley Drive and 6<sup>th</sup> Street was constructed between 1924 and 1927. Therefore, it is more than 50 years of age. The other two structures are less than 50 years of age.

The maintenance building is oriented slightly northwest-southeast. It is a long rectangular frame industrial structure measuring approximately 18 feet high with a flat-top roof and an adjacent open-air service bay situated east of the building. The 45 foot by 90 foot building has undergone several additions and modifications to its original brick and cement-mortar footprint, which is primarily composed of a brick furnace room and service bay on the ground level. What appears to be a basement-level loading dock has since been converted into a garage. Measuring 22 feet by 45 feet, the northern portion of the building currently contains most of the historical elements and architectural features of the City Yard refuse burner. Today the upper portions of the brick and cement-mortar wall construction are unpainted and provide an unobscured view of original construction elements.

The wood-plank ceiling has largely been replaced, and on the western part of the room, the ceiling is supported by two parallel I-beam joists running north-south and set into cut recesses of original brickwork. The I-beams were clearly added later. An arched brick doorway at the eastern part of the building has been filled in to accommodate a modern wall and door. Close to the ceiling of the eastern portion of the building is a pair of iron rails separated at a width of 4 feet 6 inches, remnants of a former pulley system that likely transferred items from a loading dock on the lower level to the furnace room above for incineration. Modern additions to the building are not considered historically significant, but the brick and mortar refuse burner/furnace contained within the City Maintenance Building is considered potentially significant and may yield important information about site operations and refuse disposal

## 4.4 Cultural Resources

---

practices associated with the operation of the dump during the early to mid twentieth century. Because the furnace is surrounded by more modern additions its current condition is not fully known. However, the original footprint of the furnace is fully subsumed in the larger maintenance structure. What is visible inside the maintenance building (hearth, chimney, arched ceiling, and ghosts of the lifting mechanisms) reflect elements of this early 1920s industrial structure. Removal of later-period additions likely will reveal additional information about the structure and its function in the incineration and recycling process employed by the City of Hermosa Beach between 1924 and 1947.

The construction of the New City Maintenance Yard is proposed at Valley Drive and 11th Street across from (to the south of) City Hall. This building, along with the Fire Station buildings, the Police Station, and the County Library, were built between 1961 and 1965 and designed by local architect Savo M. Stoshitch. All buildings were constructed in the New Formalist style with steel framing and posts, brick veneer, and banks of windows. Brick colonnades adorn the exterior of the City Hall the front of which faces a parking lot to the east. Additional parking is provided on the southern and western perimeters. The Civic Center complex has not been previously evaluated. For the purposes of CEQA and determining project impact, the City Hall complex is assumed to be eligible for the CRHR on a local level under Criterion 3. While there will be no direct impacts to the complex, construction of the New City Maintenance Yard across the street has the potential to cause an indirect visual impact on these historically significant structures if it detracts unfavorably from the views of the existing City Hall.

Applied EarthWorks' historian reviewed the City Assessor's records and other on-line resources in the evaluation of a third structure which is proposed to be demolished at 636 Cypress Avenue. When constructed in 1952, this commercial structure was built to contain 3,710 square feet. It had 0 bath/0 bedrooms. It has a flat roof, a double bay garage door, and is of frame construction. It is zoned commercial /industrial and no additions have since been made. Other structures surrounding 636 Cypress appear to be of the same age and function. For the purposes of CEQA, this building is not considered a historical resource.

### 4.4.4.3 Paleontological Resources

Based on the literature review and museum records search results, and in accordance with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's (SVP) sensitivity scale, the unconsolidated Holocene dune sand and drift sand within the Proposed Project sites is determined to have a low paleontological resource potential. However, the Pleistocene San Pedro Sand, associated with numerous significant paleontological localities, has a high paleontological resources potential and may underlie the surficial deposits at varying depths below the Project sites. The depth at which the San Pedro Sand underlies the surficial sand deposits in the vicinity of the Proposed Oil Production site is unknown, but may have ranged from approximately 15 feet to 50 feet prior to the development of the City Dump (Dibblee 1999; McLeod 2013; Woodring et al. 1946). As previously stated, the former dump is approximately 45 feet deep. Therefore, the likelihood of Project-related grading and excavations reaching underlying intact San Pedro Sand is considered low. However, should Project-related excavations exceed 45 feet in depth at the City Dump, or depths of 15 feet along the pipelines, or otherwise impact intact San Pedro Sand deposits, scientifically significant paleontological resources may potentially be encountered.

