

9.

Cultural Resources

9 Cultural Resources

9.1 Existing Conditions

9.1.1 Introduction

This section discusses cultural resources at the site, including a description of the cultural setting, the historic context, and the ethnographic history of the general site vicinity. Cultural resources are districts, sites, buildings, structures, objects, and landscapes significant in American history, prehistory, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture. These resources are protected by statutes and regulations at all levels of government. Cultural resources may include existing and/or potential historic and prehistoric archaeological sites, historic buildings and structures, and American Indian traditional cultural properties (TCPs). Cultural resources are divided into three groups: archaeological resources, ethnographic resources, and the historic built environment (architectural resources).

The information in this chapter is derived from a number of source documents, including the *Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan for Years 2002-2007* (ICRMP) (Department of the Navy, 2002), the *Draft Report for Concord Inland BRAC Disposal Archaeological Survey* (Garcia-Herbst and Hale, 2008), and previous technical reports that include documentation of existing structures and buildings at the site (detailed in Section 9.4, References). The ICRMP was prepared to provide an overview of current knowledge regarding historic and archaeological resources and to guide resources management procedures.

9.1.1.1 Archaeological Resources

Archaeological resources include precontact, or prehistoric, and post-contact, or historic, resources. Prehistoric resources are physical properties that result from human activities that predate European contact with native peoples in America.

Prehistoric archaeological sites may include villages, campsites, lithic or artifact scatters, fishing sites, roasting pits/hearths, milling features, rock art (petroglyphs/pictographs, intaglios), rock features (circles, blinds, etc.), and burials. Historic archaeological sites consist of the physical remains (unoccupied ruins) of structures or built objects that result from the work of EuroAmericans that are greater than 50 years old but postdate contact between Europeans and Native Americans. Historic archaeological sites may include townsites, homesteads, agricultural or ranching features, mining-related features, and refuse concentration.

9.1.1.2 Ethnographic Resources

Ethnographic resources include sites, areas, and materials important to American Indians for religious, spiritual, or traditional uses. These can encompass the sacred character of physical locations (mountain peaks, springs, and burial sites) or particular native plants, animals, or minerals that are gathered for use in traditional ritual activities. Also included are villages, burials, rock art, rock features, and traditional hunting, gathering, or fishing sites. Ethnographic resources are often referred to as “traditional cultural properties” – a type of cultural resource that can be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) if certain criteria (see National Register Bulletin 38 – *Guidelines for*

Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties – Parker and King, 1990) are met.

Ethnographic resources that meet the definition set forth in Executive Order (EO) 13007 can be considered a sacred site under federal law. Activities that might affect accessibility to, or availability of, materials used in traditional practices are subject to EO 13007. In some cases, ethnographic resources may overlap prehistoric or historic archaeological resources or they may be embedded within each other.

9.1.1.3 Historic Built Environment

Architectural resources of the historic built environment can include houses, barns, stores, post offices, bridges, and community structures that are greater than 50 years old. These resources are generally standing structures that are currently occupied or are being preserved from deterioration or are being rehabilitated to accommodate occupation and use.

9.1.2 Cultural Resources Setting

The ICRMP (Department of the Navy, 2002) contains a detailed cultural history and context of the site and the larger general vicinity of Contra Costa County from the earliest evidence of habitation to the present. The following sections summarize the prehistoric, ethnographic, and historic setting of the site.

9.1.2.1 Prehistory and Ethnography

People are known to have inhabited the project area for at least 11,000 years prior to the arrival of Spanish explorers in California in the 16th century. Information on human occupation prior to 3,000 B.C. is almost nonexistent in part because of the depositional environment and dramatic environmental changes that took place at that time.

Evidence suggests that Paleoindian (12,000 to 9,000 years before present [BP]) populations throughout California and elsewhere were small and the subsistence economies emphasized the capture of big game, including now extinct megafauna, such as mammoth and mastodon. Although Paleoindian sites are rare in California, when found, they are often near areas containing pluvial lakes and marshes.

During the Archaic Period (9,000 to 4,000 BP), California prehistoric cultures, as elsewhere, lost their emphasis on large game hunting. Subsistence economies probably diversified somewhat, and Archaic people may have begun to use certain ecological zones, such as the coast littoral zone, more intensively than before. Advances in technology enabled more efficient use of certain plant foods, including grains and plants with hard seeds. Archaic sites are relatively rare throughout California. These sites contain large projectile points, milling stones, and a lack of high-density shell deposits that indicate the early inhabitants of the project area relied on hunting and gathering of terrestrial foods (Moratto, 1984). The earliest sites in the Bay-Delta region derive from the Los Vaqueros Reservoir Area in eastern Contra Costa County. In the late 1990s, two sites produced human remains dated between roughly 10,000 and 7,000 BP (Meyer and Rosenthal, 1997, 1998).

Population densities increased throughout the Pacific period from roughly 4,000 to 150 BP. Consequently, California populations sought to produce more food from available land and to locate more dependable food supplies. The Pacific period saw the human occupation and specialized use of virtually all ecological niches in California. Populations became increasingly sedentary and settled in larger villages. Increasing social stratification, ceremonialism, and long-distance trading activity is evident in the archaeological record.

In the Bay Area, many villages were established by 4,000 BP. Village sites, commonly located near a stream, adjacent to resource-rich bayshore and marsh habitats, often had deep stratified deposits of shellfish and other remains from repeated occupations over time. Beginning around 1,700 BP, there was an increasing complexity in artifact assemblages that seems to reflect an intensified hunting, gathering, and fishing adaptation. The introduction of the bow and arrow, harpoon, and the use of clam disk beads as currency for trade are just a few indications that populations were larger and more densely settled (Moratto, 1984).

