

# 3.4

## CULTURAL RESOURCES



# 3.4

## CULTURAL RESOURCES

### 3.4.1 Introduction

This section describes the environmental and regulatory setting for cultural resources, as well as the potential impacts on cultural resources that would result from the proposed Project and the mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts. Cultural resources customarily include archaeological, ethnographic, and architectural resources (the historic built environment). Though not specifically a cultural resource, paleontological resources (fossils) also are considered here because they are discussed in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines (Environmental Checklist Form), within the context of Section V, Cultural Resources.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15120(d) prohibits an EIR from including information about the location of archaeological sites or sacred lands: “No document prepared pursuant to this article that is available for public examination shall include...information about the location of archaeological sites and sacred lands.” Therefore, the specific locations of archaeological sites have been omitted from this section, and the cultural resources technical reports are a confidential (non-printed) appendix to this document.

Potentially significant impacts would occur on unknown buried prehistoric and historical archaeological resources, buried human remains, and historical architecture. No impact would occur to known buried archaeological resources or paleontological resources. After mitigation, the following impact would remain significant and unavoidable:

- Construction of the five-story, 100,000 square-foot wave tank building would have a significant impact on the historic setting of two nearby historic resources, which are also contributors to the potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District. Although mitigation is available to reduce the impact of this structure, the overall size and scale of this structure cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. As such, this element of the proposed Project would be significant and unavoidable.

## 3.4.2 Environmental Setting

This section presents the physical setting, prehistoric context, ethnographic setting, historic context, and site-specific setting relative to cultural resources that are present in the proposed project area.

### 3.4.2.1 Historical Physical Setting

The proposed project area is located within the Los Angeles Basin, a broad, level expanse of land comprising more than 800 square miles that extends from Cahuenga Peak south to the Pacific coast, and from Topanga Canyon southeast to the vicinity of Aliso Creek. Prior to historical settlement of the area, the plain was characterized by extensive inland prairies and a lengthy coastal strand, with elevations approximately 500 feet above mean sea level. The Los Angeles plain is traversed by several large watercourses, most notably the Los Angeles, Rio Hondo, San Gabriel, and Santa Ana Rivers. Marshlands fed by fresh or salt water also once covered many portions of the area (Hamilton et al. 2004; McCawley 1996).

The Los Angeles–Long Beach Harbor was once a low-lying coastal marsh generally referred to as either the Wilmington Lagoon or San Pedro Creek. The lagoon had a complex network of estuaries, stream channels, tidal channels, sand spits, beaches, and marshy inlands (Schell et al. 2003). Although the present configuration of the Port partly reflects the natural arrangement of the landscape, filling and dredging activities have formed an extensive network of wharves and shipping channels along the waterfront. Earth deposits underlying the proposed project area consist of artificial fill materials, as this area of land has been built up during the historic development of the Port.

#### 3.4.2.1.1 Historic Context of Municipal Pier No. 1

Unless otherwise noted, the discussion below is summarized from *Historic Resources Evaluation Report for Port of Los Angeles, Municipal Pier No. 1* (Appendix E).

In anticipation of increased shipping resulting from construction of the Panama Canal, to be completed in 1914, the Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners initiated several improvements at the Port of Los Angeles in the early 1910s to capture a greater portion of the increased shipping traffic in the Pacific. Improvements to the Outer Harbor included the construction of the massive Municipal Pier No. 1. Work on the pier began with the filling of the Huntington Concession (also called the “Huntington Fill”) during the spring of 1912. Over 60 acres were in-filled with materials taken from dredging the adjacent channel to a new depth of 35 feet (Marquez and De Turenne 2007). According to the *Los Angeles Times*, this area provided the best opportunity for deep water wharfage at the Port. The Board of Harbor Commissioners Report for 1912–1913 called the construction of Municipal Pier No. 1, “one of the best pieces of wharf construction in the country,” and also noted that, “[t]his will be the finest wharf construction that can be built, and is designed for the deep sea commerce of the great ocean lines that will come through the Panama Canal from Europe, or engage in trans-Pacific trade.” The

1 Harbor Commission believed that timber construction was obsolete and concrete  
2 structures were the wave of the future, especially where oil was involved. This *Los*  
3 *Angeles Times* article compared the Port’s project with existing concrete piers in  
4 other major ports around the world, including those in Hamburg, Germany;  
5 Southampton, England; and Antwerp, Belgium; a clear attempt to position the Port of  
6 Los Angeles in an international perspective, and exemplifying the enthusiasm for  
7 capturing a larger share of the increased world trade resulting from the anticipated  
8 opening of the Panama Canal.

9 The layout of Municipal Pier No. 1 was proposed by Consulting Engineer E. P.  
10 Goodrich of New York and prepared by City Engineer Homer Hamlin and Harbor  
11 Engineer Vincent Thomas. Plans included a 12-foot-high concrete sheet piling  
12 retaining wall (bulkhead). The interior was to be filled with dredged materials and  
13 raised to a height of 16 feet above the low-water level. The area was surrounded by  
14 40 feet of docking space placed on concrete pilings. The dock would include modern  
15 traveling cranes, 16 railroad tracks, and a roadway wide enough to accommodate an  
16 electric railway, as well as provide almost 2 miles of wharfage. The construction  
17 contract, in the amount of \$444,777, was awarded to Snare & Triest in December  
18 1912.

19 Municipal Pier No. 1, located between the Main Channel and East Channel, was  
20 completed in 1914. At that time, the pier was about 2,520 feet long and 650 feet  
21 wide. The pier could be extended an additional 1,400 feet into the harbor if increased  
22 shipping traffic necessitated additional wharfage. A June 20, 1914, *Los Angeles*  
23 *Times* article called Municipal Pier No. 1 “the finest reinforced concrete wharf in the  
24 world.” The article also noted that, “[w]ithin a short time the city will have sufficient  
25 wharves to accommodate a great volume or traffic, and others will be built as rapidly  
26 as they are needed.”

27 Los Angeles Municipal Shed No. 1 (Berths 58–60) , a one-story steel-frame building  
28 measured 1,800 feet long by 100 feet wide, was constructed on site by 1915. The  
29 shed, a one-story steel-frame building, measured 1,800 feet long by 100 feet wide.  
30 City Engineer Homer Hamlin is credited with designing the shed, which was  
31 constructed for, and operated by, the American-Hawaiian Steamship Company.

32 Additional transit sheds and other structures were added to the dock over the next  
33 several years, including Municipal Warehouse No. 1, a massive, six-story concrete  
34 warehouse, which was completed in 1917 (Marquez and De Turenne 2007). See  
35 discussion of Municipal Warehouse No. 1, below. The December 6, 1914, *Los*  
36 *Angeles Times* article, anticipating the construction of Warehouse No. 1, claimed that  
37 the structure would be the “largest west of Chicago,” and noted that together with  
38 adjacent Municipal Shed No.1, “the port is expected to meet all shipping  
39 requirements for the present.”

40 Figure 3.4-1 shows an aerial view of Municipal Pier No. 1 with completed  
41 warehouses and sheds circa 1925.

## **Municipal Warehouse No. 1**

Municipal Warehouse No. 1 is a large, six-story structure containing 500,000 square feet in its 475- by 150-foot rectangular plan. The building was designed in 1915 by Peter Ficker, then an employee of the Harbor Engineers office. (Peter Ficker also designed Municipal Transit Shed No. 1). It was constructed with steel reinforced, poured-in place concrete, and has a flat roof with a short parapet wall with an unornamented cornice. The building is characterized by vertical elements on all elevations, including full-height engaged pilasters, projecting concrete fire-escape stairways, and steel loading bay doors and cast-concrete gargoyle drain spouts at each floor level. The building sits at the southeastern end of Municipal Pier No. 1 adjacent to Berths 59–60, between Signal Street to the west, the Main Ship Channel on the east, and the Outer Harbor to the south. Completed in 1917, Warehouse No.1 served as the Port's only bonded warehouse. The bonded portion of a warehouse was also used for particularly valuable goods. During the era of break-bulk cargo handling, warehousing at the Port terminals was important for efficient commerce, and Warehouse No.1 served a leading role in warehousing at the Port of Los Angeles from 1917 through the 1950s (Jones & Stokes 1999).

In 2004 Municipal Warehouse No. 1 was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. As noted in Jones & Stokes' National Register Nomination form for Municipal Warehouse No. 1, “[t]he process of transshipment dictated the order in which the Harbor Commission funded construction activities: dredging of the ship channel, construction of [Municipal] Pier 1 and associated wharves, transit sheds, and rail lines, and construction of the massive, bonded warehouse. With these facilities in place, the Port of Los Angeles entered into international commerce, and by 1923 had surpassed all the other west coast ports in tonnage and value of cargo” (Jones & Stokes 1999).

## **Berths 57–60 (Transit Sheds)**

The transit shed at Berth 57, a one-story, 93-foot-wide by 500-foot-long shed, was constructed in 1923, immediately north of Municipal Shed No. 1 (transit shed at Berths 58–60).

Plans on file with the Port indicate that a timber wharf extension had been planned along the western edge of the all-concrete pier adjacent to the transit sheds at Berth 57–60 as early as 1924 (Port 1924). However, these plans were abandoned in favor of an all-concrete wharf, which was constructed nearly 14 years later in July, 1938. This effort widened the pier by another 30 feet and provided new trackage for railcars loading and unloading goods at Berths 57–60.

## **Berths 70–71 (Westway/Pan-American Oil Company Pump House)**

As early as 1923, the Pan American Petroleum Company initiated plans to establish an oil loading station along the Main Channel at Municipal Pier No. 1 (Berths 70–71). The existing Westway Terminal Building appears to be the last remaining

K:\v\me\GIS\Projects\POLA\0021\11\mapdoc\Cultural\Figs\_4\_1\_CityDock1\_Circa\_1925.ai\_TZ (08-03-2011)



Municipal Shed  
No.1

Westways Terminal  
(Pan American  
Petroleum Company)

Warehouse No. 1

Source: POLA





1 structure from this important Port development, which included two other small  
2 buildings constructed in a similar Mission Revival architectural style as well as a  
3 large oil tank farm that surrounded the buildings (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008). In late  
4 summer of 1923, the Pan American Petroleum and Transport Company entered into a  
5 30-year lease with the Los Angeles Harbor Commission (LAHC) for 7 acres of Pier  
6 No. 1 to construct a fire-proof oil loading station along the Port's Main Channel  
7 (Berths 70–71). The purpose of the facility was to transport oil for shipment from the  
8 company's refinery at Watson via three oil lines to the Marine Loading Station  
9 located at Berths 70–71.