#### 4.4.5 Regulatory Setting

Cultural and paleontological resources have been evaluated to determine if the Proposed Project will have any significant environmental impacts on these resource types. The CRHR is an authoritative guide to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify and evaluate the state's historical resources and to indicate which properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change. The criteria for listing resources on the CRHR are based on those developed by the National Park Service for listing on the NRHP. The CRHR was established to consider a broader range of resources that better reflect the history of California. Under CRHR, a historical resource is considered significant if it:

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

According to CEQA Guidelines, a resource shall generally be considered "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR. The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources [pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code], or identified in a historical resources survey [meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code] does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

In addition to the CEQA guidelines, the *City of Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, Chapter 17.53: Historic Resources Preservation* provides guidance for the evaluation of resource significance at the local level. The ordinance is intended to identify resource types that are potentially important to the City and ensure the long-term protection and use of historical resources, such as buildings and structures, sites, and places within the City that reflect special elements of the City's architectural, artistic, cultural, historical, political, and social heritage. The City's General Plan also includes the City of Hermosa Beach Historic Resources Map that identifies Potential Locally Significant Resources, Potential State Historic Landmarks, and designated State Historic Landmarks (City of Hermosa Beach 2009). No such resources have been identified within the Proposed Project sites.

Per the City of Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, Sections 17.53.070 through 17.53.120, a historic resource may be designated a landmark if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- A. It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, or architectural history;
- B. It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history;
- C. It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;

## 4.4 Cultural Resources

---

- D. It is representative of the notable work of a builder, designer, or architect; or
- E. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic(s) represents an established and familiar visual feature or landmark of a neighborhood, community, or the City (Ord. 98-1186 §4, 11/10/98 [City of Hermosa Beach 2013]).

Based on criteria A through E above, identified cultural resources were assessed for local significance, important to the City and to the community of Hermosa Beach.

### 4.4.6 Significance Criteria

Under CEQA guidelines lead agencies are to protect and preserve resources with cultural, historic, scientific, or educational value. CEQA Section 15064.5 provides significance threshold criteria for determining a substantial adverse change to the significance of a cultural resource. In addition, Appendix G of CEQA provides additional guidance in determining a project's impact on cultural resources. The information provided in the CEQA guidelines has been used to develop the significance criteria for cultural resources for the E&B Oil Development Project. This project would have a significant impact on cultural resources if:

- The project causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. This would include physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.
- The project causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.
- If the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.
- If the project disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Generally, intact historical resources and archaeological deposits are considered significant. Severely disturbed or mixed deposits often are not considered significant but may have educational value.

Paleontological resources are also afforded protection under CEQA. Appendix G (V) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that a Project would have a significant impact on paleontological resources if it will disturb or destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Section 5097.5 of the California Public Resources Code prohibits knowing and willful excavation, removal, destruction, injury, and defacement of any paleontological site or feature on public lands (lands under jurisdiction of state, county, city, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof), except where the agency with jurisdiction has granted express permission. Section 30244 requires reasonable mitigation measures for impacts on paleontological resources that occur as a result of development on public lands.

Human remains and associated grave offerings are accorded special consideration, even when fragmentary and are considered significant. CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (d) prohibit disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, without proper

treatment and reburial with appropriate dignity. Human remains must also be treated in compliance with Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98.

Indirect impacts to cultural resources result primarily from the effects of project-induced population growth. Such growth can result in increased construction as well as increased habitation, recreational activities, or site usage, activities that can disturb or destroy cultural resources. The following section evaluates project impacts and offers mitigation measures to mitigate impacts to a less than significant level.

#### **4.4.7 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

The Proposed Project consists of two construction sites and three associated pipelines. Additionally, and as a prelude to Phase 1 of development, a temporary City Yard site will be located within the parking lots of City Hall. A parking lot is also proposed at 636 Cypress Avenue, directly to the west of the Proposed Oil Production Site. While no excavations are planned at either location, an extant building at 636 Cypress will be demolished. This structure is not a historical resource according to CEQA. Impacts to historical resources are not anticipated at the City Yard Site or 636 Cypress Avenue. Potential impacts at other locations are reviewed below and proposed mitigation measures follow.

