

5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES – HISTORICAL RESOURCES

This section of the EIR discusses and evaluates the potential impacts of the project on cultural historical resources. Historical resources can include buildings, structures, objects, sites, historic districts, and cultural landscapes. This section, in combination with Section 5.4, Cultural Resources – Archaeological Resources, addresses the potential impacts encompassing cultural resources as described within Section V of the environmental checklist form (Appendix G) of the State CEQA Guidelines. The analysis in this section is based on *Historic Resources Technical Report, La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan, Los Angeles, California* (SWCA 2023; herein called the Historic Resources Technical Report and included as Appendix D to this EIR).

5.5.1 Existing Conditions

5.5.1.1 Historical Context

The project site includes 13 acres of the eastern and northwestern portions of Hancock Park and broadly encompasses what is known as La Brea Tar Pits, which includes the George C. Page Museum (Page Museum). LACMA’s portion of the 23-acre Hancock Park has been almost entirely developed. In contrast, the property known as La Brea Tar Pits is generally a park-like setting.

Since the discovery of fossils and subsequent donation of the 23-acre parcel to the County of Los Angeles (County), Hancock Park has been reserved and preserved for use as an open space and for ongoing excavations, curation, and education for nearly a century. This section provides a summary of the full historic context and construction chronology for the property and surrounding site. The full thematic historic context section, construction chronology, and associated figures and maps are provided in the Historic Resources Technical Report in Appendix D.

RANCHO LA BREA, EARLY SETTLEMENT

Following Mexican Independence, the area around the tar pits was provisionally granted in 1828 as Rancho La Brea to Antonio Jose Rocha, a Portuguese immigrant who was a prominent early settler in the area. The land grant, which covered portions of Mid-Wilshire, Hollywood, and West Hollywood, was given with the condition that the public could continue to extract *brea* (asphaltic) material from the tar pits as needed. In 1849, Major Henry Hancock came to California as part of the California Gold Rush, initially settling in San Francisco before relocating south to Los Angeles. Hancock and his wife Ida acquired the Rancho La Brea lands in the 1850s. They primarily used the ranch for raising livestock, but also excavated asphaltum and shipped material from the tar pits throughout California. Excavations on the property ultimately created the large asphaltum lakes that characterized the property over the following decades.

Following Major Hancock’s death in 1883, in the early 1900s, Ida Hancock leased a portion of Rancho La Brea to the Salt Lake Oil Company, which quickly struck oil and spurred a significant boom in well development and oil production. In a short period, the Rancho La Brea lands surrounding the ranch house and tar pits would become a vast oil field, characterized by a landscape of derricks.

While fossil excavations would not begin until the early 1900s, the existence of fossils in La Brea Tar Pits had been observed as early as 1875. Early twentieth-century oil exploration, however, brought to light the extent and significance of the site’s paleontological resources. In light of the scientific value and importance of the site, the long-term use and character of the large parcel now encompassing Hancock Park diverged significantly from the surrounding, densely developed neighborhood. By the early

twentieth century, Rancho La Brea had already been recognized as home to one of the most important collections of late Pleistocene asphaltic fossils in the world.

As word spread of the concentration of fossils at Rancho La Brea and requests to excavate poured in, the Hancock family reduced the number of institutions allowed to dig on the property. Priority was granted (exclusively) to local institutions, primarily the Los Angeles County Museum of History, Science, and Art (the predecessor to the Natural History Museum),¹ which was given a 2-year concession to excavate. During the County dig, the team excavated over 100 pits, of which 30 included noteworthy deposits. From these deposits, the team extracted hundreds of thousands of fossilized prehistoric animal bones, which were catalogued and transported to the museum. At the time, this find was considered the largest collection of Pleistocene fossils in the world, representing thousands of animals.

Although the fossils uncovered by the Los Angeles County Museum of History, Science, and Art dig were too plentiful for a single exhibition, the museum constructed a special exhibition space called “La Brea Hall,” where some of the most iconic and complete skeletons were displayed. In addition to the exhibits in La Brea Hall, Hancock Park and La Brea Tar Pits became an extremely popular tourist destination; by 1940, the park attracted an estimated 500 visitors each Sunday (Kegley 1940).

HANCOCK PARK

The project site falls within the larger 23-acre Hancock Park, which has remained intact as a relatively undeveloped open space, public park, and cultural institution in the Mid-Wilshire neighborhood for nearly a century.² The complex is characterized by a mixture of recreational space, walkways, hardscaping, mature trees and landscaping, the La Brea Lake Pit, seeps, and excavation pits, and museums/exhibition spaces both on-site and in the surrounding vicinity.

In 1915, in light of the site’s scientific importance, G. Allan Hancock (son and heir of Henry and Ida Hancock) and the County of Los Angeles began discussing a potential donation of the tar pits and 32 acres of the adjacent property for a park and museum, which would preserve the space in perpetuity for scientific investigations and public enjoyment and education. Negotiations on this donation unfolded over a number of years, until December 1923, when the terms were finalized. The land was officially transferred to the County in 1924 (*Los Angeles Times* 1923).

Through the pre-World War II period, a number of master planning initiatives brought new facilities, dig pits and associated support structures, landscaping, hardscaping, and circulation corridors to Hancock Park. These were both theoretical, in the form of master planning efforts, and actual, with new construction and upgrades. Following the end of World War II, efforts to bring a unified master plan to Hancock Park were renewed. In 1946, the County commissioned architect and landscape planner Harry Sims Bent to develop a new master plan, which was complete by 1948. Construction of the first phase of the 1948 plan was initiated the following year. Subsequent work took place over the next 3 years, including the completion of the Observation Pit museum, a Mid-Century Modern–style pavilion that enclosed Pit 101 and allowed visitors to descend to a viewing platform.

In 1956, the County celebrated the 50-year anniversary of the initial excavations of La Brea Tar Pits with a ceremony at Hancock Park. To mark half a century of scientific exploration, which by 1956 had yielded more than 500,000 fossil bones of prehistoric animals, the celebration included Supervisor John Anson

¹ When referred to as the “Natural History Museum” this descriptor refers to the physical place located at 900 Exposition Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90007, rather than the County governmental department of the Museum of Natural History, as defined in Chapter 6.92 of the Los Angeles County Code.

² Not to be confused with the Los Angeles residential neighborhood of Hancock Park, which is located east of the project site.

Ford, Dr. Hildegard Howard, chief curator of science at the Los Angeles County Museum, and Dr. Jean Delacour, Los Angeles County Museum of History, Science, and Art director.

At the same time, though La Brea Tar Pits and the park remained scientifically relevant and remarkably popular with the public, plans for a permanent museum still had not come to fruition. In 1958, the County returned to the question of Hancock Park and its next phases of development. In 1960, the County commissioned renowned Modernist architect William L. Pereira to develop a master plan for Hancock Park, the scope of which would include the development of the new fine arts museum complex, a new paleontological museum, and associated landscape plans and improvements throughout the property (*Hollywood Citizen News* 1961a; *Los Angeles Times* 1960).

The 1961 Pereira plan primarily focused on the construction of the new Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA) facilities. The proposed paleontological museum had no funding allocated for its construction (*Hollywood Citizen News* 1961b, 1961c). By the late 1960s, following the completion and fanfare of LACMA, the plans for a paleontological museum at Hancock Park again went dormant. However, the Natural History Museum began exploring other options for activating areas of the park adjacent to the new LACMA campus and increasing the interpretive component. In 1967, a new development plan was prepared, and the County moved ahead with commissioning 52 new statues for the park, which included the mammoth sculptures within the Lake Pit, which have since become iconic features (*Los Angeles Times* 1968).

In the mid-1960s, renewed interest in the tar pits led to its designation as a National Natural Landmark and to the expansion of scientific excavations on the property (Holliday 1972). In the early 1970s, George C. Page, a successful industrialist and benefactor of the Natural History Museum, donated several million dollars in support of a paleontological museum. The resulting George C. Page Museum (Page Museum) opened to the public in the spring of 1977. Along with the construction of the Page Museum and its distinctive pyramid-like site, the landscape around the tar pits was reconfigured. New pathways and circulation pathways were constructed around the square plan of the building, hugging the west and south berms.

Through the 1980s, La Brea Tar Pits and the Page Museum were one of the principal attractions along Miracle Mile, in the emerging district known as Museum Row. While the destination remained popular with tourists, school groups, and locals alike, Hancock Park was viewed as outdated, and the County began exploring new plans for the park to create a more attractive space for contemporary audiences (Hanna/Olin, Ltd. 1994).

In its current form, Hancock Park reflects master planning initiatives and campaigns from various periods in the park's history. While much of the landscape reflects more recent campaigns (as noted above), the park's character and use as an urban open space protected and reserved for scientific exploration, curation, education, and public use, have remained intact for more than a century. The sparsely developed, 23-acre parcel, still framed with mature trees and landscaping, remains intact, reflecting the original agreement between the Hancock family and the County. Although the landscaping, facilities, and topography have been altered through the years, Hancock Park reflects a development history that is unique in Los Angeles: from the early years of oil exploration and fossil discovery, to the gradual establishment of cultural and curatorial/educational institutions to tell its story from the Pleistocene era, through post-World War II expansion, and recent upgrades and master planning efforts.

5.5.1.2 Evaluation Results

This section provides an overview of previously identified historic resources and of the results of a field survey of properties within the CEQA area of potential effects (APE). For purposes of this study, the

CEQA APE encompasses the project site and all directly adjacent or facing parcels. Associated maps and descriptions of properties within the CEQA APE are provided in the Historic Resources Technical Report in Appendix D.

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED HISTORIC RESOURCES

Within the CEQA APE, 10 properties have been previously identified as historical resources pursuant to CEQA (Table 5.51). Current California Historical Resource (CHR) status codes are provided for each. All 10 resources were identified through the City of Los Angeles citywide survey undertaking, SurveyLA; corresponding SurveyLA reports are cited throughout this section (see Architectural Resources Group, Inc. 2015a).

