

1 **4.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

2 Cultural resources include archaeological and historical objects, sites and districts, historic
3 buildings and structures, cultural landscapes, and sites and resources of concern to local Native
4 Americans and other ethnic groups.

5 Redevelopment would result in benefits to certain cultural resources, as well as potentially
6 significant and significant impacts to other such resources. With implementation of measures
7 recommended in this section, some significant impacts would be mitigated to a level that is less
8 than significant. Even with implementation of all feasible mitigation, however, some residual
9 impacts would remain significant; these impacts are considered unavoidable. The impact of loss
10 of aesthetic character related to cultural resources is disclosed and discussed in Section 4.11:
11 Aesthetics.

12 **4.6.1 Study Area**

13 The study area for cultural resources is the approximately 1,800-acre redevelopment project
14 area, plus any nearby resources that could potentially be affected by redevelopment.

15 **4.6.2 Regulatory Setting**

16 **Federal**

17 The National Environmental Quality Act (NEPA, 42, United States Code (USC) §§ 4321-4327),
18 requires federal agencies to consider potential environmental impacts and appropriate
19 mitigation measures of actions with federal involvement. The National Historic Preservation Act
20 (NHPA) (16 USC § 470 *et seq.*) addresses concerns pertinent to an action's effect on cultural
21 resources.

22 The NHPA sets forth the federal government's policy on historic preservation and the programs,
23 including establishing the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Under the NHPA,
24 historic properties include “. . . any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or
25 object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places” (16 USC
26 470w(5)). Section 106 (16 USC 470f) of the NHPA requires federal agencies, prior to
27 implementing an “undertaking” (*e.g.*, conducting its own action or issuing a federal permit), to
28 consider the effects of the undertaking on historic properties and to afford the Advisory Council
29 on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) a
30 reasonable opportunity to comment on any undertaking that would adversely affect properties
31 eligible for listing on the NRHP.

32 The U.S. Army's action at the OARB—disposal and transfer of government property—is a
33 federal undertaking, As such, the NHPA and its implementing regulations (16 USC 470 *et seq.*,
34 36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 800, 36 CFR Part 60, and 36 CFR Part 63) apply to

1 the Army's action. The Army , the lead federal agency, was responsible for NHPA Section 106
2 compliance, including consultation with the SHPO and ACHP.

3 Under the NHPA (36 CFR Section 60.4) a district, site, building, structure, or object is eligible for
4 listing in the NRHP when:

5 1. The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and
6 culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity,
7 including location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

8 2. The districts, sites, buildings, or objects meet the following criteria:

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

17 The NHPA uses the term "historic property" for cultural and archaeological resources that have
18 been determined eligible to the NRHP. Cultural and archaeological resources and structures
19 that do not qualify for listing on the NRHP are not considered to be significant and are not
20 described as historic properties. If a resource has been determined not to be eligible for listing
21 on the NRHP, it generally is not considered further in assessment of the environmental impacts
22 of a project. Further guidance for determining the eligibility of structures and historic districts are
23 published by the National Park Service (NPS), the National Register Bulletins 15 (1991a), 16A
24 (1991b), 16B (1991c), and the *Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Evaluation*
25 (1983: 44723-26). These guidelines provide instructions for evaluating and nominating National
26 Register Historic properties.

27 To retain historic integrity, a resource should possess several of the above-mentioned aspects.
28 The retention of specific aspects of integrity is essential for a resource to convey its significance.
29 For a district to retain its integrity as a whole, the majority of the components, or individual
30 resources, that make up the district's historic character must possess integrity even if they are
31 individually undistinguishable. The relationships among the district's components must be
32 substantially unchanged since the period of significance. When evaluating the impact of
33 changes upon the district's integrity, the relative number, size, design and location of the
34 resources that do not contribute to the district's significance should be considered. A district is
35 not eligible if it contains many alterations or new intrusions, so that it no longer conveys the
36 sense of the historic environment.

State

CEQA requires lead agencies to consider effects of their proposed actions on historic resources (these include built-environment historic and prehistoric archaeological resources). Historic resources are defined as those resources that meet any of the following criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Places (CRHR). These criteria are set forth in Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 of CEQA:

- Criterion A: is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- Criterion B: is associated with lives of persons important in our past;
- Criterion C: 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
- Criterion D: has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition, the definition of "historical resource" includes archaeological resources listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the CRHR as well as resources listed or eligible for listing in the NRHP or local registers. It also includes historical resources determined by the lead agency to be significant.

Where an action may adversely affect a historical resource, CEQA Section 21084.1 requires the lead agency to treat that effect as a significant environmental effect and prepare an EIR. Additionally, CEQA Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 operate independently to ensure that potential effects on unique archaeological resources are considered as part of a project's environmental analysis. A unique archaeological resource implies 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 one of the following criteria:

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

A non-unique archaeological resource indicates an archaeological artifact, object, or site that does not meet the above criteria. Impacts to non-unique archaeological resources and resources that do not qualify for listing on the CRHR receive no further consideration under CEQA.

Section 15064.5 of CEQA also assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. These procedures are detailed under Public Resources Code (PRC) 5097.94 and 5097.98. Health and Safety Code

1 Section 7050.5 codifies, with the exception of those activities defined in PRC 5097, that every
2 person who knowingly mutilates or disinters, wantonly disturbs, or willfully removes any human
3 remains in or from any location other than a dedicated cemetery without authority of law is guilty
4 of a misdemeanor.¹ If human remains were to be discovered within the project area, the
5 Alameda County Coroner must be notified within 48 hours, and the Coroner must contact the
6 California Native American Heritage Commission in the event that the remains are determined
7 to be of Native American descent.

8 **Local**

9 The City of Oakland General Plan contains a Historic Preservation Element that was adopted in
10 1994 by City Council Resolution number 70807 C.M.S. The Historic Preservation Element,
11 amended in 1998, sets forth the policy for listing on the Local Register in Policy 3.8 (Definition of
12 “Local Register of Historical Resources” and Historic Preservation for Environmental Review
13 Purposes). For purposes of environmental review under CEQA, the following properties
14 constitute the City of Oakland’s Local Register of Historical Resources:

- 15
- all Designated Historic Properties, and
 - those Potential Designated Historic Properties that have an existing rating of “A” or “B” or
17 are located within an Area of Primary Importance.

18 Until complete implementation of Historic Element Action 2.1.2 (Redesignation), the Local
19 Register of Historical Resources will also include the following designated properties: Oakland
20 Landmarks, S-7 Preservation Combining Zone properties, and the Preservation Study List
21 properties.

22 The City of Oakland also maintains the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS), a project of
23 the Community and Economic Development Department. The OCHS, which has been in
24 progress since 1979, is intended to provide an inventory of historic resources throughout the
25 city.

26 The OCHS uses a five-tier rating system for individual properties, ranging from “A” (highest
27 importance) to “E” (of no particular interest), that is incorporated in the Historic Preservation
28 Element of the General Plan by reference (pp. 31 and 32). This is termed the Individual
29 Property Rating of a building, and is based on the following criteria:

- 30
- **Visual Quality/Design:** Evaluation of exterior design, interior design, materials and
31 construction, style or type, supporting elements, feelings of association, and importance of
32 designer.