10 The 1923 Westway Terminal Building is a concrete two-story Mission Revival style  
11 building with a front gabled roof and a parapet flanked by two modern shed roofs.

## 12 **Berth 260**

13 The SCMI facility is currently located at Berth 260 on Terminal Island. The property  
14 consists of a 19,000-square-foot office and research building, a 2,700-square-foot  
15 storage warehouse, and a 2,400-square-foot shop storage. The SCMI office and  
16 research building is a two-story office building with a flat roof, overhanging eaves,  
17 and stucco siding with aluminum frame windows. The warehouse and shop consist  
18 of material from two to three modified steel frame shipping containers. The facility  
19 was found to be non-historic in the Built Environment Evaluation Report of Terminal  
20 Island because they do not meet the minimum age requirement for eligibility for  
21 listing in the federal, state, or local register. (SWCA 2011.)

## 22 **3.4.2.2 Site-Specific Setting**

### 23 **3.4.2.2.1 Cultural Records Search**

#### 24 **Archaeology**

25 ICF cultural resources staff conducted a records search at the South Central Coastal  
26 Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System  
27 located at California State University, Fullerton, on September 29, 2005, which was  
28 updated on January 16, 2008. The records search included a review of all recorded  
29 cultural resources within a 1-mile radius of the proposed project area. In addition, a  
30 review of historic registers was conducted including: California Historic Landmarks  
31 (CHL), NRHP, CRHR, California Points of Historical Interests (PHI) and California  
32 Historic Resources Inventory (HRI), California Place Names, and Los Angeles  
33 Historic-Cultural Monuments.

34 According to the record search, 19 cultural resources studies have been previously  
35 conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the proposed project area; 4 of these studies  
36 were conducted within the proposed project area. The record search indicates that no  
37 known prehistoric or historical archaeological sites are located within the proposed  
38 project area. Two archaeological sites, CA-LAN-145 and CA-LAN-1129H, have  
39 been previously identified within a 0.5-mile radius of the proposed project area.

## Historic Architectural Resources

A record search was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System located at California State University, Fullerton, for the San Pedro Waterfront Project EIS/EIR, which included the proposed project area and its vicinity. The record search included a review of federal, state, and local historic registers. Previous architectural historical resources surveys and inventories in the area were consulted. Another source consulted was *Los Angeles: An Architectural Guide* by David Gebhard and Robert Winter (2003). There are no historical resources, within the proposed project boundary, identified in the guidebook.

The majority of the proposed project area was included in the January 1997 *Phase II Cultural Resources Reconnaissance Survey of 7,500 Acres of Land and Water for the Port of Los Angeles* (Fugro West 1997). The survey was prepared for the LAHD Environmental Management Division by Fugro West, Inc., and it included documentation of historical resources on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) inventory forms (series DPR 523).

The proposed project area was surveyed in the July 2008 *Final Architectural Survey and Evaluation of Signal Street Properties, Port of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California*. The survey was prepared for the LAHD by ICF Jones & Stokes, and it included documentation of historical resources on California Department of Parks and Recreation inventory forms (series DPR 523).

In addition, the proposed project area was resurveyed in the February 2011 *Historic Resources Evaluation Report of Municipal Pier No. 1*. The report was prepared for the LAHD by ESA. The report included a summary of prior historical evaluations at Municipal Pier No. 1 by ICF Jones & Stokes and Fugro West, and evaluated the pier both individually and as a potential historic district. The evaluation found that Municipal Pier No. 1 is eligible for listing in the National Register, CRHR, and as a City of Los Angeles Monument. The pier was documented as a potential district on DPR 523 forms.

The proposed project area was identified as encompassing one architectural property, Municipal Warehouse No. 1, which is listed on the NRHP and the CRHR. Three other buildings were previously determined to be significant in a historical resources survey, transit shed at Berth 57, transit shed at Berths 58–60, and the Westway Terminal Building at Berths 70–71 (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008).

### 3.4.2.2.2 Archival Research

#### Archaeology and Historic Architectural Resources

Extensive archival research was conducted for the San Pedro Waterfront Project (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008). Because the present proposed project area was completely encompassed by the San Pedro Waterfront Project area, the research for that project was used as the basic research information for the proposed Project. Archival

1 research for San Pedro Waterfront included a review of primary and secondary  
2 documents available at the Wilmington and San Pedro Bay Historical Societies and  
3 the Los Angeles Public Library, the photo archives at the Port, regional prehistoric  
4 and ethnographic materials on file at ICF International, and the following:

- 5 ■ Sanborn fire insurance maps (1888, 1891, 1902, 1908, 1921, 1950, 1969)
- 6 ■ Historic topographic maps (1896, 1925, 1944, 1951, 1964)
- 7 ■ LAHD Port annual reports (1918-1920, 1924-1925, 1925-1926, 1926-1927)
- 8 ■ U.S. Coast Survey Map of the California Coast (1859)
- 9 ■ Historic Aerial Photographs (LAPL, LAHD, Wilmington Historical Society)
- 10 ■ General Land Office Plat Maps (1859, 1862, 1867)

11 Archival research demonstrated that the proposed project area was built from dredged  
12 materials in essentially one episode. The surface of City Dock No. 1 was then  
13 developed over the course of the twentieth century by the Port. This makes it  
14 unlikely that any historical archaeological sites (e.g., refuse deposits, earlier building  
15 foundations) are preserved in the proposed project area. The location on artificial fill  
16 precludes the possibility of intact prehistoric archaeological sites. However, several  
17 historical architectural resources are present.

### 18 **3.4.2.2.3 Existing Cultural Resources**

#### 19 **Paleontological Resources**

20 A report prepared for the San Pedro Waterfront Project (Kirby and Demere 2008),  
21 which encompasses the proposed project area, determined that the proposed project  
22 site is underlain by artificial fill. The original shoreline of the harbor lies  
23 approximately 0.2 mile to the west of the proposed project area. Given the  
24 preponderance of fill material, no further paleontological research was necessary for  
25 the proposed project area, and, therefore, no additional research was conducted for  
26 the proposed Project.

#### 27 **Archaeological Resources**

28 The identification of cultural resources in the proposed project area was based on the  
29 results of a record search, and archival and historic map research. The information  
30 generated represents the cultural resources baseline for the impact analysis because  
31 cultural resources information does not change substantially over time. The proposed  
32 project area is located on artificial fill, which would preclude the possibility of intact  
33 prehistoric archaeological sites. At the time of the study, the proposed project area  
34 was paved and developed, precluding survey for historical archaeological resources.

35 According to the record search, no known prehistoric or historical archaeological  
36 sites are located within the proposed project area. The proposed project area was  
37 built from dredged materials and then developed over the course of the twentieth  
38 century. This makes it unlikely that any historical archaeological sites are preserved

1 in the project area. The location of the proposed project area on artificial fill  
2 precludes the possibility of intact prehistoric archaeological sites.

### 3 **Historic Architectural Resources**

4 For the purposes of this Draft EIR, all buildings, structures, objects, landscape  
5 elements, and other features that could be considered historical resources are  
6 evaluated in light of each of the five definitions under CEQA. Each definition is  
7 described in more detail below, along with a listing of those historical resources on,  
8 adjacent to, near, or historically related to the proposed project site that meet any of  
9 the definitions. If a historical resource meets more than one definition, it is listed  
10 only once, under the first applicable definition category.

11 Field reconnaissance surveys of all the buildings in the study area were conducted by  
12 an architectural historian who meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Professional  
13 Qualifications Standards (48 FR 44738-9) on December 10, 2010.

### 14 **State Criteria—Historical Resources per Section 15064.5(a)** 15 **of the CEQA Guidelines**

16 The CEQA historical resources study area includes areas that would be affected by  
17 the proposed Project, which extend well beyond the federal Area of Potential Effects  
18 (APE). The CEQA statute and guidelines provide five basic definitions as to what  
19 may qualify as a historical resource. Specifically, Section 21048.1 of the CEQA  
20 statute (Division 13 of the PRC), in relevant part, provides a description for the first  
21 three of these definitions, as follows:

22 ...an historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for  
23 listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources. Historical resources  
24 included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in subsection (k) of  
25 Section 5020.1, are presumed to be historically or culturally significant for  
26 purposes of this section, unless the preponderance of the evidence demonstrates  
27 that the resource is not historically or culturally significant. The fact that a  
28 resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California  
29 Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical  
30 resources, or not deemed significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (g)  
31 of Section 5024.1 shall not preclude a lead agency from determining whether the  
32 resource may be an historical resource for purposes of this section.

33 To simplify the first three definitions provided in the CEQA statute, a historical  
34 resource is a resource that is:

- 35 ■ listed in the CRHR,
- 36 ■ determined eligible for the CRHR by the State Historical Resources Commission,  
37 or
- 38 ■ included in a local register of historical resources.

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 3) supplements the statute by providing two additional definitions of historical resources, which may be simplified in the following manner. An historical resource is a resource that is:

- identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g), or
- determined by a lead agency to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. Generally, this category includes resources that meet the criteria for listing on the CRHR (PRC Section 5024.1; 14 CCR 4852).

### **Definition 1—Listed in the California Register of Historic Resources**

There are several ways in which a resource can be listed in the CRHR; these are codified under 14 CCR 4851.

- A resource can be listed in the CRHR by the State Historical Resources Commission.
- If a resource is listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, it is automatically listed in the CRHR.
- If a resource is a California State Historical Landmark, from No. 770 onward, it is automatically listed in the CRHR.

Table 3.4-1 identifies the two properties within the APE that are listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP, and therefore are automatically listed in the CRHR.

**Table 3.4-1.** Properties within the APE that Are Listed in or Determined Eligible for Listing in the NRHP and for the CRHR (Meets Definition 1: Listed in the California Register of Historic Resources)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date Status Determined</i>
Municipal Warehouse No. 1	2500 Signal Street	NRHP listed	April 21, 2000

### **Definition 2—Determined Eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources**

There are no historical resources on, adjacent to, or near the proposed project site that are known to have been determined eligible for the CRHR by the State Historical Resources Commission.

### Definition 3—Listed in a Local Register of Historical Resources

There are no historical resources on or adjacent to the proposed project site that are listed in a local register of historical resources; specifically, Historic-Cultural Monuments and Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs).

