

2.1.8 Cultural Resources

This section evaluates the potential for historical and archaeological resources within the proposed project area and the effects of the bridge replacement project on such resources. The information presented in this section is based upon the Historic Properties Survey Report (HPSR) prepared for the project (Parsons, 2003d).

2.1.8.1 Regulatory Setting

“Cultural resources” as used in this document refers to all historical and archaeological resources, regardless of significance. Laws and regulations dealing with cultural resources include the following:

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA): The NHPA sets forth national policy and procedures regarding historic properties, defined as districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects included in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on such properties and to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) the opportunity to comment on those undertakings, following regulations issued by the ACHP (36 CFR 800).

On January 1, 2004, a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (PA) between the ACHP, FHWA, SHPO, and Caltrans went into effect for Caltrans projects, both state and local, with FHWA involvement. The PA implements the ACHP’s regulations, 36 CFR 800, streamlining the Section 106 process and delegating certain responsibilities to Caltrans. FHWA’s responsibilities under the PA have been assigned to Caltrans as part of the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program (23 CFR 773) (July 1, 2007).

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA): The ARPA applies when a project may involve archaeological resources located on federal or tribal land. ARPA requires that a permit be obtained before excavation of an archaeological resource on such land can take place.

Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act: Historic properties are also protected under Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act, which regulates the “use” of land from historic properties by transportation facilities.

NRHP: Established in 1966, the NRHP is the nation’s official list of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. The NRHP recognizes “The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- A. That are associated with events that have made significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. That embody 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
- D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (36 CFR Part 60.4).”

To be considered for NRHP eligibility, properties must generally be at least 50 years old prior to the evaluation. Properties that do not meet that age criteria must possess exceptional significance to be considered for listing.

CEQA: Historical resources are considered under CEQA, as well as California PRC Section 5024.1, which established the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). PRC Section 5024 requires state agencies to identify and protect state-owned resources that meet NRHP listing criteria. It further specifically requires Caltrans to inventory state-owned structures in its ROWs. PRC Sections 5024(f) and 5024.5 require state agencies to provide notice to and consult with SHPO before altering, transferring, relocating, or demolishing state-owned historical resources that are listed on or are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or are registered or eligible for registration as California Historical Landmarks. To be eligible for nomination, a historical resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following criteria:

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States;

2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or National History;
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values; or
4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local areas, California, or the nation.

2.1.8.2 Affected Environment

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed project was approved by Caltrans and FHWA on October 8, 2002, and October 1, 2002, respectively. The APE for the proposed project is located in the Port at the southern end of SR 710 in Los Angeles County. The project is specifically centered along Ocean Boulevard from the intersection of the Terminal Island Freeway at the western end to the easterly end of the bridge over the Los Angeles River.

The entire project area is located within the boundaries of Terminal Island and the Port. Terminal Island and the surrounding Port have undergone extensive alterations and construction since the original Port was planned and founded. The current landscape is an artificial structure consisting of ballast and introduced materials to form a base, then filled with soils transported from the mainland.

The following cultural resource studies (Parsons, 2003d) were completed for this project:

- HPSR, April 2003
- Historic Resources Evaluation Report (HRER), April 2003
- Archaeological Survey Report, October 2002

Methods used to support the studies performed for this project are described below.

- A records search to identify known or potential locations that may contain archaeological resources was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton in September 2002.
- Field surveys of the APE were conducted in August 2002.
- The NRHP (<http://www.nr.nps.gov/>), accessed on September 10, 2002, lists no properties located on Terminal Island.

- The Historic Properties Data File for Los Angeles County, August 13, 2002, lists no properties within the project area.
- The California Points of Historical Interest, 1992, of the Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation, lists no properties within a 0.5-mi (0.8-km) radius.
- The California Historical Landmarks, 2000, of the Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation, lists no properties located on Terminal Island.

Native American Consultation

Letters were mailed to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on September 24, 2002. The NAHC supplied a list of Native American individuals, groups, tribes, and entities with a potential interest in the proposed project. Letters were sent to the individuals identified by the NAHC on September 30, 2002. To date, no contact has been received from any of the potentially interested Native American parties (see Appendix B-1 of the HPSR for more information regarding coordination).

Archaeological Resources

No known archaeological resources were identified within the APE. The present formation of Terminal Island and the surrounding areas does not support the location of any archaeological deposits.

No further archaeological work should be necessary, unless the project plans are modified to include areas outside of the APE. If cultural materials are discovered during construction, then all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area will be diverted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find.

If human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that further disturbances and activities shall cease in any area or nearby area suspected to overlie remains, and the County Coroner must be contacted. Pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98, if the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner will notify the NAHC who will then notify the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). At this time, the person who discovered the remains will contact POLB so that they may work with the MLD on the respectful treatment and disposition of the remains. Further provisions of PRC 5097.98 are to be followed as applicable.

Historic Architectural Resources

A field survey was conducted on August 23, 2002, to identify historic architectural resources within

the APE. The APE includes a minimum of one parcel adjacent to the existing and potential public ROW that would be required for construction of the project alternatives. An HPSR was completed for the APE and examined 13 properties for historical significance. Only the LBGS (former Edison Power Plant No. 3 and transmission towers) appeared to meet significance criteria for inclusion in the NRHP (Criteria A and D), as well as the CRHR (Criteria 1 and 4). All other properties, including the Gerald Desmond Bridge, were determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. The SHPO concurred with the HPSR findings on July 21, 2003 (see Appendix C).