¹ Section 5097 of the PRC prohibits excavations upon, or removing, destroying, injuring, or defacing, any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, situated on public lands, and prohibiting the prevention of Native American religious worship at archaeological or sacred sites.

- 1 • **History/Association:** Association of person or organization, the importance of any event,
2 association with patterns, and the age of the building.
- 3 • **Context:** Continuity and familiarity of the building within the district.
- 4 • **Integrity/Reversibility:** Evaluation of the building's condition, its exterior and interior
5 alterations, and any structural removals.

6 Properties with conditions or circumstances that could change substantially in the future are
7 assigned both an "existing" and a "contingency" rating. The existing rating describes the
8 property under its current condition, while the contingency rating describes it under possible
9 future circumstances, such as if the property were restored. The existing rating is denoted by an
10 uppercase letter, and is the present rating of the building. The contingency rating, if any, is
11 shown second, and is denoted by a lowercase letter. Properties are also given a Multiple
12 Property Rating (1, 2, or 3) based on an assessment of the significance of the area in which the
13 property is located: properties within an Area of Primary Importance (an area that appears
14 eligible for the National Register) are rated "1"; those in an Area of Secondary Importance are
15 rated "2"; and those outside an identified district are rated "3." A plus (+) or minus (-) sign
16 indicates whether the property contributes or not to the API or ASI.

17 An Area of Primary Importance (API) is a historically or visually cohesive area or property
18 grouping that contains a "high proportion of individual properties with ratings of 'C' or higher and
19 appears eligible for the National Register of Historic Places either as a district or as a
20 historically-related complex." At least two-thirds of the properties must be "contributors" to the
21 API, reflecting the API's principal historical or architectural themes, and must not have
22 undergone major alterations. An Area of Secondary Importance (ASI) is similar to an API,
23 however potential contributors to the ASI are counted for purposes of the two-thirds threshold as
24 well as contributors; ASIs do not appear eligible for the National Register.

25 **4.6.3 Regional Setting**

26 Environmentally, Oakland and the surrounding San Francisco Bay region afford a wealth of
27 resources for human settlement. The OARB and immediate vicinity are situated mostly on
28 manmade fill placed from the 1900s through the 1940s. The extreme western end of the project
29 area is situated on the edge of a historic marsh that was important to Native American
30 settlement, as well as to later farming and industry. The San Antonio Creek marsh, as well as
31 the resources of the local streams and hills, were attractive to the earliest Native American
32 settlers of the region, who hunted and gathered a wide variety of resources. The streams and
33 the rich oak woodlands of the Oakland area also attracted settlement by later ranchers and
34 farmers. One environmental factor significant in the archaeological assessment of the project
35 area is that the Base is constructed on man-made fill. In terms of the archaeological record, this
36 precludes any likelihood of prehistoric archaeological resources within the study area.

37 The cultural history of the Oakland area is marked by four distinct periods. The area was first
38 occupied by Native Americans. The first Euro-American entry occurred around 1769, during

1 exploration for the establishment of missions by Spanish-colonials from Mexico. The rancho era
2 of settlement began with Mexican independence from Spain in the 1820s, at which time
3 settlement increased and lands were distributed among Mexican settlers. The United States
4 gained sovereignty over the region in 1848, and this event was soon followed by an onrush of
5 American settlers, whose presence would forever change the character of the region.

6 **Prehistoric Setting**

7 Human occupation of Oakland and the surrounding San Francisco Bay region extends back
8 5,000 years or more. The vicinity of the study area was occupied and used prehistorically by
9 Native American groups, who subsisted by hunting and gathering the rich resources of the
10 marshlands along the Bay shore and the nearby uplands, including abundant game, acorns,
11 and other plant sources. The people of Oakland and the surrounding Bay Region were
12 integrated into an extensive trade network that extended throughout California and the West. At
13 the time of historic contact, the area was occupied by the Ohlone (or Costanoan) group of
14 Native Americans (Levy 1978), who probably entered the Bay Region between 1,500 and 2,000
15 years ago.

16 The population and traditional lifeways of the Ohlone were severely affected by the influences of
17 the Spanish colonists and the Mission system. As the result of enforced missionization, disease
18 and direct assault, by 1800, few if any Ohlone remained on the land or subsisted in native
19 lifeways, and native population had declined in some areas by as much as ninety percent.
20 (Cook 1955).

21 **Historical Setting**

22 The historic settlement of Oakland began during the Spanish Pueblo era, 1791-1820. The
23 Spanish and later Mexican colonizers first established the Rancho San Antonio, which was
24 granted to Sergeant Luis Maria Peralta in 1820. The Rancho was later subdivided and
25 distributed among Mr. Peralta's sons. Vicente Peralta inherited that portion of Oakland nearest
26 the study area. The first building in the area was constructed as part of the Rancho San Antonio
27 headquarters located outside of the study area on 34th Avenue.

28 The core of the City of Oakland was incorporated in 1852 by Horace W. Carpenter (Hart
29 1978:305). The beginnings of the City are somewhat controversial, as Horace W. Carpenter,
30 Edson Adams, and Alexander Moon had squatted on Vicente Peralta's land since 1850. A deal
31 was struck between the parties, and Carpentier leased the land for a townsite from Vincente
32 Peralta. Carpentier and three friends laid out the townsite of Oakland, and sold lots from the
33 leased land. So many purchasers were involved in these land sales that the courts were unable
34 to handle the volume, and Vincente Peralta lost some of his most valuable land as a result
35 (Bagwell 1982).

36 A long period of monopolistic control of the waterfront followed. Carpentier gained control of the
37 waterfront by virtue of a grant deed issued by the town trustees in 1852 (Bagwell 1982:44). He
38 became mayor of Oakland in 1854 and under the monopoly formed between him and his allies,

1 the Central Pacific Railroad (later SPRR) barons, he gained further control. In 1868, Carpentier
2 and the Central Pacific Railroad formed the Oakland Waterfront Company. Carpentier granted
3 his holdings to the company, and Oakland became the western terminus for the transcontinental
4 railroad (Bagwell 1982).

5 In 1869, transcontinental rail service began along 7th Street, which was followed by the 1st Street
6 freight line and Long Wharf in 1891 (Brady and Associates 1994). With the arrival of the
7 railroad, Oakland was transformed into a commercial center with a booming population,
8 becoming the second largest city in the state after San Francisco (Moffat 1982).

9 In response to local demands, the federal government included harbor improvements to San
10 Antonio Creek in the government's Rivers and Harbor Act of 1873. A contributing factor for
11 obtaining federal aid was the perceived insecurity of Central Pacific's Long Wharf, a 2-mile-long
12 wooden pier. Since a majority of the railroad traffic for the western United States was shipped
13 from this pier, its vulnerability to marine insects and natural disasters was seen as a great long-
14 term risk to commerce.