Table 5.5-1. Previously Identified Historic Resources within CEQA APE

| Address(es) (Assessor's Parcel Number) | Property/Building Name (Inside or Outside Project Footprint) | Built Date | CHR Status Code* (Source) |
|--|--|---------------|------------------------------|
| 5801 Wilshire Boulevard (5508-016-902) (5905 Wilshire Boulevard in parcel data) | La Brea Tar Pits Historic District (inside project footprint) | Various | 3S (SurveyLA) |
| 5801 Wilshire Boulevard (5508-016-902) (5905 Wilshire Boulevard in parcel data) | George C. Page Museum (inside project footprint) | 1977 | 3S (SurveyLA) |
| 5801 Wilshire Boulevard (5508-016-902) (5905 Wilshire Boulevard in parcel data) | Hancock Park, Observation Pit (inside project footprint) | 1952 | 3S (SurveyLA) |
| 5905 Wilshire Boulevard (5508-016-902) | Pavilion for Japanese Art (outside project footprint) | 1982–1988 | 3S (SurveyLA) |
| 3rd Street (north), Hauser Boulevard (east), 6th Street (south), Fairfax Avenue (west) [†] | Park La Brea Garden Apartments Historic District (outside project footprint) | 1943 and 1951 | 3S (SurveyLA) |
| 5757 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5508-015-009) | Prudential Square (outside project footprint) | 1948 | 3S (SurveyLA) |
| 5814 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5089-008-031) (5816 & 5818 W. Wilshire Boulevard) | Craft and Folk Art Museum (outside project footprint) | 1930 | 3CS (SurveyLA) |
| 5820 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5089-010-002) | Hancock Park Building (outside project footprint) | 1958 | 3CS (SurveyLA) |
| 5828 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5089-010-001) (710 S. Stanley Avenue, 5826 W. Wilshire Boulevard) | CMAY Gallery (formerly Arthur Murray Dance Studio (outside project footprint) | 1941 | 3S (SurveyLA) |
| 5850 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5089-011-002) (5856 & 5858 W. Wilshire Boulevard) | Office building (outside project footprint) | 1951 | 3CS (SurveyLA) |

* 3S = Appears eligible for NRHP as an individual property through survey evaluation. 3CS = Appears eligible for California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) as an individual property through survey evaluation.

[†] There are multiple assessor parcel numbers associated with the Park La Brea Garden Apartments Historic District and they are not listed here separately.

EVALUATION OF PROPERTIES WITHIN CEQA APE

Field surveys and research were conducted to field check previous findings and to identify and research of-age, previously unevaluated properties within the CEQA APE. Table 5.52 summarizes the results of these efforts and the following sections provide summarized information regarding the findings for properties that qualify as historical resources pursuant to CEQA (i.e., properties designated or eligible for designation at the federal, state, or local level). Character-defining features for the historical resources within the project footprint are included. The Historic Resources Technical Report (see Appendix D) provides the full evaluations for both eligible and ineligible properties.

Table 5.5-2. Field Survey Results

| # | Address(es) (Assessor's Parcel Number) | Property/Building Name (Inside or Outside Project Footprint) | Built Date | Historical Resource? (CHR Status)* |
|----|--|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | 5801 Wilshire Boulevard (5508-016-902) (5905 Wilshire Boulevard in parcel data) | La Brea Tar Pits Historic District (inside project footprint) | Various | Yes 3CS |
| 2 | 5801 Wilshire Boulevard (5508-016-902) (5905 Wilshire Boulevard in parcel data) | George C. Page Museum (inside project footprint) | 1977 | Yes 3S; 3CB |
| 3 | 5801 Wilshire Boulevard (5508-016-902) (5905 Wilshire Boulevard in parcel data) | Observation Pit (inside project footprint) | 1952 | Yes 3S; 3CB |
| 4 | 5905 Wilshire Boulevard (5508-016-902) Eastern portion of LACMA, same address, separate parcel | Pavilion for Japanese Art (outside project footprint) | 1982–1988 | Yes 3S |
| 5 | 555 S. Ogden Drive (5509-004-013) (1943) 5900 Lindenhurst Avenue (5509-004-010) (1943) 530 Alandele Avenue (5509-004-007) (1943) 501 S. Fuller Avenue (5509-004-006) (1943) 5721 W. 6th Street (5509-004-004) (1943) | Park La Brea Garden Apartment Historic District (outside project footprint) District bounded by 3rd Street (north), Hauser Boulevard (east), 6th Street (south), Fairfax Avenue (west). | 1943 and 1951 | Yes 3S |
| 6 | 600 S. Curson Avenue (5508-015-006) | "Museum Terrace" Apartments (outside project footprint) | 1986 | No 6Z (1) |
| 7 | 640 S. Curson Avenue (5508-015-008) | "One Museum Square" Apartments (outside project footprint) | 2021 | No 6Z (1) |
| 8 | 5757 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5508-015-009) | Prudential Square (outside project footprint) | 1948 | Yes 3S |
| 9 | 5800 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5089-010-005) | Office building (outside project footprint) | 1958 | No 6Z (2) |
| 10 | 5814 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5089-010-003) | Craft and Folk Art Museum (outside project footprint) | 1930 | Yes 3CS |
| 11 | 5820 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5089-010-002) | Hancock Park Building (outside project footprint) | 1958 | Yes 3CS |
| 12 | 5828 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5089-010-001) (710 S. Stanley Avenue, 5826 W. Wilshire Boulevard) | CMAY Gallery (formerly Arthur Murray Dance Studio; outside project footprint) | 1947 (LA Co Tax Assessor) | Yes 3S |
| 13 | 5850 W. Wilshire Boulevard (5089-011-002) (5856 and 5858 W. Wilshire Boulevard) | Office building (outside project footprint) | 1951 | Yes 3CS |
| 14 | APN 5089-011-154 | Vacant land | N/A | N/A |
| 15 | 5900 Wilshire Boulevard (5086-021-038) Parcel extends to S. Ogden Drive; includes the following addresses: 5950 W. Wilshire Boulevard; 714–716 and 717–719 S. Genesee Avenue; and 5904–5950 W. Wilshire Boulevard | Mutual Benefit Life Plaza (outside project footprint) | 1969–1971 | Yes 3CS |
| 16 | 5905 Wilshire Boulevard (5508-017-009); western segment of LACMA, same address as eastern segment, different APN | Los Angeles County Museum of Art (outside project footprint) | Various | No (new museum under construction) |

* CHR Status Codes:

3S = Appears eligible for NRHP as an individual property through survey evaluation

3CB = Appears eligible for California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) both individually and as a contributor to a CRHR-eligible district through survey evaluation

3CS = Appears eligible for CRHR as an individual property through survey evaluation

6Z (1) = Less than 50 years old and not of exceptional significance

6Z (2) = More than 50 years old but lacks historical integrity

LA BREA TAR PITS HISTORIC DISTRICT | 5801 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD CHR STATUS CODE: 3CS

Based on research and site visits completed for this study, the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District is eligible for landmark designation at the state, county, and city levels. The district meets Criteria 1/1/1 as a unique, significant collection of resources and related cultural institutions and facilities specifically designed to recover, curate, and display those resources to the public, in an example of cultural/institutional development in Los Angeles extending back nearly a century.

The La Brea Tar Pits Historic District consists of related cultural/paleontological resources, site/landscape features, and institutional facilities reflecting the story of over 100 years of scientific excavation, study, public education, and exhibition of one of the world’s most significant concentrations of Pleistocene-age fossils.


Located on Wilshire Boulevard’s Miracle Mile, the historic district is bounded by Wilshire Boulevard, Curson Avenue, 6th Street, and the adjacent Los Angeles County Museum of Art complex and Japanese Pavilion. Excluding these two museums, the historic district boundaries correspond to those of Hancock Park. While Hancock Park itself, in terms of its topography, circulation corridors, and landscaping, has changed over time, the extant contributing elements of this cultural landscape are intact and convey the historic district’s significance.

In 2014/2015, the Tar Pits site was found eligible as a historic district for the NRHP, California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and for local listing through SurveyLA. The property was found to be eligible for the NRHP and CRHR, as well as designation as a Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) under Criterion A, 1, and A, respectively, with significance under two contexts. The reasons for significance for each were described in the following manner: the district was found to be a historical resource as an “excellent and extremely rare example of an intact archaeological and paleontological district in a densely developed urban area,” and for its “association with the development of county-owned cultural institutions along Miracle Mile in Los Angeles” (Architectural Resources Group, Inc. 2015b:958).





Table 5.5-3 provides an overview of the character-defining features in the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District. The Historic Resources Technical Report (see Appendix D) provides more detail on the character-defining features, including a visual overview of each character-defining feature.

Despite alterations to Hancock Park overall, the rarity and significance of the site’s paleontological resources and the buildings constructed to facilitate their active study and exhibition reflect a history of institutional and cultural development in Los Angeles (if not the United States) that is unique.

Table 5.5-3. Character-Defining Features and Components, La Brea Tar Pits Historic District


| Photograph | Character-Defining / Contributing Feature | Era / Date of Construction |
|---|--|--|
|  | Lake Pit | Early twentieth century |
|  | Excavation pits | Resources dating to prehistoric era; facilities through present day |
|  | Oil Creek | Topographic feature |
|  | Oversized parcel with significant amount of open space | ca. 1910s through present day; by the 1920s, the site's contrast with surrounding areas, which were being subdivided and developed, had become obvious. This contrast intensified with commercial development on Wilshire Boulevard and became pronounced with the completion of Metropolitan Life's Park La Brea complex. |

La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Section 5.5 Cultural Resources – Historical Resources

| Photograph | Character-Defining / Contributing Feature | Era / Date of Construction |
|---|---|----------------------------|
|  | Perimeter trees and other mature trees within the park | ca. 1920s through 1977 |
|  | Southeast corner entrance from Wilshire Boulevard | ca. 1920s |
|  | Remnant stone walls (Pits 9 and 13); these walls are assumed to date to the 1930s addition of stone walls encircling pit sites throughout the northwestern quadrant of the park | 1930s |
|  | Observation Pit | 1952 |

La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report
Section 5.5 Cultural Resources – Historical Resources

| Photograph | Character-Defining / Contributing Feature | Era / Date of Construction |
|---|--|----------------------------|
|  | Statuary depicting prehistoric animals | Various |
|  | G. Allan Hancock memorial, placed in 1963 (east of Japanese Pavilion, north of Lake Pit) | 1963 |
|  | Page Museum | 1977 |
|  | Page Museum topography, including berm | 1977 |

| Photograph | Character-Defining / Contributing Feature | Era / Date of Construction |
|---|---|----------------------------|
|  | <p>Circulation corridors and pathways (i.e., diagonal entry path, path adjacent to the Lake Pit, and pathways in north-central portion of the park flanked with mature trees)</p> | <p>1920s through 1970s</p> |
|  | <p>Overall spatial relationships between buildings, structures, open space, park/recreational areas, resources, and natural features</p> | <p>Various</p> |

**PAGE MUSEUM, LA BREA TAR PITS | 5801 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
 CHR STATUS CODE: 3S, 3CB**

In 2015, the 1977 Page Museum was identified as eligible for the NRHP and CRHR and for designation as a local HCM as part of SurveyLA. The building was documented as an “excellent example of Late Modern institutional architecture, designed by local architecture firm Thornton and Fagan” (Architectural Resources Group 2015c:164). The building is noted for having exceptional architectural significance and was determined eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C and using Criteria Consideration G (“Properties that Have Achieved Significance within the Past 50 Years”). The survey also found the Page Museum eligible for the CRHR and as a local HCM under Criterion 3/3, respectively. The building has not changed significantly since it was documented and evaluated as part of the 2015 survey. In addition, the property appears eligible under County Criterion 3.

