

4.3 Cultural Resources

This section evaluates potential impacts to cultural resources, including built environment and archaeological historical resources, as well as the disruption of human remains, that could result from implementation of the project. Historical resources include all properties (historic, archaeological, landscapes, traditional, etc.) eligible or potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), as well as those that may be eligible for historic designation pursuant to state and local laws and programs. Archaeological resources include artifacts, structural remains, and human remains belonging to an era of history or prehistory. This section is based on information provided in the One San Pedro Specific Plan Supplemental Cultural Resources Survey Report and Effects Analysis completed by Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) in 2023 (hereafter “2023 Rincon report;” Rincon 2023; see Appendix C of this EIR/EIS), which includes as appendices the One San Pedro Master Plan Project, San Pedro, California – Historic Properties Inventory Report, completed by Environmental Science Associates, Inc. in 2019 (hereafter “2019 Environmental Science Associates report”), and the One San Pedro Specific Plan – 327 Harbor Site Extended Phase I/Phase II Cultural Resources Assessment completed by Rincon in 2023.

4.3.1 Regulatory Setting

a. Federal Laws and Regulations

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 established the NRHP as “an authoritative guide to be used by federal, state, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s historic resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment” (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 60). The NRHP recognizes a broad range of cultural resources that are significant at the national, state, and local levels and can include districts, buildings, structures, objects, prehistoric archaeological sites, historic-period archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, and cultural landscapes.

Whereas individual historic properties derive their significance from one or more of the criteria discussed in the subsequent section, a historic district “derives its importance from being a unified entity, even though it is often composed of a variety of resources. With a historic district, the historic resource is the district itself. The identity of a district results from the interrelationship of its resources, which can be an arrangement of historically or functionally related properties” (United States Department of the Interior 1997). A district is defined as a geographic area of land containing a significant concentration of buildings, sites, structures, or objects united by historic events, architecture, aesthetic, character, and/or physical development. A district’s significance and historic integrity determine its boundaries. Other factors include:

- Visual barriers that mark a change in the historic character of the area or that break the continuity of the district, such as new construction, highways, or development of a different character;
- Visual changes in the character of the area due to different architectural styles, types, or periods, or to a decline in the concentration of contributing resources;
- Boundaries at a specific time in history, such as the original city limits or the legally recorded boundaries of a housing subdivision, estate, or ranch; and

- Clearly differentiated patterns of historical development, such as commercial versus residential or industrial.

Within historic districts, individual properties are identified as contributing and non-contributing. A contributing building, site, structure, or object adds to the historic associations, historic architectural qualities, or archaeological values for which a district is significant because:

- It was present during the period of significance, relates to the significance of the district, and retains its physical integrity; or
- It independently meets the criterion for listing in the NRHP.

A resource that is listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP is considered “historic property” under Section 106 of the NHPA (United States Department of the Interior 1997).

National Register of Historic Places Eligibility Criteria

To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a resource must be at least 50 years of age, unless it is of exceptional importance as defined in Title 36 of the CFR, Part 60, Section 60.4(g). In addition, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. The following four criteria for evaluation have been established to determine the significance of a resource:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
2. Is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
3. Embodies the 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; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition, to be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a property must be significant within a historic context and have sufficient integrity, as described further below.

CONTEXT

National Register Bulletin #15 states that the significance of a historic property can be judged only when it is evaluated within its historic context. Historic contexts are “those patterns, themes, or trends in history by which a specific...property or site is understood and its meaning... is made clear.” A property must represent an important aspect of the area’s history or prehistory and possess the requisite integrity to qualify for the NRHP (United States Department of the Interior 1997).

INTEGRITY

In addition to meeting one or more of the criteria of significance, a property must have integrity, which is defined as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.” The NRHP recognizes seven qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. The seven factors that define integrity are location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. To retain historic integrity a property must possess several, and usually most, of these seven aspects. Thus, the retention of the specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. In general, the NRHP has a higher integrity threshold than State or local registers.

In the case of districts, integrity means the physical integrity of the buildings, structures, or features that make up the district as well as the historic, spatial, and visual relationships of the components. Some buildings or features may be more altered over time than others. In order to possess integrity, a district must, on balance, still communicate its historic identity in the form of its character defining features (United States Department of the Interior 1997).

Secretary of the Interior's Standards

The National Park Service (NPS) issued the Secretary of the Interior's Standards (Secretary's Standards) with accompanying guidelines for four types of treatments for historic resources: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. The most applicable guidelines should be used when evaluating a project for compliance with the Secretary's Standards. Although none of the four treatments, as a whole, apply specifically to new construction in the vicinity of historic resources, Standards #9 and #10 of the Secretary's Standards provides relevant guidance for such projects. The Standards for Rehabilitation are as follows:

1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. 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.
10. 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 (NPS 2017).

It is important to note that the Secretary's Standards are not intended to be prescriptive but, instead, provide general guidance. They are intended to be flexible and adaptable to specific project conditions to balance continuity and change, while retaining materials and features to the maximum

extent feasible. Their interpretation requires exercising professional judgment and balancing the various opportunities and constraints of any given project. Not every Standard necessarily applies to every aspect of a project, and it is not necessary for a project to comply with every Standard to achieve compliance.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act requires federal agencies to return Native American cultural items to the appropriate Federally recognized Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian groups with which they are associated.

Archaeological Resources Protection Act

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 governs the excavation, removal, and disposition of archaeological sites and collections on federal and Native American lands. This act was most recently amended in 1988. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act defines archaeological resources as any material remains of human life or activities that are at least 100 years of age, and which are of archeological interest. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act makes it illegal for anyone to excavate, remove, sell, purchase, exchange, or transport an archaeological resource from federal or Native American lands without a proper permit (NPS 2007).

Archaeological Data Preservation Act

The Archaeological Data Preservation Act requires agencies to report any perceived project impacts on archaeological, historical, and scientific data and requires them to recover such data or assist the Secretary of the Interior in recovering the data.

b. State Laws and Regulations

California Environmental Quality Act

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is the principal statute governing environmental review of projects occurring in the state and is codified in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21000 et seq. CEQA requires lead agencies to determine if a proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment, including significant effects on historical or unique archaeological resources. Under CEQA Section 21084.1, a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 recognizes that historical resources include: (1) resources listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); (2) resources included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k) or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g); and (3) any objects, buildings, structures, sites, areas, places, records, or manuscripts 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 by the lead agency, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record.

If a lead agency determines that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of PRC Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 apply. If an archaeological site does not meet the criteria for a historical resource contained in the CEQA Guidelines, then the site may be treated

in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083, if it meets the criteria of a unique archaeological resource. As defined in PRC Section 21083.2, a unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site, about which it can be clearly demonstrated that without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- 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.

If an archaeological site meets the criteria for a unique archaeological resource as defined in PRC Section 21083.2, then the site is to be treated in accordance with the provisions of PRC Section 21083.2, which state that if the lead agency determines that a project would have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place. If preservation in place is not feasible, mitigation measures shall be required. The CEQA Guidelines note that if an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment.

A significant effect under CEQA would occur if a project results in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). Substantial adverse change is defined as “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.” According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)(2), the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that:

1. Convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the CRHR; or
2. Account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to PRC Section 5020.1(k) or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g) 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
3. Convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR as determined by a Lead Agency for purposes of CEQA.

In general, a project that complies with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings is considered to have impacts that are less than significant.

California Register of Historic Resources

The CRHR is “an authoritative listing and guide to be used by State and local agencies, private groups, and citizens in identifying the existing historical resources of the State and to indicate which resources deserve to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change” (PRC Section 5024.1[a]). The CRHR was enacted in 1992, and its regulations became official on January 1,

1998. The CRHR is administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). The criteria for eligibility for the CRHR are based upon NRHP criteria (PRC Section 5024.1[b]). Certain resources are determined to be automatically included in the CRHR, including California properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the NRHP. To be eligible for the CRHR, a prehistoric or historic-period property must be significant at the local, State, and/or federal level under one or more of the following four criteria:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A resource eligible for the CRHR must meet one of the criteria of significance described above and retain enough of its historic character or appearance (integrity) to be recognizable as a historical resource and to convey the reason for its significance. It is possible that a historic resource may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP but it may still be eligible for listing in the CRHR.

Additionally, the CRHR consists of resources that are listed automatically and those that must be nominated through an application and public hearing process. The CRHR automatically includes the following:

- California properties listed on the NRHP and those formally determined eligible for the NRHP;
- California Registered Historical Landmarks from No. 770 onward; and,
- Those California Points of Historical Interest that have been evaluated by the OHP and have been recommended to the State Historical Resources Commission for inclusion on the CRHR.

Other resources that may be nominated to the CRHR include:

- Historical resources with a significance rating of Category 3 through 5 (those properties identified as eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and/or a local jurisdiction register);
- Individual historical resources;
- Historic districts; and,
- Historical resources designated or listed as local landmarks, or designated under any local ordinance, such as an historic preservation overlay zone (HPOZ).

California Health and Safety Code

California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5, 7051, and 7054 address the illegality of interference with human burial remains (except as allowed under applicable PRC sections), and the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites. These regulations protect such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction, and establish procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction of a project, including treatment of the remains prior to, during, and after evaluation, and reburial procedures.

California Public Resources Code

PRC Section 5097.98, as amended by Assembly Bill 2641, provides procedures in the event human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project implementation. PRC Section 5097.98 requires that no further disturbances occur in the immediate vicinity of the discovery, that the discovery is adequately protected according to generally accepted cultural and archaeological standards, and that further activities take into account the possibility of multiple burials. PRC Section 5097.98 further requires the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), upon notification by a County Coroner, designate and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) regarding the discovery of Native American human remains. Once the MLD has been granted access to the site by the landowner and inspected the discovery, the MLD then has 48 hours to provide recommendations to the landowner for the treatment of the human remains and any associated grave goods. In the event that no descendant is identified, or the descendant fails to make a recommendation for disposition, or if the landowner rejects the recommendation of the descendant, the landowner may, with appropriate dignity, reinter the remains and burial items on the property in a location that will not be subject to further disturbance.

c. Local Laws and Regulations

City of Los Angeles General Plan

The City of Los Angeles General Plan includes a Conservation Element. Section 3 of the Conservation Element, adopted in September 2001, includes policies for the protection of archaeological resources. As stated therein, it is the City's policy that archaeological resources be protected for research and/or educational purposes. Section 5 of the Conservation Element recognizes the City's responsibility for identifying and protecting its cultural and historical heritage. The Conservation Element establishes the policy to continue to protect historic and cultural sites and/or resources potentially affected by proposed land development, demolition, or property modification activities, with the related objective to protect important cultural and historical sites and resources for historical, cultural, research, and community educational purposes (City of Los Angeles 2001).