15 The task of building the Oakland Harbor was assigned to the Corps. This project was
16 considered the largest, most complex and expensive of all of the Corps' harbor improvement
17 work in the San Francisco District (JRP 1996). In 1874–1875, work began on the two stone
18 masonry "training walls" (or jetties) that flanked the Federal Channel entrance to Oakland
19 Harbor. The concept behind the training walls was to enable (or train) the natural ebb tide to
20 scour and deepen the shipping channel. The north and south walls were 750 to 1,000 feet apart,
21 12 to 20 feet wide at the base, 8 feet wide at the top, and measured 9,500 feet and 12,000 feet
22 long, respectively. The walls were unusual because they were constructed of a random rubble
23 core that was faced with boulders weighing 1/2 to 3 tons, using a dry stone masonry technique.
24 The northern wall, formerly within the Maritime sub-district, was removed during construction of
25 the Port of Oakland's Berths 55-58 Project.

26 Commerce using the Port of Oakland increased more than 21-fold between 1874 and 1900.
27 Channel dredge material had been used to fill behind the north training wall, creating new land
28 in front of the Carpentier grant line, which the courts had ruled only reached to the low tide line
29 of 1852. This new land was used to challenge the unresolved conflict over private monopoly
30 control of the waterfront. In 1906, the City granted Western Pacific a franchise and wharfing-out
31 rights in an area adjacent to the north training wall. SPRR, who thought they had the right to all
32 tidelands, opposed this grant. The court battle lasted through 1909. In 1909, the City of Oakland
33 was successful in its claim to all new land beyond the 1852 low tide line, ending the control of
34 the Waterfront Company and creating a municipal port (Bagwell 1982). Municipal control
35 postdates the Western Pacific presence (see Bagwell 1982:187; McCarthy and Lerner 1997:4).
36 The City permitted Western Pacific to build an extensive facility for rail and ferry operations
37 adjacent to the north training wall through the study area. Built in 1909–1910, the 2-mile-long
38 development was called the Western Pacific mole, and consisted of tracks, a levee, a mole, a
39 freight shed, an ornamental ferry building, two ferry slips, and two piers (McCarthy 1997).

1 Western Pacific was acquired by Union Pacific in 1984, and this area is now referred to as the
2 UP mole.

3 The majority of the study area lies on top of a vast human-made fill plain, most of which was
4 constructed between 1900 and 1945. The earlier areas of fill were along the training walls and
5 were mostly dredge materials. The fill in the easternmost boundaries of the study area adjacent
6 to the current alignment of the I-880 corridor consisted primarily of legal and illicit refuse
7 deposits. These deposits were primarily located alongside the tracks of the Southern Pacific and
8 Western Pacific railroads (Caltrans 1990:9-10).

9 During World War II, the federal government undertook construction of two separate military
10 facilities within the study area: the OARB and the Naval Supply Center, Oakland (NSCO).
11 These facilities were extremely important during World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam
12 War, and the Gulf War, and employed thousands of people. These facilities operated until the
13 1990s, when they were slated for closure. The NSCO (later called the Fleet and Industrial
14 Supply Center, Oakland [FISCO]) has subsequently undergone redevelopment for industrial
15 port and regional recreational use.

16 **4.6.4 Local Setting**

17 No archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, or other resources of concern to local Native
18 Americans have been identified within the study area. Two historic districts and three individual
19 historic structures have been identified within the study area. The historic districts are the
20 Oakland Army Base Historic District and the Southern Pacific Railroad Industrial Landscape
21 District. The individually historic structures are the Southern Pacific Railroad Station and 16th
22 Street Tower, and the IEC Railway Bridge Yard Shop. Figure 4.6-1 illustrates the locations of
23 these resources.

24 Twelve additional buildings within the study area exceed fifty years of age, but are not
25 considered significant historic resources under the California Environmental Quality Act
26 (CEQA). Eight of these structures are on the Oakland Army Base and were subjected to further
27 study for this EIR to determine their significance (JRP 2002). These structures include OARB
28 Buildings No. 70, 773, 774, 775, 796, 840, the 7th Street Underpass, and the IEC Railway
29 Bridge. All of these structures were evaluated by an architectural historian and determined not
30 to qualify as significant historic resources or as a significant historic district for the purposes of
31 CEQA. Four additional structures were identified in the study area; these are two structures
32 within the Schnitzer Steel property, a 1940s structure located on Pacific Gas & Electric property
33 adjacent to the Howard Terminal, and a 1950s-era add-on substation to PG&E's Power Station
34 C. These structures are not historically significant under CEQA. Moreover, the proposed
35 redevelopment program would not affect these structures.

36

1 Insert

2 Figure 4.6-1 District Historic Resources

3

1 **Known Cultural Resources**

2 Figure 4.6-1 illustrates known cultural resources within the project area. A review of
3 documentation for the presence of previously recorded archaeological sites and historic built
4 environment features, and for previous archaeological surveys within the study area is based on
5 the following studies and inventories:

- 6 • studies for the I-880 Cypress Freeway replacement structure (Caltrans 1990);
- 7 • Draft, Supplemental Draft, and Final Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) for disposal
8 and reuse of OARB (Corps 1997, 2001a, 2001b);
- 9 • the EIS/Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for disposal and reuse of the Fleet and
10 Industrial Supply Center, Oakland ([FISCO] U.S. Navy and Port of Oakland 1997);
- 11 • Berths 55-58 Project EIR (Port of Oakland 1998);
- 12 • Letter Report on the Impact of the Cypress Structure Project on the OARB Historic District
13 (JRP 2000);
- 14 • Howard Terminal EIR (Port of Oakland [Brady and Associates] 1994); and
- 15 • Oakland Army Base Area Redevelopment Plan for Supplemental Cultural/Historic Resource
16 Analysis (JRP 2002).
- 17 • Oakland Army Base Wharf 6, 6½, and 7 Condition Study (Nancy Elizabeth Stoltz Design
18 and Planning 2001)
- 19 • Oakland Army Base Historic Preservation Feasibility Study; Preliminary Building Condition
20 Survey – Draft manuscript (Ripley Architects 2000)
- 21 • Oakland Army Base Historic Building Reuse Alternatives Report – Draft (Nancy Elizabeth
22 Stoltz Design and Planning 2002)

23 The OARB, FISCO, and Howard Terminal have been surveyed for built environment historic
24 structures. No additional archaeological surveys were conducted for the current action, since
25 most of the area is composed of man-made fill, and the remainder was investigated by Caltrans
26 (1990). The built environment of the OARB has been documented thoroughly by previous
27 studies.

28 **Archaeological Resources throughout the Study Area**

29 No known prehistoric archaeological sites are located within the study area. Only one
30 archaeological site has been recorded within a one-half-mile radius of the study area.
31 Prehistoric site number CA-ALA-17 is reported to be located in the vicinity of 7th and Adeline
32 streets, but its exact location is unknown. Because the study area lies almost entirely upon fill, it

1 is considered to have low archaeological sensitivity. A small portion of the study area within the
2 Maritime sub-district area bounded by Martin Luther King, Jr. Way, Brush Street, 3rd Street, and
3 the Embarcadero is located on a parcel that is not man-made fill, and may have a higher
4 potential for buried prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, although none are known
5 to exist there.