### Definition 4—Identified as Significant in an Historical Resources Survey

According to Section 15064.5(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, a resource “identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements [set forth in] section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.” The requirements set forth in PRC 5024.1(g) for historical resources surveys determine that a resource identified as significant in an historical resource survey may be listed in the CRHR if the survey meets all of the following criteria:

1. the survey has been or will be included in the State Historical Resources Inventory;
2. the survey and the survey documentation were prepared in accordance with SHPO procedures and requirements;
3. the resource is evaluated and determined by SHPO to have a significance rating of Category 1 to 5 on DPR Form 523; and
4. if the survey is five or more years old at the time of its nomination for inclusion in the CRHR, the survey is updated to identify historical resources that have become eligible or ineligible due to changed circumstances or further documentation and those that have been demolished or altered in a manner that substantially diminishes the significance of the resource.

Table 3.4-2 presents historical resources in the APE that were identified in a survey to be significant.

**Table 3.4-2.** Historical Resources in the APE Determined to Be Significant in a Historical Resources Survey (Meets Definition 4: Identified as Significant in an Historical Resources Survey)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Survey</i>	<i>Statement of Significance</i>
Transit Shed, Berth 57	Berth 57	Fugro West Survey (1997) and IFC Jones & Stokes (2008)	“This building should be regarded as eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion A (events) as one of the earliest extant sheds built during the first period of Port expansion.” The construction of such a huge building on Pier One indicates the importance of commercial activities in the Outer Harbor in the early years of the Port’s development.
Transit Shed, Berths 58–60	Berth 58	Fugro West Survey (1997)	“This building appears to be eligible for individual listing on the NRHP under

Name	Location	Survey	Statement of Significance
		and IFC Jones & Stokes (2008)	Criterion A (events). It was one of the first sheds built during the modern era of the Port of LA, and is the oldest known survivor from this period. It also appears to be eligible under Criterion C (design) for its interesting and ambitious use of neoclassical treatments.”
Potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District	Municipal Pier No. 1, including seven contributors and two non-contributors	Appendix E	With a common function, design, and history in anticipation of the increase in shipping due to the opening of the Panama Canal, Municipal Pier No. 1 and its associated structures appear to meet NRHP Criterion A (Events) individually, and as a potential historic district. Due to the early use of reinforced concrete construction at the Port of Los Angeles, which reflected both the permanence and the importance of the facility, Municipal Pier No. 1, and associated structures also appear to meet NRHP Criterion C (Design), and for its associations with the work of a master; City Engineer Homer Hamlin, who was one of the City of Los Angeles’s foremost engineers. For similar reasons, the potential historic district also appears eligible for the CRHR under Criteria 1 (Events) and 3 (Design), and as a City Monument.

1  
 2 The district evaluation by ESA identified seven contributors to the potential district,  
 3 five of which are located within the APE. They are Municipal Pier No. 1 itself,  
 4 inclusive of the entire 36-acre earth-filled pier plus the concrete pile-supported  
 5 structure along its western edge, Municipal Warehouse No. 1, transit shed at Berths  
 6 58–60, transit shed at Berth 57, and Pan American Petroleum Company Marine  
 7 Loading Station Facility at Berth 70 [Westway Terminal Building]), and two of  
 8 which are outside of the APE (former Pan-Am Terminal Facility at Berth 56  
 9 [California Fish and Game Building] and the former Immigration Station [Canetti’s  
 10 Restaurant at 309 E. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street – now closed]). Non-contributors to the potential  
 11 district included the tank farm and loading docks at Piers 70–72, and the water taxi  
 12 landing on the southwestern corner of the pier.

13 Figure 3.4-2, “APE for Historical Resources,” identifies the APE boundary in  
 14 relationship to the proposed project boundary.

15 **Definition 5—Determined Significant by the Lead Agency**

16 The fifth and final category of historical resources covers those that are determined  
 17 significant by a lead agency. This usually occurs during the CEQA compliance  
 18 process, such as the preparation of this Draft EIR. According to Section  
 19 15064.5(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, “Any object, building, structure, site, area,  
 20 place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically

1 significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic,  
 2 agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California  
 3 may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency's  
 4 determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.  
 5 Generally, a resource is considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant"  
 6 if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR" (PRC SS5024.1; 14 CCR  
 7 4852).

8 As shown in Table 3.4-3, one historical resource identified in a survey was  
 9 determined to be significant by the lead agency.

10 **Table 3.4-3.** Historical Resources in the APE Determined to Be Significant by the Lead Agency (Meets  
 11 Definition 5: Determined Significant by the Lead Agency)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Survey</i>	<i>Statement of Significance</i>
Westway/Pan-American Oil Company Pump House.	Berth 70	Fugro West Survey (1997) and IFC Jones & Stokes (2008)	Built on Pier No. 1 at Berths 70–71, the Pump House is potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A and the CRHR under Criterion 1 for its contribution to the broad patterns of local history through its association with the Pan-American Oil Company. It is also eligible under Criterion B and CRHR Criterion 2 for its association with Los Angeles oil magnate Edward J. Doheny, who formed a consortium that constructed the tanks, wharves, and refineries that by 1922 made the Los Angeles Harbor the world's leading oil shipment point. The original large diameter tanks were replaced by smaller diameter tanks. Because of its late Mission Revival architectural style applied to an industrial building, it is eligible for the CRHR under Criterion 3.

12

### 13 3.4.3 Applicable Regulations

14 The proposed project area contains several historically significant structures, and  
 15 several federal, state, and local regulations apply to the proposed Project including  
 16 the Secretary of Interior Standards and NHPA. In addition, the proposed Project  
 17 would include in-water work related to replacement piles and water intake systems.  
 18 In-water work in the bay and landside facilities related to the in-water work  
 19 (including landside construction within 100 feet of the water work) would be under  
 20 the jurisdiction of the USACE. Compliance and coordination with federal programs  
 21 such as the NRHP and consultation requirements with SHPO (Section 106) would be  
 22 required as a separate requirement from this Draft EIR and the CEQA process.





K:\Irvine\GIS\Projects\POLA\00211\_11\mapdoc\Cultural\Fig\_4\_2\_APE\_forHistoricalStructures.mxd 5/8/2012 25119



**Figure 3.4-2**  
**APE for Historical Structures**  
**City Dock No. 1 Marine Research Center Project**



## 3.4.3.1 Federal

### 3.4.3.1.1 Historic Architectural Resources

#### Secretary of Interior Standards

The Secretary of Interior Standards are guidelines for the treatment of historic structures, and, while compliance is not mandatory, they are intended to promote responsible preservation practices intended to protect cultural resources. There are four treatment approaches, which include Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. The first treatment, Preservation, places a high premium on the retention of all historic fabric through conservation, maintenance, and repair. It reflects a building's continuum over time, through successive occupancies, and the respectful changes and alterations that are made. Rehabilitation, the second treatment, emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but more latitude is provided for replacement because it is assumed the property is more deteriorated prior to work. (Both Preservation and Rehabilitation standards focus attention on the preservation of those materials, features, finishes, spaces, and spatial relationships that, together, give a property its historic character.) Restoration, the third treatment, focuses on the retention of materials from the most significant time in a property's history, while permitting the removal of materials from other periods. Reconstruction, the fourth treatment, establishes limited opportunities to re-create a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object in all new materials.

#### National Historic Preservation Act

The NHPA of 1966, as amended, is the primary set of federal laws governing projects that may affect cultural resources. Section 106 of the NHPA requires that all federal agencies review and evaluate how their actions or undertakings may affect historic properties, though it only applies to the activities undertaken by federal agencies. Historic properties may include those that are already listed on the NRHP or those that are eligible but not yet listed. The regulations implementing Section 106 are codified at 36 CFR 800 (2001). The Section 106 review process involves four steps:

- Initiate the Section 106 process by establishing the undertaking, developing a plan for public involvement, and identifying other consulting parties.
- Identify historic properties by determining the scope of efforts, identifying cultural resources, and evaluating their eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP.
- Assess adverse effects by applying the criteria of adverse effects to historic properties (resources that are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP).
- Resolve adverse effects by consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer and other consulting agencies, including the Advisory Council if necessary, to develop an agreement that addresses the treatment of historic properties.

1 To determine whether an undertaking may affect NRHP-eligible properties, cultural  
2 resources (including archaeological, historical, and architectural properties) must be  
3 inventoried and evaluated for eligibility to be listed on the NRHP. Criteria considers  
4 whether the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology,  
5 engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects  
6 that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling,  
7 and association; the resource must also meet one of the following:

- 8 A. Be associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad  
9 patterns of our history (Criterion A).
- 10 B. Be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (Criterion B).
- 11 C. Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction,  
12 or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that  
13 represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack  
14 individual distinction (Criterion C).
- 15 D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or  
16 history (Criterion D).

## 17 **3.4.3.2 State**

### 18 **3.4.3.2.1 Archaeological Resources**

19 CEQA Guidelines define a significant cultural resource as “a resource listed in or  
20 eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources” (PRC Section  
21 5024.1). A resource may be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR if it meets any one of  
22 the following criteria:

- 23 1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad  
24 patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.
- 25 2. It is associated with the lives of important historical figures.
- 26 3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of  
27 construction, represents the work of an important creative individual, or  
28 possesses high artistic value.
- 29 4. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, important prehistoric or historic  
30 information.

31 If an archaeological resource does not fall within the definition of an historical  
32 resource, but does meet the definition of a *unique archaeological resource* (PRC  
33 21083.2), then the site must be treated in accordance with the special provisions for  
34 such resources. An archaeological resource will be *unique* if it:

- 35 ■ contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions  
36 and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
- 37 ■ has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best  
38 available example of its type; or

- 1                   ■ is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or  
2                   historic event or person.

3                   Should an archaeological resource be determined potentially eligible for listing in the  
4                   CRHR based on one or more of the criteria, the integrity of the resource then comes  
5                   into question. For archaeological resources, integrity is most commonly defined as  
6                   the ability to address important research questions outlined in a formal research  
7                   design. For prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, integrity of location,  
8                   materials, and association are generally most crucial. To address important research  
9                   topics, archaeological deposits usually must be in their original location, retain  
10                  depositional integrity, contain adequate quantities and types of materials in suitable  
11                  condition to address important research topics, and have a clear association.  
12                  Associations may be defined at different social scales (household or specific activity,  
13                  region, or even city) and across various temporal spans (brief or longer term).  
14                  Cultural sites that have been affected by ground-disturbing activities such as grazing,  
15                  off-road vehicle use, trenching, and vandalism often lack the integrity to answer  
16                  important questions. This is because spatial or depositional relationships have been  
17                  lost, deposits or sites from widely different periods and associations have been  
18                  mixed, or the contents of the deposits have been skewed by selective removal of  
19                  materials.