In addition to the NRHP and the CRHR, two additional types of historic designations may apply at a local level:

1. Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM)
2. Classification by the City Council as a HPOZ

San Pedro Community Plan

The Land Use Element of the City's General Plan includes 35 community plans. Community plans are intended to provide an official guide for future development and propose approximate locations and dimensions for land use. The community plans establish standards and criteria for the development of housing, commercial uses, and industrial uses, as well as circulation and service systems. The community plans implement the City's General Plan Framework at the local level and consist of both text and an accompanying generalized land use map.

The project site is within the San Pedro Community Plan Area. The San Pedro Community Plan was most recently updated in 2017 and identifies significant cultural and historic resources primarily within Downtown San Pedro located approximate two blocks south of the project site and the Vinegar Hill HPOZ located approximately 0.4 mile south of the project site covering the area between Ninth

Street, Harbor Boulevard, Twelfth Street, and Pacific Avenue. The San Pedro Community Plan includes the following goals and policies related to cultural resources:

- **LU12.4 Historic resource preservation.** Support the preservation of culturally and historically significant sites and structures in Downtown.
- **Goal LU17.** Preservation and restoration of cultural resources, neighborhoods, and landmarks which have historical and/or cultural significance.
- **LU17.1 Celebrate history.** Protect, preserve and enhance San Pedro's historically significant resources. Support the completion of SurveyLA within the San Pedro Community Plan Area.
- **LU17.2 Retain historic elements.** Protect, preserve and enhance the historic characteristics of distinctive historic neighborhoods such as Old San Pedro/Downtown, Vinegar Hill HPOZ and study the possible expansion of the HPOZ as well as Averill Park and the Cabrillo/27th/Gaffey neighborhood.
- **LU17.3 Incentivize preservation.** Encourage and promote the use of incentives for private owners of historic properties/resources to conserve the integrity of such resources.
- **LU17.4 Identify partnerships for funding.** Coordinate with other agencies to identify new financial resources for rehabilitation grants and loans to low-and moderate-income owners of historic homes.

City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance

The Los Angeles City Council adopted the Cultural Heritage Ordinance in 1962 and most recently amended it in 2018 (Sections 22.171 et seq. of the Administrative Code). The Ordinance created a Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and criteria for designating an HCM. The CHC is comprised of five citizens, appointed by the Mayor, who have exhibited knowledge of Los Angeles history, culture, and architecture. The City of Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Ordinance states that a HCM designation is reserved for those resources that have a special aesthetic, architectural, or engineering interest or value of a historic nature and meet one of the following criteria. A HCM is any site, building, or structure of particular historical or cultural significance to the City of Los Angeles. The criteria for HCM designation are stated below:

- The proposed HCM is identified with important events of national, state, or local history or exemplifies significant contributions to the broad cultural, economic, or social history of the nation, state, city, or community is reflected or exemplified; or
- The proposed HCM is associated with the lives of with historic personages important to national, state, city, or local history; or
- The proposed HCM embodies the distinct characteristics of style, type, period, or method of construction, or represents a notable work of a master designer, builder, or architect whose individual genius influenced his or her age.

A proposed resource may be eligible for designation if it meets at least one of the criteria above. Unlike the NRHP and CRHR, the Cultural Heritage Ordinance makes no mention of concepts such as physical integrity or period of significance. However, in practice, the seven aspects of integrity are applied similarly and the threshold of integrity for individual eligibility is similar.

City of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Overlay Zone Ordinance

The Los Angeles City Council adopted the ordinance enabling the creation of HPOZs in 1979; most recently, this ordinance was amended in 2017 (LAMC Section 12.20.3). The city currently contains 35 HPOZs. The closest HPOZ to the project site is the Vinegar Hill HPOZ located approximately 0.4 mile to the south. An HPOZ is a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. Each HPOZ is established with a Historic Resources Survey, a historic context statement, and a preservation plan. The Historic Resources Survey identifies all Contributing and Non-Contributing features and lots. The context statement identifies the historic context, themes, and subthemes of the HPOZ as well as the period of significance. The preservation plan contains guidelines that inform appropriate methods of maintenance, rehabilitation, restoration, and new construction. Contributing Elements are defined as any building, structure, Landscaping, or Natural Feature identified in the Historic Resources Survey as contributing to the Historic significance of the HPOZ, including a building or structure which has been altered, where the nature and extent of the Alterations are determined reversible by the Historic Resources Survey. For CEQA purposes, Contributing Elements are treated as contributing features to a historic district, which is the historical resource. Non-Contributing Elements are any building, structure, Landscaping, Natural Feature identified in the Historic Resources Survey as being built outside of the identified period of significance or not containing a sufficient level of integrity. For CEQA purposes, Non-Contributing Elements are not treated as contributing features to a historical resource.

City of Los Angeles Historic Resources Survey

SurveyLA is a citywide survey that identifies and documents potentially significant historical resources representing important themes in the city's history. The survey and resource evaluations were completed by consultant teams under contract to the City and under the supervision of the Department of City Planning's Office of Historic Resources (OHR). The program was managed by OHR, which maintains a website for SurveyLA findings, as well as an online inventory, HistoricPlacesLA.org. The field surveys cumulatively covered broad periods of significance, from approximately 1850 to 1980 depending on the location, and included individual resources such as buildings, structures, objects, natural features and cultural landscapes as well as areas and districts (archaeological resources are planned to be included in future survey phases). The survey identified a wide variety of potentially significant resources that reflect important themes in the city's growth and development in various areas including architecture, city planning, social history, ethnic heritage, politics, industry, transportation, commerce, entertainment, and others. Field surveys, conducted from 2010-2017 were completed in three phases by Community Plan Area. However, SurveyLA did not survey areas already designated as HPOZs or areas already surveyed by the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles (CRA/LA). All tools, methods, and criteria developed for SurveyLA were created to meet state and federal professional standards for survey work.

Los Angeles's Citywide Historic Context Statement was designed for use by SurveyLA field surveyors and by all agencies, organizations, and professionals completing historical resources surveys in the City of Los Angeles. The context statement was organized using the Multiple Property Documentation format developed by the NPS for use in nominating properties to the NRHP. This format provided a consistent framework for evaluating historical resources. It was adapted for local use to evaluate the eligibility of properties for city, state, and federal designation programs. The Historic Context Statement used Eligibility Standards to identify the character defining, associative features and integrity aspects a property must retain to be a significant example of a type within a defined theme.

Eligibility Standards also indicated the general geographic location, area of significance, applicable criteria, and period of significance associated with that type. These Eligibility Standards are guidelines based on knowledge of known significant examples of property types; properties do not need to meet all of the Eligibility Standards in order to be eligible. Moreover, there are many variables to consider in assessing integrity, which depend largely on why a resource is significant under NRHP, CRHR, and/or City of Los Angeles HCM eligibility criteria. SurveyLA findings are subject to change over time as properties age, additional information is uncovered, and more detailed analyses are completed. Resources identified through SurveyLA are not designated resources. Designation by the City of Los Angeles and nominations to the CRHR and NRHP are separate processes that include property owner notification and public hearings.

Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Plan

CRA/LA was established in 1948 to revitalize economically underserved areas within the City of Los Angeles by increasing the supply of low-income housing, providing infrastructure for commercial and industrial development, and creating employment opportunities (CRA/LA 2022). To carry out these goals, CRA/LA adopted comprehensive plans for each Redevelopment Project Area. The CRA/LA was dissolved in February 2012, and administration of the Redevelopment Project Areas was initially transferred to the CRA/LA, a Designated Local Authority and successor to the CRA/LA. On September 30, 2019, the Los Angeles City Council voted to adopt Ordinance No. 186325 to effectuate the transfer of land use related plans and functions of the CRA/LA to the City of Los Angeles. As a result, the Department of City Planning has jurisdiction over review of properties located within Redevelopment Project Areas as of November 11, 2019.

Some Redevelopment Project Areas also include a historical resources survey that documents all of the historical resources—individual and districts—within the Redevelopment Project Area. These CRA/LA and CRA/LA surveys were done independent of the City’s SurveyLA effort, though some of the more recent surveys may have used the same methodology and technology that was used in SurveyLA. SurveyLA did not survey areas already surveyed by CRA/LA. Currently, there are 32 Redevelopment Project Areas throughout Los Angeles.

The City of Los Angeles also contains unique Specific Plan areas. Like Redevelopment Project Areas, some Specific Plan areas may include a historical resources survey that documents all of the historical resources within the Specific Plan area.

The study area is located within the boundaries of the Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Project. Although the *Design Standards and Guidelines: Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Project* provides a list of properties known to qualify as historical resources, no formal cultural resources inventory has been completed specifically for the redevelopment project area (CRA/LA 2005).

4.3.2 Environmental Setting

a. Project Site

The project site consists of the approximately 20-acre OSP Specific Plan Site and the 0.6-acre 327 Harbor Site. The OSP Specific Plan Site is currently developed with Rancho San Pedro, a Garden Apartment-style public housing project constructed in the 1940s and expanded in the 1950s. Rancho San Pedro is comprised of 478 dwelling units contained in 58 groupings of multi-family residential buildings arranged in super blocks with common green space, as well as 8,000 square feet (sf) of amenities, services, and administration land uses. The 327 Harbor Site is an undeveloped vacant parcel.