6 **Historic Resources: OARB Sub-District**

7 Figure 4.6-2 illustrates historic resources in the OARB sub-district and surrounding area. The
8 OARB Historic District, an NRHP-eligible district, is located in this sub-district, and portions are
9 located in both the Gateway and Port development areas. The historic district is discontinuous,
10 comprising three distinct areas. Two smaller areas are combined and designated the Northwest
11 Component; the third larger area is designated the Northeast Component. The OARB Historic
12 District was determined eligible for listing to the NRHP as a result of a 1990 study conducted by
13 Caltrans for the Cypress Structure Replacement Project. The District is also listed as an Area of
14 Primary Importance in the City of Oakland's General Plan (1994).

15 The OARB Historic District derives its significance from the following: The OARB played a
16 significant role during World War II (1941–1945), and has been determined eligible for listing in
17 the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A, representing broad patterns of
18 American History, at the local, state, and national levels of significance (see the 2001 MOA,
19 Appendix 4.6). According to the Army, it was the only complete Army port installation in the
20 nation set up with rail marshalling yards, huge warehouses, waterside transit sheds, and piers
21 capable of handling the largest transport cargo ships, supported by shops, a complete rail
22 system linking the entire operation, administrative and service buildings, a dry dock for handling
23 smaller boats and ships, and temporary quarters for housing troops. It also served as the
24 Army's disposition center, through which moved all military personnel returning from overseas
25 assignments (King 1990:2).

26 The historic district has been identified, evaluated, and recorded to Historic American Buildings
27 Survey (HABS) level II standards (Corps 1999:4-63, Caltrans 1990). When determined eligible
28 for listing to the NRHP, the district incorporated OARB Buildings No. 1, 4, 60, 85, 88, 90, 99,
29 151 (Wharf 6), 152 (Wharf 6½), 153 (Wharf 7), 802–808, 812, 821, 822, 823, 991, and the
30 Knight Railyard.² The Knight Railyard was subsequently re-evaluated by the Army, and found to
31 no longer possess sufficient integrity to be considered eligible for the NRHP (JRP 2000). The
32 Knight Railyard is also no longer considered eligible to the California or Local Register, and is
33 not considered further in this EIR as a historic resource.

34 The Army and the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) dropped all OARB structures
35 designated "temporary WWII" (Buildings No. 4, 85, 88, 90, 802–808, 821, 822, 823, and 991)
36 from federal consideration pursuant to a national Programmatic Agreement concerning World

² Buildings No. 151, 152, and 153 are not buildings but wharf structures. None of the buildings located on the wharves are contributing elements to the district.

1 War II–era military facilities. For the purpose of CEQA and the analysis for this EIR, however,
2 these temporary World War II structures are considered to be historic resources (as Historic
3 District contributors). All of the contributing structures within the OARB Historic District are
4 categorized as “3d” by the OHP (2001: PRC Reference Numbers 4623-0441-0001 through
5 00024). This category means that the structures are not individually eligible, only contributing
6 elements to the Historic District as a whole.

7 Under Section 106 of the NHPA, a signed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the
8 Department of the Army and the California SHPO has been in effect since December 11, 2001.
9 According to the MOA, included in Appendix 4.6, the Oakland Heritage Alliance and Oakland
10 Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board were consulted when the MOA was drafted. This MOA
11 addresses Army undertakings and the effect that disposal and reuse of the OARB would have
12 on the historic districts. The MOA states that “temporary structures” within the OARB historic
13 district have been removed from the NHPA Section 106 process, the Knight Railyard is no
14 longer considered a contributing element to the District due to loss of integrity, and the Army
15 has completed its mitigation measures for the Base. The U.S. Army agreed to complete
16 mitigation measures for historic resources at the OARB in 1995. These measures were outlined
17 in a MOA between the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Military Traffic Management
18 Command (Western Area), and the SHPO, dated August 30, 1995. The mitigation measures
19 included:

- 20 • Preparation of the Historic Preservation Plan for the Oakland Army Base by Hermann
21 Zillgens, December 1994.
- 22 • Completion of HABS/HAER documentation for Buildings No. 1, 4, 60, 85, 88, 90, 99, 151
23 (Wharf 6), 152 (Wharf 6½), 153 (Wharf 7), 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 812, 822, 823,
24 and 991, and submittal to the National Park Service.
- 25 • Production of a video entitled “A Job Well Done,” documenting the history of the Oakland
26 Army Base.

27 **OARB Sub-District, Gateway Development Area**

28 As depicted by Figure 4.6-2, several buildings and structures within the Gateway development
29 area are listed on or determined eligible to the NRHP or CRHR. Most of these buildings and
30 structures are eligible as contributing elements to the OARB Historic District. In addition, one
31 building (the IEC Bridge Yard Shop) is individually eligible for listing on the NRHP. The Korean
32 War-era buildings are not considered historic resources.

33 **OARB Historic District.** The following buildings are contributing elements to the OARB Historic
34 District and are located within the Gateway development area: Buildings No. 1, 4, 60, 85, a
35 portion of 88, a portion of 99, portions of 804–808, 812, 821, 822, and 823. In total, this
36 represents approximately 720,000 square feet (36 percent) of the approximately 1.99 million
37

1 Insert

2 Figure 4.6-2 OARB Sub-District Historic Resources

3 11 x 17 page 1 [ODD PAGE]

4

1 Insert Figure 4.6-2 page 2

2

1 square feet of historic buildings within the district. In addition, the following structures are
2 contributing elements to the OARB Historic District, and are located within the Gateway
3 development area: the majority of Wharf 6½, and Wharf 7 in its entirety (Buildings No. 152 and
4 153, respectively). This represents approximately 2,200 linear feet (62 percent) of the total
5 3,500 linear feet of historic wharves within the Historic District.

6 **Korean War–Era Buildings.** Several structures within the OARB have reached fifty years of
7 age since the 1990 Caltrans study. All of the structures that were constructed between 1946
8 and 1954 were re-examined by the City of Oakland to see whether they meet the definition of a
9 significant historic resource for the purposes of CEQA (JRP 2002). Within the Gateway
10 development area, Building No. 70 was evaluated. Under the Oakland Preservation Element,
11 this building would be rated as “D” (of minor importance) if rated individually. The property is not
12 individually distinctive but is typical or representative examples of military construction during
13 the Korean War. When combined with the other OARB Korean War–era buildings (Buildings No.
14 773, 774, 775, 796, and 840—located in the Port development Area, see below) they also would
15 qualify as Areas of Secondary Importance if grouped with the OARB for listing as a district.
16 Building No. 70 is not a contributor to the significance of the OARB Historic District or to the
17 themes represented at OARB (JRP 2002:25). As such, the property does not qualify as a
18 significant historic resource for the purposes of CEQA, and is not considered further in this EIR.

19 **IEC Bridge Yard Shop.** The IEC Bridge Yard Shop was found individually eligible to the NRHP
20 by Caltrans in 1990. In its 1990 Cypress study, Caltrans describes this resources as number C-
21 12, an historic railway car shop. This structure is on land currently owned by Caltrans and is not
22 expected to be affected by redevelopment.