At the time of European contact in the 1700s, the area of the future Concord Naval Weapons Stations (CNWS) was home to the Chupcan, a group of 300 to 400 people who inhabited the lower Diablo Valley, including the present cities of Concord, Clayton, Walnut Creek, and perhaps eastward to Bay Point (Milliken, 1995, 1997, as written in the CNWS ICRMP). The Chupcan were one of several linguistically related groups known collectively as the Bay Miwok (Bennyhoff, 1977; Levy, 1978). The Chupcan and the other groups in the area were tribelets: each local tribelet had one to five semi-permanent villages and numerous temporary camping spots within a fixed territory some 6 to 10 miles in diameter. The Chupcan probably used two types of dwellings, either semi-subterranean pit-house, which was used in the winter months, or a pole-framed house thatched with tule or other brushy plants. Although large semi-subterranean ceremonial houses were common in villages located to the north and east of Contra Costa County, no such ceremonial houses have been documented in the areas in or around the site.

9.1.2.2 History

Several Spanish expeditions arrived at or passed through the area beginning in 1772. Missions were established, and many of the Chupcan moved to Mission San Francisco or Mission San Jose between 1795 and 1804. Others moved north across Suisun Bay to avoid the Spanish. Between 1810 and 1832, Chupcans in the missions intermarried with other Bay Miwok groups including the Suisuns and the Napas. Those who lived in the missions experienced high death rates, because European diseases killed the Chupcans in large numbers. No present-day Native Americans can trace their ancestry to the Chupcan people (Department of the Navy, 2002).

The Spanish arrived in the San Francisco Bay Area and quickly occupied the land, including Contra Costa County. The land within the project area was used for cattle ranching and sheep grazing for more than 70 years. A land rush started with the discovery of coal in 1848 near Mt. Diablo that attracted Anglo settlers from the east. This migration westward included construction of railroads, towns, lumber mills, and more permanent settlements (including the military) in the vicinity of the site; thus broadening the economic base of the area.

The Inland Area of the CNWS (the site) had also previously been used extensively for agricultural production. Most of the lower hills and flatland of the site were altered by farming practices between the late 1800s and the 1940s, including the planting and cultivation of orchards.

The first military facility located on the south shore of Suisan Bay, initially called Bay Point and later renamed Port Chicago, was used to build freighters to provide supplies for World War I. With the attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941, this same area was used for ammunition storage. An explosion in 1944 at Port Chicago killed 320 people and destroyed ships, barges, warehouses, and other naval facilities. As a result of the explosion and the concern for military security, in 1944, the Navy purchased the land that would become the Inland Area. The area was used for storing high explosive magazines. In 1962, the area was officially named U.S. Naval Weapons Station Concord. The facility included the Inland Area, Port Chicago, and Mare Island (Self, 1993).

During the early years of the Cold War (1946 to 1963), the facility served as a weapons storage facility; providing support to the naval fleet. During the Vietnam years (1964-1972), the facility continued to provide support military efforts in Southeast Asia. From 1973 to the end of the Cold War in 1989, the facility continued its mission of supplying ammunition and maintaining and assembling missiles (JRP, 1998).

With the Navy's purchase of the area in 1944, the predominant use consisted of high-explosive and gun magazines, military barracks, and a weapons laboratory. The Navy also constructed a rail system and two air runways on the site. Of the 5,028 site acres, up to 1,200 acres are potentially contaminated from former military activities (see Chapter 10. Hazardous Materials). Networks of roads, railroads, and utilities link the buildings across the site. The site is served by three major highways—Interstate Highway (I-) 680, State Route (SR) 242, and SR 4. The Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) District serves the area via one line.

Not all areas of the site are equally developed. Most of the Navy's former administration buildings are north of SR 4. The remainder of the developed portion of the site is primarily populated with storage bunkers, railroad tracks, and roads (see Chapter 3. Land Use). Extensive fencing exists along the perimeter of the site, and the site is regularly patrolled to maintain security.

In addition, the network of roads, rail lines, and munitions bunkers developed by the Navy has substantially altered runoff, drainage, and vegetation patterns in the watershed (see Chapter 7. Hydrology and Water Quality).

9.1.3 Known Cultural Resources Within the Site

9.1.3.1 Archaeological Resources

Previous surveys identified 290 cultural resources (288 historic and 2 prehistoric sites) within the Inland Area of the CNWS. The most recent intensive cultural resources survey was conducted in 2007 (ASM, 2008) and gathered information on resources both within the boundaries of the site and in close proximity. The list of potential archaeological resources within a one-mile radius of the site includes 22 historic and two prehistoric resources. One historic site, the Contra Costa Canal Bridge, was determined eligible for the NRHP.

Investigation of one prehistoric resource, the Maltby Site, which is located outside of the boundaries of the site, revealed prehistoric burials and artifacts. The Maltby Site was discovered in 1949 and has not been evaluated for eligibility. Although it has been extensively disturbed, some resources may remain present at the originally recorded location.

The most recent survey conducted in 2007 (ASM, 2008) recorded 17 newly identified resources. Of these 17, 7 (3 prehistoric and 4 historic) are considered potentially eligible for the NRHP. Three sites are described as marginal in their potential to be eligible. This most recent research did not include formal evaluation of any resources.

The resources reported from the survey and their potential eligibility is presented in Table 9-1. Of the seven sites, four are located outside of the area of potential impact in portions of the site that will not be developed (either because they are in the Los Medanos Hills in areas with slopes greater than 30 percent or because they are in the riparian corridor buffer along Mt. Diablo Creek). Therefore, no impacts to these four sites will occur, and they will not be discussed further in this section or in the impact analysis in Section 9.3.

**Table 9-1:
 Potential NRHP Eligibility of Archaeological Resources at the Site**

Newly Discovered or Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites	Potential NRHP Eligibility	Location
<i>A-1H, Historic residence, historic occupation</i>	Yes	<i>Within site boundaries</i>
<i>A-10, Prehistoric, ground and flaked stone scatter</i>	<i>Marginal</i>	<i>Within site boundaries</i>
A-12H, Historic/modern site, outhouse and other buildings	Marginal	Outside site boundaries
A-15H, Historic, buried historic dump and foundation	Marginal	Within site boundaries, but in areas proposed for open space
P-861, Prehistoric, several large rock cisterns	Yes	Within site boundaries, but in areas proposed for open space
P-860, Cistern	Yes	Within site boundaries, but in areas proposed for open space
P-07-0003/CCO-690, Prehistoric midden and artifact scatter	Yes	Within site boundaries, but in areas proposed for open space

Note: *Italics* indicate newly discovered archaeological sites located within areas proposed for development under the reuse alternatives.