Development of the Proposed Oil Production site will be undertaken in four phases. For this cultural resources assessment, it is assumed that only Phases 1 and 3 would result in ground-disturbing activities on the Oil Production Site and hence have the potential to impact archaeological resources. In addition, the introduction of new structures, or the alteration of the existing setting, has the potential to indirectly impact historical resources and will potentially have a more lasting impact on the environment. Phases 2 and 4 will involve actual drilling and oil production. Once in place, oil drilling will not have the potential to further impact historical resources at the project sites until plans are made to cease operations and/or remove equipment. Phases 1 and 3 of the Proposed Project on the Oil Production site will entail demolition and ground-disturbing activities. It will include the complete removal and/or relocation of all buildings and at least 15 feet of over-excavation of the dump deposits (NMG Geotechnical 2012:21). One building will be relocated to the temporary City Yard. Site preparation will require that unsuitable earth materials including fill and weather dune sands be removed prior to new construction. The geotechnical report estimated that removal of fill will vary from 2 to 4 feet over most of the site. Site preparation elsewhere will require that the majority of the eastern portion of the site be excavated approximately 7 feet deeper than the surrounding grade. Further, a retaining wall will be built around the proposed tanks to ensure containment (NMG Geotechnical 2012:22). Such actions will have an impact on the Hermosa Beach City Dump site which dates to the 1920–1940s. It will also result in the demolition of the brick furnace built in 1924 which is extant within the existing maintenance building. Development at this site has the potential to impact historical and archaeological resources. Mitigation measures are necessary to ensure reduction of significant impacts.

Construction of the new permanent City Maintenance Yard on the site now occupied by Hermosa Beach Self Storage would consist of building a two-level structure to accommodate a

#### **4.4 Cultural Resources**

---

City Yard on the upper deck and the possible addition of parking for 129 cars on the lower deck. Taking advantage of the depressed nature of the site, lower level parking will be accessed from 11<sup>th</sup> Place opposite the parking lot that borders City Hall. The overall floor area of the upper deck is proposed to be approximately 48,000 gross square feet and be accessed from Valley Drive. The vehicle maintenance facility will be placed in the southwest corner of the yard. The city yard offices, gym, restrooms, lockers, and kitchen/break room will all be set in their own facility at the northwest corner of the deck. The entire complex will be surrounded by a wall. Under the replacement without parking, the yard footprint will be similar in size to the added parking option.

The proposed new permanent City Maintenance Yard with added parking, developed by RNL Design (2013), proposes that the “massing of the new facility... respect its surroundings in order to avoid overpowering its neighbors.” Further, this design sets the City Maintenance Yard shops along the southern margin of the block forming a buffer between the yard and the neighboring residences. This also places the shops at the back of the yard some distance from City Hall. A review by Applied EarthWorks’ architectural historian of the proposed design plans concluded that while the City Yard Office and Public Use area will be immediately across the street, this structure will be to the rear of City Hall reducing its visual impact further. Nonetheless, to ensure there will be no indirect impacts to City Hall due to new construction, additional design considerations are recommended below.

Pipelines will be placed below city roads and within existing utility ROWs within Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach and the City of Torrance. Placed at depths ranging from 3.5 to 4 feet, these areas, including any archaeological deposits that may have been present, are likely to have been previously disturbed due to utility construction. The potential for direct impacts to archaeological resources is therefore considered low. Pipelines will not be visible and street disturbance will be short term and temporary. Construction activities have no potential to indirectly impact resources. The potential to affect archaeological deposits along the pipeline alignments, therefore, is considered low.

##### **4.4.7.1 Historical Resources**

The existing City Yard Maintenance building contains the remnants of a historic utility building (the brick furnace) which is considered a historical resource pursuant to CEQA. Also, the Hermosa Beach City Hall complex is considered potentially significant as a historical resource under Criterion 3 of the CRHR at a local level. Each resource is considered separately in the following discussion

Impact #	Impact Description	Phase(s)	Residual Impact
CR.1	The Project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, such as the furnace remnant due to building demolition.	Phases 1 and 2	Class II Less Than Significant with Mitigation

While the existing City Maintenance Yard building is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; and it is not identified with a person or events significant in local, state or national history; nor does it embody the distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction and it is not representative of a notable builder, designer, or architect; the remnant structure does meet Criterion 4 of the CRHR and Criterion D of the NRHP. It has the potential to yield information important in prehistory or history on a local level. Demolition of the building, therefore, will cause a substantial adverse change to a potentially significant historical resources, and mitigation is required.