The primary character-defining features of the Page Museum include (but are not necessarily limited to):

- “Burial mound” berm/ pyramidal massing of the building and site
- Expansive adjacent lawn on the west
- Prominent fiberglass frieze with bas relief Pleistocene scenes and pronounced overhangs
- Structural space frame that supports the frieze and seems to float above podium level
- High degree of indoor-outdoor integration
- Open-air configuration at the podium level, with fiberglass frieze opening onto the central atrium
- Open, central atrium space with landscaping
- Symmetrical design composition, of the building and its site

- Sloped berms with turf plantings integrated into the exterior wall of the museum’s ground floor
- Descending entrance on south, flanked by stairways leading to upper podium at the second floor
- Laboratory space open to public view (interior)

OBSERVATION PIT, LA BREA TAR PITS | 5801 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
CHR STATUS CODE: 3S, 3CB

In 2015, the Observation Pit was documented in SurveyLA as an “excellent example of Mid-Century Modern institutional architecture, designed by notable local architect Harry Sims Bent” (Architectural Resources Group, Inc. 2015c:163). The 1952 building was determined eligible for the NRHP and CRHR, and for local HCM designation under Criterion C/3/3, respectively. The building has not changed significantly since it was documented and evaluated as part of the 2015 survey; this study carries forward the finding of NRHP, CRHR, and local HCM eligibility for the Observation Pit. In addition, the property appears eligible under County Criterion 3.

Pavilion for Japanese Art, LACMA | 5905 Wilshire Boulevard |
CHR Status Code: 3S

In 2015, the Pavilion for Japanese Art, built in 1988, was identified as a historical resource eligible for the NRHP and CRHR and for designation as a local HCM as part of SurveyLA. The building was found eligible as an “[e]xcellent example of an Organic style institutional building, designed by notable architect Bruce Goff and completed by notable architect Bart Prince” (Architectural Resources Group, Inc. 2015c:164). The building has not changed significantly since it was evaluated in 2015; this study carries forward the finding of NRHP, CRHR, and local HCM eligibility for the Pavilion for Japanese Art. In addition, the property appears eligible under County Criterion 3. The building is therefore considered to be a historical resource for purposes of CEQA.

Park La Brea Garden Apartment Historic District |
CHR Status Code: 3S

In 2015, as part of SurveyLA, Park La Brea Garden Apartment Historic District was identified as a historical resource eligible for the NRHP, CRHR, and as a local Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) under Criteria C/3/3 as “an excellent example of a 1940s–1950s garden apartment complex in the area, unique in Los Angeles for its inclusion of high-rise as well as low-rise multi-family residential buildings” (Architectural Resources Group, Inc. 2015b:986). The buildings within the CEQA APE have not changed significantly since they were documented as part of the 2015 survey; this study carries forward the finding of NRHP, CRHR, and local HPOZ eligibility for the Park La Brea Garden Apartment Historic District. Both the district as a whole and each contributing building within the CEQA APE are considered to be historical resources for purposes of CEQA.

Prudential Square | 5757 W. Wilshire Boulevard |
CHR Status Code: 3S

In 2015, SurveyLA identified this historical resource as eligible for the NRHP and CRHR and for designation as a local HCM. The 1948 office complex known as Prudential Square was designed by Wurdeman and Becket. Listed in Los Angeles County Tax Assessor data as 5757 W. Wilshire Boulevard, the Prudential Square complex spans the addresses of 5711–5779 West Wilshire Boulevard. This building complex has not changed significantly since it was evaluated as part of the 2015 survey; this study carries forward the finding of NRHP, CRHR, and local HCM eligibility for Prudential Square. The building is therefore considered to be a historical resource for purposes of CEQA.

**Craft and Folk Art Museum | 5814 W. Wilshire Boulevard |
CHR Status Code: 3CS**

In 2015, Survey LA identified the Craft and Folk Art Museum, built in 1930, as a historical resource eligible for the CRHR and as an HCM. Listed in Los Angeles County Tax Assessor data as 5814 W. Wilshire Boulevard, the Craft and Folk Art Museum spans the addresses of 5814–5818 West Wilshire Boulevard. This building has not changed significantly since it was documented and evaluated as part of the 2015 survey; this study carries forward the finding of CRHR and local HCM eligibility for the Craft and Folk Art Museum. The property is therefore considered to be a historical resource for purposes of CEQA.

**Hancock Park Building | 5820 W. Wilshire Boulevard |
CHR Status Code: 3CS**

In 2015, SurveyLA identified the Hancock Park office building as a historical resource eligible for the CRHR and for designation as a local HCM. This building has not changed significantly since it was documented and evaluated as part of the 2015 survey; this study carries forward the finding of CRHR and local HCM eligibility for the Hancock Park Building. The property is therefore considered to be a historical resource for purposes of CEQA.

**CMAY Gallery (formerly Arthur Murray Dance Studio) |
5828 W. Wilshire Boulevard | CHR Status Code: 3S**

In 2015, SurveyLA identified 5828 W. Wilshire Boulevard as a historical resource eligible for the NRHP and CRHR and as an HCM. The property also occupies the addresses of 710 South Stanley Avenue and 5826 West Wilshire Boulevard. This building has not changed significantly since it was documented and evaluated as part of the 2015 survey; this study carries forward the finding of NRHP, CRHR, and local HCM eligibility for the CMAY Gallery. The property is therefore considered to be a historical resource for purposes of CEQA.

5850 W. Wilshire Boulevard | CHR Status Code: 3CS

In 2015, SurveyLA identified the building at 5850 W. Wilshire Boulevard as a historical resource eligible for the CRHR and as an HCM. This building has not changed significantly since it was documented and evaluated as part of the 2015 survey; this study carries forward the finding of CRHR and local HCM eligibility for 5850 W. Wilshire Boulevard. The property is therefore considered to be a historical resource for purposes of CEQA.

**Mutual Benefit Life Plaza | 5900 Wilshire Boulevard |
CHR Status Code: 3CS**

Designed in 1969–1971 by master architects William Pereira and Gin D. Wong, the Mutual Benefit Life Plaza was found eligible for the CRHR and as an HCM in 2015 by SurveyLA under the context of Architecture and Engineering, 1850–1980, subcontext of L.A. Modernism, 1919–1980, theme of Post-War Modernism, 1946–1976, Corporate International, 1946–1976. The property was found to meet CRHR Criterion 3 and local Criterion 3 as an “[e]xcellent example of a Corporate International-style commercial building on Wilshire's Miracle Mile, designed by notable local architects William Pereira and Gin D. Wong” (Architectural Resources Group, Inc. 2015c:230). The property was found ineligible for the NRHP due to alterations. This building has not changed significantly since it was evaluated as part of the 2015 survey; this study carries forward the finding of CRHR and local HCM eligibility for Mutual Benefit Life Plaza. The property is therefore considered to be a historical resource for purposes of CEQA.

5.5.2 Regulatory Setting

The following section describes the regulations that are most relevant to the historical resources that may be affected by the project. Additional regulations that are relevant, but less directly so, are described in related sections of this EIR, including Section 5.4, Cultural Resources – Archaeological Resources, and Section 5.14, Tribal Cultural Resources.

5.5.2.1 Federal

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT OF 1966

Enacted in 1966 and amended in 2000, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) instituted a multifaceted program, administered by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior, to encourage sound preservation policies of the nation’s cultural resources at the federal, state, and local levels. The NHPA authorized the expansion and maintenance of the National Register of Historic Places, established the position of State Historic Preservation Officer and provided for the designation of State Review Boards, set up a mechanism to certify local governments to carry out the goals of the NHPA, assisted Native American tribes to preserve their cultural heritage, and created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

The NRHP was established by the NHPA of 1966 as “an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and to indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment” (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 60.2). The NRHP recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels. To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a resource must be significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of potential significance must also possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. A property is eligible for the NRHP if it is significant under one or more of the following criteria:

- Criterion A: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- Criterion B: It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past;
- Criterion C: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; and/or
- Criterion D: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to meeting these criteria, a property must retain historic integrity, which is defined in National Register Bulletin 15 as the “ability of a property to convey its significance” (National Park Service [NPS] 1990:44). In order to assess integrity, the National Park Service recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, considered together, define historic integrity.

To retain integrity, a property must possess several, if not all, of these seven qualities, which are defined in the following manner in National Register Bulletin 15:

1. Location – the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred

2. Design – the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property
3. Setting – the physical environment of a historic property
4. Materials – the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property
5. Workmanship – the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory
6. Feeling – a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time
7. Association – the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

For the purposes of this study’s indirect impact analysis, the aspects of setting and feeling are of particular relevant for this discussion; areas of particular relevance are highlighted below. The National Park Service defines the quality of setting in the following way:

Setting is the physical environment of a historic property. Whereas location refers to the specific place where a property was built or an event occurred, setting refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historical role. It involves how, not just where, the property is situated and its relationship to surrounding features and open space.

Setting often reflects the basic physical conditions under which a property was built and the functions it was intended to serve. In addition, the way in which a property is positioned in its environment can reflect the designer’s concept of nature and aesthetic preferences.

The physical features that constitute the setting of a historic property can be either natural or manmade, including such elements as: Topographic features (a gorge or the crest of a hill); vegetation; simple manmade features (paths or fences); and relationships between buildings and other features or open space.

These features and their relationships should be examined not only within the exact boundaries of the property, but also between the property and its surroundings. This is particularly important for districts. (NPS 1990:45)

The National Park Service defines the quality of feeling in the following way:

Feeling is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. It results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property’s historic character. (NPS 1990:45)

NATIONAL NATURAL LANDMARKS PROGRAM

Authorized by the Historic Sites, Buildings and Antiquities Act, the National Natural Landmarks program is administrated by the National Park Service for resources located on federal, state, or local lands. As codified in 36 CFR 62, the National Natural Landmarks program seeks to encourage the identification, study, designation, recognition, and preservation of nationally significant ecological and geological resources that reflect the nation’s natural heritage (including paleontological/fossil-based resources).