23 **OARB Sub-District, Port Development Area**

24 Several buildings and structures within the Port development area are listed on or determined
25 eligible to the NRHP or CRHR. Most of these buildings and structures are eligible as
26 contributing elements to the OARB Historic District. In addition, one structure (the IEC Bridge) is
27 no longer considered individually eligible to the CRHP or NRHP.

28 **OARB Historic District.** The following buildings are contributing elements to the OARB Historic
29 District, and are located within the Port development area: Buildings No. 90, a portion of 88, 90,
30 a portion of the majority of 99, 802, 803, portions of 804–808, and 991. These buildings
31 comprise approximately 1.25 million square feet (64 percent) of the approximately 1.97 million
32 square feet of total historic buildings within the Historic District. In addition, a portion of Wharf
33 6½ and Wharf 6 (Building No. 151) are contributing elements to the OARB Historic District.
34 These wharves represent approximately 1,300 linear feet (38 percent) of the total 3,500 linear
35 feet of historic wharves within the district.

36 **Korean War–Era Buildings.** Several structures within the OARB that reached fifty years of age
37 since the 1990 Caltrans study and which were re-examined by the City are located within the
38 Port development area. Buildings No. 773, 774, 775, 796, and 840 were evaluated. Under the

1 Oakland Preservation Element, these buildings would be rated as “D” (of minor importance) if
2 rated individually. As a whole these properties are not individually distinctive, but they are typical
3 or representative examples of military construction during the Korean War. When combined with
4 the other Korean War–era buildings (Building No. 70—see the discussion of the Gateway
5 development area, above) they also would qualify as Areas of Secondary Importance if grouped
6 with the OARB for listing as a district. Buildings No. 773, 774, 775, 796, and 840 are not
7 contributors to the significance of the OARB Historic District or to the themes represented at
8 OARB (JRP 2002:25). As such, the properties do not qualify as significant historic resources for
9 the purposes of CEQA, and are not considered further in this EIR.

10 **IEC Bridge.** The IEC Bridge was found individually eligible to the NRHP by Caltrans in 1990. In
11 its 1990 Cypress study, Caltrans identified this resource as number C-15, an historic railway
12 wye bridge. The southern half of the structure was removed during construction of the new I-880
13 freeway. The remaining approach and a portion of the elevated structure is within the Port
14 development area. The City of Oakland re-evaluated this structure to determine whether it
15 meets significance criteria for this EIR. Under the Oakland Historic Preservation Element and
16 based on the Caltrans evaluation in 1990, the 26th Street Bridge had a preliminary rating of *B*.
17 Considered significant as a rare surviving element of the interurban railway system, the bridge
18 was eligible under Criterion A. The design was also unique, and it was a rare surviving example
19 of a wye-shaped bridge. Now that the southern leg of the bridge has been demolished, the
20 bridge no longer appears eligible for listing in the CRHR. The Oakland Historic Preservation
21 Element rating would change from a *B* to a *C* based on this change. It has sufficient historical
22 and architectural value to warrant limited recognition but it does not appear eligible for listing for
23 the National Register (JRP 2001:30). As such, the property no longer qualifies as a significant
24 historic resource for the purposes of CEQA, and is not considered further in this EIR.

25 **Historic Resources: Maritime Sub-District**

26 One eligible historic resource has been identified within the Maritime sub-district: a small portion
27 of the SPRR Industrial Landscape and one of its contributing structures.

28 **Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) Industrial Landscape District.** This district is composed of
29 a group of industrial warehouse buildings located along the north side of the former SP (now
30 Union Pacific) rails between Chestnut and Castro Streets. The contributing structures within this
31 District meet the EIR significance criteria as historic resources. Caltrans identified this district in
32 the 1990 Cypress study. The former Robert Dalziel Company Warehouse (redeveloped as the
33 Phoenix Lofts), located at 737 2nd Street, is the only contributing structure to the small portion of
34 the SPRR Industrial Landscape District co-occurring with the Maritime sub-district. This building
35 is currently used as loft housing, and is not expected to be affected by redevelopment.

36 **Non-Significant Historic Resources.** Five resources that are not considered to be significant
37 historic resources for the purposes of CEQA were identified within the Maritime sub-district:
38 facilities associated with the Grove Street Pier, the 7th Street Underpass, two PG&E
39 Substations, and the Oakland Inner Harbor north training wall.

- 1 • **Grove Street Pier.** The quay wall, pier, and transit shed at the Grove Street Pier at the far
2 eastern edge of the study area were determined eligible to the NRHP, and were listed on
3 the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey. However, these structures have subsequently been
4 recorded to HABS/HAER level documentation and been demolished as part of the Port of
5 Oakland's Howard Terminal Project. They are not considered further in this EIR as historic
6 resources.
- 7 • **7th Street Underpass.** Built in 1931, the 7th Street Underpass has an Oakland Heritage
8 Survey preliminary rating of C as secondary importance based on the evaluation by Caltrans
9 in 1990. This structure was revisited by an architectural historian (JRP 2001) and was not
10 found to meet the criteria of eligibility to the National, State, or Local registers and is not
11 considered to be a significant historic resource for the purposes of CEQA.
- 12 • **PG&E Substation C.** This structure, located at 689 2^d Street, appears to be a 1950s
13 addition to the historic 1931 PG&E Substation located outside the study area, between
14 Martin Luther King, Jr. Way and Jefferson Street. The substation addition within the study
15 area has been preliminarily rated "x" by the Oakland City Planning Department's Cultural
16 Heritage Survey. As such, it is not considered a significant historic resource for the purposes
17 of CEQA, and is not considered further in this EIR as a historic resource.
- 18 • **PG&E Howard Terminal Substation.** One small corrugated metal structure is located
19 immediately adjacent (east) of the entrance gate to the Howard Terminal on Embarcadero
20 Street. The structure appears to be a small PG&E substation associated with supplying
21 power to the Howard Terminal. The substation within the study area was examined in the
22 1980s by the Oakland Heritage Survey, and given a ranking of "check not a PDHP," based
23 on the fact that it did not appear to be over 50 years of age at that time.

24 While the structure is now in excess of fifty years of age, preliminary research indicates that
25 it would not meet the significance criteria for the California Register, and would most likely
26 fall into the 'D' category of the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey; however, if a subsequent
27 redevelopment activity were proposed and this property were to be affected, an examination
28 by a qualified architectural historian of the substation and its building equipment would be
29 needed to make a formal determination. Regardless of its potentially historic nature, the
30 OARB project area would not affect this property.

- 31 • **Inner Harbor North Training Wall.** The training wall that was constructed at the mouth of
32 the Oakland Estuary during the 1880s and determined eligible for listing on the NRHP, was
33 recently impacted by the Port of Oakland Berths 55-58 project. The wall was completely
34 removed by the Port (Port of Oakland 2001), and therefore is not considered further in this
35 EIR. The Port mitigated the removal of the training wall through recordation and
36 documentation, and will complete its mitigation by applying to designate the training wall as
37 a California Point of Historical Interest and by reconstructing a 50-yard section of the training
38 wall along the shoreline of the Port's public access area, with the reconstruction to be
39 executed by the Dry Stone Masonry Conservancy.

