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

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

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

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

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

Figure 3.4-1 shows an aerial view of Municipal Pier No. 1 with completed 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
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structure from this important Port development, which included two other small buildings constructed in a similar Mission Revival architectural style as well as a large oil tank farm that surrounded the buildings (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008). In late summer of 1923, the Pan American Petroleum and Transport Company entered into a 30-year lease with the Los Angeles Harbor Commission (LAHC) for 7 acres of Pier No. 1 to construct a fire-proof oil loading station along the Port’s Main Channel (Berths 70–71). The purpose of the facility was to transport oil for shipment from the company’s refinery at Watson via three oil lines to the Marine Loading Station located at Berths 70–71.

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

Berth 260

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

3.4.2.2 Site-Specific Setting

3.4.2.2.1 Cultural Records Search

Archaeology

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

According to the record search, 19 cultural resources studies have been previously conducted within a 0.5-mile radius of the proposed project area; 4 of these studies were conducted within the proposed project area. The record search indicates that no known prehistoric or historical archaeological sites are located within the proposed project area. Two archaeological sites, CA-LAN-145 and CA-LAN-1129H, have 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 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
research for San Pedro Waterfront included a review of primary and secondary
documents available at the Wilmington and San Pedro Bay Historical Societies and
the Los Angeles Public Library, the photo archives at the Port, regional prehistoric
and ethnographic materials on file at ICF International, and the following:

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

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

3.4.2.2.3 Existing Cultural Resources

Paleontological Resources

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

Archaeological Resources

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

According to the record search, no known prehistoric or historical archaeological
sites are located within the proposed project area. The proposed project area was
built from dredged materials and then developed over the course of the twentieth
century. This makes it unlikely that any historical archaeological sites are preserved
in the project area. The location of the proposed project area on artificial fill precludes the possibility of intact prehistoric archaeological sites.

**Historic Architectural Resources**

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

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

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

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

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

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

- listed in the CRHR,
- determined eligible for the CRHR by the State Historical Resources Commission, or
- 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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date Status Determined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Warehouse No. 1</td>
<td>2500 Signal Street</td>
<td>NRHP listed</td>
<td>April 21, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Statement of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Shed, Berth 57</td>
<td>Berth 57</td>
<td>Fugro West Survey (1997) and IFC Jones &amp; Stokes (2008)</td>
<td>“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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Shed, Berths 58–60</td>
<td>Berth 58</td>
<td>Fugro West Survey (1997)</td>
<td>“This building appears to be eligible for individual listing on the NRHP under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Statement of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District</td>
<td>Municipal Pier No. 1, including seven contributors and two non-contributors</td>
<td>Appendix E</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

The fifth and final category of historical resources covers those that are determined significant by a lead agency. This usually occurs during the CEQA compliance process, such as the preparation of this Draft EIR. According to Section 15064.5(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, “Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically..."
significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource is considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the CRHR” (PRC SS5024.1; 14 CCR 4852).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Statement of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westway/Pan-American Oil Company Pump House.</td>
<td>Berth 70</td>
<td>Fugro West Survey (1997) and IFC Jones &amp; Stokes (2008)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3 Applicable Regulations

The proposed project area contains several historically significant structures, and several federal, state, and local regulations apply to the proposed Project including the Secretary of Interior Standards and NHPA. In addition, the proposed Project would include in-water work related to replacement piles and water intake systems. In-water work in the bay and landside facilities related to the in-water work (including landside construction within 100 feet of the water work) would be under the jurisdiction of the USACE. Compliance and coordination with federal programs such as the NRHP and consultation requirements with SHPO (Section 106) would be required as a separate requirement from this Draft EIR and the CEQA process.
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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.
To determine whether an undertaking may affect NRHP-eligible properties, cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, and architectural properties) must be inventoried and evaluated for eligibility to be listed on the NRHP. Criteria considers whether the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association; the resource must also meet one of the following:

A. Be associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (Criterion A).

B. Be associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (Criterion B).

C. Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (Criterion C).

D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (Criterion D).

3.4.3.2 State

3.4.3.2.1 Archaeological Resources

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

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.

2. It is associated with the lives of important historical figures.

3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic value.

4. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, important prehistoric or historic information.

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

- contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
- has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or
historic event or person.

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

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

3.4.3.2.2 Native American and Other Human Remains

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

Penal Code Section 622.5 provides misdemeanor penalties for injuring or destroying
objects of historical or archaeological interest located on public or private lands, but
specifically excludes the landowner. PRC Section 5097.5 defines as a misdemeanor
the unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, or historical, resources
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...
resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

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

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

### 3.4.3.3 Regional and Local

### 3.4.3.3.1 Archaeological Resources

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

The building department shall not issue a permit to demolish, alter or remove a building or structure of historical, archaeological or architectural consequence if such building or structure has been officially designated, or has been determined by state or federal action to be eligible for designation, on the National Register of Historic Places, or has been included on the City of Los Angeles list of historic cultural monuments, without the department having first determined whether the demolition, alteration or removal may result in the loss of or serious damage to a significant historical or cultural asset. If the department determines that such loss
or damage may occur, the applicant shall file an application and pay all fees for the
California Environmental Quality Act Initial Study and Check List, as specified in
Section 19.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. If the Initial Study and Check
List identifies the historical or cultural asset as significant, the permit shall not be
issued without the department first finding that specific economic, social or other
considerations make infeasible the preservation of the building or structure.

3.4.3.3.2 Ethnographic Resources

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

3.4.3.3.3 Paleontological Resources

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

3.4.3.3.4 Historic Architectural Resources

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

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

The City Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) was established by ordinance in 1962
to protect and/or identify architectural, historical, and cultural buildings; and
structures and sites of importance in the City's history and/or cultural heritage. The
CHC has designated over 700 sites as Historic-Cultural Monuments, including
historic buildings, corridors (tree-lined streets), and geographic areas. Historical
resources may also include resources listed in the State Historic Resources Inventory
as significant at the local level or higher, and those evaluated as potentially
significant in a survey or other professional evaluation (Appendix E). The HPOZ
provision of the zone code, Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.20.3,
was adopted in 1979, and was amended in 2001. It contains procedures for
designation and protection of areas that have structures, natural features, or sites of
historic, architectural, cultural, or aesthetic significance. HPOZ areas contain
significant examples of architectural styles characteristic of different periods in the
City's history. No area within the Port has been designated as part of an HPOZ
(Appendix E).

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

City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument Designation

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

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

City of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Overlay Zones

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

a. have substantial value as part of the development, heritage or cultural
characteristics of, or is associated with the life of a person important in the
history of the city, state, or nation;

b. are associated with an event that has made a substantial contribution to the broad
patterns of our history;

c. are constructed in a distinctive architectural style characteristic of an era of
history;
d. embody those distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or engineering specimen;

e. are the work of an architect or designer who has substantially influenced the development of the City;

f. contain elements of design, details, materials or craftsmanship which represent an important innovation;

g. are part of or related to a square, park or other distinctive area and should be developed or preserved according to a plan based on a historic, cultural, architectural or aesthetic motif;

h. owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represent an established feature of the neighborhood, community or City; or

i. retaining the structure would help preserve and protect an historic place or area of historic interest in the City.

### 3.4.4 Impact Analysis

#### 3.4.4.1 Methodology

Impacts on cultural resources from the proposed Project were evaluated by determining whether demolition or ground disturbance activities would affect areas that contain or could contain any archaeological or historical sites listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR, that are designated as a City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument or that are included within a City of Los Angeles HPOZ, or that are otherwise considered a unique or important archaeological resource under CEQA (City of Los Angeles 2006). A project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* or the Secretary of the Interior’s *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (Secretary’s Standards; Weeks and Grimmer 1995) would be considered as mitigated to a level of less than significant.

Impacts on paleontological resources were evaluated similar to buried archaeological resources, that is, by determining whether ground disturbance activities would affect areas that contain or could contain any a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

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

The disposition of Native American burials is governed by Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, and PRC Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98, and falls within the jurisdiction of the NAHC. Section 7052 of the Health and Safety Code establishes a felony penalty for mutilating, disinterring, or otherwise disturbing human remains, except by relatives.
Penal Code Section 622.5 provides misdemeanor penalties for injuring or destroying objects of historical or archaeological interest located on public or private lands, but specifically excludes the landowner. PRC Section 5097.5 defines as a misdemeanor the unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological or historical resources located on public lands.