**Mitigation Measure**

CR-1 Prior to beginning demolition of the existing City Maintenance Yard Building, guidelines shall be developed for the careful exposure of extant elements of the historic brick and mortar furnace. Once exposed, detailed documentation of the furnace shall be undertaken. Documentation shall be guided by the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards. This documentation shall include production of high quality 35-mm photographs and plan drawings of building elements exposed, including but not limited to, a floor plan, any character-defining building features, and elevation drawings.

All work carried out pursuant to the recordation of the furnace building shall be conducted by, or under the direct supervision of a person or persons meeting, at a minimum, the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards* (48 FR 44738-39 as revised in 1994) as an architectural historian. A written report detailing the HAER-like documentation shall be provided to the City upon completion the work. This report shall be produced on archivally stable materials and filed with the Hermosa Beach Historical Society.

**Residual Impact**

The architectural reconnaissance survey identified two properties within the Proposed Project sites that are more than 45 years of age and were evaluated for significance. The first, the existing City Yard Maintenance building, while not architecturally significant, was demonstrated to meet the requirements for significance under the CRHR Criterion 4.

Proposed construction activities will result in demolition of the building which has the potential to impact this resource. A methodical approach by a qualified archaeologist would be developed as part of the mitigation to allow for careful exposure of extant elements of the historic brick and

**4.4 Cultural Resources**

mortar furnace. If mitigation CR.1 is implemented, impacts would be considered **less-than significant with mitigation (Class II)**.

Impact #	Impact Description	Phase(s)	Residual Impact
CR.2	The Project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource through indirect impacts to the Hermosa Beach City Hall Complex	Phases 1 and 3	Class II Less Than Significant with Mitigation

The City Hall complex situated across the street from the proposed new City Maintenance Yard is over 50 years of age, it was built by a local architect of note, and it represents “distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction”. While not fully documented during the current study, the building complex for the purposes of CEQA is assumed to be a historical resource. Further, according to the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, City Hall is a:

“... unique location or singular physical characteristic(s) represent[ing] an established and familiar visual feature or landmark of a neighborhood, community or the City...”

Therefore, it qualifies as a City Landmark under the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, sections 17.53.070 through 17.53.120.

The City Hall complex is located across the street (to the north) of the proposed New City Maintenance Yard. City Hall’s main entrance faces a parking lot that surrounds much of the building. The elevation facing the proposed maintenance building is a secondary façade. The site on which the New City Maintenance Yard will be constructed is currently the location of a self storage facility. Removal of this facility would improve the setting surrounding City Hall and add to the City Civic complex if designed appropriately.

- According to CEQA Section 15064.5: Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archaeological and Historical Resources:
  - Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a less than a significant impact on the historical resource [CEQA Section 15064.5](B)(3).
  - In order to avoid indirect impacts to the City Hall complex the following mitigation measures, taken from *the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines* shall be applied.

**Mitigation Measure**

CR-2a The design of the New City Maintenance Yard Building shall be compatible in design, styling, material, and massing of the adjacent City Hall complex. The building design should not attempt to replicate the New Formalist style, but it shall not conflict or

contrast with the existing building style. The buildings constructed in the New City Maintenance Yard shall be no more than two stories high. They shall not overpower or overshadow the existing building complex.

- CR-2b The landscaping associated with the proposed New City Maintenance Yard shall replicate the planting types surrounding the City Civic buildings, to the extent possible, in order to blend the new construction into the existing Complex. The final design of both the new building and landscape should be developed in consultation with an historic architect or architectural historian who meets *Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards* (48 FR 44738-39 as revised in 1994).

**Residual Impact**

The City Hall complex was also recognized as a potentially significant historic resource. It is presumed eligible under Criterion 3 of the CRHR. It is also significant as a local landmark under Hermosa Beach Municipal City Code Criterion F (City of Hermosa Beach 2013a).

City Hall will not be directly impacted by the Proposed Project, but the construction of the New City Maintenance Yard across the street from City Hall has the potential to indirectly impact the resource adversely. Providing that mitigation measures CR-2a and CR-2b are implemented, impacts will be considered **less than significant with mitigation (Class II)**.

**4.4.7.2 Archaeological Resources**

Proposed construction activities have the potential to result in a substantial adverse change to the significance of an archaeological resource. The cultural resources study of the Proposed Project sites prepared by Applied EarthWorks staff has identified the former Hermosa Beach City Dump at the Project Site as a potentially significant archaeological resource (Warren et al. 2013; Appendix G). The Project may cause the following impact.

