

1    **4.4       CULTURAL RESOURCES**

2    Potential impacts to cultural resources, including historical and archaeological resources,  
3    resulting from disposal and reuse of NSTI are discussed in this section. Factors considered in  
4    determining whether an alternative would have a significant impact on cultural resources  
5    include the extent or degree to which implementation would cause either of the following:

- 6       • a substantial and adverse change in the characteristics that qualify a historic resource for  
7        listing on the NRHP; or
- 8       • a substantial and adverse change in the characteristics that qualify an archaeological  
9        resource for listing on the NRHP.

10   Under Section 106 of the NHPA, an undertaking has an effect on a historic property when it  
11   alters characteristics of the property that may qualify it for inclusion in the NRHP. The  
12   regulations implementing the NHPA define the term "adverse effect" to include the transfer,  
13   lease, or sale of the property out of federal ownership, in the absence of adequate and legally  
14   enforceable restrictions or conditions, to ensure the long-term preservation of the property.

15   As discussed in section 3.4, the Navy's analysis of the impacts to cultural resources of disposal  
16   and reuse of federal property is limited to the Navy property that is suitable for transfer.  
17   Treatment, preservation, and compliance with applicable federal legislation for the properties  
18   determined to be historically significant and potentially affected by the undertaking will be  
19   accomplished through the agreement and consultation with the SHPO, and through specific  
20   measures contained in the MOA discussed below.

21   **Identified Cultural Resources**

22   *Yerba Buena Island.* On Yerba Buena Island, Navy property suitable for transfer contains the  
23   following Navy structures that are listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP: the Torpedo  
24   Building (Building 262), the Senior Officers Quarters Historic District, which consists of  
25   Quarters 1 through 7, three garages (Buildings 83, 205, and 230), and the associated landscaping  
26   elements. Quarters 1, the Nimitz House, was listed in the NRHP in 1991. Landscaping  
27   elements and the setting of the properties are considered qualities that contribute to the  
28   significance of the structures. In addition to these properties, there are areas on the island that  
29   have been identified as archaeologically sensitive zones. These areas could contain unrecorded  
30   sites below the ground surface or underwater adjacent to the island. Sites in these areas may be  
31   discovered during construction or some other activity requiring deep excavations (see Figure 3-  
32   3 in section 3.4).

33   *Treasure Island.* On Treasure Island, the following Navy structures are listed in or eligible for  
34   listing in the NRHP: Building 1 (Administration Building), Building 2 (Hall of Transportation),  
35   and Building 3 with Building 111 as a structural element (the former Palace of Fine and  
36   Decorative Arts).

**4.4 Cultural Resources**

**1 The Memorandum of Agreement**

2 Navy must comply with Section 106 of the NHPA, which requires consultation among federal  
 3 agencies, the SHPO, the ACHP, and other interested parties. Navy and the SHPO have  
 4 prepared an MOA in order to ensure Section 106 compliance with regard to historic properties  
 5 (a copy of the signed MOA is included as Appendix H). Compliance with the MOA is intended  
 6 to ensure that project effects are not significant and that preservation measures are  
 7 implemented. The MOA includes preservation provisions concerning Navy actions prior to  
 8 disposal and long-term preservation plans following Navy disposal. For example, upon  
 9 conveyance all historic properties identified in the MOA shall be subject to the City of San  
 10 Francisco Planning Code, Article 10, Preservation of Historical, Architectural, and Aesthetic  
 11 Landmarks. Signatories to the MOA include Navy and the SHPO. Following an invitation to  
 12 participate, the ACHP has declined their opportunity to comment. The City and County of San  
 13 Francisco is included as an invited signatory. The Bay Band of Miwok Indians, the California  
 14 Preservation Foundation, and the San Francisco Historic Architecture Heritage (society) are  
 15 included as concurring parties.

**16 4.4.1 Alternative 1**

17 The proposed reuse for the NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible buildings under Alternatives 1-3 is  
 18 summarized in Table 4.4-1.

**19 Table 4.4-1. Reuse Plans for NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible Buildings on NSTI**

<i>Property</i>	<i>Alternative 1</i>	<i>Alternative 2</i>	<i>Alternative 3</i>
Senior Officers Quarters Historic District, Yerba Buena Island	Conference/reception/restaurant, possible residential	Conference/reception/restaurant, possible residential	Conference/reception/restaurant, possible residential
Torpedo Building (Building 262), Yerba Buena Island	Residential live/work units	Restaurant	Restaurant
Building 1, Treasure Island	Mixed use, including museum, office, retail	Mixed use, including museum	Mixed use, including museum
Building 2, Treasure Island	Film production	Demolition for construction of themed attraction	Film production
Building 3 (including related Building 111), Treasure Island	Film production	Demolition for construction of themed attraction	Film production

Source: San Francisco 1996e

**20 Not Significant Impacts**

21 Loss of potentially significant historic resources (Factor 1). To accommodate planned reuse of  
 22 historic properties, as described in Table 4.4-1, the buildings would likely need to be  
 23 rehabilitated. Alternative 1 would include a substantial level of rehabilitation and construction  
 24 on Treasure Island. Construction in the vicinity of the historic properties at NSTI, particularly  
 25 Building 1, Building 2, and Building 3/111, may be out of character with the historic buildings

1 and their setting and could have an adverse effect on these properties. Although the proposed  
2 themed attraction may restore Building 1, Building 2, and Building 3/111, such construction  
3 could alter the character-defining features of Treasure Island (i.e., the setting in which these  
4 historic properties are located).