9.1.3.2 Historic Resources

Surveys of historic structures at the site were conducted in 1993 and 1998. In 1993, a survey conducted by the Navy (Self, 1993) documented resources within the site that were constructed during or prior to World War II. More than 500 structures were documented in the 1993 survey, including some that pre-dated military ownership of the site (Self, 1993). During the Cold War, 375 buildings and structures were constructed at the site. A subsequent survey (JRP, 1998) documented Cold War-Era and other selected buildings and structures. Both these surveys concluded that no historic structures exist at the site

that maintained historic significance and integrity, based on the criteria of the NRHP, that would make them eligible for listing (JRP, 1998).

The base chapel, located in the Administrative Area north of SR 4, does have a feature of interest. The north end of the chapel has a series of stained glass windows that memorialize the victims of the Port Chicago disaster. The City of Concord, the Concord Historical Society, the Friends of Port Chicago, the National Park Service, and the Navy have discussed actions to preserve the stained glass features.

The Navy intends to conduct a comprehensive survey of architectural resources at the site in summer 2008. If the planned Navy survey is conducted and completed in the time frame for preparing this the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and if the findings of those planned surveys differ from those of the previous surveys (i.e., determines there are architectural resources eligible for the NRHP and CRHR), the updated information from the Navy's planned surveys will be considered in the EIR assessment.

9.2 Standards of Significance

Criteria for determining significant impacts associated with cultural resources have been developed based on Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, 1970) Guidelines and any relevant agency thresholds. For the purposes of this EIR, development of any of the proposed alternatives may have significant impact on cultural resources if it would:

- Adversely affect the significance of a historical resource.
- Adversely affect the significance of an archaeological resource.
- Disturb any human remains.

9.3 Potential Cultural Resources Impacts

This section begins with a description of the methodology and assumptions incorporated in the analysis of potential cultural resources impacts. Then, impacts common (C) to all seven alternative reuse concepts are identified. Impacts that are considered to be significant are presented first, accompanied by an explanation of why the application of a standard resulted in a determination that the impact would be significant. When a significant impact has been set forth, mitigation measures to address that potential impact are also presented, along with a determination of whether the impact will continue to be significant after implementation of the mitigation measure. Next, impacts that are less than significant are presented. After the presentation of information about the impacts common to all of the seven alternative reuse concepts, information is then presented about potential land use impacts that are specific to Alternative Concepts 1 through 7. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures are presented first, followed by impacts that are considered to be less than significant. The section concludes with a description of the potential impacts of the "No Project" (NP) Alternative.

As discussed in Section 9.1 and in greater detail in other sections of this EIR (Chapter 3. Land Use; Chapter 7. Hydrology and Water Quality; and Chapter 10. Hazardous Materials), the site has been highly disturbed by previous activities, including military use for ammunition handling and storage, cattle grazing resulting in soil erosion near water bodies, and ranching activities that involved extensive soil disturbance for mining and agricultural use. Although the site has been extensively disturbed, the proposed construction associated with the alternative concepts has the potential to affect the historic integrity of cultural resources.

9.3.1 Methodology

9.3.1.1 Regulatory Context

The analysis of impacts is based on significance criteria (see Section 9.2) and on various State and federal requirements, as presented in Table 9-2.

**Table 9-2:
 Relevant Cultural Resources Laws, Regulations, and Executive Orders**

Federal Law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended in 2000 – National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended in 1994 – Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act, 1974 – American Indian Religious Freedom Act, 1978 – Archaeological Resource Protection Act, 1979 – The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 1990
State Law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CEQA Section 5024.1 (Defines Eligibility to California Register of Historic Resources)
Executive Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Executive Order 11593, Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment, 1971 – Executive Order 13007, Indian Sacred Sites – Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, 2000 – White House Memorandum on Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments (April 29, 1994)
Regulations and Guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 14 CCR 15126.4 (Mitigation); CEQA Guidelines 15126.4(b)(3) (Mitigation of Found Resources); PRC 21083.2-21084.1 (Mitigation of Found Resources) – 36 CFR Part 60, National Register of Historic Places – 36 CFR Part 79, Duration of Federally Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections – 36 CFR Part 800, Implementing Regulations, including Section 106 – CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 et al.; PRC 5024.1 (Effects Definitions) – National Register Bulletins (multiple) – PRC 5024.1; CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (Defines Eligibility to California Register of Historic Resources) – PRC 5097.94-98; California Health and Safety Code 7050.5 (Discovery of Human Remains) – Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation

Notes:

- CCR = California Code of Regulations
- CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act
- CFR = Code of Federal Regulations
- PRC = California Public Resources Code

9.3.1.2 Archaeological Resources

Impacts to archaeological resources were evaluated by determining whether any demolition, construction, or ground disturbing activities as a result of the alternative reuse concepts would affect areas that contain or could contain any archaeological resource eligible for listing in the NRHP or the California Register of Historic Places (CRHR), or that is otherwise considered a unique or important archaeological resource under CEQA. Figure 9-1 illustrates the site by the identified potential for the presence of archaeological resources.

9.3.1.3 Historic Structures

As discussed in Section 9.1, previous surveys have not identified any historic structures at the site with the potential for NRHP eligibility (any historic resource potentially eligible would be on lands identified as preserved under all seven alternative concepts). No further analysis of historic resources is conducted as part of this EIR based on the fact that no potentially eligible historic structures exist at the site.

9.3.2 Assumptions about Potential Cultural Resources Impacts

Following are the assumptions that have been applied in the analysis of potential cultural resources impacts of the alternative reuse concepts. The assumptions are based on information gathered during the planning process to develop the seven alternative reuse concepts. This information has been incorporated into all the reuse concepts as ways to avoid or minimize their environmental consequences.