Impact #	Impact Description	Phase	Residual Impact
CR.3	A substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, such as dump deposits, due to ground disturbance and over excavation.	Phases 1 and 3	Class II Less Than Significant with Mitigation

The records and literature search completed at the SCCIC revealed that no previously recorded archaeological sites have been reported within the Proposed Project sites. However, the City Dump was not previously evaluated. Geologic coring showed that subsurface archaeological deposits exist in the lower layers of the dump. With items such as “glass, porcelain, and ceramics” present, this historic dump potentially contains consumer behavioral data dating to the early 1920s. Recycling and incineration were among the practices explored for refuse disposal in the City of Los Angeles at the turn of the century. Investigations undertaken in 2006 at the former Pacific Garbage Reduction Plant (CA-LAN-2770H) revealed that significant archaeological deposits could be present in municipal dumps/landfills (Livingstone et al.

#### 4.4 Cultural Resources

---

2006:421–460). Excavations in this Los Angeles facility revealed that important information can be gained about municipal operations during a period of refuse collection crisis, which occurred from the 1880s through the mid 1900s as municipalities struggled to cope with excessive waste deposit in uncontrolled neighborhood dumps (CA-LAN-2121/H), in the City’s streets, and in surrounding stream courses (e.g., Los Angeles River). The City Dump at Hermosa Beach appears to have similar data potential. This site is considered potentially eligible at the local level under the City of Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, Chapter 17.53: Historic Resources Preservation, Criterion B.

*It is identified with ....events significant in local, state, or national history...;*

It is also considered potentially eligible under Criterion 4 of the CRHR:

*Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.*

The Proposed Project entails ground-disturbing construction activities at the Oil Production site. It will result in the complete removal of all buildings and at least 15 feet of the dump deposits (NMG Geotechnical 2012:21). Implementation of the Proposed Project will cause a substantial adverse change in a potentially significance archaeological resource (the former City of Hermosa Beach Dump and furnace site). Ground-disturbing construction activities at the New City Maintenance Yard and pipeline excavations may also cause adverse change in a potentially significance archaeological resource (prehistoric archaeological remains).

No known prehistoric sites exist in the immediate proximity of the Proposed Project sites or along the proposed pipeline alignment and based on the best available evidence, the potential for encountering prehistoric archaeological deposits is considered low. No evidence of prehistoric archaeological resources was found during the cultural resources survey. However, the project sites are in an urban environment in which the ground surface is obscured by paving and structures, thereby limiting the visibility of any surface evidence of archaeological resources. Taking into consideration local Native American concerns, any discovery of unanticipated prehistoric archaeological remains would be considered a significant archaeological resource and implementation of the Proposed Project would have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

#### Mitigation Measures

CR-3a Prior to any ground-disturbing activities or building removal within the Proposed Project sites, an Archaeological Monitoring Plan shall be developed by a qualified archaeologist with provision for review and input by concerned Native Americans and approval by the City. The Plan will also address worker safety during building demolition and ground disturbing activities and during the implementation of the Remedial Action Plan. The Plan is to include provisions for archaeological and Native American monitoring, detailed documentation of all early twentieth-century artifact-bearing deposits exposed during ground-disturbing site work, and development of a clear collection policy for both prehistoric and historic artifacts, subsequent artifact analysis, reporting of findings, and disposition and/or curation of

any significant artifacts recovered. All reports of findings shall be filed with to SCCIC.

- CR-3b Any significant archaeological deposits remaining in the area of the previous City of Hermosa Beach Dump following over-excavation at the Proposed Oil Development Project site must be protected in place. Stabilization and covering of these archaeological deposits shall be monitored by a qualified historical archaeologist meeting the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards* (48 FR 44738-39 as revised in 1994).

### Residual Impact

The alterations, grading, and additions at the Proposed Oil Production Site in Hermosa Beach will substantially alter the terrain surrounding the dump including the removal of several feet from the current grade. It is proposed that 15 feet of earth removal will occur within the area of the dump pit and vegetation largely will be cleared around it. While not known, but based on geological borings, it is expected that archaeological deposits will continue to depths between 29 to 45 feet. Therefore, the full contents of the dump pit will not be removed. Indirect impacts could occur due to unanticipated erosion following site development resulting in the subsequent destruction of archaeological deposits not removed as a result of the Project. Reduction of the protective cap (15 feet of fill) and subsequent Project Site maintenance could subject significant archaeological deposits to increased exposure resulting in further Project impacts. Therefore, any significant archaeological deposits remaining in the unexcavated area of the dump site following construction must be protected in place, in accordance with CEQA.