The project area was a mostly a low-lying coastal marsh prior to modern development. Today, the project area is mostly developed with residential units, landscaped open areas, and paved parking lots and roadways. Topographically, the project area slightly slopes down to the east with elevations ranging between 85 to 20 feet above mean sea level on the OSP Specific Plan Site and between 28 and 21 feet on the 327 Harbor Site. According to the Preliminary Geotechnical Report for the OSP Specific Plan Site, the western/northwestern-most portions of the OSP Specific Plan Site consist of Pleistocene sand deposits overlaid by 0 to 10 feet of fill. The central portion of the OSP Specific Plan Site consists of Holocene channel deposits overlaid by 5 to 25 feet of fill. The southeastern-most portion of the OSP Specific Plan Site consists of cut terrace deposits of the Pleistocene sand deposits with no fill present (Group Delta Consultants, Inc. 2022a; Appendix D). The preliminary geotechnical investigation for the 327 Harbor Site indicates the presence of fill material approximately 9 to 10 feet below current grade and consists of medium dense, very fine to fine, silty, and clean sand mixed with silty clay. Below fill soils, the 327 Harbor Site consists of Holocene-age medium dense to dense silt sand overlying a variably thick silt clay to clayey silt layer (Group Delta Consultants, Inc. 2022b; Appendix D).

b. Historical Resources

As documented in the 2023 Rincon report, efforts to identify historical resources within the project site and a 0.5-mile radius surrounding it (the study area¹) included a review of the 2019 Environmental Science Associates report, relevant SurveyLA studies, the NRHP, CRHR, lists of California Historical Landmarks (CHL) and California Points of Historical Interest, City of Los Angeles HCMs, the Built Environment Resources Directory for Los Angeles County and its predecessor, the California State Historic Property Data File, the Archaeological Determination of Eligibility list, in addition to a field survey of the study area. Additional research included consultation of Design Standards and Guidelines: Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Project (CRA/LA 2005). The 2023 Rincon report identified eight properties within the study area that are eligible for historic designation. Because they are designated or eligible for designation at the national, state, or local level, all of these properties qualify as historical resources pursuant to CEQA. These historical resources are listed in Table 4.3-1, shown in Figure 4.3-1, and discussed in more detail below.

¹ Refer to Section 4.3.3, *Impact Analysis*, for a description and figure illustrating the study area.

Table 4.3-1 Designated and Eligible Historical Resources in the Study Area

Resource Name	Resource Address/Physical Location	Historical Resource Status
Rancho San Pedro	275 First Street	Original portion of Rancho San Pedro was previously determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and listed in the CRHR by a consensus through Section 106 process; entirety of Rancho San Pedro identified by SurveyLA as potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM; evaluated and recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM in the 2023 Rincon report.
Ralph J. Scott Fireboat	Within 444 South Harbor Boulevard (APN 7440-030-906)	Listed as an NHL.
San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building	Within 444 South Harbor Boulevard (APN 7440-030-906)	Designated as City of Los Angeles HCM #146 in 1975; listed in the NRHP and CRHR in 1996.
Los Angeles Cruise Terminal	Within the northern portion of unaddressed Los Angeles County parcel-APN 7440-026-903	Previously recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP and as an HCM; eligibility confirmed in the 2023 Rincon report.
Senator William H. Savage House	101 South Harbor Boulevard (Senator William H. Savage House) ¹	Recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM in the 2023 Rincon report.
103 North Mesa Street	103 North Mesa Street (APN 7449-022-014)	Recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM in the 2023 Rincon report.
Port of Los Angeles (POLA) Administration Building	425 South Palos Verdes Street (APN 7455-019-916)	Previously recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR and as an HCM; eligibility confirmed in the 2023 Rincon report.
Liberty Hill Site	Within 100 West 5th Street	Registered as CHL No. 1021 and listed in the CRHR in 1997.
¹ Address listed as 111 South Harbor Boulevard by Survey LA		

Figure 4.3-1 Historical Resources within Study Area



Rancho San Pedro Complex (P-19-188237)

Rancho San Pedro occupies the entirety of the project site and is composed of ten Los Angeles County Assessor's parcels, on which lies 478 public housing units in addition to a community building surrounded with landscaped areas. Units are contained in 58 groupings of townhouses, stacked flats, and two-story apartment buildings, neatly arranged in super blocks across with shared green space. The original portion of the property was developed to house defense workers in 1942. The original portion of the property is bounded by West Santa Cruz Street to the north, North Palos Verdes Street to the east, West Third Street to the south, and North Centre Street to the west. The property was converted to low-income housing in 1952 and expanded to both the east and west in 1953 (1953 Extension).

Rancho San Pedro was initially recorded and evaluated for listing in the NRHP by architect Steven Fader in 2004, resulting in the recommendation of NRHP eligibility for the original portion of Rancho San Pedro under Criterion A for its association with the early development of public housing and the development of housing for World War II defense workers, and under Criterion C as a representative example of a public housing project influenced by the Garden City movement. On the basis of the 2004 evaluation, the original portion of Rancho San Pedro was formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and therefore automatically listed in the CRHR.

Rancho San Pedro was subsequently identified in 2012 as part of SurveyLA. At that time, the entirety of the property, including the 1953 Extension, was recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and for designation as an HCM under Criteria A/1/1 and C/3/3 a residential property type and a Public Housing Complex property sub-type.

The 2019 Environmental Science Associates report also considered the historical significance of the entirety of Rancho San Pedro and recommended it eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and HCM designation under Criteria A/1/1 and C/3/3. This evaluation suggested additional research may be required to clarify the eligibility of the 1953 Extension. While there have been no changes to the property that would warrant reconsideration of its designation at the federal, state, or local level, a California Department of Parks and Recreation update was prepared for the property to document the current effort and clarify that the property's significance and eligibility are applicable to its entirety and not just the original portion.

In concurrence with the 2019 Environmental Science Associates report, the 2023 Rincon report recommended Rancho San Pedro eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and local HCM designation. Under Criterion A/1/1, Rancho San Pedro is eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and for local designation for its association with the development of public housing in Los Angeles between the years of 1937 and 1955. As one of Los Angeles's first public housing complexes, the construction of Rancho San Pedro was enabled by federal legislation such as the Housing Act of 1937 (original portion) and the American Housing Act of 1949 (1953 Extension). Therefore, the property possesses a significant association with this theme. Under Criterion C/3/3, Rancho San Pedro is a representative example of the Garden Apartment property type as applied to defense/public housing and exhibits such characteristics of the type such as the superblock site plan, low-slung buildings, repetition of building models throughout plan, and stylistically simple buildings, among others. Despite small differences among the two, such as increased density in the 1953 Extension, these characteristics are generally shared among the entire Rancho San Pedro.

Ralph J. Scott Fireboat

The Ralph J. Scott Fireboat is a fireboat constructed in 1925 and is located within the study area, approximately 220 feet (0.04 mile) from the project site. The vessel is one of the best existing examples of a 1920s-era, high-speed, shallow draft style fireboat in America. It is in the process of being restored and is currently housed in a tent adjacent to Los Angeles Fire Department Station 112. The boat was listed as a NHL in 1989 and is additionally listed in the NRHP decommissioned and removed from the water.

According to the NHL nomination prepared for the boat, the Ralph J. Scott is eligible for designation as a NHL under NHL Criterion 1 (properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are identified with, or that outstandingly represent, the broad national patterns of United States history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained) and NHL Criterion 4 (properties that embody the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type specimen exceptionally valuable for a study of a period, style, or method of construction). Under Criterion 1, the fireboat is associated with the history and modernization of the Port of Los Angeles (POLA) under the direction of Fire Chief Ralph J. Scott. The vessel was the first steel motorized fireboat owned by the Los Angeles Fire Department and was well-known for fighting several major fires on wharves and other vessels from 1925 through the 1980s. Under Criterion 4, the Ralph J. Scott is an excellent example of 1920s fireboat design. It is the fourth oldest fireboat remaining in the United States and only one of ten remaining fireboats over 50 years old. The vessel's key character defining features are those that convey its design and use as a 1920s-era fireboat, including the following: riveted steel hull including ironwood rubrail, riveted decks and deckhouse, chain-hoisted turret tower, the tower's hoisting motor, riveted steel hose reels, Byron Jackson pumps, and original bell.

While the Ralph J. Scott has been removed from the water since the time of its last recordation, it is currently being restored and is presumed to retain a level of integrity consistent with its last recordation. Due to its previous designation as a NHL and listing in the NRHP and CRHR, the Ralph J. Scott was not reevaluated as part of the 2023 Rincon report.

San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building (P-19-176736)

The San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building is located in the vicinity of the Ralph J. Scott Fireboat, on the same roughly 14-acre Los Angeles County Assessor's parcel, which has been largely redeveloped since the historic period. The building, which currently houses the Los Angeles Maritime Museum, is located within the study area, approximately 416 feet (0.08 mile) from the project site. Designed by architect Derwood Lydell Irvin of the Los Angeles Harbor Department, the San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building was constructed in 1941 in a Streamline Moderne style, operating as a ferry for workers on Terminal Island, which was accessible only by boat at the time. The building was designated as HCM #146 in 1975 and was listed in the NRHP and CRHR in 1996. Its period of significance spans 1941 to 1945.

The San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building is significant under Criterion A/1/1 for its association with the maritime transportation development of the POLA during World War II and under Criterion C/3/3 as an exceptional example of the Streamline Moderne style. Its character-defining features include much of its Streamline Moderne style detailing including the following: fluted, curved corners, flat roof with horizontal banding, smooth stucco wall finish, towers, and vertical projections. The San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building is one of the last remaining Streamline Moderne-style buildings in the area (Smith 1995).

Research for the 2023 Rincon report confirmed the resource appears largely as it did when it was designated and there have been no changes to the building which would warrant reconsideration of its designation at the federal, state, or local level.