- Evaluation of eligibility would be based on the criteria for the NRHP and the CRHR.
- Prior to any future development of the site, consultation would be initiated with the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and other interested parties, including the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).
- Construction activities would use standard best management practices and other reasonable care to prevent impacts to known eligible archaeological resources.
- Only two archaeological resources have been identified in areas of the site subject to development.
- No historic architectural resources exist at the site, and therefore impacts to historic architectural resources would not occur as a result of implementing the alternative reuse concepts.

9.3.3 Cultural Resources Impacts Common (C) to all Seven Alternative Reuse Concepts

This section describes impacts common to all seven alternative concepts. The mitigation measures common to all seven of the alternative concepts are summarized in Table 9-3, and are cited, where applicable, in the following analysis of the common impacts.

**Table 9-3:
Common Mitigation Measures Applicable to Cultural Resources**

Mitigation Approach	Citation	Applicability	Mitigation Measure
Preservation in Place (General category applied to analysis of all seven alternatives for mitigating the impacts to archaeological resources)	14 California Code of Regulations 15126.4	Applicable to NRHP potentially eligible sites (Preferable to Data Recovery)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Avoidance. – Incorporating the site within a green space that would not be disturbed. – Conservation easement. – Site capping.
Data Recovery (General category applied to analysis of all seven alternatives for mitigating the impacts to archaeological resources)	14 California Code of Regulations 15126.4	Applicable to NRHP potentially eligible sites (Use if no feasible alternatives exist that can avoid or lessen the significant adverse effect)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prepare Data Recovery Plan. – Obtain OHP approval prior to excavation. – Deposit resulting studies with California Historical Resources Regional Information Center.
Discovery of Archaeological Resources (Mitigation for impacts to newly discovered archaeological resources)	California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(j); CEQA Guidelines 15126.4(b)(3); and 36 Code of Federal Regulations 800.11.1	Examples of artifacts that could be found: ground stone tools (mortars, bowls, pestles, and manos); chipped stone tools (projectile points or choppers); flakes of stone not consistent with the immediate geology such as obsidian or fused shale; concentrations of trash pits containing bottles and/or ceramics; structural remains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cease construction within 30 feet. – Retain qualified archaeologist to evaluate finds. – If determined to be significant resources, avoid or mitigate consistent with OHP Guidelines. – Construction equipment operators required to attend pre-construction meeting presented by a professional archaeologist to ensure operator recognition of these materials during construction.
Discovery of Human Remains	The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 1990; California Public Resources Code 5097.94-98; California Health and Safety Code 7050.5 (Discovery of Human Remains)	Human remains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Cease excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains. – If remains are found in any area other than a burial site or cemetery, no further excavation will occur until the Contra Costa County Coroner is contacted. The Coroner will determine the age, cause of death of the deceased, and whether remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Contra County Coroner must contact the NAHC. – The NAHC shall comply with PRC Section 5097.98 consultation requirements (or, if consultation is not possible, re-inter the remains with appropriate dignity, on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance).

9.3.3.1 Common Potentially Significant Cultural Resources Impacts

Impact Cultural Resources C-1: All seven alternative reuse concepts could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that could be determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR. New construction is proposed in areas with known archaeological resources. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

One historic structure and one prehistoric archaeological site have been documented within the site. These two sites have not been formally evaluated for the NRHP or CRHR. Preliminary analysis of both sites (ASM, 2008) suggests they may have characteristics that may qualify them as eligible for the NRHP. If these resources are determined to be eligible, implementation of any of the seven alternative concepts could result in impacts to archaeological resources, and these impacts would be significant. Residential use is proposed in the southeast portion of the site, along limited portions of Mt. Diablo Creek, and the areas including and adjacent to the abandoned airfield. Implementation of any of the alternative concepts could result in significant impacts to these known resources in addition to resources that could be found during planning and construction.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources C-1: The City of Concord shall require all development/activities at the site that disturb previously surveyed archaeological resources to apply either Preservation in Place to avoid archaeological sites, or to apply Data Recovery to extract, document, and curate information and artifacts prior to construction. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

The City of Concord shall require any project proponent to implement the mitigation measures described in Table 9-3 (Preservation in Place or, if necessary, Data Recovery). Impacts after mitigation would be less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources C-2: All seven alternative reuse concepts could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

Previous research has documented varying degrees of disturbance of the site from historic agriculture, mining, and military use; therefore, impacts to unidentified subsurface archaeological resources could occur as a result of earth-disturbing activities.

Figure 9-1 shows the areas identified in previous studies as having a high, moderate, or low potential for archaeological deposits at the site. The determination of these categories is based on the types and age of the soils¹ (Department of the Navy, 2002).

¹ The categories (high, low, medium) on Figure 9-1 indicate potential areas in which archaeological deposit might be found. The soil distribution and, therefore, the assignment of the potential categories, are only approximations based on published soils data (Department of the Navy, 2002).

Such deposits at the site have a restricted distribution. Areas identified in previous studies as having a high potential for archaeological resources occur in the floodplain areas along Mt. Diablo Creek and marshes and in the alluvial fan deposits in the Tidal Area of the CNWS (which is not part of the proposed site). For all the alternative concepts, the riparian corridor of Mt. Diablo Creek at the site would be preserved with a 300-foot buffer that would be retained as open space. In addition, the areas identified as having moderate potential have been extensively disturbed since 1944 by the Navy and prior to that, by production agriculture. The upland areas of the site are considered to have low potential for archaeological remains. This area is preserved under all seven alternative concepts.