5.5.2.2 State

The policies of the NHPA are implemented at the state level by the California Office of Historic Preservation, a division of the California Department of Parks and Recreation. The Office of Historic Preservation is also tasked with carrying out the duties described in the California Public Resources Code (PRC) and maintaining the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and CRHR. The state-level regulatory framework also includes CEQA, which requires the identification and mitigation of substantial adverse impacts that may affect the significance of eligible historical resources.

CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Created in 1992 and implemented in 1998, the CRHR is, according to PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1, “an authoritative guide in California to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state’s historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change.” Certain properties, including those listed in or formally determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and California Historical Landmarks numbered 770 and higher, are automatically included in the CRHR. Other properties recognized under the California Points of Historical Interest program, identified as significant in historical resources surveys, or designated by local landmarks programs, may be nominated for inclusion in the CRHR.

According to PRC Section 5024.1(c), a resource, either an individual property or a contributor to a historic district, may be listed in the CRHR if the State Historical Resources Commission determines that it meets one or more of the following criteria, which are modeled on NRHP criteria:

- Criterion 1: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
- Criterion 2: It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- Criterion 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;
- Criterion 4: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Resources nominated to the CRHR must retain enough of their historic character or appearance to convey the reasons for their significance. Resources whose historic integrity does not meet NRHP criteria may still be eligible for listing in the CRHR.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

CEQA requires a Lead Agency to analyze whether historical resources may be adversely impacted by a project. Under CEQA, 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. Evaluating such potential effects is a two-part process: first, the determination must be made as to whether the project involves historical resources. Second, if historical resources are present, the project must be analyzed for a potential substantial adverse change in the significance of the resource.

According to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, for the purposes of CEQA, a historical resource is:

1. A resource listed in, or formally determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (PRC 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq);

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the PRC or identified as significant in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the PRC; or
3. Any building, structure, object, site, or district that the lead agency determines eligible for national, state, or local landmark listing; generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be historically significant (and therefore a historical resource under CEQA) if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register (as defined in PRC Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).

According to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and PRC Section 5024.1, the fact that a resource is not listed or determined eligible for listing in the CRHR or is not included in a local register or survey shall not preclude the Lead Agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource. According to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b), a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment.

Substantial Adverse Change to Historical Resources

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 specifies that “substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means 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.” Material impairment occurs when a project alters in an adverse manner or demolishes “those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion” or eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP, CRHR, or local register. In addition, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2, the “direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the environment shall be clearly identified and described, giving due consideration to both the short-term and long-term effects.”

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(d) further defines direct and indirect impacts in the following manner:

1. A direct physical change in the environment is a physical change in the environment which is caused by and immediately related to the project.
2. An indirect physical change in the environment is a physical change in the environment, which is not immediately related to the project, but which is caused indirectly by the project. If a direct physical change in the environment in turn causes another change in the environment, then the other change is an indirect physical change in the environment.
3. An indirect physical change is to be considered only if that change is a reasonably foreseeable impact which may be caused by the project.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines and Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15126.4(b)(1), a project that has been determined to conform with the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Secretary’s Standards)* is generally considered a project that will not cause a significant adverse impact to historical resources. The *Secretary’s Standards* and associated Guidelines are not prescriptive but are “intended to promote responsible preservation practices” (Weeks and Grimmer 2001:3). The standards offer recommendations for maintaining, repairing, and replacing historic features, as well as for designing additions.

As developed by the National Park Service, the *Secretary's Standards* consist of four related treatment approaches: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. It is anticipated that rehabilitation would be the appropriate approach for the project. Rehabilitation, which is the most flexible treatment approach of the four, is defined as the process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

The 10 *Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation* are:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall 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 architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall 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 other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.

In 2017, the National Park Service issued an update to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings* (Grimmer 2017). The updated document includes additional, project-specific detail on how to comply with and implement the *Secretary's Standards*.

Table 5.5-4 summarizes the recommendations for historic building sites that are of particular relevance to the project. Table 5.5-5 summarizes the recommendations for significant settings of historic districts and neighborhoods.

Table 5.5-4. Standards for Rehabilitation, Recommended Treatments for Historic Building Sites

| Recommended | Not Recommended |
|--|---|
| <p>Identifying, retaining, and preserving features of the building site that are important in defining its overall historic character.</p> <p>Site features may include 1) walls, fences, or steps; circulation systems, such as walks, paths or roads; 2) vegetation, such as trees, shrubs, grass, orchards, hedges, windbreaks, or gardens; 3) landforms, such as hills, terracing, or berms; 4) furnishings and fixtures, such as light posts or benches; 5) decorative elements, such as sculpture, statuary, or monuments; 6) water features, including fountains, streams, pools, lakes, or irrigation ditches; and 7) subsurface archaeological resources, other cultural or religious features, or burial grounds which are also important to the site.</p> | <p>Removing or substantially changing buildings and their features or site features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the property so that, as a result, the character is diminished.</p> |
| <p>Retaining the historic relationship between buildings and the landscape</p> | <p>Removing or relocating buildings or landscape features, thereby destroying the historic relationship between buildings and the landscape.</p> <p>Removing or relocating buildings on a site or in a complex of related historic structures (such as a mill complex or farm), thereby diminishing the historic character of the site or complex.</p> <p>Moving buildings onto the site, thereby creating an inaccurate historic appearance.</p> <p>Changing the grade level of the site if it diminishes its historic character. For example, lowering the grade adjacent to a building to maximize use of a basement, which would change the historic appearance of the building and its relation to the site.</p> |
| <p>Protecting and maintaining buildings and site features by providing proper drainage to ensure that water does not erode foundation walls, drain toward the building, or damage or erode the landscape</p> | <p>Failing to ensure that site drainage is adequate so that buildings and site features are damaged or destroyed; or, alternatively, changing the site grading so that water does not drain properly</p> |
| <p>Minimizing disturbance of the terrain around buildings or elsewhere on the site, thereby reducing the possibility of destroying or damaging important landscape features, archaeological resources, other cultural or religious features, or burial grounds</p> | <p>Using heavy machinery or equipment in areas where it may disturb or damage important landscape features, archaeological resources, other cultural or religious features, or burial grounds</p> |
| <p>Protecting buildings and landscape features when working on the site</p> | <p>Failing to protect building and landscape features during work on the site or failing to repair damaged or deteriorated site features</p> |
| <p>Designing new onsite features...when required by a new use, so that they are as unobtrusive as possible, retain the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape, and are compatible with the historic character of the property</p> <p>Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction that are compatible with the historic character of the site and preserve the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape</p> | <p>Introducing new construction on the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, material, or color, which destroys historic relationships on the site</p> |

Table 5.5-5. Standards for Rehabilitation, Recommended Treatments for Setting (Districts)

| Recommended | Not Recommended |
|--|--|
| Identifying, retaining, and preserving building and landscape features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the setting. Such features can include 1) circulation systems, such as roads and streets; 2) furnishing and fixtures, such as light posts or benches; 3) vegetation, gardens, and yards; 4) adjacent open space, such as fields, parks, commons, or woodlands; and 5) important views or visual relationships. | Removing or substantially changing those building and landscape features in the setting which are important in defining the historic character so that, as a result, the character is diminished. |
| Retaining the historic relationship between buildings and landscape features in the setting. For example, preserving the relationship between a town common or urban plaza and the adjacent houses, municipal buildings, roads, and landscape and streetscape features. | Altering the relationship between the buildings and landscape features in the setting by widening existing streets, changing landscape materials, or locating new streets or parking areas where they may negatively impact the historic character of the setting. Removing or relocating buildings or landscape features, thereby destroying the historic relationship between buildings and the landscape in the setting. |
| Protecting buildings and landscape features when undertaking work in the setting | Failure to protect buildings and landscape features during work in the setting |
| Evaluating the overall condition of materials and features to determine whether more than protection and maintenance, such as repairs to materials and features in the setting, will be necessary | Failing to undertake adequate measures to ensure the protection of materials and features in the setting. |
| Repairing features in the setting by reinforcing the historic materials. Repairs may include the replacement in kind or with a compatible substitute material of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of setting features when there are surviving prototypes, such as fencing, paving materials, trees, and hedgerows. Repairs should be physically and visually compatible. | Failing to repair and reinforce damaged or deteriorated historic materials and features in the setting. Removing material that could be repaired or using improper repair techniques. Replacing an entire feature of the building or landscape in the setting when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing components are feasible |
| Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction that are compatible with the historic character of the setting that preserve the historic relationship between the buildings and the landscape. | Introducing new construction into historic districts which is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting, or which damages or destroys important landscape features |
| Removing non-significant buildings, additions, or landscape features which detract from the historic character of the setting | Removing a historic building, a building feature, or landscape feature which is important in defining the historic character of the setting. |

5.5.2.3 County of Los Angeles

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

In September 2015, the County Board of Supervisors adopted a Historic Preservation Ordinance (HPO) and Mills Act Program for all unincorporated territories of the county. As codified in Chapter 22.124, the HPO established the County Register of Landmarks and Historic Districts, along with the following designation criteria in unincorporated communities of the county:

- A. A structure, site, object, tree, landscape, or natural land feature may be designated as a landmark if it is 50 years of age or older and satisfies one or more of the following criteria:
 1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the history of the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located;
 2. It is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in the history of the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located;

3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, architectural style, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of an architect, designer, engineer, or builder whose work is of significance to the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located; or possesses artistic values of significance to the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located;
 4. It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, significant and important information regarding the prehistory or history of the nation, State, County, or community in which it is located;
 5. It is listed, or has been formally determined eligible by the United States National Park Service for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places, or is listed, or has been formally determined eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing, on the California Register of Historical Resources;
 6. If it is a tree, it is one of the largest or oldest trees of the species located in the County; or
 7. If it is a tree, landscape, or other natural land feature, it has historical significance due to an association with an historic event, person, site, street, or structure, or because it is a defining or significant outstanding feature of a neighborhood.
- B. Property less than 50 years of age may be designated as a landmark if it meets one or more of the criteria set forth in subsection A of this Section, and exhibits exceptional importance.
- C. The interior space of a property, or other space held open to the general public, including but not limited to a lobby, may be designated as a landmark or included in the landmark designation of a property if the space qualifies for designation as a landmark under subsections A or B of this Section.
- D. Historic districts. A geographic area, including a noncontiguous grouping of related properties, may be designated as an historic district if all of the following requirements are met:
1. More than 50 percent of owners in the proposed district consent to the designation;
 2. The proposed district satisfies one or more of the criteria set forth in subsections A.1 through A.5, inclusive, of this Section; and
 3. The proposed district exhibits either a concentration of historic, scenic, or sites containing common character-defining features, which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan, physical development, or architectural quality; or significant geographical patterns, associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of parks or community planning.