Former Edison Power Plant No. 3 (Exhibit 2.1.8-1) and the transmission towers (Exhibit 2.1.8-2) are potentially eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and D, owing to their importance in the industrial development of the Long Beach Harbor and the Los Angeles area, and for the plant's remaining steam-electric generating technology from the early 1900s; however, two of the three original plant buildings (Plants No. 1 and No. 2) were demolished prior to this evaluation, compromising the integrity of the resource's original setting. Furthermore, the remaining plant has been completely resurfaced, compromising any architectural significance that the facility may have had.

Further discussion and analysis regarding the LBGS can be found under separate cover in the HPSR.

2.1.8.3 Environmental Consequences

Evaluation Criteria

Title 36 CFR Part 800 defines adverse effects on historic properties as follows:

Section 800.5(1), Criteria of Adverse Effect – An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.

Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:

1. Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;
2. Isolation of the property from or alteration of the character of the property's setting when that character contributes to the property's qualification for the NRHP;

3. Introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property or alter its setting;
4. Neglect of a property resulting in its deterioration or destruction; and
5. Transfer, lease, or sale of the property (36 CFR Part 800.9 [b]).

Under 36 CFR Part 800.9 (c), there are "effects of an undertaking that would otherwise be found to be adverse [but] may be considered... not adverse for the purpose of these regulations."

1. When the historic property is of value only for its potential contribution to archaeological, historical, or architectural research, and when such value can be substantially preserved through the conduct of appropriate research, and such research is conducted in accordance with applicable professional standards and guidelines;
2. When the undertaking is limited to the rehabilitation of buildings and structures and is conducted in a manner that preserves the historical and architectural value of affected historic property through conformance with the Secretary's "Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings;" or
3. When the undertaking is limited to the transfer, lease, or sale of a historic property, and adequate restrictions or conditions are included to ensure preservation of the property's significant historic features.

No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not result in impacts to cultural resources and would have no adverse effect on historic properties.

North-side Alignment Alternative

This alternative would locate the new bridge closer than the existing bridge to the NRHP-eligible former SCE Power Plant No. 3, and it would require a sliver of the property near the channel (0.58-acre [0.23-ha] for footing and aerial easements). Although the North-side Alignment Alternative would require a sliver ROW acquisition, it would not physically affect the building. Additionally, new transmission towers would be constructed on both sides of the Cerritos Channel, adjacent to the existing towers, which are part of the historic resource. The existing towers would remain intact, and the transmission lines would be relocated to the new towers (see Section 2.1.4 [Utilities] for more information).

As described above, Power Plant No. 3, which was built in 1927 (Exhibit 2.1.8-1), and the steel lattice, high-tension transmission towers, which were built in 1912 and 1924 (Exhibit 2.1.8-2) on either side of the Cerritos Channel, were determined eligible for listing in the NRHP. That finding was made by consensus through the Section 106 process. The eligibility of the resources is under Criteria A and D; therefore, they are listed in the CRHR under Criteria 1 and 4. The significance of these resources is for their important role in industrial development of the Long Beach Harbor and Los Angeles area, and for the plant's remaining steam-electric generating technology from the early 1900s. The SHPO concurrence letter officially agreed with the FHWA determination that building the new bridge and "construction of...new high-voltage transmission towers adjacent to the existing towers, which will be left standing..." would have no adverse effect on historic resources (see Appendix C).

Section 4(f): NRHP-eligible resources are also eligible for consideration under Section 4(f). These resources consist of the electrical steam-electric generating equipment and technology within the Power Plant No. 3 building and the high-voltage transmission towers. As previously discussed, the SHPO concurred with FHWA that construction of the North- or South-side Alignment Alternatives would not have an adverse effect on historic properties, per Section 106 of the NHPA; therefore, construction of the North- or South-side Alignment Alternatives would not result in a use under Section 4(f).

South-side Alignment Alternative

This alternative would be located south of the existing bridge, further away from the historic

power plant; however, as with the North-side Alignment Alternative, it would require construction of new high-voltage transmission towers and lines adjacent to the historic towers to provide additional vertical clearance for ships.

The SHPO concurrence letter officially agreed with the FHWA determination that building the new bridge and "construction of...new high-voltage transmission towers adjacent to the existing towers, which will be left standing..." would have no adverse effect on historic resources (see Appendix C).

Rehabilitation Alternative

The Rehabilitation Alternative would include improvements to the existing bridge only. The Gerald Desmond Bridge was determined ineligible for inclusion on the NRHP during the Section 106 Process (see Appendix C). Additionally, the Rehabilitation Alternative would not physically alter or damage the historic Edison Power Plant or require relocation of the associated transmission lines that cross the Cerritos Channel. This alternative would not change the character of the property's use or setting or introduce visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that would diminish the historic features. The Rehabilitation Alternative would have no adverse effect on historic resources.

2.1.8.4 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

No measures required.



**Exhibit 2.1.8-1
Photograph of Edison Power Plant No. 3**



**Exhibit 2.1.8-2
Photograph of Transmission Towers**

This page intentionally left blank.