Los Angeles Cruise Terminal (P-19-190106)

The Los Angeles Cruise Terminal is located in the northernmost extent of the study area, approximately 1,120 feet (0.21 mile) from the project site, in the northern portion of the unaddressed Los Angeles County Assessor's parcel 7440-026-903. The building itself extends outside the study area and is partially located on an adjacent parcel (APN 7440-024-911). The roughly 44-acre parcel on which the Cruise Terminal is located is primarily paved, serving as a surface parking lot to support the terminal building. The parcel includes two additional terminal buildings in its southern portion, one of which likely temporary, that were constructed sometime after 1985.

The rectangular-planned, two-story, steel-framed Los Angeles Cruise Terminal was designed collaboratively by the architecture and engineering firms Kistner, Wright & Wright, and Edward H. Fickett in 1963 in the International Style. It was previously recorded and evaluated in 2012 and recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP and as an HCM under Criteria A/1 and C/3; the 2012 evaluation did not assess the building's eligibility for the CRHR. Under Criterion A/1, the Cruise Terminal, is directly associated with POLA's post-World War II expansion, which resulted in its establishment as the capital of maritime commerce in the Western Hemisphere. Under Criterion C/3, the Los Angeles Cruise Terminal is a rare example of an International Style cruise terminal in California and for its engineering merits, including its steel frame and concrete construction, which allows for the dramatic extension of the cantilevered decks and the heavy loads bearing on the massive Y-shaped auto ramp. The building's character-defining features include those that express the International style, including its rectangular form, the use of steel in combination with concrete, smooth undecorated wall surfaces, metal-framed windows, and use of cantilevers.

The 2023 Rincon report confirmed the property appears largely as it did when it was evaluated in 2012 and there have been no changes to the building which would warrant reconsideration of its eligibility at the federal or local level. As such, the property remains eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and designation as an HCM.

101 South Harbor Boulevard (Senator William H. Savage House)

The property at 101 South Harbor Boulevard (Senator William H. Savage House) is located within the study area, immediately adjacent to the project site. The property encompasses an early twentieth-century vernacular building originally constructed as the residence of a San Pedro City Attorney and California State Senator William H. Savage. Following its use as a residence, the building was converted to institutional use by the Seaman's Church Institute (SCI) and significantly expanded during the period in which the SCI occupied the property (circa 1920 to circa 1966). Due to these alterations, the property does not retain integrity sufficient to convey any potential significant associations from its earliest period of development as the residence of William H. Savage.

As a result of the 2023 Rincon report, the property is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM under Criterion A/1/1 as defined by the following SurveyLA context, theme and property type: Industrial Development (context), Port of Los Angeles, 1907-1980 (theme), Port Worker Residential, Commercial, and Community Resources (property type) (City of Los Angeles 2018). Operating from 101 South Harbor Boulevard (Senator William H. Savage House) for a period of over 45 years, the SCI provided residential, social, and recreational services to the thousands of sailors who traveled through the port. In doing so, the property may be considered a community resource

related to the local shipping industry's workforce, mariners. According to SurveyLA guidance documentation, resources possessing these associations are rare within Los Angeles (City of Los Angeles 2018). Although the property was altered to accommodate the functions of the SCI, it has not changed substantially since this time and therefore retains sufficient integrity to convey its significance as a community resource for port workers. Its period of significance corresponds to the period in which the SCI operated from it, circa 1920 to circa 1966. Its character-defining features include its overall form and footprint, which has been consistent since its expansion in the 1920s, as well as its original building materials, such as wood doors and windows.

103 North Mesa Street

The 103 North Mesa Street site is located within the study area, approximately 100 feet (0.02 mile) from the proposed project site, on the northwest corner of North Mesa Street and West First Street. The property encompasses a two-story residential quadplex originally constructed as a single-family residence circa 1896, prior to the incorporation of San Pedro in 1909. The building's architectural detailing is derived from multiple styles, including folk Victorian and Queen Anne.

In 1908, the residence was owned by John A. Anderson, one of San Pedro's first real estate agents who, by 1904, had formed a business partnership with George H. Peck, aptly named "Peck & Anderson." Anderson is identified in the *Los Angeles Citywide Historic Context Statement-Context: Pre-Consolidation Communities of Los Angeles, 1862-1932*, as a noteworthy individual and real estate developer, "perhaps second in power only to the Southern Pacific Railroad" (City of Los Angeles 2016).

As a result of the 2023 Rincon report, the property is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM under Criterion A/1/1 as defined by the following SurveyLA context, theme and property type: Pre-consolidation Communities of Los Angeles, 1862-1932 (context); San Pedro, 1882-1909 (theme); Life in Independent San Pedro (sub-theme); Residential Single-Family; and House (property type) (City of Los Angeles 2016). Under this Criterion, the property is significant for its direct association with the residential development of San Pedro as an early residential property illustrating the early development of San Pedro as an Independent city. The property is additionally recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM under Criterion B/2/2 for its direct association with John A. Anderson, who with George H. Peck, is identified as a significant and noteworthy real estate "pioneer" in San Pedro. The property's character-defining features include its overall form as well as original building materials such as various forms of wood siding and windows.

POLA Administration Building/425 South Palos Verdes Street (P-19-190962)

The POLA Administration Building is located at 425 South Palos Verdes Street, in the study area, approximately 247 feet (0.05 mile) from the project site, and in a residential and commercial area. The four-story building was designed in the Late Modern Style by master architect John Carl Warnecke and constructed in 1980 as a new headquarters building for POLA administration due to demand for a larger facility.

In 2014, the POLA Administration Building was recorded, evaluated, and recommended eligible for listing as an HCM. In 2019, the historical significance of the property was again considered and recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR but ineligible for listing in the NRHP, due to reduced integrity. Under Criterion 3/3, the POLA administration building is a significant example of the High-Tech and Sculptural substyle of the Late-Modern style and for its innovative use of Cor-Ten steel framing. The building exemplifies the key character-defining features of the High-Tech and Sculptural substyles including the following: extreme exaggeration through the Cor-Ten frame, mirrored glass

curtain walls, multi-level, multi-geometric shaped concrete terraced base, repetition of form, and exposed structural system.

The 2023 Rincon report confirmed that the property appears largely as it did when it was previously evaluated in 2019, and there have been no changes to the building that would warrant reconsideration of its eligibility at the local or state level.

Liberty Hill Site (P-19-150331/P-19-276421/CHL# 1021)

The Liberty Hill Site is located within the study area, at 100 West Fifth Street, approximately 50 feet (0.01 mile) from the project site. The site was the location of the 1923 Industrial Workers of the World Strike which protested low wages, bad working conditions, and the imprisonment of union activists. American writer Upton Sinclair was famously arrested for participating in this labor movement. Though the Liberty Hill Strike was unsuccessful, it empowered workers in Los Angeles and throughout California to continue fighting for improved working conditions. The Liberty Hill Site was registered as CHL No. 1021 in 1997 and automatically listed on the CRHR per CEQA regulations at that time.

Although the property is a designated CHL and a resource under CEQA, there are no physical features dating to its historical period which convey its significance. A bronze plaque commemorating the site was placed on the property in 1998; however, this feature postdates the historic events for which the property is designated. The property was also developed in 1992 with the Los Angeles Harbor Chapter Boys and Girls Club building. The building, which was designed by Albert C. Martin and Associates was recorded, evaluated, and recommended ineligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and local designation by SWCA in 2014 (P-19-190959).

The 2023 Rincon report confirmed the Liberty Hill Site appears largely as it did when it was registered as a CHL in 1997. There have been no changes that would warrant reconsideration of its designation. It was not reevaluated as part of the current effort.

c. Archaeological Resources

Geoarchaeological Review

The results of the geoarchaeological review detailed in the 2019 Environmental Science Associates report indicated that ethnographic data reveals the presence of at least six Gabrielino villages in the San Pedro area, including one, according to some sources, which may have been located adjacent or within the immediate vicinity of the project site (Environmental Science Associates 2019). Additional information provided to Rincon during Section 106 and AB 52 consultation for the project by Robert F. Dorame, Chairperson for the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of the California Tribal Council, and Andrew Salas, the Chairperson for the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians, Kizh Nation, also notes the presence of villages within the vicinity of the project site. For additional geoarchaeological review information, refer to Section 4.14.3(c), *Tribal Cultural Resources*.

Archaeological Resources Identified in the California Historical Resources Information System Search

The following integrates the results of a CHRIS search previously completed and summarized in the 2019 Environmental Science Associates report for the OSP Specific Plan Site and an additional CHRIS search for the 327 Harbor Site. On May 21, 2019, Environmental Science Associates staff conducted a CHRIS search for the OSP Specific Plan Site at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), housed at California State University, Fullerton. Additionally, on May 24, 2022, SCCIC staff conducted

an in-house CHRIS search for the 327 Harbor Site (Records Search #23677.9816). The SCCIC is the official state repository for cultural resources records and reports for Los Angeles County. The purpose of the records search was to identify previously recorded cultural resources, as well as previously conducted cultural resources studies within the study area so that the area's cultural resources sensitivity could be assessed.

The 2019 and 2022 CHRIS searches identified a combined six previously conducted cultural resource studies (LA-02399, LA-07031, LA-8504, LA-10527, LA-10528, and LA-12710) that include all or portions of the study area. The 2019 Environmental Science Associates and 2023 Rincon reports provide details regarding these studies. The 2019 CHRIS search as presented in the 2019 Environmental Science Associates report and the 2022 CHRIS search conducted by Rincon identified a combined 44 cultural resources that have been previously recorded within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. Of these, the majority are built environment resources such as historical buildings and structures. Three prehistoric archaeological resources and one historical archaeological resource were identified within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. One of the resources is partially located in the study area outside of the project site (P-19-003801/CA-LAN-3801), and one is potentially located within the study area outside of the project site (P-19-000146/CA-LAN-146). The archaeological resources within or potentially within the study area are described in additional detail below.

P-19-000146/CA-LAN-146

Resource P-19-000146 is a prehistoric archaeological site that consists of a shell midden with various species of shell present. No map was associated with the site recorded for P-19-000146, however, it is possible that it was located in the northeastern corner of the project study area. The site was originally recorded in 1912 by N.C. Nelson and was updated 1977 by Paul Langerwarter. Mr. Langerwarter stated that resource P-19-000146 was totally destroyed by grading for a parking lot. In addition, he states that the original archaeological site may have actually be a paleontological site because it matched the description for the paleontological site known as the Lumberyard site (City of Los Angeles HCM #187) but since it has been destroyed, there is no way of verifying this.