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

If the remains are of Native American origin:

a. the descendants of the deceased Native Americans will make a recommendation to the person responsible for the excavation work as to the means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods, as provided in PRC Section 5097.98. Upon discovery of human remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity is not damaged or disturbed until specific conditions are met through discussions with the descendants regarding their preferences for treatment (PRC Section 5097.98 as amended); or

b. if the NAHC is unable to identify a descendant, or the descendant fails to respond within 48 hours after being notified by the commission, the landowner is required to reinter the human remains and to protect the site where the remains are reinterred from further and future disturbance.

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

3.4.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

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

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

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

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

CR-5: 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.

### Impacts and Mitigation

**Impact CR-1:** 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 significance as an important resource.

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

**Impact Determination**

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

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

No impacts would occur.

**Impact CR-2:** 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.

The proposed project area is located on artificial land, built with fill dredged from the harbor. The proposed project area was built from dredged materials in essentially one episode during 1912–1914, and then the artificial land surface was developed.
over the course of the twentieth century. This precludes the possibility of intact
prehistoric archaeological sites. However, there is a remote possibility that displaced
prehistoric material may be present in the artificial fill, having been dredged up from
the shallow harbor floor. Nevertheless, because this material is not in situ, it would
not be a significant cultural resource.

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

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

Impact Determination

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

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

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.
Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

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

Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.
Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

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

Impact Determination

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

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.
Residual Impacts

No impacts would occur.

Impact CR-5: The proposed Project would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a 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.

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

Properties in the APE Listed in or Determined Eligible for Listing in the California Register of Historic Resources

Municipal Warehouse No. 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Construction of the wave tank could have an indirect impact on the historic setting of the Westway Terminal Building, as well as the transit shed at Berth 57 (described below), given its adjacency to both resources and its large height and mass relative to those smaller historic resources. The wave tank building would be the second largest structure on the pier with one less story than the tallest structure (Municipal Warehouse No. 1) but more visually prominent than the other historic resources located nearby. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards provide guidance on new construction adjacent to historic resources. Standard #9 states that, “new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials,
features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.” The Secretary’s Standards recommend that “adjacent new construction be compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.” Finally, the Standards also state that “introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture, or which destroys historic relationships on the site…” is not recommended. This guidance is typically understood to mean that new construction adjacent to historic resources should be subordinate to those resources, allowing them to retain their visual prominence within their historic setting. The construction of this large, new facility may alter in an adverse manner the integrity of setting due to the potentially incompatible height, scale, and mass of the new structure in relation to nearby historic structures, such as the Westway Terminal Building and the transit shed at Berth 57. Moreover, because the wave tank would alter the setting of contributing resources to the potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District, this portion of the proposed Project would also result in a significant adverse impact on the district as a historic resource. Standard # 10 states that “new additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.” Given the wave tank’s relatively large size and scale compared to adjacent historic resources and its permanent construction type, this proposed project element would not be consistent with the guidance provided by the Secretary’s Standards and, as such, may result in an adverse impact.

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

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

Transit Shed at Berth 57

Phase I of the proposed Project would result in a number of changes to transit shed at Berth 57 for adaptive reuse by SCMI. Upon completion of the wharf improvements (see discussion below under Wharf Improvements and Associated Ground Improvements), work would begin on upgrading the existing 46,500-square-foot Berth 57 transit shed to current seismic and occupancy codes. Phase I would also include the demolition of an existing wood-frame addition to allow construction of a
new 3,600-square-foot glazed entryway. The new entrance would present a
contemporary, neutral, and visually prominent entrance into the SCMI facility,
distinct from the existing historic transit shed façade; and may include large glass
aquaria at the entranceway. The façade would be the same general shape and profile
as the transit shed in terms of height and massing, and would include an area for
public education and outreach. The remainder of Berth 57 would be utilized for
research laboratories, lecture and classroom spaces, and storage.