20                  Even without a formal determination of significance and nomination for listing in the  
21                  CRHR, the lead agency can determine that a resource is potentially eligible for such  
22                  listing to assist in determining whether a significant impact would occur. The fact  
23                  that a resource is not listed in the CRHR, or has not been determined eligible for such  
24                  listing, and is not included in a local register of historic resources does not preclude  
25                  an agency from determining that a resource may be a historical resource for the  
26                  purposes of CEQA however it must be based upon substantial evidence in light of the  
27                  whole record per PRC section 15064.5(3).

### 28    **3.4.3.2.2    Native American and Other Human Remains**

29                  The disposition of Native American burials and other human remains except in a  
30                  dedicated cemetery are governed by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and  
31                  Safety Code, and PRC Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98, and falls within the jurisdiction  
32                  of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Section 7052 of the Health  
33                  and Safety Code establishes a felony penalty for mutilating, disinterring, or otherwise  
34                  disturbing human remains, except by relatives. This includes non-Native American  
35                  human remains and human remains in non-archaeological contexts.

36                  Penal Code Section 622.5 provides misdemeanor penalties for injuring or destroying  
37                  objects of historical or archaeological interest located on public or private lands, but  
38                  specifically excludes the landowner. PRC Section 5097.5 defines as a misdemeanor  
39                  the unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, or historical, resources  
40                  located on public lands.

### 3.4.3.2.3 Paleontological Resources

For purposes of CEQA, paleontological resources are treated as cultural resources. The CEQA Environmental Checklist (CEQA Guidelines Appendix G), under the Cultural Resources heading, includes the question would the project “[d]irectly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.” PRC Section 5097.5 prohibits excavation or removal of any “vertebrate paleontological site or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands.” PRC Section 30244 requires reasonable mitigation of adverse impacts on paleontological resources from development on public land. Penal Code Section 623 spells out regulations for the protection of caves, including their natural, cultural, and paleontological contents. It specifies that no “material” (including all or any part of any paleontological item) be removed from any natural geologically formed cavity or cave.

### 3.4.3.2.4 Historic Architectural Resources

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a.3) and PRC Section 21084.1 define the criteria used to determine the significance of cultural resources, characterized as “historic resources” as follows:

Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. (PRC SS5024.1; 14 CCR 4852.)

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5(b) [revised October 26, 1998]) state that “a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” To this end, the Guidelines list the following definitions:

1. Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means 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.
2. The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:
  - a. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
  - b. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical

1 resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its  
2 identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of  
3 section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency  
4 reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of  
5 evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

- 6 c. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical  
7 characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance  
8 and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of  
9 Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

10 PRC Section 21083.2(j) states that an historical resource is a resource listed in, or is  
11 determined to be eligible for listing in, the CRHR, or listed in a local register of  
12 historical resources, or deemed significant pursuant to criteria identified in PRC  
13 Section 5024.1(g) defined above, unless the preponderance of the evidence  
14 demonstrates that the resource is not historically or culturally significant. The fact  
15 that a resource is not listed in, or is determined not to be eligible for listing in, the  
16 CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources, or not deemed  
17 significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (g) of Section 5024.1 does not  
18 preclude a lead agency from determining whether the resource may be an historical  
19 resource. CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 guide the evaluation of  
20 impacts on prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. Section 15064.5(c)  
21 provides that, to the extent an archaeological resource is also a historical resource, the  
22 provisions regarding historical resources apply. These provisions endorse the first set  
23 of standardized mitigation measures for historic resources by providing that projects  
24 following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic  
25 Properties be considered as mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Specifically,  
26 CEQA Guidelines (Section 15064.5(b)(3) states that “Generally, a project that  
27 follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Buildings for  
28 Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Weeks and Grimmer, 1995), shall be considered  
29 mitigated to a level of less-than-significant impact on the historical resources.”

### 30 **3.4.3.3 Regional and Local**

#### 31 **3.4.3.3.1 Archaeological Resources**

32 City guidelines for the protection of archaeological resources are set forth in Section  
33 3 of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles Conservation Element, which, in  
34 addition to compliance with CEQA, requires the identification and protection of  
35 archaeological sites and artifacts as a part of local development permit processing.  
36 Specifically, Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 91.106.4.5 states the following:

37 The building department shall not issue a permit to demolish, alter or remove a  
38 building or structure of historical, archaeological or architectural consequence if  
39 such building or structure has been officially designated, or has been determined  
40 by state or federal action to be eligible for designation, on the National Register of  
41 Historic Places, or has been included on the City of Los Angeles list of historic  
42 cultural monuments, without the department having first determined whether the  
43 demolition, alteration or removal may result in the loss of or serious damage to a  
44 significant historical or cultural asset. If the department determines that such loss

1 or damage may occur, the applicant shall file an application and pay all fees for the  
2 California Environmental Quality Act Initial Study and Check List, as specified in  
3 Section 19.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. If the Initial Study and Check  
4 List identifies the historical or cultural asset as significant, the permit shall not be  
5 issued without the department first finding that specific economic, social or other  
6 considerations make infeasible the preservation of the building or structure.

### 7 **3.4.3.3.2 Ethnographic Resources**

8 Relative to ethnographic resources, the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (2006) states:  
9 “Consider compliance with guidelines and regulations such as the California Public  
10 Resources Code.” No specific local regulations mandating the protection of  
11 ethnographic resources exist.

### 12 **3.4.3.3.3 Paleontological Resources**

13 City guidelines for the protection of paleontological resources are specified in  
14 Section 3 of the City of Los Angeles General Plan Conservation Element. The policy  
15 requires that the City’s paleontological resources be protected for research and/or  
16 educational purposes. It mandates the identification and protection of significant  
17 paleontological sites and/or resources known to exist or that are identified during  
18 land development, demolition, or property modification activities.

### 19 **3.4.3.3.4 Historic Architectural Resources**

20 City guidelines for the protection of historic architectural resources are also set forth  
21 in Section 3 of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles Conservation Element  
22 (see Section 3.4.3.2.1, “Archaeological Resources,” above for details).

23 Five types of historic protection designations apply in the City: (1) Historic-Cultural  
24 Monument designation by the City's Cultural Heritage Commission and approved by  
25 the City Council; (2) placement on the California Register of Historical Resources or  
26 (3) the National Register of Historic Places (1980 National Historic Preservation  
27 Act); (4) designation by the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) as being of  
28 cultural or historical significance within a designated redevelopment area; and (5)  
29 classification by the City Council (recommended by the planning commission) as an  
30 HPOZ. These designations help protect structures and support rehabilitation fund  
31 requests (Appendix E).

32 The City Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) was established by ordinance in 1962  
33 to protect and/or identify architectural, historical, and cultural buildings; and  
34 structures and sites of importance in the City's history and/or cultural heritage. The  
35 CHC has designated over 700 sites as Historic-Cultural Monuments, including  
36 historic buildings, corridors (tree-lined streets), and geographic areas. Historical  
37 resources may also include resources listed in the State Historic Resources Inventory  
38 as significant at the local level or higher, and those evaluated as potentially  
39 significant in a survey or other professional evaluation (Appendix E). The HPOZ  
40 provision of the zone code, Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.20.3,  
41 was adopted in 1979, and was amended in 2001. It contains procedures for



1 designation and protection of areas that have structures, natural features, or sites of  
2 historic, architectural, cultural, or aesthetic significance. HPOZ areas contain  
3 significant examples of architectural styles characteristic of different periods in the  
4 City's history. No area within the Port has been designated as part of an HPOZ  
5 (Appendix E).

6 The significance of an historical resource is also based on (1) whether the site has  
7 been coded by the Department of Building and Safety with a Zoning Instruction  
8 number in the 145 series (which indicates prior identification of the property as  
9 historic); (2) whether the resource has been classified as historic in an historical  
10 resources survey conducted as part of the updating of the Community Plan, the  
11 adoption of a redevelopment area, or other planning project; (3) whether the resource  
12 is subject to other federal, state, or local preservation guidelines; (4) whether the  
13 resource has a known association with an architect, master builder, or person or event  
14 important in history such that the resource may be of exceptional importance; and (5)  
15 whether the resource is over 50 years old and a substantially intact example of an  
16 architectural style significant in Los Angeles. (City of Los Angeles 2006.)

### 17 **City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument Designation**

18 In the City of Los Angeles, resources may be designated as Historic-Cultural  
19 Monuments under Sections 22.120, et seq., of the LAMC. An historical or cultural  
20 monument is defined as:

21 "[A]ny site (including significant trees or other plant life located thereon), building  
22 or structure of particular historic or cultural significance to the City of Los  
23 Angeles, such as historic structures or sites in which the broad cultural, political,  
24 economic or social history of the nation, state or community is reflected or  
25 exemplified, or which are identified with historic personages or with important  
26 events in the main currents of national, state or local history, or which embody the  
27 distinguishing characteristics of an architectural-type specimen, inherently  
28 valuable for a study of a period style or method of construction, or a notable work  
29 of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual genius influenced his  
30 age."

### 31 **City of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Overlay Zones**

32 HPOZs are essentially locally designated historic districts or groupings of historical  
33 resources. Under the HPOZ ordinance (LAMC Section 12.20.3), to be significant,  
34 structures, natural features, or sites within the involved area or the area as a whole  
35 must meet one or more of the following criteria:

- 36 a. have substantial value as part of the development, heritage or cultural  
37 characteristics of, or is associated with the life of a person important in the  
38 history of the city, state, or nation;
- 39 b. are associated with an event that has made a substantial contribution to the broad  
40 patterns of our history;
- 41 c. are constructed in a distinctive architectural style characteristic of an era of  
42 history;

- 1 d. embody those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or  
2 engineering specimen;
- 3 e. are the work of an architect or designer who has substantially influenced the  
4 development of the City;
- 5 f. contain elements of design, details, materials or craftsmanship which represent an  
6 important innovation;
- 7 g. are part of or related to a square, park or other distinctive area and should be  
8 developed or preserved according to a plan based on a historic, cultural,  
9 architectural or aesthetic motif;
- 10 h. owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represent an  
11 established feature of the neighborhood, community or City; or
- 12 i. retaining the structure would help preserve and protect an historic place or area  
13 of historic interest in the City.