P-19-003801/CA-LAN-3801/Mexican Hollywood

Mexican Hollywood (P-19-003801) is a historic-period archaeological site which consists of the below-grade remains of a former Mexican American neighborhood which existed from the 1920s until it was razed in 1952 in support of the construction of harbor facilities. The site is located partially within the current study area, at the southeast corner of Swinford Street and North Harbor Boulevard and continues south in the greenway terminating near the intersection with West O'Farrell Street. The site, measuring 220-meters by 40-meters, was identified by ICF Jones & Stokes during archaeological monitoring efforts associated with the Waterfront Gateway Development Project in 2008 (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008). The Mexican Hollywood site record describes 15 subsurface features and 13 surface scatter loci including domestic refuse, glass and ceramic artifacts, faunal bone, brick and mortar building fragments, and linear structures that were identified during construction monitoring. Determined to contain data potential (Criterion D/4), three of the features were identified as a cylindrical, unmortared stacked brick structure and two refuse deposits consisting of consumer goods, kitchen items, and building materials deposited between the 1920s and 1950s. Although the area has been highly disturbed by construction activities since 1952 with the construction of harbor facilities, parking lots, and infrastructure associated with Berths 91, 92, 93A, and 93B, archaeological monitoring identified "data rich deposits in their original depositional provenience" (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008) that may contribute to the understanding of this historic-period Mexican maritime

community in Los Angeles. Mexican Hollywood has been recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP and the CRHR under Criterion D/4.

Archaeological Pedestrian Field Survey

The OSP Specific Plan Site was not surveyed for archaeological resources due to the paved setting and lack of ground visibility. Exposed soils are present at the 327 Harbor Site, and therefore, an archaeological pedestrian survey was conducted by a Rincon archaeologist at this location on July 20, 2022. The survey was conducted using transect intervals spaced approximately five meters apart and oriented generally from north to south. Exposed ground surfaces were examined for artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools), ecofacts (e.g., marine shell and bone), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a cultural midden, historical debris (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics), and features indicative of the former presence of structures or buildings (e.g., standing exterior walls and foundations).

Two concrete foundations and an asphalt parking lot were observed within the 327 Harbor Site during the field survey. Review of historical aerial imagery confirms the concrete foundations and asphalt parking lot date to the historic-period (Nationwide Environmental Title Research 2022). Small, friable marine shell fragments, and three large clam shell fragments were observed eroding out of the eastern boundary of the parcel onto the sidewalk. Additionally, one unmodified banded chert fragment and one large battered banded chert cobble was identified in a disturbed context, adjacent to modern construction debris in the northwestern portion of the parcel. Fracture patterns and lack of cortex weathering on the chert fragment and cobble suggest the breaks to be recent and are likely a result of previous ground-disturbing activities associated with development of the parcel. Given the proximity to the Pacific Ocean it is possible the shell was imported with the fill on site from a local source. The origins of the shell, unmodified chert fragment and cobble were unclear given the lack of associated artifacts and context of the finds.

Extended Phase I Investigation at the 327 Harbor Site

Due to the proximity of Mexican Hollywood (P-19-003801) to the 327 Harbor Site and finds identified during the archaeological survey, Rincon conducted an Extended Phase I (XPI) investigation between August 8 and August 11, 2022, to assess the presence or absence of archaeological deposits associated with Mexican Hollywood or with a previously unidentified prehistoric archaeological resource. A Native American monitor was retained for the XPI excavations in the event that prehistoric archaeological deposits were encountered during trenching activities. Chairperson Robert Dorame of the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council monitored the XPI excavation.

Testing by mechanical backhoe trenching was determined to be the most effective subsurface exploration method, as it allowed for an expedited examination of the soil profiles and an assessment of the potential to encounter buried archaeological deposits. Rincon excavated a total of four trenches, oriented north to south, to identify artifact densities and features that may have provided pertinent information concerning the historical and/or prehistoric occupation of the area. XPI testing identified a previously unrecorded archaeological resource (OSP-S1) with a possible prehistoric and confirmed historic-period component. The historic-period component consisted of nine features including five concrete foundations, one intact refuse pit, two asphalt foundations, one brick foundation and associated artifacts including glass shards, intact glass bottles, ceramic fragments, nails, bricks, scrap metal, nails and burnt faunal bones. Diagnostic glass bottle bases included: one circular clear glass bottle (Brockway Glass Company, 1925-1934); one circular cobalt blue glass bottle (Maryland Glass Corp., 1921-1971); one circular clear glass Pepsodent antiseptic bottle (Owens-Illinois

Glass Company, ca. 1930s); one rectangular clear glass Mennen aftershave bottle (Owens-Illinois Glass Company, 1929-1960); one kidney clear glass half pint liquor bottle (Latchford-Marble Glass Company, 1939-1957) (Made in Chicago Museum n.d.; Society of Historical Archaeology 2022).

The possible prehistoric artifacts and ecofacts were largely related to resource processing and subsistence including naturally occurring ochre, possible chipped stone and chipped stone tools, and moderate to high-density shell fragments (clam, abalone, scallop, oyster, and *Olivella*). Based on the results of the XPI, Phase II testing was conducted to determine if intact cultural deposits associated with OSP-S1 existed within the 327 Harbor Site, to evaluate the deposit(s) for listing on the CRHR, and to determine whether the project would impact historical or unique archaeological resources under CEQA. For additional information regarding the XPI investigation, refer to Appendix J of the Rincon 2023 report (Appendix C).

Phase II Investigation at the 327 Harbor Site

Rincon conducted a Phase II investigation on October 10 through 14, 2022 and October 17, 2022, that included the excavation of two 1.0-meter by 1.0-meter test units (TU). The TUs were excavated within areas of the 327 Harbor Site that had the greatest density and diversity of recovered artifacts during the XPI investigation. Native American monitoring was conducted by Chairperson Dorame of the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council.

Phase II testing identified historic-period cultural materials and possible prehistoric materials in a disturbed context. TU1 was excavated in 10-centimeter (4-inch), controlled levels to a depth of 109 centimeter below depth (cmbd) (43 inches). A hand auger was used in the southwest corner of the test unit to excavate an additional 10 arbitrary levels (Levels 11-20) from a depth of 109 cmbd (43 inches) to 209 cmbd (82 inches). TU 2 was excavated in 10-centimeter (4-inch), controlled levels to a depth of 112 cmbs (44 inches). Historic-period cultural materials were recovered from both test units and consisted of glass shards, ceramic pipe fragments, ceramic tile fragments, nails, scrap metal, brick fragments, whiteware ceramic fragments, a crockery shard and three screw cap bottle fragments. Recovered diagnostic artifacts include one Owens-Illinois Glass Company Duraglass bottle base (ca. 1940-1970), one Simons pressed brick (ca. 1905-1935), one Obear-Nester Glass Company bottle base (1945), one Maywood Glass Company bottle base (1945), one Anchor Hocking Glass Corporation bottle base (ca. 1938-1980), and one Owens-Illinois Duraglass bottle base (ca. 1929-1960) (California Bricks 2022; Glass Bottle Marks n.d.; Society of Historical Archaeology 2022).

A possible prehistoric component with ecofacts consisting primarily of shell (clam, abalone, scallop, oyster and *Olivella*) and locally sourced ochre were encountered within the TUs. Possible chipped stone was also found; however, no diagnostic tools or diagnostic hallmarks of lithic reduction were noted during laboratory review of the stone. Heavy equipment are known to create false artifacts. These false artifacts are referred to as “tractorfacts” where heavy equipment striking stones can create chipped stone fragments that appear to have been reduced through flintknapping techniques. Given the level of previous ground disturbance within the project site, the lack of midden soils, and absence of formal tools, the lithic materials present within the project site may be the result of modern activity rather than prehistoric tool production. The moderate to high-density shell fragments recovered during testing may indicate subsistence resource processing; however, given the proximity to the Pacific Ocean they may also be naturally occurring. Based on the data collected during testing, the possible prehistoric component of OSP-S1 may have been an early lithic reduction site. No intact deposits or human remains were identified in either of the excavated TUs. For additional information regarding the Phase II investigation, refer to Appendix J of the Rincon 2023 report (Appendix C).

4.3.3 Impact Analysis

a. Significance Thresholds and Methodology

Significance Thresholds

In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project could have a potentially significant impact if it were to result in one or more of the following:

1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resources pursuant to Section 15064.5
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5
3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries

For this analysis, the CEQA Appendix G thresholds are relied upon. The analysis utilizes factors and considerations identified in the 2006 L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (Thresholds Guide), as appropriate, to assist in answering the Appendix G threshold questions. The Thresholds Guide identifies the following criteria to evaluate cultural resources impacts:

Built Environment Historical Resources

A project would have a significant impact if a substantial adverse change in historic significance occurs due to any of the following:

- Demolition of a significant resource
- Relocation that does not maintain the integrity and significance of a significant resource
- Conversion, rehabilitation, or alteration of a significant resource which does not conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
- Construction that reduces the integrity or significance of important resources on the site or in the vicinity (City of Los Angeles 2006).

Archaeological Resources

A project would normally have a significant impact upon archeological resources if it would disturb, damage, or degrade an archeological resource or its setting that is found to be important under the criteria of CEQA because it:

- Is associated with an event or person of recognized importance in California or American prehistory or of recognized scientific importance in prehistory
- Can provide information which is both of demonstrable public interest and useful in addressing scientifically consequential and reasonable archaeological research questions
- Has a special or particular quality, such as the oldest, best, largest, or last surviving example of its kind
- Is at least 100 years old and possesses substantial stratigraphic integrity
- Involves important research questions that historical research has shown can be answered only with archaeological methods (City of Los Angeles 2006).