Based on the past extensive site disturbance from recent historical uses, it is not expected that unidentified archaeological resources will be found. If, however, project-related activities result in an impact to a previously undiscovered NRHP- or CRHR-eligible cultural resource, this would be considered potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources C-2: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown archaeological resources to cease construction and to contact the appropriate agencies. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

The City of Concord shall require the project proponent to adhere to the following measures:

- If archaeological resources were found during construction, all construction activities would cease in the immediate vicinity of the find and the appropriate agency representatives would be contacted.
- The contractor shall stop construction within 30 feet of the exposure of the new find until a qualified archaeologist could be retained to evaluate the find. If the resource is determined to be eligible for listing, the mitigation measures described in Table 9-3 shall be implemented.
- Preservation in Place or Data Recovery would be followed. Implementing these mitigation measures would reduce the impact to less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources C-3: All seven alternative reuse concepts could result in inadvertent discovery of human remains. If human remains were found during construction, work would cease and the necessary agency representatives would be contacted. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

Complex prehistoric habitation sites and human remains have not been documented within the site. Known prehistoric archaeological sites within the site include artifact assemblages comprising groundstone and other lithic tools, as well as features associated with resource procurement and processing, and human remains have not been discovered at those assemblages. Because prehistoric archaeological resources occur both within the site and in the general project vicinity, however, this analysis conservatively assumes a potential finding of significance.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources C-3: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown human remains to contact the appropriate authorities and to comply with the requirements presented in Table 9-3. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

The City of Concord would require the project proponent to conform to the following measures:

Although not expected, if human remains are found during construction, project officials are required by the California Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) to contact the Contra Costa County Coroner. If the Coroner determines that the find is Native American, he/she must contact the NAHC. The NAHC, as required by the Public Resources Code (Section 5097.98) determines and notifies the Most Likely Descendant with a request to inspect the burial and make recommendations for treatment or disposal. If this mitigation measure were implemented, the impact would be less than significant.

9.3.3.2 Common Potential Impacts that are Less Than Significant

Impact Cultural Resources C-4: All seven alternative reuse concepts could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Construction could affect archaeological resources that have been determined not eligible for listing. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

For any of the alternative concepts, if an archaeological resource has been determined not eligible for listing on the NRHP or the CRHR, the impact would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources C-4: None required.

Impact Cultural Resources C-5: All seven alternative reuse concepts could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. During construction, new archaeological resources could be found. If the new resource is determined not eligible for listing, this impact would be less than significant.

If a site is discovered during construction and the resource is evaluated for significance and eligibility and is determined not eligible for the NRHP or the CRHR, construction may continue. The impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources C-5: None required.

9.3.4 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 1

9.3.4.1 Potentially Significant Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 1

Impact Cultural Resources 1-1: Alternative Concept 1 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing

on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed in areas with known archaeological resources, could destroy or damage existing eligible resources. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

For this alternative concept, almost 32 percent of the site would be dedicated to residential low-density, single-family housing that could result in impacts to known eligible archaeological sites and areas that have a moderate potential for the discovery of new archaeological sites. Although the site is highly disturbed from prior historical use and much of the area is identified as of moderate potential (see Figure 9-1) and much of the potential development is located in the highly disturbed area where munitions bunkers are currently located, construction has the potential to result in significant impacts to archaeological resources. Areas excluded from development would preclude further disturbance of areas of high and moderate potential.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 1-1: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that could potentially disturb previously surveyed archaeological resources to apply either Preservation in Place to avoid archaeological sites or Data Recovery to extract, to document the history, and to curate found artifacts prior to construction. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

A mitigation plan would have to be prepared for the two potentially eligible sites that have been previously surveyed. Either the known archaeological sites would be avoided, or, if avoidance is not feasible, a data recovery plan would be prepared and approved, prior to the excavation of the resource. See Table 9-3 for the detailed description of this measure that would mitigate this impact to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 1-2: Alternative Concept 1 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed for areas with a high to moderate potential for the discovery of new resources, could inadvertently damage or destroy new archaeological sites that could be potentially eligible. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

As noted in Impact Cultural Resources 1-1, extensive areas of the site have been previously disturbed. Although historical use has resulted in site disturbance, the potential exists for the discovery of previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing. The riparian corridor of Mt. Diablo Creek at the site would be preserved as a result of Alternative Concept 1 with a 300-foot buffer that would be retained as open space. In addition, the areas identified as having moderate potential have been extensively disturbed since 1944 by the Navy and prior to that by mining and agricultural production. The upland areas of the site are considered to have low potential for archaeological remains. This area is preserved with Alternative Concept 1.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 1-2: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown archaeological resources to cease construction and to contact the necessary agency representatives. With implementation of this mitigation

measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

If such sites are found during planning and/or construction, the contractor would be required to stop construction within 30 feet of the exposure of these finds until a qualified archaeologist could be retained to evaluate the find. If the resource is determined to be potentially eligible for listing, the applicable measures shown in Table 9-3 would be required. If mitigation measures are implemented, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 1-3: Alternative Concept 1 could result in impacts to undiscovered human remains. If human remains are found during construction, work would cease, and necessary agency representatives would be contacted. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

As discussed in Impact Cultural Resources 1-1 and 1-2, much of the site has been previously disturbed, and areas noted as high and moderate potential for archaeological resources are either preserved or reserved for open space.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 1-3: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown human remains to contact the Contra Costa Coroner to determine cause of death and to determine if the remains are Native American. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Although not anticipated based on the extensive site disturbance and the historical use patterns of the site, if human remains are found with the construction of this alternative concept, work would be required to stop immediately. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the mitigation for the human remains were implemented.

The Coroner would contact the necessary State and federal agencies. The Coroner would determine the age, cause of death of the deceased, and whether remains are of Native American origin. If it is determined the remains are of Native American origin, the Contra County Coroner would be required to contact the NAHC. The NAHC would follow procedures described in this section here and in PRC Section 5097.98. If this mitigation measure is implemented, the impact would be less than significant.

9.3.4.2 Cultural Resources Potential Impacts that are Less Than Significant

Impact Cultural Resources 1-4: Alternative Concept 1 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Construction could affect archaeological resources that have been determined not to be significant. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

Construction of Alternative Concept 1 could affect previously surveyed archaeological sites. Because these resources were surveyed and determined not eligible for listing on the NRHP or the CRHR, impacts would not occur; therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 1-4: None required.