40 **Historic Resources: 16th/Wood Sub-District**

41 Two historic resources exist within this sub-district. The SPRR (later Amtrak) station and 16th
42 Street Tower, both located at the corner of 16th and Wood streets. These buildings were
43 determined eligible for listing on the NRHP by Caltrans in 1990. The structures were damaged
44 in the Loma Prieta earthquake, are currently in a state of disrepair, and many of the decorative
45 elements have been removed. However, the resource most likely retains sufficient integrity to be

1 listed on the NRHP, and is also listed by the City of Oakland as a Landmark District (Ordinance
2 number 10434 C.M.S., January 31, 1984).

3 Three other NRHP-eligible historic properties were removed from 714 Pine Street, 1815 Shorey
4 and 1817 Shorey (later Short) Street during the re-construction of I-880 and temporarily stored
5 on blocks on the corner of 9th and Cedar streets. Two of the houses have since been moved
6 outside of the project area and have been rehabilitated. The third house remains at 9th and
7 Cedar but is not expected to be affected by redevelopment. These houses are not considered
8 further in this EIR.

9 The Standard Oil Warehouse that was located at 9th and Cedar streets was determined eligible
10 to the NRHP by Caltrans in 1990. It was subsequently demolished and removed by the owner
11 and is not considered further in this EIR as a historic resource.

12 The Phoenix Ironworks site is also located within the 16th/Wood sub-district. This industrial
13 facility was built in stages between 1934 and 1945, and was completely destroyed in 1996.
14 When extant, the facility was evaluated by Caltrans as not eligible to the NRHP (1990). The City
15 of Oakland assigned a rating of “C3” to the (now destroyed) buildings on the property (Betty
16 Marvin, personal communication 2001). This rating did not qualify the structures as NRHP
17 eligible or as nationally, state, or locally significant. This site is not eligible for the NRHP. This
18 site is not considered further in this EIR as a historic resource.

19 The Oakland Point Historic District is located outside, but immediately adjacent to the 16th/Wood
20 sub-district. This historic district is not expected to be affected by redevelopment, and is not
21 considered further in this EIR.

22 **4.6.5 Impact Analysis Methodology**

23 With redevelopment, some portions of the district would be subject to building demolition and
24 land clearing activities. For purposes of impact analysis, it is assumed that all buildings and
25 structures on the Base (but not all buildings within the OARB sub-district) would be demolished.
26 This would include all OARB historic resources. For the Maritime sub-district, no significant
27 historic resources would be impacted. For the 16th/Wood sub-district, it is assumed the extant
28 historic resources—the SPRR (Amtrak) Station and Tower—would be preserved.

29 **Significance Criteria**

30 Redevelopment would have a significant impact on the environment if it would:

- 31 • Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic
32 feature;
- 33 • Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; or

- 1 • Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource including
2 unique archaeological resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5;
3 substantial adverse changes include physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration
4 of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical
5 resource would be materially impaired. Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines further
6 defines that the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project
7 demolishes or materially alters, in an adverse manner, those physical characteristics of the
8 resource that:
 - 9 – convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion on, or eligibility for inclusion
10 on, the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by the State Historical
11 Resources Commission;
 - 12 – account for its inclusion on a Local Register of historical resources or its identification in
13 a historical resources survey form (DPR Form 523) ; or
 - 14 – convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion on, or eligibility for inclusion
15 on, the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by the lead agency.

16 **4.6.6 Impacts**

17 A total of two NRHP-listed historic districts and four individual historic resources that are
18 considered to be significant historic resources for the purposes of CEQA have been identified
19 within the study area. These include the OARB Historic District (NRHP and Local Register), the
20 SPRR Industrial Landscape District (NRHP and Local Register), the SPRR Station, the SPRR
21 16th Street Tower, and the IEC Railway Bridge Yard Shop.

22 **Benefits**

23 Renovation and reuse of the SPRR (Amtrak) Station and 16th Street Tower would alleviate
24 existing blight within the 16th/Wood sub-district by renovating these derelict buildings, while
25 maintaining their external historic character. This renovation and reuse of the SPRR Station and
26 16th Street Tower is expected to improve the historic character or quality of the site and its
27 surroundings. This is a benefit of redevelopment.

28 As described in its application to the Army for the Gateway peninsula, the EBRPD intends to
29 include cultural interpretation as a key element of park development. At the time of its
30 application, EBRPD envisioned the inclusion of cultural interpretive displays that describe the
31 role and contribution of the OARB to the American military efforts of World War II, the Korean
32 War, and the Vietnam War. The EBRPD also envisioned interpretive panels depicting the
33 Oakland Key System and its interface with the San Francisco ferry system. The Gateway
34 peninsula was the location where passengers made a trolley-ferry transfer. Inclusion of cultural
35 historic interpretive features is a benefit of redevelopment.

- 1 **Mitigation 4.6-6:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair
2 share basis distribution of copies of the complete OARB HABS/HAER
3 documentation prepared by the Army to: Oakland History Room,
4 Oakland Public Library; Bancroft Library, University of California; and
5 Port of Oakland Archives for the purpose of added public access to
6 these records.
- 7 **Mitigation 4.6-7:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair
8 share basis distribution of copies of “A Job Well Done” documentary
9 video published by the Army to: the Oakland History Room, Oakland
10 Public Library; Bancroft Library, University of California; the Port of
11 Oakland Archives; local public schools and libraries; and local public
12 broadcasting stations.
- 13 **Mitigation 4.6-8:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair
14 share basis preservation and long-term curation of murals from OARB
15 Building No. 1, and OBRA shall either donate the murals to the
16 Oakland Museum of California, or provide a permanent location within
17 the project area.
- 18 **Mitigation 4.6-9:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair
19 share basis a program to salvage to the maximum extent feasible as
20 whole timber posts, beams, trusses and siding of warehouses to be
21 deconstructed. These materials shall be used on site, used in other
22 East Bay Area construction, or be sold into the recycled construction
23 materials market. Landfill disposal of salvageable construction
24 material from contributing historic structures shall be prohibited by
25 contract specification. Salvage and reuse requirements shall be
26 enforced via contract specification.
- 27 **Mitigation 4.6-10:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair
28 share basis production and distribution of a brochure describing
29 history and architectural history of the OARB to local libraries and
30 schools.
- 31 **Mitigation 4.6-11:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair
32 share basis acquisition of copies of construction documentation and
33 photographs of historic buildings currently in the OARB files. Copies
34 shall be transferred to the Oakland History Room files and Port
35 historic archives, including funding to cover costs of archiving and
36 cataloging these materials at the Oakland History Room.
- 37 **Mitigation 4.6-12:** At least one building each in the Gateway and Port development
38 areas of the OARB sub-district, if feasible, shall include architectural

1 design elements such as double eaves and clerestory windows
2 evocative of the warehouse structures.