Implementation of the Proposed Project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. Evaluation of the Hermosa Beach City Dump situated within the existing City Maintenance Yard has been shown to have the potential to contain significant historical archaeological deposits. The proposed over-excavations of the city dump area up to 15 feet for the installation of the oil drilling and production equipment have the potential to impact these deposits.

With the implementation of mitigation measures CR-3a and CR-3b above as well as CR-5 below, impacts would be considered **less than significant with mitigation (Class II)**.

#### 4.4.7.3 Paleontological Resources

Based on the literature review and museum records search results, and in accordance with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's (SVP) sensitivity scale, the unconsolidated Holocene dune sand and drift sand (Qsp) mapped within the Proposed Project sites is determined to have a low paleontological resource potential. However, the Pleistocene San Pedro Sand, associated with numerous significant paleontological localities found in the vicinity of the Proposed Project, has a high paleontological resource potential and may underlie the surficial deposits at varying depths. Therefore, the Proposed Project has the potential to:

#### 4.4 Cultural Resources

Impact #	Impact Description	Phase	Residual Impact
CR.4	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geological feature.	Phases 1 and 3	Class II Less Than Significant with Mitigation

The following mitigation measure applies.

#### Mitigation Measure

CR-4 Should Project-related excavations be designed to exceed 45 feet in depth at the City Dump, or depths greater than 15 feet along the pipelines, or otherwise be shown to have the potential to impact intact San Pedro Sand deposits as described above, a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (PRMMP) shall be developed by a qualified paleontologist in consultation with the City and implemented prior to or during Project-related ground disturbing activities. The Plan will also address worker safety during building demolition and ground disturbing activities and during the implementation of the Remedial Action Plan.

#### Residual Impact

Implementation of the Proposed Project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse impact to a unique paleontological resource or site or a unique geologic feature. However, the implementation of mitigation measure CR-4 would reduce this impact to a level that is **less than significant with mitigation (Class II)**.

#### 4.4.7.4 Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains

While only limited evidence of prehistoric archaeological deposits was found within proximity to the Proposed Project sites and along the pipeline alignments, the possibility (albeit limited) to expose human remains exists.

Impact #	Impact Description	Phase	Residual Impact
CR.5	The Project could have a substantial impact if it results in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of a formal cemetery.	Phases 1 and 3	Class II Less Than Significant with Mitigation

State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur at the site until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Therefore the following mitigation measure applies:

**Mitigation Measure**

CR-5 Ground-disturbing activities in the area of the discovery shall immediately be halted or redirected. A temporary construction exclusion zone shall be established surrounding the site to allow for further examination and treatment of the find. A City representative shall immediately notify the Los Angeles County Coroner's office by telephone. By law, the Coroner will determine within two working days of being notified if the remains are subject to his or her authority. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission who will appoint the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). Additionally, if the remains are determined to be Native American, a plan will be developed regarding the treatment of human remains and associated burial objects and the plan will be implemented under the direction of the MLD.

There is no direct evidence of prehistoric archaeological remains occurring in the Proposed Project sites or along the Proposed Pipeline; however, human remains and associated grave offerings are accorded special consideration, even when fragmented, and such impacts would be considered significant; however, because there is no record of burials in the area and the likelihood of finding any burials is extremely low this impact is considered to be **less than significant with mitigation (Class II)**.

**4.4.8 Other Issue Area Mitigation Measure Impacts**

None of the mitigation measures proposed for other issue areas would increase the impacts to cultural resources. Therefore, additional analysis or mitigation for cultural resources is not required.

**4.4.9 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

For the purpose of the Proposed Project as outlined in Section 3 above, the cumulative impact study area includes the immediate vicinity surrounding the Proposed Project sites and the crude and gas pipelines in the City of Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, and Torrance, as well as the area around the Proposed City Maintenance Yard. Known projects of a scale and in a location that could add to cumulative impacts to cultural resources were found only in the City of Redondo Beach. Nonetheless, the broader cumulative impact study area encompasses the three communities of Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, and Torrance.