Impact Archaeological Resources 1-5: Alternative Concept 1 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. During construction, new archaeological resources could be found. If a new resource is determined not eligible for listing, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

If a resource is discovered during construction of Alternative Concept 1, and is determined not eligible for the NRHP or the CRHR, construction would be allowed to continue. The impact would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 1-5: None required.

9.3.5 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 2

9.3.5.1 Significant Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 2

Impact Cultural Resources 2-1: Alternative Concept 2 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed in areas with known archaeological resources, could destroy or damage existing eligible resources. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

For this alternative concept, almost 32 percent of the site would be dedicated to residential low-density, single-family housing that could result in impacts to known eligible archaeological sites and areas that have a moderate potential for the discovery of new archaeological sites. Although the site is highly disturbed from prior historical use and much of the area is identified as of moderate potential (see Figure 9-1) and much of the potential development is located in the highly disturbed area where munitions bunkers are currently located, construction has the potential to result in significant impacts to archaeological resources. Areas excluded from development would preclude further disturbance of areas of high and moderate potential.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 2-1: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that could potentially disturb previously surveyed archaeological resources to apply either Preservation in Place to avoid archaeological sites or Data Recovery to extract, to document the history, and to curate found artifacts prior to construction. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

A mitigation plan would have to be prepared for the two potentially eligible sites that have been previously surveyed. Either the known archaeological sites would be avoided, or, if avoidance is not feasible, a data recovery plan would be prepared and approved, prior to the excavation of the resource. If the resource is determined to be potentially eligible for listing, the applicable measures shown in Table 9-3 would be required.

Impact Cultural Resources 2-2: Alternative Concept 2 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed for areas with a high to moderate potential for the discovery of new resources, could inadvertently damage or destroy new archaeological sites that could be potentially eligible. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

As noted in Impact Cultural Resources 2-1, extensive areas of the site have been previously disturbed. Although historical use has resulted in site disturbance, the potential exists for the discovery of previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing. The riparian corridor of Mt. Diablo Creek at the site would be preserved as a result of Alternative Concept 2 with a 300-foot buffer that would be retained as open space. In addition, the areas identified as having moderate potential have been extensively disturbed since 1944 by the Navy and prior to that by mining and agricultural production. The upland areas of the site are considered to have low potential for archaeological remains. This area is preserved with Alternative Concept 2.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 2-2: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown archaeological resources to cease construction and to contact the necessary agency representatives. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

If such sites are found during planning and/or construction, the contractor would be required to stop construction within 30 feet of the exposure of these finds until a qualified archaeologist could be retained to evaluate the find. If the resource is determined to be potentially eligible for listing, the applicable measures shown in Table 9-3 would be required. If this mitigation measure is implemented, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 2-3: Alternative Concept 2 could result in impacts to undiscovered human remains. If human remains are found during construction, work would cease, and necessary agency representatives would be contacted. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

As discussed in Impact Cultural Resources 2-1 and 2-2, much of the site has been previously disturbed, and areas noted as high and moderate potential for archaeological resources are either preserved or reserved for open space.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 2-3: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown human remains to contact the Contra Costa Coroner to determine cause of death and to determine if the remains are Native American. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Although not anticipated based on the extensive site disturbance and the historical use patterns of the site, if human remains are found with the construction of this alternative concept, work would be required to stop immediately. There shall be no further excavation

or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the mitigation for the human remains were implemented.

The Coroner would contact the necessary State and federal agencies. The Coroner would determine the age, cause of death of the deceased, and whether remains are of Native American origin. If it is determined the remains are of Native American origin, the Contra County Coroner would be required to contact the NAHC. The NAHC would follow procedures described in this section here and in PRC Section 5097.98. If this mitigation measure is implemented, the impact would be less than significant.

9.3.5.2 Cultural Resources Impacts that are Less Than Significant

Impact Cultural Resources 2-4: Alternative Concept 2 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Construction could affect archaeological resources that have been determined not to be significant. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 2-4 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-4.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 2-4: None required.

Impact Cultural Resources 2-5: Alternative Concept 2 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. During construction, new archaeological resources could be found. If a new resource is determined not eligible to listing, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 2-5 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-5.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 2-5: None required.

9.3.6 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 3

9.3.6.1 Potentially Significant Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 3

Impact Cultural Resources 3-1: Alternative Concept 3 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed in areas with known archaeological resources, could destroy or damage existing eligible resources. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

For this alternative concept, almost 32 percent of the site would be dedicated to residential low-density, single-family housing that could result in impacts to known eligible archaeological sites and areas that have a moderate potential for the discovery of new archaeological sites. Although the site is highly disturbed from prior historical use and much of the area is identified as of moderate potential (see Figure 9-1) and much of the potential development is located in the highly disturbed area where munitions bunkers are currently

located, construction has the potential to result in significant impacts to archaeological resources. Areas excluded from development would preclude further disturbance of areas of high and moderate potential.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 3-1: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that could potentially disturb previously surveyed archaeological resources to apply either Preservation in Place to avoid archaeological sites or Data Recovery to extract, to document the history, and to curate found artifacts prior to construction. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

A mitigation plan would have to be prepared for the two potentially eligible sites that have been previously surveyed. Either the known archaeological sites would be avoided, or, if avoidance is not feasible, a data recovery plan would be prepared and approved, prior to the excavation of the resource. See Table 9-3 for the detailed description of this measure that would mitigate this impact to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 3-2: Alternative Concept 3 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed for areas with a high to moderate potential for the discovery of new resources, could inadvertently damage or destroy new archaeological sites that could be potentially eligible. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

As noted in Impact Cultural Resources 3-1, extensive areas of the site have been previously disturbed. Although historical use has resulted in site disturbance, the potential exists for the discovery of previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing. The riparian corridor of Mt. Diablo Creek at the site would be preserved as a result of Alternative Concept 3 with a 300-foot buffer that would be retained as open space. In addition, the areas identified as having moderate potential have been extensively disturbed since 1944 by the Navy and prior to that by mining and agricultural production. The upland areas of the site are considered to have low potential for archaeological remains. This area is preserved with Alternative Concept 3.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 3-2: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown archaeological resources to cease construction and to contact the necessary agency representatives. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