According to HPO Section 22.124.080, landmarks and historic districts may be nominated for designation through resolution by the Board of Supervisors or the Landmarks Commission.

5.5.2.4 City of Los Angeles

While the project site is located within the city of Los Angeles, it is owned by the County of Los Angeles. Accordingly, the project is not subject to City of Los Angeles (City) regulatory controls. Nonetheless, City regulatory and planning documents that are most relevant to the project as they relate to historic resources are provided herein for informational purposes.

LOS ANGELES HISTORIC-CULTURAL MONUMENTS

Local landmarks in the city are known as Historic-Cultural Monuments and are managed under direction from the City of Los Angeles Planning Department, Office of Historic Resources. In accordance with

Section 22.171.7, an HCM “is any site (including significant trees or other plant life located thereon), building, or structure of particular historical or cultural significance to the City of Los Angeles” that meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. 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;
2. Is associated with the lives of historic personages important to national, state, city, or local history; or
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a 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.

In Los Angeles, the Cultural Heritage Commission may recommend approval or disapproval of applications for designation; this recommendation is made to the City Council, which may adopt a designation by majority vote.

5.5.3 Thresholds of Significance

The following threshold of significance are based on the Environmental Checklist contained in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. A project would result in significant adverse impacts related to cultural historical resources if it would:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

5.5.4 Impact Assessment Methodology

The following section presents an overview of the methodology used in this report. To consider potential direct and indirect impacts to historical resources, the CEQA APE consists of parcels within and directly adjacent to the project footprint.

To characterize all properties within the CEQA APE, SWCA conducted primary- and secondary-source research in a wide variety of collections. A phase of literature review of previous studies was completed, and data gaps were identified to guide research efforts. Research focused on a variety of materials relating to the history and development of the project site and its role in the history of institutional/cultural development in Los Angeles. Materials consulted included historical maps, photographs, and newspapers; aerial and ground-based photographs; publications and journal articles; and other materials. Sources included a wide variety of archives and collections. For the purposes of this investigation, the results of Los Angeles’s citywide historical resources survey undertaking, SurveyLA, for the Wilshire Community Plan Area were used for all properties falling within the CEQA APE, unless a preponderance of evidence suggested that alternative conclusions were more appropriate.

To accurately assess the project and its conceptual components, SWCA met with the County of Los Angeles Museum of Natural History Foundation and the Design Team to review project drawings, architectural plans and conceptual sketches, and site design concepts. Field surveys took place in February 2022 and July 2022. Properties within the CEQA APE were inspected and photographed. Digital photography and field notes allowed for a thorough depiction of the subject properties and their existing conditions.

Subject properties were assigned the appropriate CHR status code. The principal elements of the project were studied for potential direct and indirect impacts to historical resources pursuant to CEQA.

5.5.5 Environmental Impact Analysis

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Historical Resource Pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines?

Under the State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5, a project with an effect 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. Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource 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. The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters those physical characteristics that convey the significance of the resource and justify its inclusion (or eligibility for inclusion) in the NRHP, CRHR, or local register. In general, a project that follows the *Secretary's Standards* (Weeks and Grimmer 2001) and associated Guidelines shall be considered as mitigated to below the level of significance.

CONSTRUCTION

This section addresses the potential for the project to result in significant adverse impacts to identified historical resources as a result of project construction. Impacts are discussed in terms of changes to character-defining and contributing features of historic resources that could result during project construction.

13-acre La Brea Project Site

This section addresses the potential direct significant adverse impacts to identified historical resources within the 13-acre project site. The Historic Resources Technical Report (see Appendix D) identified three historical resources within the project footprint: La Brea Tar Pits Historic District, the Page Museum, and Hancock Park Observation Pit.

Table 5.5-6 summarizes the primary character-defining features of the district, along with those conceptual project components most relevant in terms of potential impacts, and the aspects of integrity most likely to be impacted by project implementation.

La Brea Tar Pits Historic District

The La Brea Tar Pits Historic District consists of numerous related contributors and character-defining features embodying the district's significance. This includes archaeological and paleontological resources (considered in separate reports); related buildings and structures; landscaping and hardscaping features; and site-plan configuration and spatial relationships characterizing the property. Taken together, these elements reflect a shared story of nearly 100 years of purposeful preservation of the Hancock Park land and its resources, scientific excavation and curation, and design and construction of facilities for public education and exhibits.

In addition, master planning efforts for Hancock Park, which included a long-term plan for an on-site museum, stopped and started over the years. As a result, the district and its components display an eclectic character, developed in phases.

The project envisions a comprehensive, unified master plan/design for La Brea Tar Pits, which has been a long-term goal for Hancock Park. The proposed master plan is intended to strengthen and encourage continued scientific research at the site; enhance the visitor's experience through a continuous, thematic circulation route, the addition of more shade structures, and expanded, enhanced facilities; and an aesthetic upgrade for facilities, landscaping and hardscaping, and the park. Overall, the master plan would more explicitly integrate and brand Hancock Park and La Brea Tar Pits for pedestrians approaching or passing on Wilshire Boulevard and on 6th Street, with proposed new gateways, signage, and fencing.

As a reimagining of the Tar Pits complex, the project introduces a series of new features, buildings, structures, circulation corridors, and other elements that would fill-in and divide the components of the historic district, shifting the setting and feeling of the historic district and removing some of its character-defining features. The project remains conceptual in nature; however, as presently envisioned, the project elements that would impact contributing components and character-defining features of the historic district are described below.

Page Museum Renovations, New Public Promenade, and New Museum Building

The renovations to the Page Museum, the development of the new public promenade and the new museum building would have the most immediate, direct impact to the historic district (as well as the Page Museum and its character-defining features and site, discussed specifically below). These changes focus on the principal built-environment resource and a focal point of the historic district, the Page Museum. Among the primary character-defining features of the Page Museum are its orthogonal site, which includes not just the museum but the raised berm surrounding and defining it on each side; the expansive lawn adjacent to the west, which contributes to the visual primacy and prominence of the Page Museum; and the relative absence of numerous other built-environment features around it.

The project would eliminate the berms on the west and north elevations. Furthermore, a sizable portion of the northwest corner of the museum would be demolished and replaced to accommodate a connection point to the new museum building and the covered, curved arcade and promenade. Berms along the west and north would be built-up to create a curved public promenade; the new museum building would also be constructed behind the Page Museum. The new site design and construction would envelop and extend the Page Museum and its site along the west and north elevations.

In this way, the primacy of the Page Museum within the existing site design would be diminished; at present, the museum is a stand-alone focal point of the Tar Pits complex. As envisioned, the project would incorporate the Page Museum into a connected three-part complex, with a pathway replacing the character-defining berms on the west and north. The new museum building would also compete with the Page Museum to the point of making it appear to be a supplemental annex to the larger new facility.

Wilshire Gateway Entry Plaza and Lake Pit

The project would replace the diagonal pathway leading into the park in the southeast corner (a character-defining feature) with a curved pathway and entry plaza. A pedestrian bridge and pathway would lead over the Lake Pit, which would replace the main entrance/walkway to the park and visually divide the Lake Pit. The visibility of the lake and statues from Wilshire Boulevard, in particular westbound, would potentially be diminished, thus affecting the visual role La Brea Tar Pits play in the surrounding environment. In addition, because the design process is ongoing, physical impacts to the lake itself from the bridge's structural elements could occur. When considered in tandem with other master plan elements affecting character-defining features, this project component would impact the aspects of "setting" and "feeling" of the historic district and would contribute to the overall loss of integrity.

Enhanced Central Green

The project element of the enhanced central green would affect the lawn west of the Page Museum, which is considered a character-defining feature of the historic district. The lawn would be retained, but the size would be reduced. At present, the lawn provides an open space and unimpeded view to the Page Museum. In the project, the lawn would be enveloped in the new, curved pedestrian path. When considered in tandem with other master plan elements affecting character-defining features, this project component would impact the aspects of “setting” and “feeling” of the historic district and would contribute to the overall loss of integrity.

Revamped Pit 91

The proposed redesign of Pit 91 would not affect identified character-defining features or contributing elements of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District such that, on its own, it would cause or contribute to a significant adverse impact to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District. This project element would retain the contributing feature (tar pits) and replace temporary construction and buildings with a permanent exhibition area. The extended chain fencing would be removed. The project would construct viewing areas around each of the tar pits, with improved pit protection zones and fencing, seating, and interpretive signage. The project would remove and replace noncontributing temporary storage and research buildings adjacent to Project 23.

New Pedestrian Path

The new pedestrian path would create a unified circulation corridor throughout the park and would shift the main entrance/approach. Affected character-defining features include the diagonal entrance/walkway at the corner of Wilshire Boulevard and Curson Avenue (as noted above), historic trees along the north; and the overall configuration of park features connected by meandering paths. Contributing pathways include the southeast entry diagonal path, the path along the north side of the Lake Pit, and the tree-shaded paths west of the parking area. When considered in tandem with other master plan elements affecting character-defining features, this project component would impact the aspects of “setting” and “feeling” of the historic district and would contribute to the overall loss of integrity.

6th Street Entry Gateway and Support Building

The 6th Street Entry Gateway and Support Building would not affect identified character-defining features or contributing elements of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District such that a distinct, direct or indirect impact to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District would be expected.

Conclusion, Impacts to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District

Implementation of the project would result in a comprehensive redesign of Hancock Park, which would erode and interrupt the eclectic but cohesive character-defining features of this historic district such that it would no longer convey the reasons for its significance as a CRHR- and locally eligible historic district. The loss of eligibility of the resource represents material impairment and an impact to the environment. Each one of the project elements on its own would not affect the district’s eligibility to the extent that it would be materially impaired (except for alterations to the Page Museum, addressed above and below in Table 5.5-6). In conclusion, for the eligible La Brea Tar Pits Historic District, full build-out of the project, with the variety of design updates, upgrades, and new construction planned for the site, would be a *significant impact* to the district.