## 14 **3.4.4 Impact Analysis**

### 15 **3.4.4.1 Methodology**

16 Impacts on cultural resources from the proposed Project were evaluated by  
17 determining whether demolition or ground disturbance activities would affect areas  
18 that contain or could contain any archaeological or historical sites listed in or eligible  
19 for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, that are designated as a City of Los Angeles  
20 Historic-Cultural Monument or that are included within a City of Los Angeles  
21 HPOZ, or that are otherwise considered a unique or important archaeological  
22 resource under CEQA (City of Los Angeles 2006). A project that follows the  
23 Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with*  
24 *Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic*  
25 *Buildings* or the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and*  
26 *Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (Secretary's Standards; Weeks and  
27 Grimmer 1995) would be considered as mitigated to a level of less than significant.  
28 Impacts on paleontological resources were evaluated similar to buried archaeological  
29 resources, that is, by determining whether ground disturbance activities would affect  
30 areas that contain or could contain any a unique paleontological resource or site or  
31 unique geologic feature.

32 Furthermore, the impact analysis assumed that the proposed Project would comply  
33 with all applicable local, state, and federal laws, including those mentioned in the  
34 following paragraphs.

35 The disposition of Native American burials is governed by Section 7050.5 of the  
36 California Health and Safety Code, and PRC Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98, and falls  
37 within the jurisdiction of the NAHC. Section 7052 of the Health and Safety Code  
38 establishes a felony penalty for mutilating, disinterring, or otherwise disturbing  
39 human remains, except by relatives.

1 Penal Code Section 622.5 provides misdemeanor penalties for injuring or destroying  
2 objects of historical or archaeological interest located on public or private lands, but  
3 specifically excludes the landowner. PRC Section 5097.5 defines as a misdemeanor  
4 the unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological or historical resources  
5 located on public lands.

6 If human remains are discovered or recognized during site preparation, grading, or  
7 construction, there will be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any  
8 nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the County  
9 coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of  
10 death is required. If the remains are determined by the coroner to be of Native  
11 American origin, the descendants will be identified and notified through the Native  
12 American Heritage Commission.

13 If the remains are of Native American origin:

- 14 a. the descendants of the deceased Native Americans will make a recommendation  
15 to the person responsible for the excavation work as to the means of treating or  
16 disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated  
17 grave goods, as provided in PRC Section 5097.98. Upon discovery of human  
18 remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity is not damaged  
19 or disturbed until specific conditions are met through discussions with the  
20 descendants regarding their preferences for treatment (PRC Section 5097.98 as  
21 amended); or
- 22 b. if the NAHC is unable to identify a descendant, or the descendant fails to respond  
23 within 48 hours after being notified by the commission, the landowner is required  
24 to reinter the human remains and to protect the site where the remains are  
25 reinterred from further and future disturbance.

26 According to the California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at  
27 one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native  
28 American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052). Section 7050.5 requires that  
29 excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner  
30 can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If the remains  
31 are determined to be Native American, the coroner will contact the California Native  
32 American Heritage Commission.

### 33 3.4.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

34 The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles 2006) provides specific  
35 thresholds of significance to address potential impacts on cultural resources resulting  
36 from implementation of a project. The proposed Project would have a significant  
37 impact on cultural resources if it would:

38 **CR-1:** Disturb, damage, or degrade a known prehistoric and/or historical  
39 archaeological resource resulting in a reduction of its integrity or significance as an  
40 important resource

1 **CR-2:** Disturb, damage, or degrade an unknown prehistoric and/or historical  
2 archaeological resource resulting in a reduction of its integrity or significance as an  
3 important resource

4 **CR-3:** Disturb, damage, or degrade unknown human remains.

5 **CR-4:** Result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a paleontological  
6 resource of regional or statewide significance.

7 **CR-5:** Result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical  
8 resource, involving demolition, relocation, conversion, rehabilitation, alteration, or  
9 other construction that reduces the integrity or significance of important resources on  
10 the site or in the vicinity.

### 11 **3.4.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation**

12 **Impact CR-1: The proposed Project would not disturb,**  
13 **damage, or degrade a known prehistoric and/or historical**  
14 **archaeological resource resulting in a reduction of its**  
15 **integrity or significance as an important resource.**

16 As stated under Section 3.4.2.2.2, “Archival Research,” a comprehensive records  
17 search and review of relevant archival documents indicate that there are no known  
18 prehistoric or historical archeological resources within the proposed project area.  
19 Consequently, there is no potential for the proposed Project to impact known  
20 archaeological resources.

#### 21 **Impact Determination**

22 Because there are no known prehistoric or historical archeological resources in the  
23 proposed project area, the proposed Project would have no impact on known  
24 prehistoric or historical archeological resources.

#### 25 **Mitigation Measures**

26 No mitigation is required.

#### 27 **Residual Impacts**

28 No impacts would occur.

29 **Impact CR-2: The proposed Project would not disturb,**  
30 **damage, or degrade an unknown prehistoric and/or**  
31 **historical archaeological resource resulting in a reduction of**  
32 **its integrity or significance as an important resource.**

33 The proposed project area is located on artificial land, built with fill dredged from the  
34 harbor. The proposed project area was built from dredged materials in essentially  
35 one episode during 1912–1914, and then the artificial land surface was developed

1 over the course of the twentieth century. This precludes the possibility of intact  
2 prehistoric archaeological sites. However, there is a remote possibility that displaced  
3 prehistoric material may be present in the artificial fill, having been dredged up from  
4 the shallow harbor floor. Nevertheless, because this material is not in situ, it would  
5 not be a significant cultural resource.

6 Construction of City Dock No. 1 on artificial fill followed by the construction of  
7 buildings that remain in place to the present, makes it unlikely that any historical  
8 archaeological sites (e.g., refuse deposits, earlier building foundations) are preserved  
9 in the proposed project area. However, there is a slight possibility that the remains of  
10 previous historical development may be buried within the artificial fill of the  
11 proposed project site. Excavation and trenching, as well as other ground-disturbing  
12 actions, have the potential to damage or destroy these previously unidentified,  
13 possibly significant archeological resources.

14 Construction activities at Berth 260 near Fish Harbor would only include light  
15 surface grading of the heavily disturbed site and demolition of the existing structures.  
16 There would not be any new construction. Therefore, construction activities at Berth  
17 260 would not encounter unknown prehistoric or historical archaeological resources.

## 18 **Impact Determination**

19 Disturbance of any deposits that have the potential to provide data important in  
20 history regarding Port history and development, class and ethnicity, urban geography,  
21 and labor relations would be considered significant. However, existing laws and  
22 regulations (PRC Section 15064.5 (f) and PRC 21082) would ensure any discovery of  
23 archaeological materials would not result in a significant impact. Therefore, impacts  
24 related to the possible disturbance, damage, or degradation of cultural resources  
25 would be less than significant.

26 In the event that any artifact or an unusual amount of bone, shell, or nonnative stone  
27 is encountered during construction, LAHD would require work to stop immediately  
28 and relocated to another area. The contractor would stop construction within 100 feet  
29 of the exposed resource until a qualified archaeologist can be retained by LAHD to  
30 evaluate the find (see 36 CFR 800.11.1 and 14 CCR 15064.5(f)). Examples of such  
31 cultural materials might include ground stone tools such as mortars, bowls, pestles,  
32 and manos; chipped stone tools such as projectile points or choppers; flakes of stone  
33 not consistent with the immediate geology such as obsidian or fused shale; historic  
34 trash pits containing bottles and/or ceramics; or structural remains. If the resources  
35 are found to be significant, they would be avoided or treated consistent with SHPO  
36 Guidelines. As a standard practice, all construction equipment operators would  
37 attend a preconstruction meeting presented by a professional archaeologist retained  
38 by LAHD that will review types of cultural resources and artifacts that would be  
39 considered potentially significant, to ensure operator recognition of these materials  
40 during construction.

## 41 **Mitigation Measures**

42 No mitigation is required.

1                   **Residual Impacts**

2                   Impacts would be less than significant.

3                   **Impact CR-3: The proposed Project would not disturb,**  
4                   **damage, or degrade unknown human remains.**

5                   The results of the proposed project technical analysis indicates a low potential to  
6                   encounter buried prehistoric or historic period human remains within the proposed  
7                   project area. The proposed project area is located on artificial land, which precludes  
8                   the possibility of intact prehistoric burials. Also, no known historic period burials or  
9                   cemeteries have been documented within the proposed project area.

10                  However, there is a remote possibility that displaced prehistoric human remains may  
11                  be present in the artificial fill, having been dredged up from the shallow harbor floor.  
12                  There is also a remote possibility that human remains could have been disposed of in  
13                  the artificial fill during the historical period. Excavation and trenching, as well as  
14                  other ground-disturbing actions, have the potential to damage or destroy previously  
15                  unidentified human remains within the proposed project area.

16                  Construction activities at Berth 260 near Fish Harbor would only include light  
17                  surface grading of the heavily disturbed site and demolition of the existing structures.  
18                  There would not be any new construction. Therefore, construction activities at Berth  
19                  260 would not have the potential to encounter buried human remains.

20                  In the event human remains are discovered, LAHD would be required to comply with  
21                  state law which states that there would be no further excavation or disturbance of the  
22                  area or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the  
23                  coroner is contacted and the appropriate steps taken pursuant to Health and Safety  
24                  Code Section 7050.5 and PRC Section 5097.98. If the coroner determines the  
25                  remains to be Native American, the coroner would contact the NAHC within 24  
26                  hours. If Native American human remains are discovered during proposed project  
27                  construction, it would be necessary to comply with state laws relating to the  
28                  disposition of Native American burials that are under the jurisdiction of the NAHC  
29                  (PRC Section 5097).

30                  **Impact Determination**

31                  Although the possibility of encountering buried human remains is extremely low, the  
32                  possibility cannot be ruled out. However, existing laws and regulations would ensure  
33                  any discovery of human remains would not result in a significant impact. Therefore,  
34                  impacts related to the possible disturbance, damage, or degradation of human remains  
35                  would be less than significant.