If such sites are found during planning and/or construction, the contractor would be required to stop construction within 30 feet of the exposure of these finds until a qualified archaeologist could be retained to evaluate the find. If the resource is determined to be potentially eligible for listing, the applicable measures shown in Table 9-3 would be required. If this mitigation measure is implemented, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 3-3: Alternative Concept 3 could result in impacts to undiscovered human remains. If human remains are found during construction, work would cease, and necessary agency representatives would be contacted. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

As discussed in Impact Cultural Resources 2-1 and 2-2, much of the site has been previously disturbed, and areas noted as high and moderate potential for archaeological resources are either preserved or reserved for open space.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 3-3: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown human remains to contact the Contra Costa Coroner to determine cause of death and to determine if the remains are Native American. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Although not anticipated based on the extensive site disturbance and the historical use patterns of the site, if human remains are found with the construction of this alternative concept, work would be required to stop immediately. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the mitigation for the human remains were implemented.

The Coroner would contact the necessary State and federal agencies. The Coroner would determine the age, cause of death of the deceased, and whether remains are of Native American origin. If it is determined the remains are of Native American origin, the Contra County Coroner would be required to contact the NAHC. The NAHC would follow procedures described in this section here and in PRC Section 5097.98. If this mitigation measure is implemented, the impact would be less than significant.

9.3.6.2 Cultural Resources Potential Impacts of Alternative Concept 3 that are Less Than Significant

Impact Cultural Resources 3-4: Alternative Concept 3 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Construction could affect archaeological resources that have been determined not eligible for listing. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 3-4 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-4.

Mitigation Measure 3-4: None required.

Impact Cultural Resources 3-5: Alternative Concept 3 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. During construction, new archaeological resources could be found. If a new resource is determined not eligible for listing, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 3-5 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-5.

Mitigation Measure 3-5: None required.

9.3.7 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 4

For Alternative Concept 4, the same land use types would occur as proposed under Alternative Concept 1 with the addition of Residential (moderate).

9.3.7.1 Potentially Significant Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 4

The impacts of Alternative Concept 4 are the same as those in Alternative Concepts 1, 2, and 3 and are incorporated into this analysis as Impact Cultural Resources 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3, with the following changes. The site acreage proposed for redevelopment is less than is proposed for Alternative Concepts 1, 2, or 3.

Impact Cultural Resources 4-1: Alternative Concept 4 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed in areas with known archaeological resources, could destroy or damage existing eligible resources. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 4-1 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-1.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 4-1: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that could potentially disturb previously surveyed archaeological resources to apply either Preservation in Place to avoid archaeological sites or Data Recovery to extract, to document the history, and to curate found artifacts prior to construction. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 4-2: Alternative Concept 4 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed for areas with a high to moderate potential for the discovery of new resources, could inadvertently damage or destroy new archaeological sites that could be potentially eligible. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 4-2 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-2.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 4-2: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown archaeological resources to cease construction and to contact the necessary agency representatives. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 4-3: Alternative Concept 4 could result in impacts to undiscovered human remains. If human remains are found during construction, work would cease, and necessary agency representatives would be contacted. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 4-3 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-3.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 4-3: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown human remains to contact the Contra Costa Coroner to determine cause of death and to determine if the remains are Native American. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

9.3.7.2 Cultural Resources Impacts that are Less Than Significant

Impact Cultural Resources 4-4: Alternative Concept 4 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Construction could affect archaeological resources that have been determined not eligible for listing. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 4-4 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-4.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 4-4: None required.

Impact Cultural Resources 4-5: Alternative Concept 4 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. During construction, new archaeological resources could be found. If a new resource is determined not eligible for listing, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 4-5 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-5.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 4-5: None required.

9.3.8 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 5

For Alternative Concept 5, proposed land use is the same as Alternative Concept 4.

9.3.8.1 Potentially Significant Impacts of Alternative Concept 5

The impacts of Alternative Concept 5 are the same as those in Alternative Concept 1, 2, 3, and 4 and are incorporated into this analysis as Impact Cultural Resources 5-1, 5-2, and 5-3, with the following changes. The site acreage proposed for redevelopment is less than Alternative Concepts 1, 2, 3, or 4.

Impact Cultural Resources 5-1: Alternative Concept 5 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed in areas with known archaeological resources, could destroy or damage existing eligible resources. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 5-1 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-1.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 5-1: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that could potentially disturb previously surveyed archaeological resources to apply either Preservation in Place to avoid archaeological sites or Data Recovery to extract, to document the history, and to curate found artifacts prior to construction. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 5-2: Alternative Concept 5 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed for areas with a high to moderate potential for the discovery of new resources, could inadvertently damage or destroy new archaeological sites that could be potentially eligible. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 5-2 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-2.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 5-2: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown archaeological resources to cease construction and to contact the necessary agency representatives. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 5-3: Alternative Concept 5 could result in impacts to undiscovered human remains. If human remains are found during construction, work would cease, and necessary agency representatives would be contacted. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 5-3 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-3.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 5-3: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown human remains to contact the Contra Costa Coroner to determine cause of death and to determine if the remains are Native American. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

9.3.8.2 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 5 that are Less Than Significant

Impact Cultural Resources 5-4: Alternative Concept 5 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Construction could affect archaeological resources that have been determined not eligible for listing. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 5-4 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-4.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 5-4: None required.

Impact Cultural Resources 5-5: Alternative Concept 5 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. During construction, new archaeological resources could be found. If a new resource is determined not eligible for listing, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 5-5 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-5.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 5-5: None required.

9.3.9 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 6

For Alternative Concept 6, proposed land use is the same as Alternative 2, except that Commercial Hotels would be included, but Commercial Office would not.

9.3.9.1 Potentially Significant Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 6

The impacts of Alternative Concept 6 are the same as those in Alternative Concepts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and are incorporated into this analysis as Impact Cultural Resources 6-1, 6-2, and 6-3, with the following changes. The site acreage proposed for redevelopment is less than Alternative Concepts 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.