Table 5.5-6. Potential Impacts on Character-Defining Features, La Brea Tar Pits Historic District

| Primary Character-Defining Feature | Is Feature Retained? | Relevant and/or Adjacent Conceptual Project Component/s | Aspects of Integrity Potentially Impacted by Project Element Implementation | Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation in Potential Noncompliance with Conceptual Project Element |
|--|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Oversized, sparsely developed parcel, with large swaths of open park space | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Museum Building and New Public Promenade would reduce open park space with additional construction ▪ The site's oversized parcel and some open space/recreational areas would be retained though diminished | Setting; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.</p> |
| Lake Pit | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wilshire Gateway Entry Plaza and Lake Pit and New Pedestrian Path would change the configuration of the corner entrance to the park ▪ The Lake Pit, which is one of the key contributing resources to the historic district, would be preserved ▪ A pathway and bridge would lead over the Lake Pit | Setting | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 4: Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.</p> |
| Mature trees framing Hancock Park, with concentrations along the north and east | Partially | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landscaping plan would remove a number of the historic trees appearing to date to the 1920s establishment of Hancock Park | Design; Setting; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 4: Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.</p> |
| Page Museum and its site, with pyramidal massing, square plan, and sharply raised berms; visual prominence of Page Museum (see Table 5.5-7 for potential impacts to individually eligible Page Museum) | Partially | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Page Museum Renovations, New Museum Building, and New Public Promenade would change these character-defining features ▪ West and north berms would be removed/built up to accommodate promenade ▪ Pyramidal massing would be mostly replaced ▪ Open-air roof, podium, and central atrium would be covered ▪ Visual primacy of the Page Museum would be diminished | Design; Materials; Workmanship; Setting; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 3: Each property shall 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 architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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</p> |
| Observation Pit | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Circulation corridors and landscaping adjacent to the Observation Pit have been altered over time ▪ The closest project element, a portion of the New Pedestrian Path, would resemble the land use patterns, hardscaping, and circulation corridors already adjacent to this historic resource | Some changes to adjacent Setting (but minimal given level of recent alteration in landscaping in the northwest quadrant of Hancock Park) | Complies with <i>Secretary's Standards</i> |
| Corner entrance with diagonal entry path at Wilshire Boulevard | Partially | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wilshire Gateway Entry Plaza and Lake Pit would shift the corner entrance to a new entry point farther west on Wilshire Boulevard ▪ This project element would remove the character-defining diagonal entry and pathway | Design; Setting; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 3: Each property shall 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 architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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</p> |

| Primary Character-Defining Feature | Is Feature Retained? | Relevant and/or Adjacent Conceptual Project Component/s | Aspects of Integrity Potentially Impacted by Project Element Implementation | Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation in Potential Noncompliance with Conceptual Project Element |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Circulation corridors/pathways, including east-west pathways leading from parking lot and north-south pathway northwest from Central Green | Partially | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhanced Central Green, New Museum Building, New Pedestrian Path would alter/replace some of the character of character-defining circulation corridors and pathways of the historic district ▪ Pathways and circulation corridors dating to the period of significance, which reflect the district's development over time, would be replaced with a unified system and series of designed pathways and landscaping; new construction would interrupt or remove these extant features | Setting; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.</p> |
| Remnants of 1930s stone walls in northwestern portion of site | Unknown; it is possible that implementation of the Master Plan could remove this feature. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landscaping plan and/or facilities upgrades to tar pits and seep sites could impact this feature and other extant remnants of stone walls | Design; Materials; Setting; Feeling | <p>Unknown at this time because the project is conceptual in nature and the Master Plan does not provide specific information on whether the remnants of 1930s stone walls would be retained or removed. The potential exists for impacts to adjacent historical resources through construction staging, construction activities, and implementation of project landscaping. Construction staging activities should be carefully designed to plan for and avoid any adjacent historical resources (including but not limited to details regarding off-site staging, parking, equipment and material storage, movement, and use).</p> |
| Significant paleontological resources on the site, including various dig and studies sites | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revamped Pit 91 would remove temporary facilities that are not considered character-defining ▪ The significant resources would be preserved ▪ Temporary facilities would be replaced and upgraded | None; the improved facilities would enhance visibility of these significant paleontological resources | <p>While the conceptual project complies with the Secretary's Standards, the potential exists for impacts to adjacent historical resources through construction staging and construction activities. Construction staging activities should be carefully designed to plan for and avoid any adjacent historical resources (including but not limited to details regarding off-site staging, parking, equipment and material storage, movement, and use).</p> |

Page Museum, La Brea Tar Pits

As previously noted, the Page Museum is a historical resource pursuant to CEQA (eligible for the NRHP, CRHR, and as a local HCM). Related to this resource, the design plans for the project currently contain elements that do not comply with the *Secretary's Standards*. Not all projects that depart from the *Secretary's Standards* cause significant adverse impacts; however, the remodel of the Page Museum, in addition to including seismic and systems upgrades necessary for the building's long-term viability, also includes major alterations to key character-defining features. Table 5.5-7 provides an overview of the affected character-defining features for each conceptual project component, as applicable and to the extent that project-level detail is available.

These alterations include:

- a) Elimination of the sharply raised berms on the west and north elevations of the museum site
- b) Eliminating the indoor-outdoor integration provided by the open roof, podium, and central atrium, by adding a roof structure and photovoltaic panels and enclosing the open space at the podium with fenestration
- c) Adding windows beneath the Pleistocene-era frieze, which will diminish the museum's high degree of indoor-outdoor integration and the visual prominence of the frieze as one of the key character-defining features of the museum
- d) Shifting the principal entrance to the new museum building; the principal, descending entrance ramp to the Page Museum would be retained physically but converted in use to serve as an outdoor classroom space; the main entrance to the museum would shift to the annex to the west
- e) Demolition of a portion of the museum's northwest corner
- f) A site redesign in which the Page Museum, which is presently a prominent, stand-alone feature, would be incorporated as one component of an integrated, connected three-part complex, including built-up berms on the west and north, a public promenade, and new museum building; new construction does not include visual, physical distinctions and separations between the old and the new
- g) Construction of the new museum building, which, though on par with or slightly higher than the Page Museum, would visually compete with the Page Museum

Taken together, these planned alterations to the Page Museum would compromise its historic integrity to the point that the historical resource would no longer convey the reasons for its significance. Therefore, the project would cause an impact to the environment through material impairment of a historical resource, the Page Museum, which would be *significant*.

Table 5.5-7. Potential Impacts to Character-Defining Features, Page Museum Renovations

| Primary Character-Defining Feature | Is Feature Retained? | Conceptual Project Plans | Aspects of Integrity Potentially Impacted by Project Element | Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation in Potential Noncompliance with Conceptual Project Element |
|---|----------------------|--|--|---|
| Oversized one-story mass/height | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The height of the building would be retained Seismic upgrades would be achieved through addition of shear-wall supports that would be concealed from view | N/A | Could comply with <i>Secretary's Standards</i> (if seismic upgrades are, as described, hidden and any significant historic fabric that is disturbed by the construction is repaired and re-installed or replaced in-kind). |
| Prominent fiberglass frieze with bas relief Pleistocene scenes and pronounced roof overhangs | Partially | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The roof frieze would be retained Windows would be installed beneath the frieze, sealing the open space presently characterizing the podium | Design; Workmanship, Materials; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.</p> |
| Fishbowl-like laboratory space in museum interior | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fishbowl-like laboratory would be retained | While conceptual in nature, this project element would not be expected to result in significant adverse impacts if all project components are designed to comply with the <i>Secretary's Standards</i> | Could comply with <i>Secretary's Standards</i> (if character-defining features of the laboratory space are retained and/or replaced in-kind). |
| Burial mound-like site with sharply raised berms with turf plantings on each side, pyramidal massing, and a square plan | Partially | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Berms on the west and north would be removed and built up to accommodate New Public Promenade Site's pyramidal massing would be replaced Topography and character of west and north berms would be changed to accommodate promenade connecting Page Museum with new building, via curved arcade | Design; Setting; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.</p> |
| Symmetrical design composition, building and site | Partially | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Symmetrical design composition of the Page Museum itself would be largely retained Symmetrical design composition of the site would not be retained Page Museum site would be changed and incorporated into/extended by the curved New Public Promenade and new museum building | Design; Setting; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.</p> |
| Descending entrance progression on south elevation into the center of the building, flanked by mirror stairways leading to the upper podium at the second-floor | Partially | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Page Museum's primary entrance would shift to serve as an outdoor classroom The entrance would remain operational New ADA-accessible ramps would flank the outdoor classroom space A cantilevered shade structure is proposed for the Page Museum entrance, which is presently open-air | Design; Materials; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.</p> |

| Primary Character-Defining Feature | Is Feature Retained? | Conceptual Project Plans | Aspects of Integrity Potentially Impacted by Project Element | Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation in Potential Noncompliance with Conceptual Project Element |
|--|----------------------|---|--|---|
| Indoor-outdoor integration; open-air roof; open configuration at the podium level overlooking atrium | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indoor-outdoor integration of the Page Museum itself would be severely diminished ▪ Open-air configuration of the roof and podium would be covered/sealed ▪ Open-air roof would be covered, with proposed materials to include photovoltaic panels ▪ Windows would be installed at the podium level, closing the open-air design | Design; Materials; Workmanship; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.</p> |
| Open central atrium with landscaping | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The open, central atrium with landscaping would be removed and replaced | Design; Materials; Workmanship; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 5: Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.</p> |
| Visual primacy as principal built-environment feature of historic district | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New construction on-site, including the new museum building and New Public Promenade along with changes to the Enhanced Central Green would diminish the Page Museum's visual primacy at the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District | Design; Setting; Feeling | <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.</p> <p>Rehabilitation Standard No. 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.</p> |

Observation Pit

The project does not include changes to the Observation Pit. In addition, the site and surroundings have already been updated and altered over time, and the closest project element, a portion of the new pedestrian path, would resemble the land use patterns, hardscaping, and circulation corridors already adjacent to this historical resource. Therefore, impacts to the Observation Pit would be *less than significant*.

Properties Adjacent to the Project Site

The following sections address the potential for the project to impact the historic integrity and compatibility of the adjacent historic resources. While potential direct impacts would not result to these properties, it is important to consider whether the project would cause significant indirect impacts to these resources as a result of the introduction of project elements in the proximity of these resources.

Pavilion for Japanese Art

The surrounding land uses, which currently consist of landscaping, pathways, and the elements of the Tar Pits complex, would be retained, albeit with a new design configuration. In terms of new construction, the new museum building planned for the park's northwestern quadrant would be located at a significant distance from the Pavilion for Japanese Art; the scale/mass and design of the new museum building, though largely conceptual at present, would not be expected to overwhelm or otherwise significantly impact the setting and feeling of the Pavilion for Japanese Art to the point that it would no longer convey the reasons for its significance. The closest project element to the Pavilion for Japanese Art would be the new pedestrian path; at present, this area of the park already includes various walkways and landscaping. In addition, the Pavilion for Japanese Art is closest to/oriented toward the new LACMA facility, which represents a more significantly altered change in setting than the master plan for La Brea Tar Pits. In summary, the master plan elements adjacent to the resource would be compatible in terms of use, character, mass/scale, and design, and indirect impacts to the Pavilion for Japanese Art from project implementation would be *less than significant*.