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

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

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

The existing transit shed at Berth 57 would also require extensive renovations for
occupancy by SCMI to convert it from warehouse use to its proposed new uses for
research, education, office, and laboratory. The existing transit sheds would
primarily serve as an “outer shell building” to provide basic shelter. The proposed
SCMI facility would be in essence, a self-contained structure within the existing
envelope of the transit shed, while the interior would be adaptively re-used to
integrate state-of-the-art fire/life safety protection, seismic resistance, security
features, and utility infrastructure as required by its change in use. Interior space
would be used for office space for faculty, staff, and administration; laboratory space
for teaching and research laboratories; lab support and building support spaces; and
outdoor space for outdoor teaching, classrooms, and storage space. The exterior of
the transit sheds would largely be maintained with the exception of necessary
improvements to the siding, roof, cornices, etc. repair, retrofit, and rehabilitation of the transit shed to address structural deficiencies is expected to be additive and easily accessed because all structural elements are exposed. These include repairing rusted exterior corrugated metal siding with new panels, upgrading structural connections to meet established seismic and wind load resistance, retrofitting large openings (east and west façades) to ensure stability and water tight openings, sandblasting and repainting corroded steel members and gusset plates, and replacing deteriorated and damaged steel members, as required. In addition, it is anticipated that new traverse and longitudinal frames would be added, interior steel columns repaired, and new concrete encasements around the base of each column constructed. Installation of a continuous perimeter foundation wall, limited to shallow excavations (2 to 3 feet maximum) to inhibit water intrusion at the building perimeter and utility placement may be required.

- The transit shed at Berth 57’s revisions and upgrades would be designed to meet the Secretary’s Standards’ requirement, including plan review by a qualified consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary’s Standards. The following discussion provides an evaluation of how this proposed project element would generally meet the guidance provided in the Secretary Standards.

- It is anticipated that some of the transit shed at Berth 57’s existing metal roll-up style doors would be replaced with new glazed openings to provide more light, air, and egress into the interior spaces. This modification would not be inconsistent with the guidance provided by the Secretary’s Standards, because they would maintain the repetitive punched openings along the structure’s elevations, and most of the roll-up doors are non-original replacements. The design of the new glazing systems would reference the industrial maritime character of the building, with industrial metal sashes and clear glazing, as opposed to vinyl or wood sashes and reflective or opaque glazing.

- Deteriorated historic features would be repaired rather than replaced whenever feasible. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature would match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials (Secretary’s Standard #6). In the case of the transit shed at Berth 57, rusting corrugated metal siding, steel members, and gusset plates would be prepared, and those materials that cannot be repaired due to advanced deterioration would be replaced in-kind with similar metal materials.

- Correcting structural deficiencies in preparation for the new use is allowable by the Secretary’s Standards assuming they are completed in a manner that preserves the structural system and individual character-defining features. In the case of the interior of the transit shed at Berth 57, the open trusses are character-defining features of the building’s interior. Upgrading the structural connections would not obscure, remove, or otherwise significantly alter in an adverse manner the metal truss system.

- Removal and replacement of portions of the roof and western façade to accommodate the wharf improvements and associated ground improvements at the transit shed at Berths 57–60 would reuse the existing materials (corrugated metal roofing and siding) to the extent feasible. Where the severity of
deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature would match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials (Secretary’s Standard #7).

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

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

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

Transit Shed at Berths 58–60

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

In order to achieve the conversion of Berths 58–60, construction would first involve upgrading the wharf to current seismic code (see discussion below under Wharf Improvements and Associated Ground Improvements). Upon completion of the wharf, the next steps would involve upgrading and expanding the existing 180,000-square-foot transit shed at Berths 58–60 to meet current seismic code, as well as renovating the building in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards. Conversion of Berths 58–60 would occur much as it would for the transit shed at Berth 57 in that tenant improvements would be constructed within the envelope of the existing warehouses. In addition, the south end of Berth 60 would be developed to accommodate a public viewing area for its views of the Main Channel and the harbor entrance, with a waterfront café and a viewing platform. Under the proposed Project, the water taxi service would remain but the maintenance operations would be relocated within the general vicinity of Berth 60 to better accommodate the public space.
The repairs and upgrades to the transit shed at Berths 58–60 would be designed to meet the Secretary’s Standards’ requirement for new work to be compatible with yet architecturally differentiated from the old, including plan review by a qualified consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary’s Standards. The building parameters discussed above for the transit shed at Berth 57 would be applicable to the transit shed at Berth 58–60 repairs.