36                  **Mitigation Measures**

37                  No mitigation is required.

1                   **Residual Impacts**

2                   Impacts would be less than significant.

3                   **Impact CR-4: The proposed Project would not result in the**  
4                   **permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a paleontological**  
5                   **resource of regional or statewide significance.**

6                   The proposed project area is located on artificial land, built with fill dredged from the  
7                   harbor. A report prepared for the San Pedro Waterfront Project (Kirby and Demere  
8                   2008), which encompasses the proposed project area, determined that the proposed  
9                   project site is underlain by artificial fill. The original shoreline of the harbor lies  
10                  approximately 0.2 mile to the west of the proposed project area. This precludes the  
11                  possibility of intact fossils or paleontological deposits being found in the proposed  
12                  project area. However, there is a remote possibility that displaced paleontological  
13                  materials or fossils material may be present in the artificial fill, having been dredged  
14                  up from the shallow harbor floor. Any organic remains encountered in the artificial  
15                  fill will have lost their original stratigraphic and geologic context due to the disturbed  
16                  nature of artificial fill materials. Any fossils found in this material are not in situ, and  
17                  would not be a significant paleontological resource under CEQA.

18                  Excavation into undisturbed geologic deposits underlying the proposed project area,  
19                  which include Quaternary alluvium and Pleistocene-age offshore marine deposits of  
20                  San Pedro Sand, would potentially impact fossil resources. If construction of the  
21                  proposed Project would reach such depths as to excavate into intact sediments  
22                  underlying the proposed project site, this could result in significant impacts because  
23                  of the potential to damage or destroy significant nonrenewable fossil resources. .  
24                  However, no proposed project-related construction is planned that would reach to  
25                  depths that would impact intact geological formations underlying the proposed  
26                  project site.

27                  Construction activities at Berth 260 near Fish Harbor would only include light  
28                  surface grading of the heavily disturbed site and demolition of the existing structures.  
29                  There would not be any new construction. Therefore, there would not be a potential  
30                  to impact any possible paleontological resources buried at Berth 260.

31                  **Impact Determination**

32                  Because there are no paleontological resources in the proposed project area, the  
33                  project would have no impact on these resources. No proposed project-related  
34                  construction is planned that would reach to depths that would impact intact  
35                  geological formations underlying the proposed project area. Therefore, the proposed  
36                  Project would have no impacts on paleontological resources.

37                  **Mitigation Measures**

38                  No mitigation is required.

## 1 Residual Impacts

2 No impacts would occur.

3 **Impact CR-5: The proposed Project would result in a**  
4 **substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical**  
5 **resource, involving demolition, relocation, conversion,**  
6 **rehabilitation, alteration, or other construction that reduces**  
7 **the integrity or significance of important resources on the**  
8 **site or in the vicinity.**

9 Given the historical significance of the proposed project site and its eligibility for  
10 listing in the CRHR as a Historic District (see Appendix E for the full technical  
11 report), modifications to the existing transit sheds and associated structures that  
12 contribute to the potential Historic District would be considered significant impacts if  
13 not modified in accordance with the Secretary's Standards. Most modifications to  
14 the contributing existing buildings and structures would be done in accordance with  
15 these standards; however, some would not. The following describes the impacts  
16 related to each of the listed or listing-eligible resources:

### 17 **Properties in the APE Listed in or Determined Eligible for Listing in the** 18 **California Register of Historic Resources**

#### 19 *Municipal Warehouse No. 1*

20 The proposed Project includes a new public pile-supported promenade along the  
21 eastern side of City Dock No. 1. This new walkway would provide public access to  
22 the waterfront and would have minimal effect on the historic setting of the  
23 warehouse. No substantial adverse change in the significance of this structure would  
24 occur because the building's historic integrity would remain intact after completion  
25 of this portion of the proposed Project.

26 A 50,000-square-foot, 2-story building for NOAA that would include office and  
27 laboratory space would be constructed in the vicinity of Municipal Warehouse No. 1.  
28 As presented in the project description, the NOAA building would be designed in  
29 accordance with the Secretary's Standards, including plan review by a qualified  
30 consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary's Standards.

31 The 2-story building would be subordinate to the 6-story Municipal Warehouse No. 1  
32 primary historical resource. The building design would reference the adjacent  
33 building's maritime industrial character, materials, and massing. As an example,  
34 appropriate design cues would be taken from the adjacent Municipal Warehouse No.  
35 1 building such as, such as a rectilinear form with flat roof or monitor roof shapes,  
36 exposed exterior walls painted a light color, expressed pilasters, repetitively punched  
37 openings, and symmetrically arranged elevation. The use of overly elaborate  
38 architectural styles that purposely depart from the simple, maritime industrial  
39 character of the area would be avoided, as would large amounts of landscaping,  
40 because landscaping is not characteristic of the area. As such, this proposed project



1 element would be generally consistent with the guidance provided by the Secretary's  
2 Standards.

3 *Westway Terminal/Pan American Oil Co. Pump House*

4 The proposed Project includes the redevelopment of the 14.3-acre Westway Liquid  
5 Bulk Marine Terminal at Berths 70–71. A 50,000-square-foot facility for NOAA that  
6 would include office and laboratory space would be developed on the remediated  
7 Berth 70–71 site. The historic Westway Terminal Building (also known as the Pan-  
8 American Oil Company Pump House) would be adaptively reused by a future  
9 occupant. As presented in the project description, reuse would be completed in a  
10 manner consistent with the Secretary's Standards, including, plan review by a  
11 qualified consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary's  
12 Standards.

13 The Mission Revival style character of the Westway Terminal Building would be  
14 retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features  
15 and spaces that characterize this building, stucco wall cladding, or stepped Mission  
16 parapet, would be avoided.

17 Deteriorated historic features of the Westway Terminal Building would be repaired  
18 rather than replaced, to the extent feasible. Where the severity of deterioration  
19 requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature would match the old in  
20 design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials.  
21 Replacement of missing features would be substantiated by documentary, physical,  
22 or pictorial evidence, to the extent available. As such, this proposed project element  
23 would be generally consistent with the guidance provided by the Secretary's  
24 Standards.

25 The proposed waterfront promenade would wrap around the existing dock area near  
26 the Westway Terminal Building. This dock area has already been altered, and the  
27 building that remains would not be demolished or altered. Therefore, no significant  
28 impact resulting from this proposed project element is anticipated.

29 Redevelopment of Berths 70–71 would also involve development of an 80,000-  
30 square-foot, steel-reinforced concrete wave tank on the land side, which would be  
31 enclosed within its own five-story 100,000-square-foot building. The building would  
32 be approximately 50 feet tall.

33 Construction of the wave tank could have an indirect impact on the historic setting of  
34 the Westway Terminal Building, as well as the transit shed at Berth 57 (described  
35 below), given its adjacency to both resources and its large height and mass relative to  
36 those smaller historic resources. The wave tank building would be the second largest  
37 structure on the pier with one less story than the tallest structure (Municipal  
38 Warehouse No. 1) but more visually prominent than the other historic resources  
39 located nearby. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards provide guidance on new  
40 construction adjacent to historic resources. Standard #9 states that, "new additions,  
41 exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials,  
42 features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall  
43 be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials,

1 features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the  
2 property and its environment.” The Secretary’s Standards recommend that “adjacent  
3 new construction be compatible with the historic character of the site and which  
4 preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the  
5 landscape.” Finally, the Standards also state that “introducing new construction onto  
6 the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design,  
7 materials, color, and texture, or which destroys historic relationships on the site...” is  
8 not recommended. This guidance is typically understood to mean that new  
9 construction adjacent to historic resources should be subordinate to those resources,  
10 allowing them to retain their visual prominence within their historic setting. The  
11 construction of this large, new facility may alter in an adverse manner the integrity of  
12 setting due to the potentially incompatible height, scale, and mass of the new  
13 structure in relation to nearby historic structures, such as the Westway Terminal  
14 Building and the transit shed at Berth 57. Moreover, because the wave tank would  
15 alter the setting of contributing resources to the potential Municipal Pier No. 1  
16 Historic District, this portion of the proposed Project would also result in a  
17 significant adverse impact on the district as a historic resource. Standard # 10 states  
18 that “new additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in  
19 such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the  
20 historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.” Given the wave tank’s  
21 relatively large size and scale compared to adjacent historic resources and its  
22 permanent construction type, this proposed project element would not be consistent  
23 with the guidance provided by the Secretary’s Standards and, as such, may result in  
24 an adverse impact.

25 The building would incorporate materials and design that would be compatible with  
26 the historic materials, features, of existing historic structures, and its design would  
27 comply with the Secretary’s Standards to the extent feasible within the context of its  
28 needed size. For example, the design of the wave tank would reference motifs,  
29 massing, and materials of other large-scale building in the immediate vicinity to help  
30 maintain the industrial maritime character of the district. However, due the wave  
31 tank building’s size and massing, the impact of this new structure on the historic  
32 setting of individually significant buildings and contributors to the potential  
33 Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District could not be reduced to a less-than-significant  
34 level, even with incorporation of mitigation (see discussion below of Mitigation  
35 Measure MM CR-1). As such, the impact of this portion of the proposed Project  
36 would be significant and unavoidable.

### 37 **Project Effects on Historic Properties in the APE Determined to be** 38 **Significant in Previous Historical Resources Surveys**

#### 39 *Transit Shed at Berth 57*

40 Phase I of the proposed Project would result in a number of changes to transit shed at  
41 Berth 57 for adaptive reuse by SCMI. Upon completion of the wharf improvements  
42 (see discussion below under Wharf Improvements and Associated Ground  
43 Improvements), work would begin on upgrading the existing 46,500-square-foot  
44 Berth 57 transit shed to current seismic and occupancy codes. Phase I would also  
45 include the demolition of an existing wood-frame addition to allow construction of a

1 new 3,600-square-foot glazed entryway. The new entrance would present a  
2 contemporary, neutral, and visually prominent entrance into the SCMI facility,  
3 distinct from the existing historic transit shed façade; and may include large glass  
4 aquaria at the entranceway. The façade would be the same general shape and profile  
5 as the transit shed in terms of height and massing, and would include an area for  
6 public education and outreach. The remainder of Berth 57 would be utilized for  
7 research laboratories, lecture and classroom spaces, and storage.