Park La Brea Garden Apartment Historic District

This large historic district forms the northern border of the CEQA APE for this project analysis. The contributors to the district are located across a wide expanse of West 6th Street and screened by the mature trees and landscaping of Hancock Park. Master plan elements facing the Park La Brea Garden Apartment Historic District would be compatible in terms of land use, character, mass/scale, and design. In addition, the new museum building, which would be across 6th Street, is sited at enough of a distance and exhibiting a modest mass/scale that it would not be expected to result in material impairment to the historic resource such that it would no longer convey the reasons for its significance. In summary, impacts to the Park La Brea Garden Apartment Historic District would be *less than significant*.

Prudential Square (5757 W. Wilshire Boulevard)

This 1948 office complex, designed by Wurdeman and Becket, occupies the CEQA APE's southeast corner. Surrounding land uses would be retained, as La Brea Tar Pits would remain a public park with hardscaping/pathways, landscaping and open space, interspersed with institutional facilities and tar pits/excavation sites, albeit with a new design configuration and additions. The closest project element to Prudential Square would be the Wilshire Gateway Entry Plaza & Lake Pit. This element would renovate the existing entrance to La Brea Tar Pits at Wilshire Boulevard and South Curson Avenue. A large, shaded canopy would stretch down Wilshire Boulevard and curve around to South Curson Avenue to

create a new welcome pavilion and shaded entry plaza. These changes to the corner entrance to the park retain the existing land uses and are compatible in terms of character, mass/scale, and design when seen from the perspective of this facing historic resource. In summary, impacts to the Prudential Square from project implementation would be *less than significant*.

Craft and Folk Art Museum (5814 W. Wilshire Boulevard)

Constructed in 1930, the Craft and Folk Art Museum is an American Colonial Revival/French Revival style building located south of the project site, across Wilshire Boulevard. The facing, extant land uses would be retained, as La Brea Tar Pits would remain a public park with hardscaping/pathways, landscaping, and open space, interspersed with institutional facilities and tar pits/excavation sites, albeit with a new design configuration and additions. The closest project element to the Craft and Folk Art Museum would be the Wilshire Gateway Entry Plaza and Lake Pit. This project element would renovate the existing entrance to La Brea Tar Pits at Wilshire Boulevard and South Curson Avenue. A large, shaded canopy would stretch down Wilshire Boulevard and curve around to South Curson Avenue to create a new welcome pavilion and shaded entry plaza. In addition, from this vantage point of Wilshire Boulevard, the new pedestrian path would add a curved walkway over the Lake Pit that would be visible from across Wilshire Boulevard. However, these changes retain the existing land uses and are compatible in terms of character, mass/scale, and design when seen from the perspective of this adjacent historic resource. In summary, impacts to the Craft and Folk Art Museum from project implementation would be *less than significant*.

Hancock Park Building (5820 W. Wilshire Boulevard)

Located south of the project site across Wilshire Boulevard, the Hancock Park Building was designed in 1958 in the International/Mid-Century Modern style by architects Jack H. MacDonald and Cejay Parsons. The building is located south of the project site, across Wilshire Boulevard. The facing, extant land uses would be retained, as La Brea Tar Pits would remain a public park with hardscaping/pathways, landscaping, and open space, interspersed with institutional facilities and tar pits/excavation sites, albeit with a new design configuration and additions. The closest project element to the Hancock Park Building would be the Wilshire Gateway Entry Plaza and Lake Pit. This project element would renovate the existing entrance to La Brea Tar Pits at Wilshire Boulevard and South Curson Avenue. A large, shaded canopy would stretch down Wilshire Boulevard and curve around to South Curson Avenue to create a new welcome pavilion and shaded entry plaza. In addition, from this vantage point of Wilshire Boulevard, the new pedestrian path would add a curved walkway over the Lake Pit that would be visible from across Wilshire Boulevard. However, these changes retain the existing land uses and are compatible in terms of character, mass/scale, and design when seen from the perspective of this adjacent historic resource. In summary, impacts to the Hancock Park Building from project implementation would be *less than significant*.

CMAY Gallery (formerly Arthur Murray Dance Studio) (5828 W. Wilshire Boulevard)

Located south of the project site across Wilshire Boulevard, CMAY Gallery (formerly the Arthur Murray Dance Studio) was designed in 1947 by notable local architect Stiles O. Clements in the Late Moderne style. The building is located south of the project site, across Wilshire Boulevard. The facing, extant land uses would be retained, as La Brea Tar Pits would remain a public park with hardscaping and pathways, landscaping, and open space, interspersed with institutional facilities and tar pits/excavation sites, albeit with a new design configuration and additions. The closest project element to the CMAY Gallery would be the Wilshire Gateway Entry Plaza and Lake Pit. This project element would renovate the existing entrance to La Brea Tar Pits at Wilshire Boulevard and South Curson Avenue. A large, shaded canopy

would stretch down Wilshire Boulevard and curve around to South Curson Avenue to create a new welcome pavilion and shaded entry plaza. In addition, from this vantage point of Wilshire Boulevard, the new pedestrian path would add a curved walkway over the Lake Pit that would be visible from across Wilshire Boulevard. However, these changes retain the existing land uses and are compatible in terms of character, mass/scale, and design when seen from the perspective of this adjacent historic resource. In summary, impacts to the CMAY Gallery from project implementation would be *less than significant*.

Office Building (5850 W. Wilshire Boulevard)

Located south of the project site across Wilshire Boulevard, 5850 West Wilshire Boulevard was designed in 1951 in the International Style by well-known local architect Stiles O. Clements. The building is located south of the project site, across Wilshire Boulevard. The facing, extant land uses would be retained, as La Brea Tar Pits would remain a public park with hardscaping/pathways, landscaping, and open space, interspersed with institutional facilities and tar pits/excavation sites, albeit with a new design configuration and additions. The closest project element to 5850 West Wilshire Boulevard would be the Wilshire Gateway Entry Plaza and Lake Pit. This project element would renovate the existing entrance to La Brea Tar Pits at Wilshire Boulevard and South Curson Avenue. A large, shaded canopy would stretch down Wilshire Boulevard and curve around to South Curson Avenue to create a new welcome pavilion and shaded entry plaza. In addition, from this vantage point of Wilshire Boulevard, the new pedestrian path would add a curved walkway over the Lake Pit that would be visible from across Wilshire Boulevard. However, these changes retain the existing land uses and are compatible in terms of character, mass/scale, and design when seen from the perspective of this adjacent historic resource. In summary, impacts to 5850 West Wilshire Boulevard from project implementation would be *less than significant*.

Mutual Benefit Life Plaza (5900 Wilshire Boulevard)

Located southwest from the project site across Wilshire Boulevard, the Mutual Benefit Life Plaza was designed in 1969–1971 by notable local architects William Pereira and Gin D. Wong. The building complex is located southwest of the project site, across Wilshire Boulevard. The facing, extant land uses would be retained, as La Brea Tar Pits would remain a public park with hardscaping/pathways, landscaping, and open space, interspersed with institutional facilities and tar pits/excavation sites, albeit with a new design configuration and additions. Although not directly adjacent, the closest project element to 5850 West Wilshire Boulevard would be the Wilshire Gateway Entry Plaza and Lake Pit. In addition, from this vantage point southwest of the project site, the new pedestrian path would add a curved walkway over the Lake Pit that would be partially visible from across Wilshire Boulevard to the southwest. However, these changes retain the existing land uses and are compatible in terms of character, mass/scale, and design when seen from the perspective of this adjacent historic resource. In summary, impacts to the Mutual Benefit Life Plaza from project implementation would be *less than significant*.

In summary, no significant adverse indirect impacts of adjacent historical resources would occur with implementation of the project. This finding, as described above, is based on the overall compatibility of master plan elements in terms of land use, general character, mass/scale, and design and that indirect effect would not result in material impairment of adjacent historical resources. The potential for impacts to adjacent historical resources would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion, Construction Impacts

Construction of the project would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of two identified historical resources: the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and the Page Museum. The proposed alterations to the Page Museum would compromise its historic integrity to the point that the historical resource would no longer convey the reasons for its significance. In addition, project implementation

would result in a comprehensive redesign of Hancock Park, which would erode and interrupt the eclectic but cohesive character-defining features of this historic district such that it would no longer convey the reasons for its significance as a CRHR- and locally eligible historic district. The loss of eligibility of the resource represents material impairment and an impact to the environment. Therefore, the project would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 and impacts would be *potentially significant*.

OPERATION

After construction of the project, no alterations to the project site or features within the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District would be associated with the Master Plan. Thus, the Master Plan would not result in any operational effects which would compromise the historic integrity of the site, the Page Museum, or the project surroundings. Therefore, *no impact* to historical resources would occur during project operation.

| CR-HIST Impact 1 | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>As a result of project construction, the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Historical Resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Specifically, the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of two identified historical resources: the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and the George C. Page Museum. This impact would be significant.</i></p> <p><i>Project operation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historic resources pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. No operational impacts would occur.</i></p> <p><i>(CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold V. a)</i></p> | |
| Mitigation Measures | |
| <p>CR-HIST/mm-1.1</p> | <p><i>Impacts to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum resulting from project implementation shall be reduced through the ongoing input to the Design Team from a qualified Historic Architect, as the project design progresses. The Historic Architect shall satisfy the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Historic Architecture as defined by the National Park Service and in accordance with 36 CFR 61 and possess a minimum of ten (10) years of project-level experience in designing, developing, and reviewing architectural plans for conformance with the Secretary’s Standards.</i></p> <p><i>The Historic Architect shall work with the Design Team to identify options for new construction, upgrades, stabilization, repairs, and rehabilitation activities that will facilitate compliance with the Secretary’s Standards. This historic preservation input to the Design Team shall begin in the earliest phases of schematic design phase possible and extend throughout the development of 50% Construction Drawings.</i></p> <p><i>For new construction, the Historic Architect shall work with the Design Team to identify options and opportunities for: (1) ensuring compatibility of scale and character for new construction, site and landscape features, and circulation corridors, (2) ensuring that new construction, in materials, finishes, design, scale, and appearance, is compatible but differentiated from historic contributors and character-defining features; and (3) ensuring that new construction is designed and sited in such a way that it reinforces and strengthens, as much as feasible, character-defining site plan features, landscaping, and circulation corridors.</i></p> <p><i>For modernization and upgrade projects, the Historic Architect shall work with the Design Team to identify project options that facilitate compliance with the Secretary’s Standards.</i></p> |