3 **Residual Significance:** Significant and unavoidable

4 Redevelopment would eliminate evidence of a specific period in the history of West Oakland
5 military transportation and operations, potentially including all structures contributing to a
6 designated historic district (Buildings No. 1, 4, 60, 85, 88, 90, 99, 151 [Wharf 6], 152 [Wharf 6½],
7 153 [Wharf 7], 802–808, 812, 821, 822, 823, and 991). Loss of these resources is considered a
8 significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6-2 through 4.6-7, as well as
9 Mitigation Measure 4.11-1 (intended to primarily mitigate impacts to aesthetic resources, but
10 which would partially mitigate impacts to cultural resources as well), would partially compensate
11 for this loss; however, the residual impact is considered significant, and the impact unavoidable.

12 ~ ~ ~

13 **Impact 4.6-3:** Redevelopment would render the OARB Historic District no longer
14 eligible to the National and/or California Registers of Historic Places
15 or the Local Register.

16 **Significance:** Significant and unavoidable

17 **Mitigation:** Measures 4.6-2 through 4.6-12 described above

18 **Residual Significance:** Significant

19 Redevelopment would eliminate evidence of a specific period in the history of West Oakland
20 military transportation and operations, potentially including all structures contributing to a
21 designated historic district (Buildings No. 1, 4, 60, 85, 88, 90, 99, 151 [Wharf 6], 152 [Wharf 6½],
22 153 [Wharf 7], 802-808, 812, 821, 822, 823, and 991). Loss of the historic setting that makes
23 the District eligible to the NRHP, CRHP, or the Local Register is considered significant impact.
24 Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6-2 through 4.6-12 would partially compensate for this
25 loss; however, the residual impact is considered significant, and the impact unavoidable.

26 ~ ~ ~

27 **Impact 4.6-4:** Redevelopment would result in renovation of the SPRR (Amtrak)
28 Station and 16th Street Tower, which could alter the historic character
29 of the buildings in a manner that could affect their eligibility.

30 **Significance:** Significant

31 **Mitigation 4.6-13:** Prior to major renovation of a historically significant structure, the
32 redeveloper of the SPRR Station and 16th Street Tower shall ensure
33 that historically significant artifacts and features, if present within the

1 building, are recorded and deposited with the appropriate museum. All
2 renovation of the exterior of a historic structure shall be consistent
3 with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation
4 Studies.

5 **Residual Significance:** Less than significant

6 Renovation and re-use of the SPRR Station and 16th Street Tower may alter evidence of a
7 specific period in the history of West Oakland transportation. With implementation of Mitigation
8 Measure 4.6-8, the impact would be substantially rectified, and the residual impact is considered
9 less than significant.

10 ~ ~ ~

11 **4.6.7 Mitigation**

12 Implementation of the following mitigation measures will avoid, minimize, reduce, rectify, or
13 compensate for significant impacts of redevelopment.

14 **Mitigation 4.6-1:** Should previously unidentified cultural resources be encountered during
15 redevelopment, work in that vicinity shall stop immediately, until an assessment of the finds can
16 be made by an archaeologist. If the resource is found to be significant under CEQA, an
17 appropriate mitigation plan must be developed.

18 This measure applies to Impact 4.6-1.

19 The City and/or Port of Oakland, or its developer will retain an archaeologist, upon any
20 unanticipated discovery. The archaeologist will prepare a preliminary evaluation to assess the
21 archaeological sensitivity of the specific site(s) under consideration and will recommend actions
22 to protect archaeological resources. If the archaeologist's evaluation indicates a more detailed
23 site assessment is warranted, an archaeologist shall initiate a testing program. The
24 archaeologist will prepare a report determining the potential significance of the find and
25 recommend measures to minimize potential effects on archaeological resources; measures
26 might include a site security program, additional on-site investigations, or documentation,
27 preservation, and recovery of cultural material.

28 If, after testing, the archaeologist determines that the discovery is not significant as defined in
29 CEQA, no further investigations or precautions are necessary to safeguard the find. The
30 archaeologist will prepare a final report to be sent to the responsible agency, the Oakland
31 Landmarks Advisory Board, and the California Historical Resources Information System
32 Northwest Information Center.

33 If, after testing, the archaeologist determines that the discovery is significant as defined in
34 CEQA, ground-disturbing activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery will remain
35 suspended until an appropriate plan can be agreed upon and implemented. If further

1 investigations or precautions are necessary or appropriate, City and/or Port of Oakland and the
2 archaeologist will jointly determine what additional procedures are necessary to protect the
3 resource and/or mitigate any significant impacts. Additional measures might include a redesign
4 of the project, data recovery excavations, or a program to monitor all site excavation, during
5 which the archaeologist will record observations in a permanent log. The archaeologist will
6 prepare a final report to be sent to the responsible agency, the Oakland Landmarks Advisory
7 Board, and the California Historical Resources Information System Northwest Information
8 Center.

9 Should any human remains be encountered, work in the vicinity shall halt and the County
10 Coroner notified immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner
11 will contact the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) pursuant to
12 subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code. The NAHC in Sacramento will
13 identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 5097.98 of the
14 Public Resources Code. The City and/or Port of Oakland and the contracted archaeologist will
15 consult with the MLD. The MLD may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or her
16 authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American remains and
17 may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for
18 treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave
19 goods. The descendents shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within
20 24 hours of their notification by the Native American Heritage Commission. The
21 recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human
22 remains and items associated with Native American burials. Work may not commence until the
23 coroner's approval has been received.

24 ~ ~ ~

25 **Mitigation 4.6-2:** The City, Port and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair-share
26 basis development of a commemoration site at a public place located within the Gateway
27 development area.

28 This measure applies to Impacts 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 and Cumulative Impact 5.6-1.

29 Land shall be set aside for development of a commemoration site at a publicly accessible place
30 located within the Gateway development area (potentially the Gateway Park at the Bay Bridge
31 touchdown peninsula). The commemoration site should include relocated physical elements of
32 the OARB Historic District, along with appropriate monument(s) to memorialize the contributions
33 of civilians and the military in the Bay Area to all wars.

- 34 • The City and the Port shall explore opportunities to identify structures and/or portions of
35 structures to be preserved or moved to commemoration site.
- 36 • A master plan shall be prepared for the commemoration site, including selection of
37 appropriate physical elements, the design of monuments and the design of the

1 commemoration site itself. The master planning process should involve the City and the
2 Port, the public and interested historical and veterans groups, historic experts, and other
3 public agencies.

- 4 • Implementation of the commemoration site master plan may be phased along with the
5 timing of new development. No demolition or deconstruction of historic structures shall occur
6 until necessary for redevelopment activities.
- 7 • The master plan may include an endowment to be funded by the City and the Port for on-
8 going maintenance, replacement and potentially curator costs associated with
9 commemoration site and with trail linkages as described below.
- 10 • The City and the Port shall develop an ongoing outreach program informing the public of the
11 importance of the OARB to the community and the region, and of the existence of the
12 commemorative site.

13 ~ ~ ~

14 **Mitigation 4.6-3:** The City shall ensure the commemoration site is linked to the Gateway Park
15 and the Bay Trail via a public access trail.