8 According to the DPR inventory form’s description of the addition proposed for  
9 demolition, it “sits in front of the original façade and covers the original architectural  
10 details of this elevation including an ornamental clock that was built into the frieze.  
11 This substantial modification, likely added to the building by the Navy during World  
12 War II, compromised the historic integrity of the building” (ICF Jones & Stokes  
13 2008). Removal of a non-historic feature would be consistent with the guidance  
14 provided in the Secretary’s Standards, and would have no adverse effect on the  
15 historic significance of the building.

16 The Secretary’s Standards provide specific guidance with regard to new additions to  
17 historic properties. Standard # 9 states that, “[n]ew additions, exterior alterations, or  
18 related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the  
19 property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible  
20 with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity  
21 of the property and its environment.” The “contemporary, neutral, and visually  
22 prominent entrance into SCMI facility, distinct from the existing historic transit shed  
23 façade,” would be designed to meet the Secretary’s Standards’ requirement for new  
24 work to be architecturally differentiated from the old, including plan review by a  
25 qualified consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary’s  
26 Standards. The new entrance addition to the transit shed at Berth 57 would be no  
27 taller than the north end of the transit shed in order to be subordinate to the historical  
28 resource’s primary façade.

29 The new entrance addition would integrate aesthetically with the transit shed at Berth  
30 57 by referencing design motifs from the maritime industrial character of the historic  
31 building, such as its gable roof form, corrugated metal siding, rectilinear massing,  
32 and regularly punched openings. The new entrance addition will be designed so that  
33 character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.

34 The existing transit shed at Berth 57 would also require extensive renovations for  
35 occupancy by SCMI to convert it from warehouse use to its proposed new uses for  
36 research, education, office, and laboratory. The existing transit sheds would  
37 primarily serve as an “outer shell building” to provide basic shelter. The proposed  
38 SCMI facility would be in essence, a self-contained structure within the existing  
39 envelope of the transit shed, while the interior would be adaptively re-used to  
40 integrate state-of-the-art fire/life safety protection, seismic resistance, security  
41 features, and utility infrastructure as required by its change in use. Interior space  
42 would be used for office space for faculty, staff, and administration; laboratory space  
43 for teaching and research laboratories; lab support and building support spaces; and  
44 outdoor space for outdoor teaching, classrooms, and storage space. The exterior of  
45 the transit sheds would largely be maintained with the exception of necessary

1 improvements to the siding, roof, cornices, etc. repair, retrofit, and rehabilitation of  
2 the transit shed to address structural deficiencies is expected to be additive and easily  
3 accessed because all structural elements are exposed. These include repairing rusted  
4 exterior corrugated metal siding with new panels, upgrading structural connections to  
5 meet established seismic and wind load resistance, retrofitting large openings (east  
6 and west façades) to ensure stability and water tight openings, sandblasting and  
7 repainting corroded steel members and gusset plates, and replacing deteriorated and  
8 damaged steel members, as required. In addition, it is anticipated that new traverse  
9 and longitudinal frames would be added, interior steel columns repaired, and new  
10 concrete encasements around the base of each column constructed. Installation of a  
11 continuous perimeter foundation wall, limited to shallow excavations (2 to 3 feet  
12 maximum) to inhibit water intrusion at the building perimeter and utility placement  
13 may be required.

- 14 ■ The transit shed at Berth 57's revisions and upgrades would be designed to meet  
15 the Secretary's Standards' requirement, including plan review by a qualified  
16 consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary's Standards.  
17 The following discussion provides an evaluation of how this proposed project  
18 element would generally meet the guidance provided in the Secretary Standards.
- 19 ■ It is anticipated that some of the transit shed at Berth 57's existing metal roll-up  
20 style doors would be replaced with new glazed openings to provide more light,  
21 air, and egress into the interior spaces. This modification would not be  
22 inconsistent with the guidance provided by the Secretary's Standards, because  
23 they would maintain the repetitive punched openings along the structure's  
24 elevations, and most of the roll-up doors are non-original replacements. The  
25 design of the new glazing systems would reference the industrial maritime  
26 character of the building, with industrial metal sashes and clear glazing, as  
27 opposed to vinyl or wood sashes and reflective or opaque glazing.
- 28 ■ Deteriorated historic features would be repaired rather than replaced whenever  
29 feasible. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive  
30 feature, the new feature would match the old in design, color, texture, and other  
31 visual qualities and, where possible, materials (Secretary's Standard #6). In the  
32 case of the transit shed at Berth 57, rusting corrugated metal siding, steel  
33 members, and gusset plates would be prepared, and those materials that cannot be  
34 repaired due to advanced deterioration would be replaced in-kind with similar  
35 metal materials.
- 36 ■ Correcting structural deficiencies in preparation for the new use is allowable by  
37 the Secretary's Standards assuming they are completed in a manner that  
38 preserves the structural system and individual character-defining features. In the  
39 case of the interior of the transit shed at Berth 57, the open trusses are character-  
40 defining features of the building's interior. Upgrading the structural connections  
41 would not obscure, remove, or otherwise significantly alter in an adverse manner  
42 the metal truss system.
- 43 ■ Removal and replacement of portions of the roof and western façade to  
44 accommodate the wharf improvements and associated ground improvements at  
45 the transit shed at Berths 57–60 would reuse the existing materials (corrugated  
46 metal roofing and siding) to the extent feasible. Where the severity of

1 deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature would  
2 match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials  
3 (Secretary's Standard #7).

4 In the case of the transit shed at Berth 57, the new interior "buildings" would not  
5 obscure or destroy the interior truss work, allowing these features to read as original  
6 features of the building. The new interior structures would not reach the ceiling, thus  
7 allowing the open, floor-to-ceiling height of the interior spaces to read visually as  
8 they do today (i.e., not obscure the clerestories). The new construction would also  
9 retain a significant amount of open interior space, particularly in the center of the  
10 building, where long interior vistas are possible (i.e., new construction will be  
11 relegated to the side aisles of the structure). The buildings would be differentiated  
12 from the old but also compatible with the massing and scale of the building.  
13 Therefore, industrial shed-like architecture with exposed steel structures and metal  
14 siding would be an appropriate architectural motif for the new construction.

- 15 ■ New additions and adjacent or related new construction would be undertaken in  
16 such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of  
17 the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired (Secretary's  
18 Standard #10).

19 As this project element would be generally consistent with the guidance provided by  
20 the Secretary's Standards, no significant impacts on the historic transit shed at Berth  
21 57 are anticipated.

#### 22 *Transit Shed at Berths 58–60*

23 Under Phase II, Berths 58–60 would be converted into approximately 120,000 square  
24 feet of marine research/laboratory/office space. The remaining portion would be  
25 retrofitted to accommodate up to 60,000 square feet of future research and/or marine-  
26 related business incubator space, or other similar institution. Adjacent to the transit  
27 sheds would be a waterfront café and a public plaza. Berthing space for two to three  
28 research vessels, up to 250 feet long, would be available at Berths 58–60.

29 In order to achieve the conversion of Berths 58–60, construction would first involve  
30 upgrading the wharf to current seismic code (see discussion below under Wharf  
31 Improvements and Associated Ground Improvements). Upon completion of the  
32 wharf, the next steps would involve upgrading and expanding the existing 180,000-  
33 square-foot transit shed at Berths 58–60 to meet current seismic code, as well as  
34 renovating the building in conformance with the Secretary's Standards. Conversion  
35 of Berths 58–60 would occur much as it would for the transit shed at Berth 57 in that  
36 tenant improvements would be constructed within the envelope of the existing  
37 warehouses. In addition, the south end of Berth 60 would be developed to  
38 accommodate a public viewing area for its views of the Main Channel and the harbor  
39 entrance, with a waterfront café and a viewing platform. Under the proposed Project,  
40 the water taxi service would remain but the maintenance operations would be  
41 relocated within the general vicinity of Berth 60 to better accommodate the public  
42 space.

1 The repairs and upgrades to the transit shed at Berths 58–60 would be designed to  
2 meet the Secretary’s Standards’ requirement for new work to be compatible with yet  
3 architecturally differentiated from the old, including plan review by a qualified  
4 consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary’s Standards. The  
5 building parameters discussed above for the transit shed at Berth 57 would be  
6 applicable to the transit shed at Berth 58–60 repairs.

7 As this proposed project element would be generally consistent with the guidance  
8 provided by the Standards, no significant impacts on historic resources are  
9 anticipated.

### 10 **Learning Center (Berth 56)**

11 The proposed Project would construct a two-story Learning Center at Berth 56 (150-  
12 seat lecture hall/auditorium and classrooms), approximately 11,500 square feet in  
13 size. Berth 56 is located within the potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District.  
14 This new construction has the potential to indirectly affect the historic setting of the  
15 historic district. However, the Learning Center would be designed in accordance  
16 with the Secretary’s Standards, including plan review by a qualified consulting  
17 architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary’s Standards. The design  
18 parameters and considerations applicable to the proposed NOAA building at Berths  
19 70–71 would also be applicable to the Learning Center building.

20 Given the relatively far distance (about 250 feet) between the proposed Learning  
21 Center and the former Pan-Am Terminal Facility at Berth 56 (California Fish and  
22 Game Building) no indirect impacts on the historic setting of this district contributor,  
23 in particular, is anticipated.

24 As this proposed project element would be generally consistent with the guidance  
25 provided by the Secretary’s Standards, no significant impacts on historic resources  
26 are anticipated.

### 27 **Wharf Improvements and Associated Ground Improvements (Berths 57–** 28 **60)**

29 The wharves on the west side of Pier 1 were constructed in multiple stages. The first  
30 structure was constructed circa 1913 and consists of a concrete pile-supported wharf  
31 approximately 36 feet wide and 2,540 feet long. A concrete retaining wall is located  
32 at the wall at the back, with hydraulically placed fill material behind the wall to  
33 create the backlands. This inshore wharf consists of hundreds of concrete piles that  
34 are octagonal in plan, about 16 inches square, have a 20-foot separation, and are  
35 arranged in rows of six. In 1938, the wharf was widened by constructing a new  
36 parallel concrete pile-supported wharf approximately 27 feet wide immediately in  
37 front of the original 1913 wharf. This outshore wharf consists of hundreds of  
38 concrete piles that are square in plan, about 16 inches square, have a 15-foot  
39 separation, and are arranged in rows of six. The outermost row of concrete piles and  
40 concrete deck soffit are visible from the water, while the inner rows are less visible.  
41 Both wharves have been found to be structurally deficient from a seismic standpoint,  
42 and many of the piles, beams, and caps are in poor condition.