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

**Learning Center (Berth 56)**

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

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

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

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

The wharves on the west side of Pier 1 were constructed in multiple stages. The first structure was constructed circa 1913 and consists of a concrete pile–supported wharf approximately 36 feet wide and 2,540 feet long. A concrete retaining wall is located at the wall at the back, with hydraulically placed fill material behind the wall to create the backlands. This inshore wharf consists of hundreds of concrete piles that are octagonal in plan, about 16 inches square, have a 20-foot separation, and are arranged in rows of six. In 1938, the wharf was widened by constructing a new parallel concrete pile–supported wharf approximately 27 feet wide immediately in front of the original 1913 wharf. This outshore wharf consists of hundreds of concrete piles that are square in plan, about 16 inches square, have a 15-foot separation, and are arranged in rows of six. The outermost row of concrete piles and concrete deck soffit are visible from the water, while the inner rows are less visible. Both wharves have been found to be structurally deficient from a seismic standpoint, and many of the piles, beams, and caps are in poor condition.
In order to accommodate the proposed project elements at Berths 57–60, construction would involve first upgrading the adjacent wharf and the existing retaining wall to current seismic code. There are two potential options for the wharf improvements and associated ground improvements.

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

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

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

Municipal Pier No. 1, inclusive of the entire 36-acre earth-filled pier plus the concrete pile-supported structure along its western edge beneath Berths 57–60, appears to be eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR, and as a City Monument both individually and as a contributor to a potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District (see district discussion below). The outermost (western) edge of the wharf consists of approximately 16-inch-square concrete piles spaced about 15 feet apart with a concrete deck resting directly above. This is considered a character-defining feature of the pier. While both wharf improvement options would require wholesale demolition of this character-defining feature of Municipal Pier No. 1 and installation of new steel super piles and concrete decking, the outermost edge of the wharf would be reconstructed in a manner consistent with the Secretary’s Standards to retain its
original appearance. The Secretary’s Standards (#6) states that where the severity of
deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature should
match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Similar to the
existing design, the first row of concrete piles, end caps, and decking along the
westernmost edge of the wharf would be reconstructed using approximately 16-inch-
square concrete piles spaced about 15 feet apart with a concrete deck resting directly
above. As such, these new features would match the old in design, color, texture, and
materials, and would conform to the guidance provided by the Secretary’s Standards.
Given that the new 60- to 72-inch super piles would be set back approximately 27 to
63 feet from the outer (western) edge of the wharf (depending on which option is
selected), and would be screened from water- or land-based views by the compatible
replacement piles described above, Municipal Pier No 1 would generally retain its
original appearance after proposed project completion. As such, this proposed
project component would have a less-than-significant impact on Municipal Pier No. 1
as a historic resource.

Potential Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District

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

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

Impact Determination

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

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

MM CR-1. HABS/HAER Recodnation of Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District

Setting. 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.

Residual Impacts

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

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

3.4.4.3.2 Summary of Impact Determinations

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

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

Table 3.4-4. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Cultural Resources

Associated with the Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impacts after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4 CULTURAL</td>
<td>CR-1: 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</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Impacts | Impact Determination | Mitigation Measures | Impacts after Mitigation
--- | --- | --- | ---

**significance as an important resource.**

**CR-2:** 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

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

Less than significant | No mitigation is required. | Less than significant

**CR-4:** 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

**CR-5:** 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 | **MM CR-1. HABS/HAER Recordation of Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District Setting.** 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
### 3.4.4.4 Mitigation Monitoring

#### Table 3.4-5. Mitigation Monitoring for Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>MM CR-1. HABS/HAER Recordation of the Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Prior to construction of the wave tank and undertaking the Berths 57–60 wharf upgrades and ground improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
<td>LAHD and Project Applicant(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Impacts</td>
<td>Significant and unavoidable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.4.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

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

- Construction of the five-story, 100,000 square-foot wave tank building would have a significant impact on the historic setting of 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.