16 This measure applies to Impacts 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 and Cumulative Impact 5.6-1.

17 Within the Gateway development area, this trail may be located along the shoreline. Beyond the
18 Gateway, the trail would follow the new alignment of Maritime Street, connecting to 7th Street,
19 which connects to the Port’s Middle Harbor Shoreline Park and other existing and planned trail
20 segments.

- 21 • The design and development of this on-site trail shall include a series of interpretive panels,
22 exhibits and design elements that communicate the scope and historical significance of
23 Base activities and their impact on the community throughout the life of the Base.
- 24 • A brochure shall be developed and made available describing the history of the Army Base
25 that could be used as a self-guided tour, related to the interpretive panels and exhibits
26 described above.

27 ~ ~ ~

28 **Mitigation 4.6-4:** The City, Port and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair-share
29 basis collection and preservation of oral histories from OARB military and civilian staff.

30 This measure applies to Impacts 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 and Cumulative Impact 5.6-1.

31 Oral histories shall be collected from OARB staff working at the Base from the 1940s through
32 Base closure. Implementation of this measure should begin as soon as possible. The scope of
33 this measure should include the following:

- 34 • professional quality publication of a master catalog of the interviews;

1 The Army has produced a television broadcast-quality video documentary that describes the
2 mission and historical significance of the OARB. This documentary is currently available to the
3 public, but is not widely distributed. This mitigation measure will ensure that the documentary is
4 widely distributed and made available to a larger audience interested in the history of the Base.
5 It will also offset the modification and/or destruction of many of the historic buildings on the
6 base, preserve their images, and provide a description of their function and role to the interested
7 public.

8 ~ ~ ~

9 **Mitigation 4.6-8:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share
10 basis preservation and long-term curation of murals from OARB Building No. 1, and OBRA shall
11 either donate the murals to the Oakland Museum of California, or provide a permanent location
12 within the project area.

13 This measure applies to Impacts 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 and Cumulative Impact 5.6-1.

14 A mural commemorating the military transportation function of the Base is currently in storage at
15 the OARB. Preservation through stabilization, conservation, and display will ensure this mural is
16 preserved for future generations. This artwork is a unique historical document that evokes the
17 historical importance of the Base, and commemorates the contributions of the U.S. military to
18 Oakland and the nation at large. The mural shall be preserved in a publicly-accessible location,
19 which may include the Gateway Park, a building within the Gateway development area, Middle
20 Harbor Shoreline Park, or the Oakland Museum. This measure should include funding for long-
21 term curation to standards approved by a qualified art historian.

22 ~ ~ ~

23 **Mitigation 4.6-9:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share
24 basis a program to salvage as whole timber posts, beams, trusses, and siding of warehouses to
25 be demolished to the maximum extent feasible. These materials shall be used on site, used in
26 other East Bay Area construction, or be sold into the recycled construction materials market.
27 Landfill disposal of salvageable construction material from contributing historic structures shall
28 be prohibited by contract specification. Salvage and reuse requirements shall be enforced via
29 contract specification.

30 This measure applies to Impacts 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 and Cumulative Impact 5.6-1.

31 The long warehouses located within the OARB Historic District (Buildings No. 802–808) are
32 constructed almost exclusively of high-quality lumber. The large scale of the buildings
33 necessitated the use of large-dimension beams. Today it is ecologically and economically cost
34 prohibitive to produce timbers of these dimensions and quality. Salvage operations shall employ
35 members of local job-training bridge programs (Youth Employment Program, Joint

1 Apprenticeship Training Committee, Homeless Collaborative) or other similar organizations to
2 provide construction training opportunities to Oakland residents.

3 Salvage and reuse of the timber from these structures will help to reduce the impacts on the
4 environment and save this ecologically and historically valuable material for reuse in the local
5 community.

6 ~ ~ ~

7 **Mitigation 4.6-10:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share
8 basis production and distribution of a brochure describing history and architectural history of the
9 OARB to local libraries and schools.

10 This measure applies to Impacts 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 and Cumulative Impact 5.6-1.

11 A brochure commemorating the military transportation function of the OARB, and the off-base
12 components of the redevelopment area, will be produced. This brochure shall build upon the
13 previously completed historical documentation produced by the Port of Oakland, the Navy, and
14 the Army for previous projects. This brochure will document the history of the redevelopment
15 area.

16 ~ ~ ~

17 **Mitigation 4.6-11:** The City, Port, and OARB sub-district developers shall fund on a fair share
18 basis acquisition of copies of construction documentation and photographs of historic buildings
19 currently in the OARB files and transfer the copies to the Oakland History Room files and Port
20 historic archives, including funding to cover costs of archiving and cataloging these materials at
21 the Oakland History Room.

22 This measure applies to Impacts 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 and Cumulative Impact 5.6-1.

23 The Army has amassed a collection of historical photographs, engineering records, and
24 administrative records related to the OARB. This collection is currently not available to the
25 public at large. This mitigation measure will ensure that the collection is made available to a
26 larger audience interested in the history of the Base. It will also offset the modification and/or
27 destruction of many of the historic buildings on the Base, preserve their images, and provide a
28 description of their function and role to the interested public.

29 ~ ~ ~

30 **Mitigation 4.6-12:** At least one building each in the Gateway and Port development areas of the
31 OARB sub-district, if feasible, shall include architectural design such as double eaves and
32 clerestory windows elements evocative of the warehouse structures.

33 This measure applies to Impacts 4.6-2, 4.6-3, and 4.11-2, and Cumulative Impact 5.6-1.

1 Implementation of this measure would provide new, modern buildings reflecting the most
2 distinctive architectural elements of the visually prominent 800-series warehouses, contributing
3 structures to the OARB Historic District. Inclusion of these distinctive elements in the modern
4 architecture would provide an aesthetic connection to the historic architecture of the site, and
5 would partially compensate for the visual loss of these architectural elements. It is preferred
6 these elements be included in buildings constructed near the location of the 800-series
7 warehouses. It is preferred the structures selected to implement these measures be in a
8 prominent location visible from Gateway, nearby elevated, or arterial roadways. Finally, it is
9 preferred, but not required, this measure be implemented on buildings comprising by number
10 the first 10 percent of buildings constructed in each of the Gateway and Port development
11 areas.

12 ~ ~ ~

13 **Mitigation 4.6-13:** Prior to major renovation of a historically significant structure, the
14 redeveloper of the SPRR Station and 16th Street Tower shall ensure that historically significant
15 artifacts and features, if present, are recorded and deposited with the appropriate museum. All
16 renovation of the exterior of a historic structure shall be consistent with the Secretary of
17 Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Studies.

18 This measure applies to Impact 4.6-4.

19 The SPRR (Amtrak) Station and 16th Street Tower have interior and exterior architectural
20 elements that help to make it eligible to the NRHP. The Secretary of Interior, through the
21 National Park Service, has published guidelines for renovation and redevelopment of historic
22 structures. By implementing this mitigation measure, and requiring that contractors conform to
23 the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Studies, the architectural
24 elements and features which contribute to these historic resources' eligibility will be preserved.

25 ~ ~ ~
26 ~