Methodology

A cultural resources study area for the proposed project was delineated to encompass areas that contain known and potential cultural resources that may be directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed project. The potential for impacts to historical resources of an archaeological nature and archaeological resources is limited to the project site, where demolition, direct ground disturbance, temporary construction, and staging would occur. A review of cultural resources documentation covering areas outside the project site was conducted to assess the project site's potential sensitivity for archaeological resources.

Impacts to built environment historical resources would potentially occur within the project site as a result of demolition, construction, or other project-related activities with the potential to directly and materially alter a built environment historical resource. In addition, built environment resources are potentially subject to indirect impacts, such as visual, noise, vibration and/or ground settlement effects that may result from construction of the project. To assess potential indirect impacts, the study area for built environment resources was delineated to include, in addition to the project site, the first row of adjacent parcels surrounding the project site. The cultural resources study area is depicted in Figure 4.3-2, below.

The 2023 Rincon report utilized this study area and was produced as a supplemental assessment to the 2019 Environmental Science Associates report. The 2019 Environmental Science Associates report included archival and background research, a NAHC SLF search, Native American outreach, an intensive ground survey of the project site, and a windshield survey of the study area outside the project site. The report also discussed the historic status of Rancho San Pedro and considered the eligibility of the property for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and for local designation.

Tasks completed as part of the 2023 Rincon report included supplemental archival and background research; support by consultation with local interested parties, interested Native American tribes, and the SHPO; an intensive-level built environment survey of the study area, excepting the direct project site; an archaeological pedestrian field survey at the 327 Harbor Site; XPI and Phase II testing of the 327 Harbor Site; and consideration of the historical significance of all properties in the study area containing built environment features constructed prior to 1976.

The supplemental research and analysis informed the effort to determine whether the project would cause impacts to historical resources. For purposes of the analysis of impacts to historical resources, historical resources include (a) all resources in the CRHR (which include those on the NRHP); (b) all HCMs, (c) all HPOZs; and (d) all resources identified as potentially eligible for listing, individually or as a contributor, in a survey prepared for or accepted by the City. For purposes of conducting a conservative analysis and identifying all potential significant impacts to historical resources in this EIR/EIS, the City has determined to treat all resources in SurveyLA that are identified as potentially eligible for designation to a local or state register, individually or as a contributor, as a historical resource. As described above, the historical resources assessment for the project identified eight historical resources for the purposes of CEQA within the study area.

Based on CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, activities would have a significant impact to historical resources if they would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Section 15064.5 explains that, "[s]ubstantial 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."

Figure 4.3-2 Cultural Resources Study Area



Imagery provided by Microsoft Bing and its licensors © 2022.

Fig 4.3-2 Cultural Resources Study Area

To assess potential impacts to archaeological resources, a number of sources were consulted to identify known archaeological resources in and around the project site. This included a review of the following registers and databases: the NRHP, CRHR, list of CHLs, list of California Points of Historical Interest, list of City of Los Angeles HCMs, and the Archaeological Determination of Eligibility list, in addition to a review of known archaeological resources identified in the SCCIC records search conducted as part of the 2019 Environmental Science Associates report and tribal consultation carried out by HACLA. In addition, an archaeological pedestrian survey, XPI, and Phase II testing was conducted at the 327 Harbor Site to assess the potential for archaeological resources to occur.

b. Project Design Features

No specific project design features are proposed in regard to cultural resources.

c. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

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

Impact CR-1 THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD INVOLVE THE DEMOLITION OF RANCHO SAN PEDRO, WHICH QUALIFIES AS A HISTORICAL RESOURCE PURSUANT TO SECTION 15064.5. ALTHOUGH MITIGATION MEASURES CUL-1 AND CUL-2 ARE PROPOSED TO REDUCE THIS IMPACT, THIS IMPACT WOULD REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE.

The proposed project would involve the phased demolition of existing structures on the OSP Specific Plan Site and the construction of up to 1,553 multi-family residential units, 85,000 sf of services, amenities and administration uses, and 45,000 sf of local-serving commercial/retail uses. The 327 Harbor Site would be developed with 47 residential units to serve as replacement housing for current Rancho San Pedro residents during construction on the OSP Specific Plan Site.

The proposed project includes two development scenarios (see Section 2, *Project Description*) that would involve phasing the construction on the OSP Specific Plan Site in different ways. Under Scenario A, the densest development would be located in Planning Areas 2 and 3, whereas under Scenario B, development would be densest in Planning Areas 1 and 2. Under both scenarios, the footprint of proposed development would be identical, construction and grading activities would be the same, and the overall buildout of the project site would involve the same types and amounts of land uses. Therefore, this analysis applies to both Scenario A and Scenario B.

Project Site

The 327 Harbor Site is undeveloped and does not contain any historical resources; therefore, project activities on the 327 Harbor Site would not result in impacts to historical resources. However, the proposed project would result in the demolition of the entire Rancho San Pedro on the OSP Specific Plan Site, portions of which are listed in the CRHR and the entirety of which is eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR, and for designation as a HCM. As such, it qualifies as a historical resource under CEQA and the demolition of Rancho San Pedro would result in a direct significant impact to historical resources.

Study Area

Seven additional historical resources are located outside the project footprint but within the study area; these include the Ralph J. Scott Fireboat, San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building, Los Angeles Cruise Terminal, 101 South Harbor Boulevard (Senator William H. Savage House), 103 North Mesa Street, POLA Administration Building, and the Liberty Hill Site. Although the demolition and construction activities associated with the project would not directly physically alter any of these resources, it would introduce new visual features into their immediate surroundings. The potential for project-related impacts to each of these resources is discussed further below.

The Ralph J. Scott Fireboat is currently sited in a temporary tent structure, approximately 220 feet southeast of the project site, across Harbor Boulevard in an area developed with institutional and public use. The boat is a designated NHL under Criteria 1 and 4 and is listed in the NRHP and the CRHR. Its significance is conveyed in its physical form, through such character-defining features as its riveted steel hull, decks, and deckhouse, none of which would be at all physically altered by the proposed project. With relation to the boat's setting, outside of its location adjacent to the waters of the port, there are limited physical features of its surroundings which contribute to the boat's historical significance. The wider setting of the Ralph J. Scott Fireboat consists of urban development that varies in its density and use and is largely consistent with the proposed project. The proposed project would not materially alter in an adverse manner the characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance and justify its eligibility for historic designation. The proposed project would therefore result in a less than significant impact to the Ralph J. Scott Fireboat pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

The San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building is located at Berth 84, approximately 416 feet southeast of the project site, across Harbor Boulevard. The building sits adjacent to the port channel, in a developed area that includes the Los Angeles Fire Department Station 112 and a public park. It is eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM under Criteria A/1/1 and C/3/3. While its significance is largely conveyed through its physical features, for example the details that define its Streamline Moderne-style architecture, its setting is also important in conveying its significance. However, the physical features within its setting that contribute to its historic significance include its adjacency to Terminal Island and the water, neither of which will be changed by the proposed project. Outside of the building's immediate surroundings, which are primarily institutional and public use, the wider setting of the building consists of urban development consistent with the proposed project. The proposed project would not materially alter in an adverse manner the characteristics of the San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building that convey its historical significance and justify its eligibility for historic designation. The proposed project would therefore result in a less than significant impact to the San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

The Los Angeles Cruise Terminal is located almost 0.25 mile northeast of the project site, along the port channel, surrounded by a large, paved parking lot. The building is eligible for listing in the NRHP and as an HCM under Criteria A/1 and C/3, and its significance is largely conveyed via the physical features that define its International Style. However, its physical location and setting adjacent to the water also convey its significance related to the development of the POLA. These elements of the building's setting and its character of use as a cruise terminal would not be altered by the proposed project. The building's wider setting is varied and includes development consistent with the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not materially alter in an adverse manner the characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance and justify its eligibility for historic designation. The proposed project would therefore result in a less than significant impact to the Los Angeles Cruise Terminal pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

101 South Harbor Boulevard (Senator William H. Savage House) is located immediately adjacent to the project site. The property is eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM under Criteria A/1/1 and C/3/3, and its period of significance encompasses the decades in which it was occupied by the SCI (1920-1966). Throughout and following this period, development in the property's surroundings was altered such that its setting largely no longer contributes to its ability to convey significance. Despite the property's reduced integrity of setting, it remains a rare example of a community services-oriented property associated with the development and operation of the POLA. The proposed project would not result in a change of the character of its use or of physical features within its setting that contribute to its historic significance. Given the property's already urban surroundings, construction of the proposed project would not further reduce its integrity of setting. Therefore, the proposed project would not materially alter in an adverse manner the characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance and justify its eligibility for historic designation. The proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to 101 South Harbor Boulevard (Senator William H. Savage House) pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

103 North Mesa Street is located approximately 100 feet from the OSP Specific Plan Site, catty corner across North Mesa Street. The property is eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, and as an HCM under Criteria A/1/1 and B/2/2, and its period of significance encompasses the years in which it was associated with significant San Pedro real estate agent John Anderson (1896-1909). Since its period of significance, its surroundings have been significantly altered such that its setting largely no longer contributes to its ability to convey significance. Despite reduced integrity, the property remains a rare example of a residential property type dating from San Pedro's post-consolidation period and retains sufficient integrity to convey this association, in addition to its significant association under Criterion B/2/2, with John Anderson. The proposed project would not result in a change of the character of its use or of physical features within its setting that contribute to its historic significance. Given the property's already urban surroundings, construction of the proposed project would not further reduce its integrity of setting. Additionally, construction-related visual elements would be temporary in nature and would be removed entirely following construction. The proposed project would not materially alter in an adverse manner the characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance and justify its eligibility for historic designation. It would therefore result in a less than significant impact to 103 North Mesa Street pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

The POLA Administration Building is eligible for historic designation for its architectural merit, as an example of the High-Tech and Sculptural substyle of the Late-Modern style and for its use of Cor-Ten steel framing. The building conveys its significance in its physical form, through the presence of the key character-defining features of these substyles, including extreme exaggeration through the Cor-Ten frame, mirrored glass curtain walls, multi-level, multi-geometric shaped concrete terraced base, repetition of form, and an exposed structural system. There are no site features or elements of the building's setting which work to convey its historical significance or justify its eligibility for historic designation. The proposed project would not materially alter in an adverse manner the characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance and justify its eligibility for historic designation. The proposed project would therefore result in a less than significant impact to the POLA Administration Building pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

The Liberty Hill Site is designated as CHL No. 1021 as the site of the 1923 Industrial Workers of the World Strike. The resource's significance does not extend to the Boys and Girls Club Building located within it, which has been previously recorded and found ineligible for listing as a historical resource. The Liberty Hill Site conveys its significance by its physical presence as the location of a historic event, and not through its physical features. The proposed project would not materially alter in an adverse

manner the characteristics of the resource that convey its historical significance and justify its eligibility for historic designation. The proposed project would therefore result in a less than significant impact to the Liberty Hill Site pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Although the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to historical resources in the project site vicinity, as discussed above, the proposed project would result in the demolition of Rancho San Pedro. Pursuant to Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, demolition of Rancho San Pedro would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to a historical resource.