According to CEQA cultural resources include historic properties (standing buildings or structures), historical and prehistoric archaeological sites, paleontological resources, and human remains inside or out of designated cemeteries. Grading and ground disturbing activities can significantly impacts these non-renewable resources. Without mitigation, these resources would be destroyed through construction and urban expansion resulting in cumulative loss of cultural resources over time. However, applicable state and City laws and regulations, as discussed in

#### 4.4 Cultural Resources

---

Section 4.4.4 above, offer guidance for managing cultural resources, provide for preservation of significant natural and cultural resources, and direct mitigation through data recovery where avoidance is not possible.

Among known projects proposed for the City of Redondo Beach one is of a scale and in a location that could cumulatively add to the Proposed Project impacts to historical resources. This project, the Redondo Beach Energy Project (RBEP), does have the potential to impact standing structures and other built environment resources. It is a federally entailed project. Projects with federal involvement require systematic identification and management of cultural resources stressing avoidance or data recovery. Taken in conjunction with the Proposed Oil Development Project all impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level. The current project has imposed mitigation measure as required by CEQA and the City of Hermosa Beach Municipal Code, thus reducing impacts to a less than significant level. Under this cumulative scenario the Proposed Project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on historical resources.

The records review for the Proposed Oil Development Project identified only one archaeological resource within the area of potential effect (APE). In reviewing other projects proposed for the cumulative impact study area, two projects proposed in the City of Redondo Beach are of the scale and location that could cumulatively add to the Project impacts on archaeological resources. These projects are the RBEP and Harbor Development Project. Archaeological resources have been previously identified in vicinity to the RBEP. The existence of similar resources in the Harbor Development Project APE is not known at this time. While impact to archaeological resources are likely to occur as a result of these projects, and will no doubt occur on other projects in the planning stage in the surrounding region, imposition of similar mitigation measures to those proposed for the Proposed Oil Development Project would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Providing that mitigation measures are properly designed and implemented as required by CEQA, there would be no loss of data or cumulative impacts to archaeological resources in the impact study area.

Three projects proposed for the City of Redondo Beach are of a scale and in a location that could cumulatively add to the Project impacts on paleontological resources. These projects include:

- Redondo Beach Energy Project;
- Anita Traffic Lane Modifications Project;
- Harbor Development Project.

These areas of Redondo Beach potentially are underlain by the same Pleistocene San Pedro Sand (Qsp) deposits as discussed for the Proposed Project. The research for the current study demonstrated that 87 fossil localities within Los Angeles County are recorded. These deposits are considered to have high paleontological resources potential and may underlie the surficial deposits at varying depths within the Redondo Beach project areas. However, with the mitigation of impacts on these projects, whether required by federal, state, or local laws, cumulative impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level and there would be no cumulative loss of significant or unique paleontological resources.

The current study suggests that there is little potential to encounter human remains in the general study area, and there are no previously reported prehistoric sites that have been shown to contain human burials. The potential to inadvertently expose Native American or other human remains during construction is possible, but considered low. Nonetheless, any disturbance or impacts to human remains would be considered significant under CEQA and these impacts cannot be reduced through mitigation. Therefore, exposure of human remains has the potential to result in cumulatively significant impact. On all federal and CEQA projects, however, avoidance, preservation in place, and development of a reburial plan in consultation with the NAHC and local tribes is required to reduce the impacts wherever possible.

**4.4.10 Mitigation Monitoring Plan**

**Table 4.4-1 Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation Measure	Requirements	Compliance Verification		
		Method	Timing	Responsible Party
CR-1	<p>Prior to beginning demolition of the existing City Maintenance Yard Building, guidelines shall be developed for the careful exposure of extant elements of the historic brick and mortar furnace. Once exposed, detailed documentation of the furnace shall be undertaken. Documentation shall be guided by the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards. This documentation shall include production of high quality 35-mm photographs and plan drawings of building elements exposed, including but not limited to, a floor plan, any character-defining building features, and elevation drawings.</p> <p>All work carried out pursuant to the recordation of the furnace building shall be conducted by, or under the direct supervision of a person or persons meeting, at a minimum, the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (48 FR 44738-39 as revised in 1994) as an architectural</p>	Development and implementation of a monitoring and documentation plan by a qualified archaeologist.	During building demolition within areas of recorded historical resources.	Project Proponent and Construction Contractor