Impact Cultural Resources 6-1: Alternative Concept 6 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed in areas with known archaeological resources, could destroy or damage existing eligible resources. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 6-1 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-1.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 6-1: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that could potentially disturb previously surveyed archaeological resources to apply either Preservation in Place to avoid archaeological sites or Data Recovery to extract, to document the history, and to curate found artifacts prior to construction. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 6-2: Alternative Concept 6 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed for areas with a high to moderate potential for the discovery of new resources, could inadvertently damage or destroy new archaeological sites that could be potentially eligible. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 6-2 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-2.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 6-2: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown archaeological resources to cease construction and to contact the necessary agency representatives. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 6-3: Alternative Concept 6 could result in impacts to undiscovered human remains. If human remains are found during construction, work would cease, and necessary agency representatives would be contacted. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 6-3 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-3.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 6-3: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown human remains to contact the Contra Costa Coroner to determine cause of death and to determine if the remains are Native American. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

9.3.9.2 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 6 that are Less Than Significant

Impact Cultural Resources 6-4: Alternative Concept 6 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the

NRHP or CRHR. Construction could affect archaeological resources that have been determined not eligible for listing. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 6-4 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-4.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 6-4: None required.

Impact Cultural Resources 6-5: Alternative Concept 6 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. During construction, new archaeological resources could be found. If a new resource is determined not eligible for listing, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 6-5 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-5.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 6-5: None required.

9.3.10 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 7

For Alternative Concept 7, proposed land use is the same as Alternative Reuse 4, except the acreage of configuration would vary.

9.3.10.1 Potentially Significant Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 7

The impacts of Alternative Concept 7 are the same as those in Alternative Concepts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 and are incorporated into this analysis as Impact Cultural Resources 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3, with the following changes.

Impact Cultural Resources 7-1: Alternative Concept 7 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed in areas with known archaeological resources, could destroy or damage existing eligible resources. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 7-1 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-1.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 7-1: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that could potentially disturb previously surveyed archaeological resources to apply either Preservation in Place to avoid archaeological sites or Data Recovery to extract, to document the history, and to curate found artifacts prior to construction. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 7-2: Alternative Concept 7 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for listing

on the NRHP or CRHR. New construction, proposed for areas with a high to moderate potential for the discovery of new resources, could inadvertently damage or destroy new archaeological sites that could be potentially eligible. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 7-2 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-2.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 7-2: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown archaeological resources to cease construction and to contact the necessary agency representatives. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this potentially significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

Impact Cultural Resources 7-3: Alternative Concept 7 could result in impacts to undiscovered human remains. If human remains are found during construction, work would cease, and necessary agency representatives would be contacted. This impact is considered to be potentially significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 7-3 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-3.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 7-3: The City of Concord shall require all development activities at the site that unearth previously unknown human remains to contact the Contra Costa Coroner to determine cause of death and to determine if the remains are Native American. With implementation of this mitigation measure, this significant impact would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

9.3.10.2 Cultural Resources Impacts of Alternative Concept 7 that are Less Than Significant

Impact Cultural Resources 7-4: Alternative Concept 7 could result in impacts to previously surveyed archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Construction could affect archaeological resources that have been determined not eligible for listing. This impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 7-4 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-4.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 7-4: None required.

Impact Cultural Resources 7-5: Alternative Concept 7 could result in impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources that are not eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. During construction, new archaeological resources could be found. If a new resource is determined not eligible for listing, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

The analysis of Cultural Resources 7-5 is the same as discussed under Impact Cultural Resources C-5.

Mitigation Measure Cultural Resources 7-5: None required.

9.3.11 Impacts of “No Project” Alternative (NP-1)

9.3.11.1 Potentially Significant Cultural Resources Impacts of the “No Project” (NP) Alternative

None identified.

9.3.11.2 Potentially Significant Cultural Resources Impacts of the “No Project” (NP) Alternative

None identified.

9.4 References

ASM Affiliates, Inc. (ASM). 2008. *Draft Report for Concord Inland BRAC Disposal Archaeological Survey, Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Contra Costa County, CA.* Prepared for NAVFAC SW, San Diego, CA. January.

Bennyhoff, James A. 1977. *The Napa and Wappo Prehistory. In Toward a New Taxonomic Framework for Central California Archaeology.* Essays by James A. Bennyhoff and David A. Frederickson, edited by R.E. Hughes. Contributions of the University of California Archaeological research Facility No. 52, Berkeley.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). 1970. Available online at: www.ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/.

California Office of Historic Preservation. Undated. Available online at: www.ohp.parks.ca.gov. Accessed March 7, 2008.

Department of the Navy. 2002. *Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan for Years 2002-2007, Volume I of II.* Engineering Field Activity, West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

Department of the Navy. 2006. *Final Environmental Condition of Property Report for the Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Concord, California.* Base Realignment and Closure Program Management Office.

Garcia-Herbst, Arleen and Micah Hale. 2008. *Draft Report for Concord Inland BRAC Disposal Archaeological Survey, Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Contra Costa County, California.* January.

JRP Historical Consulting Services (JRP). 1998. *Inventory and Evaluation of National Register Eligibility of Cold War Era and Selected Other Buildings and Structures, Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, Contra Costa County, California.*

Levy, R. 1978. Eastern Miwok. In California, edited by R.F. Heizer. *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 8. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Meyer. J., and J.S. Rosenthal. 1997. *Archaeological and Geoarchaeological Investigations at Eight Prehistoric Sites in the Los Vaqueros Reservoir Area, Contra Costa County, California*. Report submitted to Contra Costa Water District, Concord, California.

Meyer. J., and J.S. Rosenthal. 1998. *An Archaeological Investigation of Artifacts and Human Remains from CA-CCo-537, Los Vaqueros Project Area, Contra Costa County, California*. Report submitted to Contra Costa Water District, Concord, California.

Self, William, et al. 1993. Cultural Resources Overview Naval Weapons Station Concord, Contra Costa County, California. August.