1 In order to accommodate the proposed project elements at Berths 57–60, construction  
2 would involve first upgrading the adjacent wharf and the existing retaining wall to  
3 current seismic code. There are two potential options for the wharf improvements  
4 and associated ground improvements.

5 The first option involves installing 127 new 72-inch diameter steel pipe piles with 20  
6 feet of spacing along the outside footprint of the existing building. The piles would  
7 be installed in-water and would carry virtually all of the seismic loads, leaving the  
8 existing structure to carry only gravity loads. Work would include removing the roof  
9 of the existing transit sheds, demolishing 18,288 square feet of existing concrete slab,  
10 installing silt curtains, driving the piles, pouring new pile caps and deck slab, and  
11 replacing the roof. Exterior façade removal and reinstallation along the entire length  
12 of the western edge of Berths 58–60 would be required.

13 The second option involves the installation of 252 new 60-inch diameter steel pipes  
14 (in groups of four), which would be located along the back face of the existing  
15 seawall, outside of the water, spaced 40 feet apart. The four pile groups would be  
16 installed with a 5-foot-thick concrete pile cap to minimize the displacement of the  
17 wharf structure during a seismic event. A 6-inch-thick topping slab acting as a “drag-  
18 slab” would extend across the existing deck to tie in the existing wharf structure to  
19 the new pile clusters. Work would include removing the roof of the existing transit  
20 sheds, demolishing 6,300 square feet of existing concrete slab, installing silt curtains,  
21 driving the piles, pouring new pile caps and deck slab, and replacing the roof.

22 Both options would require removal and replacement of both buildings’ roofs and  
23 western façades. The roof and western façades of these buildings are considered  
24 character-defining features of these historic properties. Demolition of a character-  
25 defining feature would not be consistent with the guidance provided in the  
26 Secretary’s Standards, which require retention of such features. As such, the original  
27 corrugated metal siding and roofing would be removed, stored, and reinstalled to the  
28 extent feasible and where such materials and features are currently in good condition,  
29 or would be replaced in-kind if such materials are deteriorated beyond  
30 repair/replacement. The repairs and upgrades to the transit shed at Berths 58–60  
31 would be designed to meet the Secretary’s Standards’ requirement, including plan  
32 review by a qualified consulting architectural historian for compliance with the  
33 Secretary’s Standards. As such, no significant impacts on the transit shed at Berths  
34 58–60 resulting from the wharf improvements are anticipated.

35 Municipal Pier No. 1, inclusive of the entire 36-acre earth-filled pier plus the  
36 concrete pile - supported structure along its western edge beneath Berths 57–60,  
37 appears to be eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR, and as a City Monument  
38 both individually and as a contributor to a potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic  
39 District (see district discussion below). The outermost (western) edge of the wharf  
40 consists of approximately 16-inch-square concrete piles spaced about 15 feet apart  
41 with a concrete deck resting directly above. This is considered a character-defining  
42 feature of the pier. While both wharf improvement options would require wholesale  
43 demolition of this character-defining feature of Municipal Pier No. 1 and installation  
44 of new steel super piles and concrete decking, the outermost edge of the wharf would  
45 be reconstructed in a manner consistent with the Secretary’s Standards to retain its

1 original appearance. The Secretary's Standards (#6) states that where the severity of  
2 deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature should  
3 match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Similar to the  
4 existing design, the first row of concrete piles, end caps, and decking along the  
5 westernmost edge of the wharf would be reconstructed using approximately 16-inch-  
6 square concrete piles spaced about 15 feet apart with a concrete deck resting directly  
7 above. As such, these new features would match the old in design, color, texture, and  
8 materials, and would conform to the guidance provided by the Secretary's Standards.  
9 Given that the new 60- to 72-inch super piles would be set back approximately 27 to  
10 63 feet from the outer (western) edge of the wharf (depending on which option is  
11 selected), and would be screened from water- or land-based views by the compatible  
12 replacement piles described above, Municipal Pier No 1 would generally retain its  
13 original appearance after proposed project completion. As such, this proposed  
14 project component would have a less-than-significant impact on Municipal Pier No. 1  
15 as a historic resource.

#### 16 *Potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District*

17 A potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District was recommended eligible for  
18 listing in the NRHP and CRHR, and as a City Monument in a historical resources  
19 survey (Appendix E).

20 The proposed Project would include new construction within the potential district  
21 (NOAA building and wave tank), as well as alterations to contributing resources  
22 (Berths 57–60, and Westway Terminal Building/Pump House, and Municipal Pier  
23 No. 1 itself), all of which could adversely affect the historic integrity of the district.  
24 New buildings and repair and upgrade of structure eligible for listing would be  
25 designed to meet the Secretary's Standards, including plan review by a qualified  
26 consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary's Standards,  
27 which would reduce the severity of the impact. However, as discussed above, the  
28 height and mass of the proposed wave tank cannot be mitigated. Therefore, this  
29 project element would result in a significant and unavoidable impact on the setting of  
30 adjacent historic structures, as well as the setting of the potential Municipal Pier No.  
31 1 Historic District as a whole.

#### 32 **Impact Determination**

33 An objective of the proposed Project is to adaptively re-use the historic transit sheds  
34 at Berths 57–60. The proposed new buildings and repair and upgrade of historic  
35 structures would be designed to meet the Secretary's Standards, including plan  
36 review by a qualified consulting architectural historian for compliance with the  
37 Secretary's Standards. The proposed rehabilitation of the degraded transit sheds and  
38 Berths 57–60 wharves would have a beneficial impact on those historic structures.

39 However, as discussed above, the size and massing of the proposed wave tank  
40 building would result in significant impacts on the setting of adjacent historic  
41 structures, as well as to the Municipal Pier 1 Historic District as a whole. As such,  
42 the proposed wave tank building would result in a significant and unavoidable impact  
43 on historic resources.



1 **Mitigation Measures**

2 **MM CR-1. HABS/HAER Recordation of Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District**  
 3 **Setting.** Prior to construction of the wave tank and undertaking the Berths 57–60  
 4 wharf upgrades and ground improvements, LAHD will record the existing setting of  
 5 the Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District, including recordation of the western  
 6 elevation of the wharf, in accordance with the federal Historic American Building  
 7 Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) program. This  
 8 program consists of large-format, black and white photographs, preparation of a  
 9 historic resources report, and archiving of both at local repositories of historical  
 10 information.

11 **Residual Impacts**

12 Although Mitigation Measure MM CR-1 would reduce the impact of construction of  
 13 the wave tank on the historic setting of individually eligible buildings and  
 14 contributors to the potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District, it would not  
 15 sufficiently reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. As such, this  
 16 component of the proposed Project would remain significant and unavoidable.

17 After mitigation, the size of the proposed wave tank building would continue to result  
 18 in significant impacts on adjacent historic structures, as well as on the potential  
 19 Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District as a whole.

20 **3.4.4.3.2 Summary of Impact Determinations**

21 Table 3.4-4 summarizes the impact determinations of the proposed Project related to  
 22 cultural resources, as described in the detailed discussion in Section 3.4.4.3.  
 23 Identified potential impacts may be based on State or City of Los Angeles  
 24 significance criteria, LAHD criteria, and the scientific judgment of the report  
 25 preparers.

26 For each type of potential impact, the table describes the impact and impact  
 27 determinations, describes any applicable mitigation measures, and notes the residual  
 28 impacts (i.e., the impact remaining after mitigation). Impacts, whether significant or  
 29 not, are included in this table.

30 **Table 3.4-4.** Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Cultural Resources  
 31 Associated with the Proposed Project

<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	<i>Impact Determination</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Impacts after Mitigation</i>
<b>3.4 CULTURAL</b>			
<b>CR-1:</b> The proposed Project would not disturb, damage, or degrade a known prehistoric and/or historical archaeological resource resulting in a reduction of its integrity or	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact

<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	<i>Impact Determination</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Impacts after Mitigation</i>
significance as an important resource.			
<b>CR-2:</b> The proposed Project would not disturb, damage, or degrade an unknown prehistoric and/or historical archaeological resource resulting in a reduction of its integrity or significance as an important resource.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
<b>CR-3:</b> The proposed Project would not disturb, damage, or degrade unknown human remains.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
<b>CR-4:</b> The proposed Project would not result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a paleontological resource of regional or statewide significance.	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
<b>CR-5:</b> The proposed Project would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, involving demolition, relocation, conversion, rehabilitation, alteration, or other construction that reduces the integrity or significance of important resources on the site or in the vicinity.	Significant	<b>MM CR-1. HABS/HAER Recordation of Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District Setting.</b> Prior to construction of the wave tank and undertaking the Berths 57–60 wharf upgrades and ground improvements, LAHD will record the existing setting of the Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District, including recordation of the western elevation of the wharf, in accordance with the federal Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) program. This program consists of large-format, black and white photographs, preparation of a historic resources report, and archiving of both at local repositories of historical information.	Significant and unavoidable

1 **3.4.4.4 Mitigation Monitoring**

2 **Table 3.4-5.** Mitigation Monitoring for Cultural Resources

<p><b>CR-5:</b> The proposed Project would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, involving demolition, relocation, conversion, rehabilitation, alteration, or other construction that reduces the integrity or significance of important resources on the site or in the vicinity.</p>	
Mitigation Measures	<p><b>MM CR-1. HABS/HAER Recordation of the Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District Setting</b></p>
Timing	<p>Prior to construction of the wave tank and undertaking the Berths 57–60 wharf upgrades and ground improvements.</p>
Methodology	<p>Review plans and ensure design is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards; document and record Municipal Pier No.1 setting prior to changes from construction activities.</p>
Responsible Parties	<p>LAHD and Project Applicant(s)</p>
Residual Impacts	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p>

3  
4 **3.4.4.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

5 One significant unavoidable impact on cultural resources would occur during  
6 construction and operation of the proposed Project:

- 7 ■ Construction of the five-story, 100,000 square-foot wave tank building would  
8 have a significant impact on the historic setting of nearby historic resources,  
9 which are also contributors to the potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic  
10 District. Although mitigation is available to reduce the impact of this structure,  
11 the overall size and scale of this structure cannot be mitigated to a less-than-  
12 significant level. As such, this element of the proposed Project would be  
13 significant and unavoidable.

14  
15