| CR-HIST Impact 1 | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <p><i>The Historic Architect shall review proposed materials, finishes, window treatments/configuration, and other details to ensure compliance with the Secretary’s Standards. The Historic Architect shall provide specifications for architectural features or materials requiring restoration or removal, maintaining and protecting relevant features in place, or on-site storage. Specifications shall include detailed drawings or instructions where historic features may be impacted.</i></p> <p><i>The Historic Architect shall document the input provided to the Design Team in Memoranda for the Record at the Schematic and 50% Construction Documents phases. A Draft Memorandum for the Record shall be provided to interested parties including the Los Angeles Conservancy and the Los Angeles County Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment.</i></p> <p><i>The Historic Architect shall participate in pre-construction and construction monitoring activities, as appropriate, to facilitate conformance with the Secretary’s Standards and/or lessening of material impairment to historical resources.</i></p> |
| CR-HIST/mm-1.2 | <p><i>An Inventory and Treatment Plan shall be prepared by a qualified historic preservation professional and implemented for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District. Once complete, the Draft Inventory and Treatment Plan shall be provided to interested parties such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment. The Inventory and Treatment Plan shall be finalized prior to the commencement of construction activities.</i></p> <p><i>Specific requirements for the Inventory and Treatment Plan are provided below:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A qualified historic preservation professional shall be retained to prepare the Inventory and Treatment Plan. The historic preservation professional shall satisfy the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for History and/or Architectural History as defined by the National Park Service and in accordance with 36 CFR 61 and possess a minimum of ten (10) years of project-level experience in CEQA review of historic resources and reviewing architectural plans for conformance with the Secretary’s Standards. A landscape architect or landscape specialist with a minimum of five (5) demonstrated years of experience working with historic landscapes shall contribute to preparation of the Inventory and Treatment Plan to identify historic landscaping and trees that fall within the period of significance for the historic district (up to 1977).</i> • <i>The Inventory and Treatment Plan shall adhere to best professional practices promulgated by the National Park Service and State Office of Historic Preservation.</i> • <i>The Inventory and Treatment Plan shall supplement the historic resources survey completed and documented in the Historic Resources Technical Report for the La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan by documenting the character-defining features and existing conditions of those “contributing” (i.e., historically significant) components of the historical resource. The inventory shall include site plan features, commemorative plaques and statues, artwork and sculptures, and other extant contributors to the historic district.</i> • <i>The study shall include recommendations for annual maintenance activities, treatment and repair priorities, and maximum retention of remaining district contributors. All recommendations shall be designed to maximize retention of remaining contributors to the historic district and minimize the loss of character-defining features.</i> <p><i>The Final Inventory and Treatment Plan shall be used for the ongoing stewardship of the property following construction.</i></p> |

| CR-HIST Impact 1 | |
|-------------------------|--|
| CR-HIST/mm-1.3 | <p>A Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)-like Documentation Package shall be prepared to document the contributing features of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum prior to the authorization of demolition or construction activities. The HABS-like Documentation Package shall adhere to best professional practices promulgated by the National Park Service and shall be provided to interested parties such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment. Documentation shall be in accordance with the applicable standards described in the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation.</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of construction activities, a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in History and/or Architectural History shall be retained to prepare HABS-like documentation for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum.</p> <p>Required contents for the HABS-like package include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Photographs</u>: Photographic documentation will focus on the Page Museum and, within the historic district, those contributing elements (built, landscape, hardscape, paleontological, and natural features) slated for demolition, alterations, or adjacent new construction. Photographs shall include detail shots of contributing features and components slated for demolition, with overview and context photographs for the adjacent setting. Photographs shall be taken using a professional-quality single lens reflex (SLR) digital camera with a minimum resolution of 10 megapixels. Digital photographs will be provided in electronic format. • <u>Descriptive and Historic Narrative</u>: The historian or architectural historian will prepare descriptive and historic narrative of the historical resources/features slated for demolition. Physical descriptions will detail each contributing component, with accompanying photographs, and information on how the resource fits within the broader historic district during its period of significance. The historic narrative shall draw upon previously prepared studies, including the Historical Resources Technical Report prepared for the La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan, as well as the La Brea Tar Pits Inventory and Treatment Plan prepared under Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.2. The narrative shall also include a methodology section specifying the name of researcher, date of research, and sources/archives visited, as well as a bibliography. Within the written history, statements shall be footnoted as to their sources, where appropriate. <p>Upon finalization of the HABS-like Documentation Package, a hard copy and digital copy shall be prepared and offered to the Natural History Museum Seaver Center for Western History Research, University of Southern California Special Collections, and the Los Angeles Public Library.</p> |
| CR-HIST/mm-1.4 | <p>A Retrospective Exhibit and Interpretive Program shall be prepared and implemented. The Retrospective Exhibit and Interpretive Project shall be prepared by a qualified historic preservation professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in History and/or Architectural History. The exhibit materials shall be drawn from previous studies including but not limited to the Inventory and Treatment Plan described in Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.2 and the HABS-like documentation package described in Mitigation Measure CR- HIST/mm-1.3, as well as other supplemental research materials as needed.</p> <p>The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program shall focus on the history of the site, the people involved in the early ownership, development, and scientific discoveries and excavations, and the events leading to its donation to the County of Los Angeles, as well as on the site’s development through the end of the period of significance for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District, 1977.</p> |

| CR-HIST Impact 1 | |
|---|---|
| | <p><i>The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program may include but not be limited to exhibit materials and interpretive panels, both exterior (e.g., as a series of panels in the park), interior (e.g., as a permanent exhibit in the Page Museum or new museum building), and online (on the museum website). The exhibit and interpretive program shall be designed for maximum public accessibility.</i></p> <p><i>The plan for the interpretive and commemorative program shall be detailed in an Interpretive Program Plan Memorandum to be prepared with the guidance of a qualified historic preservation professional. The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program shall be completed within three (3) years of commencement of initial construction activities. The Draft Interpretive Program Plan Memorandum shall be reviewed by interested parties such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for comment.</i></p> |
| CR-HIST/mm-1.5 | <p><i>A pre-construction protection plan for historical resources shall be prepared prior to any major alteration or construction activities that may potentially damage historic resources or contributing features of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District or Page Museum. A qualified Historic Architect shall be retained to develop a Preservation Protection Plan that identifies potential risks to historical resources within or adjacent to the immediate project footprint. The Historic Architect shall satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for Historic Architecture as defined by the National Park Service and in accordance with 36 CFR 61 and possess a minimum of ten (10) years of project-level experience in reviewing architectural plans for conformance with the Secretary's Standards.</i></p> <p><i>The Preservation Protection Plan may include, but not be limited to, the following components:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Inclusion/mapping of the historical resource/contributing feature on any architectural drawings, site plans, and/or construction documents.</i> <i>• Site walk with Design Team and construction team representative to review staging areas for construction and construction sequence and activities, to identify areas of concern and to provide input for proactive avoidance of unforeseen impacts.</i> <i>• Procedures and timing for the placement and removal of temporary protection features, such as fencing and other barriers, around the historical resource/contributing feature.</i> <i>• Monitoring of the installation and removal of temporary protection features by the Historic Architect, or designee.</i> <i>• Post-construction survey to document the condition of the historic resource after project completion.</i> <i>• Preparation of a technical memorandum documenting the pre-construction and post-construction conditions of the historic resource and compliance with protective measures outlined in the Preservation Protection Plan.</i> <p><i>The Preservation Protection Plan shall be submitted in draft form to interested parties including the Los Angeles Conservancy and the Los Angeles County Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment.</i></p> |
| Impacts Following Mitigation | |
| <p><i>Upon implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.1 through CR-HIST/mm-1.5 to address the substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, construction impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. No operational impacts would occur.</i></p> | |

5.5.6 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Cumulative impacts to historical resources may occur if the project and related projects cumulatively affect historical resources in the immediate vicinity, contribute to changes within the same historic district, or involve resources that are examples of the same property type or significant within the same context as the one within the project site. Although impacts to historical resources, if any, tend to be site specific, a significant cumulative impact associated with the project and related projects would occur if the combined impact of the project and related projects would materially and adversely alter those physical characteristics that convey the historic significance of a historical resource and that justify its listing, or eligibility for listing, as a historical resource.

Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, provides a list past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future development projects that are anticipated to occur in the vicinity of the project site. These projects include a mix of residential, commercial, and mixed-use developments. The cumulative geographic scope considered for historical resources is the same CEQA APE used in the analysis above, defined as parcels within and directly adjacent to the project footprint. Two projects included in the cumulative development scenario identified in Chapter 4 are within the CEQA APE, including the following:

- **LACMA Renovation:** Located directly adjacent to the project site (on parcels directly west and south across Wilshire Boulevard) at 5906 West Wilshire Boulevard. The project includes museum renovation and is under construction. Construction activities are estimated to be completed at the end of 2024.
- **Wilshire Curson Project:** Located approximately 0.03 miles southeast of the project site at 5700 -5780 Wilshire Boulevard; 712-752 South Curson Avenue; 5721-5773 West 8th Street; and 715-761 South Masselin Avenue. The project includes office and commercial uses and would involve both the renovation of existing buildings as well as the demolition and construction of new buildings. The project is currently under environmental review and anticipated construction timeframes are not available as of the publication date for this EIR.

As discussed in CR-HIST Impact 1, the project was evaluated for its potential to result in direct impacts to the historical resources within the project site as well as indirect impacts to adjacent properties with historic resources. While the project would not result in impacts to adjacent properties with historic resources, the project would directly result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and the Page Museum, rendering both resources no longer eligible for significance. When considered in combination with the impacts of these projects in the cumulative scenario, the project would contribute incrementally to significant impacts on historical resources. Further, the project's contribution to these cumulative impacts would be considerable and significant.

Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.1 through CR-HIST/mm-1.5 would avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for the significance of the impacts to the degree feasible. However, they would not mitigate impacts below the level of significance. Therefore, no feasible mitigation exists that would reduce the project's contribution to less than cumulative considerable.

| CR-HIST Impact 2 (Cumulative) |
|--|
| Construction of the project would result in substantial adverse changes to the significance of a Historical Resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which would be considerable impacts contributing to cumulative historical resources impacts. Specifically, the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of two identified historical resources: the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and the George C. Page Museum. These direct construction impacts would also be significant. No operational impacts to historical resources would occur; therefore, contributions to cumulative impact would similarly not occur during the project's operational period. |
| Mitigation Measures |
| <i>Implement Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.1 through CR-HIST/mm-1.5.</i> |
| Impacts Following Mitigation |
| <i>With implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.1 through CR-HIST/mm-1.5, the project's construction impacts to historical resource impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. As well, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to historical resources would remain significant and unavoidable. No operational impacts to historical resources would occur.</i> |