Mitigation Measures

The project would alter those characteristics of Rancho San Pedro that justify its eligibility for historic designation. The following measures, which are generally consistent with other measures adopted for other recent similar projects in the area, are included below to mitigate to the greatest extent feasible impacts to built environment historical resources pursuant to CEQA.

CUL-1 Interpretive Display

HACLA shall ensure that the project Applicant prepares and installs an interpretive display in the Phase 1 Community Room, which will be open to the public. The interpretive display shall be completed to coincide with the opening of the Phase 1 Community Room. It shall include a brief history of the historical resource, its significance in the contexts of public and defense worker housing in Los Angeles during the Second World War and public housing design related to the Garden City and Modern movements, and a description of the project which led to the demolition of the historical resource. The display shall be professionally written, illustrated, and designed, and shall include the website address associated with the informational website created by implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2. The content shall be prepared by persons meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for history or architectural history in coordination with the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources. The Interpretive Display may be rotated amongst Community Rooms and/or public outdoor spaces throughout the OSP Specific Plan Site with approval by HACLA.

CUL-2 Informational Website

HACLA and/or the project Applicant shall add to their existing website a section dedicated to the history of Rancho San Pedro Complex and public housing in Los Angeles within six months of the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the Phase 1 Community Room. The website shall be maintained by HACLA and shall provide content on the history of Rancho San Pedro Complex, the significance of public housing in the city, and notable examples of public housing architecture and site planning. It shall include links to other scholarly sources of information on the history and design of the site within the context of public housing in the city. The new website section shall be professionally written, illustrated, and designed. The content shall be prepared by persons meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for history or architectural history and shall be periodically updated, as needed, if new scholarly information related to the history or significance of Rancho San Pedro and public housing become available following the initial publishing of the website.

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would mitigate impacts to Rancho San Pedro to the greatest extent feasible. However, because compliance with the Secretary's Standards or avoidance is not possible, legal precedent has established that such measures cannot mitigate

impacts to a level of less than significant because the loss of historical fabric cannot be readily compensated for by commemorative mitigation². Therefore, impacts to a historical resource, specifically, Rancho San Pedro, would remain significant and unavoidable.

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

Impact CR-2 CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO IMPACT PREVIOUSLY UNKNOWN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES. IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES CUL-3 THROUGH CUL-6 REQUIRE ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING AND THE PROPER TREATMENT OF ANY ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES UNEARTHED DURING PROJECT CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. THEREFORE, THIS IMPACT WOULD BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION.

The proposed project would involve the phased demolition of existing structures on the OSP Specific Plan Site and the construction of up to 1,553 multi-family residential units, 85,000 sf of services, amenities and administration uses, and 45,000 sf of local-serving commercial/retail uses. The 327 Harbor Site would be developed with 47 residential units to serve as replacement housing for current Rancho San Pedro residents during construction on the OSP Specific Plan Site.

The proposed project includes two development scenarios (see Section 2, *Project Description*) that would involve phasing the construction on the OSP Specific Plan Site in different ways. Under Scenario A, the densest development would be located in Planning Areas 2 and 3, whereas under Scenario B, development would be densest in Planning Areas 1 and 2. Under both scenarios, the footprint of proposed development would be identical, construction and grading activities would be the same, and the overall buildout of the project site would involve the same types and amounts of land uses. Therefore, this analysis applies to both Scenario A and Scenario B.

No prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources were observed within the OSP Specific Plan Site as part of the study summarized in the 2019 Environmental Science Associates report. As mentioned above and discussed further in Section 4.14, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, the 2023 Rincon report confirmed that there are six Gabrielino Villages located in the general vicinity of the study area, including one (*Xoyuunga* village) that most ethnographic maps and descriptions place just inside the study area or immediately adjacent to the study area. The location of the village has not been confirmed through any archaeological investigations; however, the study area and surrounding area is highly disturbed and includes fill material up to 25 feet below grade. Therefore, the likelihood of encountering remnants of the *Xoyuunga* village or any intact archaeological resources is considered low. Further, the 2023 Rincon report identified one prehistoric resource (P-19-000146/CA-LAN-146) potentially located within the study area and one historical archaeological resource (P-19-003801/CA-LAN-3801) partially located within the study area. However, P-19-000146/CA-LAN-146 has been destroyed by modern development, and all remaining portions of P-19-003801/CA-LAN-3801 are located below grade and do not extend into the project site.

The archaeological pedestrian field survey of the 327 Harbor Site conducted by Rincon identified three historic-period foundations, clam shell fragments, one unmodified chert fragment, and one battered chert cobble. Due to the proximity of P-19-003801/CA-LAN-3801 to the 327 Harbor Site and finds identified during the archaeological survey, Rincon conducted an XPI investigation to assess the presence or absence of archaeological deposits associated with P-19-003801/CA-LAN-3801 or with a previously unidentified prehistoric archaeological resource. XPI testing identified a previously

² League for Protection of Oakland's Architectural and Historic Resources v. City of Oakland (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 896.

unrecorded archaeological resource (OSP-S1) with a possible prehistoric and confirmed historic-period component. Phase II testing was conducted to determine if intact cultural deposits associated with OSP-S1 existed within the 327 Harbor Site, to evaluate the deposit(s) for listing on the NRHP and the CRHR, and to determine whether the project would impact historical or unique archaeological resources under CEQA.

Archaeological testing at the 327 Harbor Site did not identify subsurface deposits that had clear contexts or associations with P-19-003801 and determined that the deposits associated with OSP-S1 within the 327 Harbor Site are limited in both density and diversity and, therefore, do not have the potential to provide data to answer research questions important to the prehistory/history of the San Pedro area. Additionally, no materials were recovered from an intact (i.e., previously undisturbed) deposit that could be submitted for radiocarbon dating to confirm the date(s) of prehistoric occupation of the site. The tested areas within the 327 Harbor Site exhibited a high-level of ground disturbance from previous grading, underground utility installation, and building construction, maintenance, and demolition, and therefore lack integrity. Given the extent of excavation that has taken place, additional archaeological excavation would have a low potential to discover intact archaeological features or diagnostic artifacts that retain integrity and would provide sufficient data to inform on the practices of the inhabitants. OSP-S1 is recommended ineligible for listing in the CRHR under Criteria 1, 2, 3 and 4 and is, therefore, not considered a historical resource under CEQA.

Although the presence of archaeological resources on the project site is unlikely, ground-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to damage or destroy previously unknown historic or prehistoric archaeological resources that may be present on or below the ground surface. Therefore, project construction impacts would be potentially significant. Upon completion of construction activities, ground-disturbing activities would cease, and project operation would not result in impacts to archaeological resources.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-3 Project Archaeologist

HACLA shall retain a Project Archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology to ensure mitigation and/or conditions of approval for the project, as they relate to archaeological resources, are completed. The Project Archaeologist shall oversee and implement the Worker's Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) and cultural resources monitoring (CUL-4 and CUL-5). The Project Archaeologist shall be responsible for preparing and executing any testing and/or reporting programs necessary in the event of a find during project execution.

CUL-4 Worker's Environmental Awareness Training

A qualified archaeologist and Native American representative shall be retained to conduct a WEAP training on archaeological sensitivity for all construction personnel prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activities associated with the project. The training shall be conducted by an archaeologist who meets or exceeds the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology and a locally affiliated Native American representative. Archaeological sensitivity training shall include a description of the types of cultural materials that may be encountered, cultural sensitivity issues, the regulatory environment, and the proper protocol for treatment of materials in the event of a find.

CUL-5 Archaeological Monitoring

Working under the direct supervision of the Project Archaeologist, an archaeological monitor shall be present during ground-disturbing activity for project construction, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, demolition, trenching, and excavation, for the duration of the aforementioned activities or until the Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the HACLA and monitoring tribes, determines monitoring is no longer necessary (e.g., initial ground disturbance is complete, soils are sterile for cultural resources). The archaeological monitor shall prepare daily logs to be submitted at the completion of the project as part of the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report. In the event that previously unidentified prehistoric or historical archaeological materials or human remains are encountered during project construction, the archaeological monitor shall retain the authority to halt and/ or redirect work up to 100 feet away from the discovery until an evaluation of the resource is complete and the location of the find has been cleared for further activity by the Project Archaeologist.

A Native American monitor representing one of the consulting Native American Tribes shall be present during ground-disturbing activity for project construction, including but not limited to site clearing, grubbing, demolition, trenching, and excavation, for the duration of the proposed project or until the Project Archaeologist determines monitoring is no longer necessary. The Native American monitor shall prepare daily logs and submit weekly updates to the Project Archaeologist. In addition, the Native American monitor shall prepare and submit a summary statement upon completion of monitoring to include in the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report prepared for the project. The Project Archaeologist and HACLA shall review and include the statement as part of the Cultural Resources Monitoring Report prepared for the project.

At the completion of monitoring, the Project Archaeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resources Monitoring Report to document the findings during the monitoring effort for the project. The report shall include the monitoring logs completed for the project and document any discoveries made during construction monitoring. The report shall also include the monitoring logs prepared by the Native American monitor for the project. The Cultural Resources Monitoring Report shall be submitted to HACLA and the SCCIC.