**4.4 Cultural Resources**

Mitigation Measure	Requirements	Compliance Verification		
		Method	Timing	Responsible Party
	historian. A written report detailing the HAER-like documentation shall be provided to the City upon completion the work. This report shall be produced on archivally stable materials and filed with the Hermosa Beach Historical Society.			
CR-2a	The design of the New City Maintenance Yard Building shall be compatible in design, styling, material, and massing of the adjacent City Hall complex. The building design should not attempt to replicate the New Formalist style, but it shall not conflict or contrast with the existing building style. The buildings constructed in the New City Maintenance Yard shall be no more than two stories high. They shall not overpower or overshadow the existing building complex.	Design of the New City Maintenance Building and landscape	Design Phase	Project Proponent and City
CR-2b	The landscaping associated with the proposed New City Maintenance Yard shall replicate the planting types surrounding the City Civic buildings, to the extent possible, in order to blend the new construction into the existing Complex. The final design of both the new building and landscape should be developed in consultation with an historic architect or architectural historian who meets <i>Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards</i> (48 FR 44738-39 as revised in 1994).	Design of the New City Maintenance Building and landscape	Design Phase	Project Proponent and City
CR-3a	Prior to any ground-disturbing activities or building removal within the Proposed Project sites, an Archaeological Monitoring Plan shall be developed by a qualified	Development and implementation of a monitoring plan by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with	The monitoring plan shall be submitted for review by the City of	Project Proponent and Construction Contractor

Mitigation Measure	Requirements	Compliance Verification		
		Method	Timing	Responsible Party
	archaeologist with provision for review and input by concerned Native Americans and approval by the City. <u>The Plan will also address worker safety during building demolition and ground disturbing activities and during the implementation of the Remedial Action Plan.</u> The Plan is to include provisions for archaeological and Native American monitoring, detailed documentation of all early twentieth-century artifact-bearing deposits exposed during ground-disturbing site work, and development of a clear collection policy for both prehistoric and historic artifacts, subsequent artifact analysis, reporting of findings, and disposition and/or curation of any significant artifacts recovered. All reports of findings shall be filed with to SCCIC.	concerned Native American tribes.	Hermosa Beach and approval prior to beginning development. Plan shall be implemented prior to and during construction.	
CR-3b	Any significant archaeological deposits remaining in the area of the previous City of Hermosa Beach Dump following over-excavation at the Proposed Oil Development Project site must be protected in place. Stabilization and covering of these archaeological deposits shall be monitored by a qualified historical archaeologist meeting the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards</i> (48 FR 44738-39 as revised in 1994).	Following construction any remaining archaeological deposits must be stabilized and covered for protection.	Following over-excavation	Project Proponent and Construction Contractor
CR-4	Should Project-related excavations be designed to exceed 45 feet in depth at the City Dump, or depths greater than 15 feet along the pipelines, or otherwise be	A paleontological resource monitoring and mitigation program (PRMMP) for treatment of the	The monitoring plan shall be submitted for review by the City of	Project Proponent and Construction Contractor

**4.4 Cultural Resources**

Mitigation Measure	Requirements	Compliance Verification		
		Method	Timing	Responsible Party
	shown to have the potential to impact intact San Pedro Sand deposits as described above, a Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (PRMMP) shall be developed by a qualified paleontologist in consultation with the City and implemented prior to or during Project-related ground disturbing activities. <u>The Plan will also address worker safety during building demolition and ground disturbing activities and during the implementation of the Remedial Action Plan.</u>	paleontological resources will be developed and implemented.	Hermosa Beach and approval prior to beginning development. Plan shall be implemented prior to and/or during construction.	
CR-5	Ground-disturbing activities in the area of the discovery shall immediately be halted or redirected. A temporary construction exclusion zone shall be established surrounding the site to allow for further examination and treatment of the find. A City representative shall immediately notify the Los Angeles County Coroner's office by telephone. By law, the Coroner will determine within two working days of being notified if the remains are subject to his or her authority. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission who will appoint the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). Additionally, if the remains are determined to be Native American, a plan will be developed regarding the treatment of human remains and associated burial objects and the plan will be implemented under the direction of the MLD.	The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted by the Los Angeles County Coroner, and a Most Likely Descendant must be designated. Any further treatment of the remains will occur in consultation with the MLD, the NAHC, and a qualified archaeologist.	Upon discovery of human remains.	Project Proponent and Construction Contractor