5 The prepared MOA requires that any rehabilitation work performed prior to final Navy  
6 disposal conform to the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for*  
7 *Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (US Department of the Interior 1996). Following Navy disposal,  
8 the MOA stipulates that the properties would be subject to San Francisco Planning Code,  
9 Article 10, Preservation of Historical and Aesthetic Landmarks, to insure long-term protection  
10 of the properties and their setting. The impact, therefore, would not be significant.

11 Loss of potentially significant archaeological resources (Factor 2). Implementing Alternative 1 could  
12 result in the repair, relocation, or construction of supporting infrastructure on Yerba Buena  
13 Island in archaeologically sensitive zones (Figure 3-3). The MOA identifies required measures  
14 to guard against the potential loss of important information about the prehistoric or historic  
15 occupation of the island and for the unexpected discovery of archaeological remains.  
16 Implementing the MOA would insure that archaeological resources would not be significantly  
17 affected.

#### 18 4.4.2 Alternative 2

19 A summary of the proposed reuse for the NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible buildings under  
20 Alternative 2 appears in Table 4.4-1.

#### 21 *Significant and Not Mitigable Impact*

22 Impact: Demolition of historic resources (Factor 1). Alternative 2 involves the demolition of  
23 Building 2 and Building 3 on Treasure Island, both of which are eligible for listing on the  
24 NRHP. This demolition would result in the loss of significant historic resources.

25 *Mitigation.* This adverse effect can be lessened by recording the affected resources to the  
26 standards of either the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) or the Historic American  
27 Engineering Record (HAER). HABS/HAER recordation would reduce but would not eliminate  
28 the adverse effect caused by demolishing NRHP-eligible resources. Available mitigation  
29 measures, short of preservation, would not reduce impacts of demolition below the threshold of  
30 significance. This mitigation measure is consistent with recordation requirements stipulated by  
31 the MOA.

#### 32 *Not Significant Impacts*

33 Loss of potentially significant historic resources (Factor 1). Alternative 2 proposes alteration of  
34 historic properties for reuse, as described in Table 4.4-1, construction in the vicinity of the  
35 historic properties, or deterioration of vacant buildings after transfer. As described above for  
36 Alternative 1, the MOA requires that any rehabilitation work performed or any construction in  
37 the vicinity of historic structures prior to Navy disposal conform to the Secretary of the  
38 Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (US  
39 Department of the Interior 1996).

#### 4.4 Cultural Resources

---

1 Following Navy disposal, the MOA stipulates that the properties would be subject to San  
2 Francisco Planning Code, Article 10, Preservation of Historical and Aesthetic Landmarks, to  
3 insure long-term protection and historically appropriate rehabilitation of the structures and  
4 their setting. Following provisions in the MOA, rehabilitation of historic properties would not  
5 constitute a significant impact.

6 Loss of potentially significant archaeological resources (Factor 2). Implementing Alternative 2 could  
7 result in the repair, relocation, or construction of supporting infrastructure on Yerba Buena  
8 Island in archaeologically sensitive zones (Figure 3-3). The MOA identifies measures that guard  
9 against the potential loss of important information about the prehistoric or historic occupation  
10 of the island and for the unexpected discovery of archaeological remains. Implementing the  
11 MOA would insure that archaeological resources would not be significantly affected.

#### 12 4.4.3 Alternative 3

13 A summary of the proposed reuse for the NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible buildings under  
14 Alternative 3 appears in Table 4.4-1. The projected reuse of NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible  
15 buildings would be identical to that of Alternative 1, although on a smaller scale.

#### 16 *Not Significant Impacts*

17 Loss of potentially significant historic resources (Factor 1). Similar to Alternative 1, Alternative 3  
18 proposes alteration of historic properties for reuse, as described in Table 4.4-1, construction in  
19 the vicinity of the historic properties that affects the character of those properties, or  
20 deterioration of vacant buildings after transfer. As described above for Alternative 1, the  
21 prepared MOA requires that any rehabilitation work performed or any construction in the  
22 vicinity of historic structures prior to Navy disposal conform to the Secretary of the Interior's  
23 *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (US Department of  
24 the Interior 1996).

25 Following Navy disposal, the MOA stipulates that the properties would be subject to San  
26 Francisco Planning Code, Article 10, Preservation of Historical and Aesthetic Landmarks.  
27 Article 10, which includes preservation measures that protect the character of historic districts.  
28 The MOA ensures that potential reuse activities would not result in construction that  
29 diminishes the character of historic resources.

30 Loss of potentially significant archaeological resources (Factor 2). Similar to Alternative 1,  
31 implementing Alternative 3 could result in the repair, relocation, or construction of supporting  
32 infrastructure on Yerba Buena Island in archaeologically sensitive zones (Figure 3-3). The MOA  
33 identifies measures that guard against the potential loss of important information about the  
34 prehistoric or historic occupation of the island and for the unexpected discovery of  
35 archaeological remains. Following the measures within the MOA would eliminate any  
36 potential significant impacts.

#### 37 4.4.4 No Action Alternative

38 Deterioration of historic property and archaeologically sensitive areas (Factors 1 and 2). The No  
39 Action Alternative would be a continuation of the caretaker status of NSTI surplus property.

1 There would be minimal use of the property and facilities under this alternative. Ongoing  
2 activities would include maintenance to minimize deterioration and essential security  
3 operations. No structures would be demolished or reused, and NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible  
4 buildings would not be affected. Archaeologically sensitive areas would remain under the control  
5 and jurisdiction of Navy and would be afforded the protection of federal historic and  
6 archaeological preservation laws and regulations.

7

**4.4 Cultural Resources**

---

1

**This page intentionally left blank.**