CUL-6 Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources

If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities that have not been previously identified, work in a 100-foot radius of the find shall be halted and redirected. The Project Archaeologist or the archaeological monitor shall provide recommendations regarding the resource's potential significance and potential treatment in consultation with the Native American monitor. If the discovery is identified to be a site (generally more than three artifacts), the evaluation shall require preparation of an Archaeological Testing Plan (ATP) to determine if the resource qualifies for CRHR and/or NRHP listing. Such evaluations will be used to determine if the project may have a significant impact/adverse effect on the resource. Following the execution of the ATP, if the lead agency in consultation with the Project Archaeologist, determines the discovery is significant and cannot be avoided by the project, additional work such as an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) shall be completed prior to the resumption of ground-disturbing activities in the immediate area to mitigate any significant impacts to cultural resources. The ATP and ADRP are described in further detail below.

NRHP/CRHR criteria for evaluating the significance of archaeological resources shall be used in the event a cultural resource is discovered. If resources are discovered that the Project Archaeologist recommends the resource meets the significance criteria of NRHP Criterion D and or the CRHR

Criterion 4, and if preservation in place is not feasible, an ADRP shall be implemented. If resources are found to meet NRHP criteria A and/or B and/or C and or the CRHR criteria 1 and/or 2 and/or 3, then representatives of the appropriate descent community or the appropriate community members shall be notified upon the determination.

- **Archaeological Testing Plan:**

The purpose of the ATP will be to determine the extent and possible presence/absence of archaeological resources and to identify whether the resources constitute an historic property or historical resource using the criteria of the NRHP/CRHR.

- The ATP shall be conducted in accordance with an approved ATP that will be reviewed by the consulting Native American Tribes.
- At the completion of the ATP, the Project Archaeologist and Staff Archaeologists shall submit a written report of the findings.
- If the Project Archaeologist determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the project, at the discretion of the project sponsors either:
 - The project shall be re-designed as to avoid any adverse effects; or
 - A data recovery program shall be implemented.

- **Archaeological Data Recovery Program:**

Should a cultural resource that qualified for NRHP/CRHR listing under Criterion D/4 for data potential be identified and cannot be avoided by the project, an ADRP shall be completed to comprehensively document the resource and exhaust the data potential. The ADRP shall be conducted by the Project Archaeologist in accordance with the California OHP's 1990 *Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format*.

Prior to implementing the field component of the ADRP, a Data Recovery Plan (Plan) shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist selected to carry out the ADRP. The Plan shall be prepared in consultation with Native American groups who have participated in consultation for the project and reviewed and approved by HACLA. The Plan shall, at minimum, include the following:

- Field Methods and Procedures
- Thresholds for Achieving Data Redundancy
- Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis
- Discard and Deaccession Policy
- Interpretive Program
- Security Measures
- Final Report
- Curation

Significance After Mitigation

Mitigation Measures CUL-3 through CUL-6 would ensure that proper procedures are in place in the event that archaeological resources are discovered during construction activities. With implementation of mitigation, potential impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources during project construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

Impact CR-3 GROUND-DISTURBING ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT COULD RESULT IN DAMAGE TO OR DESTRUCTION OF HUMAN BURIALS. IMPACTS WOULD BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT ADHERENCE TO EXISTING REGULATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURE CUL-7.

The proposed project would involve the phased demolition of existing structures on the OSP Specific Plan Site and the construction of up to 1,553 multi-family residential units, 85,000 sf of services, amenities and administration uses, and 45,000 sf of local-serving commercial/retail uses. The 327 Harbor Site would be developed with 47 residential units to serve as replacement housing for current Rancho San Pedro residents during construction on the OSP Specific Plan Site.

The proposed project includes two development scenarios (see Section 2, *Project Description*) that would involve phasing the construction on the OSP Specific Plan Site in different ways. Under Scenario A, the densest development would be located in Planning Areas 2 and 3, whereas under Scenario B, development would be densest in Planning Areas 1 and 2. Under both scenarios, the footprint of proposed development would be identical, construction and grading activities would be the same, and the overall buildout of the project site would involve the same types and amounts of land uses. Therefore, this analysis applies to both Scenario A and Scenario B.

Human burials outside of formal cemeteries can occur in prehistoric archeological contexts. While no known burial sites have been identified within the project site, excavations during construction activities could have the potential to disturb these resources, which include Native American burial sites. Although it is unlikely that human remains are present, the project site has at least the possibility of containing previously unidentified human remains.

As per consultation with the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation and the Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, the study area lies within sensitive area regarded as the ancestral and traditional territories of both entities. Additionally, both entities recommended archaeological and tribal monitoring take place during ground disturbance construction activity associated with the project. If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the Los Angeles County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner is required to notify the NAHC, which would determine and notify a MLD who must complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and provide recommendations for treatment to the landowner within 48 hours of being granted access. Additionally, archaeological and Native American monitors would be present during all project ground-disturbing activities with the potential to encounter human remains, as required by Mitigation Measures CUL-3 through CUL-6. Incidental discoveries would be treated in accordance with existing regulation as required by Mitigation Measure CUL-7.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-7 Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains and Associated Grave Goods

In the event human remains are unexpectedly discovered at any time during the implementation of the project, HACLA, the Project Archaeologist and the project sponsors shall follow the California Health and Human Safety Code Section 7050.5, which states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section

5097.98. Therefore, in the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the Los Angeles County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner will notify the NAHC. Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98(d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Any items associated with human remains that are placed or buried with Native American human remains are to be treated in the same manner as the remains in accordance with PRC 5097.98(d)(2). The NAHC shall notify an MLD, and the MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of being granted site access to make recommendations. The landowner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from subsequent disturbance. Any discovery of human remains or grave goods shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.

Significance After Mitigation

Results of the impacts analysis provided above indicate that ground-disturbing activities associated with construction of the proposed project may result in significant impacts previously unidentified human remains. However, compliance with Mitigation Measure CUL-7, which required adherence to existing regulations, would ensure proper identification and treatment of any human remains that may be present. As a result, impacts to human remains would be less than significant with mitigation.

4.3.4 Cumulative Impacts

As discussed above, the proposed project is anticipated to cause a significant impact to built environment historical resources with implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2 and less than significant impacts to archaeological historical resources and human remains with implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-3 through CR-7. The potential for cumulative impacts to built environmental historical resources, archaeological resources, and human remains is discussed further below.

a. Built Environment Historical Resources

The proposed project would involve the demolition of the existing Rancho San Pedro public housing complex. As discussed above, the 2023 Rincon report recommended the entire property, including the 1953 Extension, eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and CRHR, and for designation as an HCM under Criteria A/1/1 and C/3/3. Under Criteria A/1/1, the property is significant for its association with the development of public housing in Los Angeles between 1937 and 1955. Under Criterion C/3/3, Rancho San Pedro is eligible as a representative example of the Garden Apartment property type as applied to defense/public housing. Based on analysis detailed in the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Rose Hill Courts Project, there are more than 30 public and private Garden Apartment properties located in Los Angeles (UltraSystems Environmental 2019).

A cumulative impact may occur if multiple properties of a similar class, Garden Apartment-style public housing complexes, were subject to individual impacts. In addition, a cumulative impact may occur if the combined effect of other projects in the vicinity of the proposed project site would result in alterations to the setting or other impacts that would affect the integrity of historical resources within the study area. The cumulative projects in listed in Section 3.4, *Cumulative Development*, include a range of projects, including adaptive reuse of existing buildings and construction of new mixed-use, hotel, restaurant, and residential developments with buildings up to eight stories. One cumulative project, located at 111 North Harbor Street, is located in the cultural resources study area, while most of the remaining cumulative projects are located outside the study area within approximately one

block. The cumulative projects are consistent with the San Pedro Community Plan and the general revitalization efforts in the San Pedro area designed to transform aging and underutilized buildings into community serving and residential uses. The cumulative projects are similar to the proposed project in that they include a mix of commercial and residential uses, with some being of similar height to the buildings in the proposed project.

Although none of the cumulative projects would directly alter any of the known historical resources in the study area, the cumulative projects have the potential to affect the respective settings of the historical resources located in the study area by introducing new uses and visual elements. However, in most cases, the settings of the historical resources in the study area do not convey the resources' significance. However, there are three exceptions: Ralph J. Scott Firehouse, San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building, and Los Angeles Cruise Terminal. The elements of these resources' settings that contribute to their significance are their proximity to the water and, in the case of the San Pedro Municipal Ferry Building, proximity to Terminal Island. New development associated with the proposed project and cumulative projects would not change the proximity of these resources to the water or alter Terminal Island, and therefore, would not contribute to a diminishment of the characteristics that convey the significance of any known historical resources in the study area.

Although the cumulative projects would not include alterations to Garden Apartment-style public housing complexes, it is unknown whether other projects outside the cumulative study area would cause impacts to properties of this class. It is reasonably foreseeable that redevelopment, rehabilitation, and/or other activities carried out by HACLA or other entities would involve Garden Apartment-style public housing complexes. It is possible such projects would result in impacts to Garden Apartment-style public housing complexes that qualify as historical resources, diminishing the number of historical resources significant in the same historical context as Rancho San Pedro. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to built environment historical resources be less than significant.

b. Archaeological Resources and Human Remains

Cumulative projects would increase the potential for impacts to buried archaeological historical resources and human remains through construction activities in the area. However, such impacts are generally site-specific and project-specific mitigation for cumulative development projects would limit this impact to less than significant. As described under Impacts CUL-2 and CUL-3 above, implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-3 through CR-7 would ensure the proposed project would result in less than significant impact related to archaeological historical resources and human remains. Potential impacts to archaeological historical resources and human remains under the cumulative projects would be addressed on a case-by-case basis, and appropriate mitigation would be designed to mitigate impacts resulting from individual projects. Therefore, cumulative impacts to archaeological historical resources and human remains would be less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank.