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Introduction

The City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (CLADPW), Bureau of Engineering, proposes to construct a new pedestrian and bicycle bridge over the Los Angeles River. The proposed Taylor Yard Bikeway and Pedestrian Bridge over the Los Angeles River Project would be situated roughly 3 miles north of downtown Los Angeles between Elysian Valley on the west and Taylor Yard on the east, with its eastern abutment at Kerr Road and its western abutment between Altman Street and Dorris Place. The proposed bridge would be designed for bicycle and pedestrian use; it would also support emergency vehicles. On the south, the proposed bridge would connect to an existing bikeway along the river; on the north, a bikeway would be constructed along Kerr Road to connect to San Fernando Road.

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to support the proposed project’s compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations at 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 800. Because no historical resources were identified in the project area of potential effects (APE)/study area, this technical report is being submitted with a determination of “no historic properties affected” for the purposes of Section 106. Furthermore, the project would not cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource under CEQA.

Project Description and Location

Location

The proposed project would be located at the Los Angeles River and in the surrounding Silverlake-Echo Park-Elysian Park Community Plan Area of the city of Los Angeles. Specifically, the northern abutment of the proposed bridge would be adjacent to Kerr Road, and the southern abutment would be adjacent to the Los Angeles River Greenway Trail (bikeway), between Altman Street and Dorris Place (the southern abutment would be adjacent to 2331 Dorris Place). Proposed street intersection improvements at San Fernando Road/Cypress Road would occur north of the proposed bridge. Additionally, a two-way bike and pedestrian path would be developed on Kerr Road, connecting the proposed bridge to San Fernando Road.

Figures 1 and 2 show the regional and project locations.
Figure 1
Regional Location
Taylor Yard Bikeway/Pedestrian Bridge Over the LA River Project
Surrounding Land Uses

Land uses in this area include residential uses to the east, industrial uses to the south, and Rio de Los Angeles State Park to the west. The proposed two-way bike path on Kerr Road is bordered by the Taylor Yard Transit Village to the south, San Fernando Road to the east, Rio de Los Angeles State Park to the north, and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks to the west. The proposed bridge would cross the Los Angeles River in the southern portion of the project area. The northern abutment lies adjacent to a proposed natural river area, commonly known as the G2 property. This property is currently owned by UPRR. Within the G2 parcel lies the southernmost stretch of Kerr Road, a private street that is owned by Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) and California State Parks. Kerr Road allows access to the Taylor Yard Commuter Rail Central Maintenance Facility as well as the residential housing developments to the east. To the west of Kerr Road is Rio de Los Angeles State Park.

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) operates high-voltage transmission lines along the north bank of the Los Angeles River. The transmission lines restrict flexibility with respect to bridge design flexibility because no bridge element may be within 25 feet of the transmission line. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) maintains a maintenance road along the northern bank of the Los Angeles River. The road is used by LACDPW, LADWP, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and LACMTA. Additionally, the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) operates both a main line and tail track through the project footprint.

The southern bank of the Los Angeles River is used as a bikeway, which begins at Fletcher Drive, to the north, and continues to Egret Park at Riverside Drive, to the south. Directly south of the bridge is the CLADPW, Bureau of Sanitation, Dorris Place Maintenance Yard.

Figure 3 provides a visual representation of the proposed project.

Purpose

The proposed project aims to:

- Support the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (LARRMP) goal of bringing residents back to the Los Angeles River.
- Support the City of Los Angeles (City) commitment to invest in recycled-water infrastructure.
- Construct a pedestrian access system to link the communities of Elysian Valley and Cypress Park, located east and west of Taylor Yard, thereby fulfilling the commitment of the 1992 Taylor Yard Rail Commuter Facility Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC), SCRRRA, and the City.
Figure 3
Bridge Rendering(s)
Taylor Yard Bikeway/Pedestrian Bridge
Over the LA River Project

Source: City of Los Angeles
Bureau of Engineering, Studio Pali Falalei architects, HOOD
Design: ARLP Tetra Tech, The Merco Group
Background

In 2007, Los Angeles City Council (C.F. 07-1342) adopted the long-range LARRMP, which, among other recommendations, includes

- Continue development of non-motorized transportation and recreation elements, including bike and pedestrian paths and multi-use trails at the river and tributary rights of way, and enhance river identity with non-motorized bridges.
- Commission “signature” non-motorized bridges that express a design or artistic sensibility and become landmarks for the river.
- Always safely accommodate both pedestrians and bicycle traffic.
- Light for safety, and design lighting features to highlight the bridge.

The LARRMP includes the Taylor Yard bridge as Project No. 171. Additionally, the Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration Study discusses a need for a bridge over the Los Angeles River at Taylor Yard.

In 1992, LACTC, SCRRRA, and the City entered into an agreement regarding the Taylor Yard Rail Commuter Facility. This 1992 MOU included a commitment (Section 3.F.) to build a pedestrian bridge across the Los Angeles River at Taylor Yard.

Description

The proposed project would construct a multi-modal bridge over the Los Angeles River between Elysian Valley on the west and Taylor Yard on the east. The proposed bridge would be designed for bicycle and pedestrian use; it would also support emergency vehicles. On the south, the proposed bridge would connect to an existing bikeway along the river. Two American with Disabilities Act– (ADA-) compliant ramps would also be constructed in this area. On the north, a 275-foot-long bikeway ramp would be constructed. This ramp would lead to a proposed two-way bike path, with buffer, along Kerr Road that would connect to San Fernando Road, as shown in Figure 4. Under the proposed project, nine magnolia trees located along Kerr Road would be removed. Crosswalks would be added at the San Fernando Road/Future Street and Cypress Street/Future Street intersections. An at-grade crossing for an existing railroad would be located on the east side.

The proposed steel-framed bridge would be approximately 400 feet long and supported on abutments and a concrete pier in the central portion of the channel. The abutment on the north would be located along the Los Angeles River maintenance road; the abutment on the south would be located along an existing bikeway. Both abutments would be adjacent to the tops of the channel slopes. The abutment on the north side would include construction of a retaining wall, ranging in height from 5 to 18 feet. The bridge structure itself would be approximately 30 feet high by 24 feet, 3 inches wide. The width of the actual pedestrian and bikeway path would be approximately 18 feet. The pedestrian and bikeway path would descend to the south at an inclination of approximately 3.1 percent.
The proposed bridge design would minimize disruption of the waterway as well as the number of structural supports in the river. The design would include a foundational support pier in the riverbed, which has a soft bottom in this area. Except for the pier, the bridge would be located above the river’s cross-sectional flow area. The proposed project would cross land that is under the jurisdiction of the City, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, and USACE.

The proposed bridge would be designed to carry two 16-inch LADWP water lines for reclaimed water, connecting Elysian Valley to Cypress Park. LADWP water line installation would start 5 feet south of the masonry wall on the bikeway side, travel underground perpendicular to the bikeway, continue up through the bridge landing, straddle under the bridge deck, travel back underground through the bridge landing, continue through Kerr Road, then connect to an existing waterline in San Fernando Road. The water lines would be a visible bridge element, hanging under the bridge deck. These lines represent the investment in recycled-water infrastructure that the City is making.

Construction

Bridge construction would require an orchestrated approach with respect to the sequence of construction. Any work in the Los Angeles River proper would occur during the dry season (April to October) and require an active approach to avoid adversely affecting the surrounding environment and water quality.

During the dry season, a work platform would be created over the Los Angeles to keep vehicles and workers off of the rocky, muddy, or sandy bottom surface. A construction crane would be used to install the structural steel truss segments that would compose the bridge. Specifically, the truss sections would be fabricated off-site, then assembled in a staging area adjacent to the north channel slope. The sections would be brought down to the river bottom with use of construction platforms/ramps. Cranes would be positioned nearby to lift the structural steel sections into place without disrupting the river habitat, thereby reducing construction cost and time. The staging area would also facilitate the movement of smaller components, equipment, and materials to and from the project site.

Potential Easements

The bridge itself would rest on City property; therefore, no easement would be required.

2433 Birkdale Street (Assessor’s Parcel Number [APN] 5445-003-039)

The bike ramp that would be built on the Los Angeles River Greenway Trail would occupy property owned by Birkdale Holding Company as well as William Meade. Birkdale Holding Company has been contacted regarding dedication of a portion of the property (i.e., an area needed for the bike ramp, stairs, a section of the water line, and landscaping). If necessary, the parcel may have to be acquired through a permanent easement.
As a worst-case scenario, the proposed project would require the following easements:

1. Permanent Easement (for permanent construction of bike ramps, stairs, landscaping, and a portion of the water line)
2. Temporary Right-of-Way Construction Easement (when performing construction activities)

**UPRR Property (APN 5445-004-803)**

The path would be on the G2 parcel, which is owned by UPRR.

As a worst-case scenario, if the City does not purchase the G2 parcel, the proposed project would require the following easements:

1. Permanent Easement (for permanent construction of bike ramp and retaining wall)
2. Temporary Right-of-Way Construction Easement (when performing construction activities; also to allow use of the staging area)

**LACMTA Property (APN 5445-004-903)**

A portion of the northeast retaining wall may encroach on LACMTA property. However, because only a sliver would be required for construction, a permanent easement may not be necessary.

1. Temporary Right-of-Way Construction Easement (when performing construction activities for the retaining wall)
2. Permanent Easement (unlikely)

**Kerr Road**

Kerr Road is privately owned by LACMTA and California State Parks. LADWP has already begun the process of negotiating for a permanent easement and temporary construction easement to install a water line under Kerr Road. Outreach efforts have been made to the real estate staff at LACMTA and California State Parks to discuss dedicating the road to public use. However, for a worst-case scenario, the following easements could be required:

**California State Parks**

1. Permanent Easement (for water line)
2. Temporary Right-of-Way Construction Easement (to construct water line)

**LACMTA**

1. Permanent Easement
2. Temporary Right-of-Way Construction Easement
Regulatory Framework

Federal

National Environmental Policy Act

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, establishes the federal policy of protecting important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage during federal project planning. All federal or federally assisted projects requiring action pursuant to Section 102 of NEPA must take into account the effects on cultural resources. According to NEPA regulations, when considering whether an action may “significantly affect the quality of the human environment,” an agency must consider, among other things, unique characteristics of the geographic area, such as proximity to historic or cultural resources (40 CFR Section 1508.27[b][3]) and the degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

NEPA regulations require, to the fullest extent possible, agencies to prepare draft environmental impact statements concurrently with environmental impact analyses and the related surveys and studies required by the NHPA. When Section 106 of the NHPA and NEPA are integrated, project impacts that would cause adverse effects under Section 106 are usually considered to be significant under NEPA.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

Section 106 of the NHPA (Section 106) requires federal agencies, or those they fund or permit, to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties. These are defined by Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations (36 CFR Part 800) for implementing Section 106, as discussed below.

*Historic property* means any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, NRHP, as maintained by the Secretary of the Interior. This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization that meet the NRHP criteria [36 CFR Section 800.16(l)].

The implementing regulations for Section 106 set forth a four-step process for compliance. Initiation of the Section 106 process includes establishment of an undertaking, identification of the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and coordination with other reviews, such as those under NEPA (36 CFR 800.3). In the second step, the APE is established and historic properties are identified. During this step, information from interested parties is sought, and the SHPO is consulted regarding the eligibility of historic properties in the APE (36 CFR 800.4). Third, the criteria of adverse effect are applied to those properties that have been identified as NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible properties and SHPO concurrence
is obtained (36 CFR 800.5). Fourth, adverse effects identified in step three are resolved through avoidance, minimization, or mitigation, resulting in either a change to the proposed project or execution of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) (36 CFR 800.6).

To determine whether an undertaking could affect NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible properties, cultural resources (including archaeological, historical, and architectural properties) must be inventoried and evaluated for listing in the NRHP. For projects involving a federal agency, cultural resource significance is evaluated in terms of eligibility for listing in the NRHP. For a property to be considered for inclusion in the NRHP, it must meet the criteria for evaluation set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.4, as follows:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and

(a) That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

(b) That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

(c) That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master or that possess high artistic values or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

(d) That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Among other criteria considerations, a property that has achieved significance within the last 50 years is not considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP unless certain exceptional conditions are met.

The following sections provide the historic context for the project area, a discussion of the methodology for identifying and evaluating properties in the project area with respect to NRHP eligibility, and the criteria for adverse effects.

**State**

**California Environmental Quality Act**

In accordance with CEQA Section 21084.1, the proposed project would have a significant adverse environmental impact if it would “cause a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.” As defined under Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section 4850, a historical resource is “any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that is historically or archaeologically significant or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural history of California.” A historical resource is further defined under Public Resources Code Section 15064.5 as a “resource listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).” A resource shall be considered by the lead state agency to be historically significant under CEQA if it meets any of the following criteria for listing in the CRHR:
1. The resource is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;

2. The resource is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

3. The resource embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or represents the work of an important creative individual or possesses high artistic values; or

4. The resource has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition, properties listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR. Therefore, all historic properties under federal preservation law are automatically considered historical resources under CEQA.

**Historical Resources**

Established in 1970, CEQA directs state and local government entities to analyze and publically disclose environmental impacts of proposed projects. Moreover, it requires development and adoption of mitigation measures to lessen impacts.

California Public Resources Code Section 21060.5 defines the term *environment* to include “objects of historic… significance.” For the purposes of CEQA, the term *historical resources* is defined at Section 15064.5(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines. The text below is abbreviated and excerpted.

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing in, the CRHR (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1; Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 4850 et seq.).

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code, or identified as significant in a historic resource survey that meets the requirements Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered a historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing in the CRHR (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1; Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 4852), including the following:
(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;

(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or represents the work of an important creative individual or possesses high artistic values;

(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

4. The fact that a resource is not listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be a historical resource, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.
Environmental Setting

The proposed Taylor Yard Bikeway and Pedestrian Bridge over the Los Angeles River Project would be located at the Los Angeles River and in the surrounding Silverlake-Echo Park-Elysian Park Community Plan Area of the city of Los Angeles. Specifically, the northern abutment of the proposed project would be adjacent to Kerr Road, and the southern abutment would be adjacent to the Los Angeles River Greenway Trail (bikeway), between Altman Street and Dorris Place (the southern abutment would be adjacent to 2331 Dorris Place).

The project study area is surrounded by a neighborhood with a mix of industrial buildings, commercial buildings, and residential dwellings. Much of the landscape within the study area currently consists of vacant land north of the Los Angeles River, on the former site of the Taylor Yards. Kerr Road runs along the northern boundary of the project study area, with Rio De Los Angeles State Park located north of the project boundary. The area northeast of the study area, along San Fernando Road, consists of largely light industrial and commercial buildings. To the south, on the southern end of the project study area, postwar-era industrial building are found along the river, with single-family residential dwellings located farther to the south.

Methodology

The evaluation of historical resources in the immediate vicinity of with the proposed project included a review of existing sources of information and a field survey. Existing sources of information, combined with information collected during the field visit, are used to determine historical resource significance for each building and evaluate potential effects on historic architectural resources.

Sources of Information

ICF International staff members consulted a variety of sources to determine the significance of the subject properties. The search included a review of:

- National Register of Historic Places
- California Register of Historical Resources
- California Inventory of Historic Resources
- California Historical Landmarks (State of California 1996) et seq.
- California Points of Historical Interest (State of California 1992) et seq.
- City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments
- City of Los Angeles Parcel Viewer – County of Los Angeles Tax Assessor
- City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning – Zoning Information and Map Access System
Field Survey

On May 4, 2016, Andrew Bursan conducted a field survey of the architectural resources in the study area. Mr. Bursan is a historian at ICF International who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards. Mr. Bursan photographed and documented properties within the study area and took notes on the integrity and the current condition of the buildings.

Section 106 Area of Potential Effect/CEQA Study Area

A Section 106 APE/CEQA study area map was created to show the limits of disturbance, project limits, staging areas, temporary impact areas, and temporary and permanent easements. The southern portion of the study area includes a property at 2433 Birkdale Street that would require temporary and permanent easements for the construction of bikeway ramps, stairs, and a portion of an LADWP water line as well as the installation of landscaping. The property at 2331–2335 North Dorris Place is included at the southern end of the project area because approximately 3 feet of the LADWP water line would extend below the property. The map does not include intersection restriping work at San Fernando Road and Cypress Avenue or the addition of ADA ramps at existing bike path access points on Dallas Avenue and Riverdale Avenue. This work, which would be limited to the existing right of way, is not included because it is considered extremely minor (see Figure 4).
Figure 4: Area of Potential Effect/Study Area Map (APE/study area highlighted in blue)
Record Search

On February 23, 2016, ICF senior archaeologist Stephen Bryne conducted a record search for the project study area at the South Central Coastal Information Center, located at California State University, Fullerton. For prehistoric resources, the search included a review of all available archaeological resources reports and archaeological site records within a 1-mile radius of the study area. The buffer area for the built environment was 0.25 mile.

The Los Angeles River channel (Glendale Narrows section) is the only cultural resource in the study area, according to the record search. The southern end of the Glendale Narrows encompasses the section of the Los Angeles River that runs through the project study area. In the North Atwater Crossing Project Environmental Assessment from November 2014, Greenwood and Associates determined that the Glendale Narrows section of the Los Angeles River channel, including the portion that crosses the project study area, is not eligible for the NRHP, CRHR, or local historic designation for the following reasons:

- The historical setting of the resource was significantly compromised by construction of interstate 5 (Golden State Freeway) in the late 1950s. Construction of a 10-lane freeway directly adjacent to the river channel severed the connection between the natural environment of Griffith Park and the waterway that had existed until that time.
- The segment does not appear eligible for state or local historic designation by merit of its association with important historical events or patterns of events.
- Although the system as a whole may be viewed as historically important, this particular section of the Los Angeles River channel does not possess any special or noteworthy associations with the flood control program developed and implemented by USACE, the agency with primarily responsibility.
- The existing channel is a standard design that was constructed with standard materials. It is comparable in appearance and function to the 100-plus miles of channels that have carried all of the county’s principal rivers since the mid-twentieth century. This segment displays no unique or innovative design elements.

Although a portion of the Los Angeles River was listed as part of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument No. 942, the section of the river that was determined to be eligible is within Griffith Park, roughly 3 miles north of the study area. The listing did not include any portion of the river that would be associated with the study area.

Table of Previously Evaluated Properties in the Project Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles River Channel, Glendale Narrows Section</td>
<td>Found not eligible (no status code provided)</td>
<td>May 29, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, the California State Historic Resources Inventory, and the City of Los Angeles Historic Cultural Monuments databases were reviewed, as were the NRHP and CRHR. No additional resources were identified.

**Properties in APE/Study Area with Potential Temporary or Permanent Easements**

**2331–2335 North Dorris Place (APN 5445-005-903)**

Looking Northeast at the Westernmost Building at 2331–2335 North Dorris Place

The parcel at 2331–2335 North Dorris Place is a Los Angeles Building and Safety property with two 1970s-era buildings and two automobile canopies. Although a portion of the LADWP water line would run under this property, the buildings on the parcel were all built after 1972, according to historic aerial maps, and are therefore less than 45 years old. Because the buildings are less than 45 years old, the property was not evaluated.
The property at 2433 Birkdale Street contains a twin-gabled warehouse. It is directly adjacent to the Los Angeles River. The property may require temporary and permanent easements for the construction of bike ramps, stairs, and a portion of an LADWP water line as well as the installation of landscaping. It does not appear that the introduction of easements would result in the demolition of any building on the property. The buildings on the parcel were constructed in 1956, according to a Los Angeles building permit dated April 10 of that year. Although the building is more than 45 years old, it is a prosaic example of a postwar utilitarian warehouse, and its architectural design is commonplace throughout much of Los Angeles and Southern California. Building permits also indicate that the building experienced large additions in 1966 and 1967. These have diminished the building’s integrity of design and workmanship. Therefore, because of the undistinguished architecture as well as modifications that altered the building’s character-defining features, the building at 2433 Birkdale Street does not meet NRHP Criterion C, CRHR Criterion 3, or the criterion for local listing. In addition, research did not reveal any associations with individuals or businesses that would warrant listing the property under NRHP Criterion A or B, CRHR Criterion 1 or 2, or the criterion for local listing. Potential easements at the property would have no impact on historic resources. The property is not a historic property for the purposes of Section 106 or a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA.
Southern Pacific Railroad Tracks: Historic aerial maps indicate that the Southern Pacific railroad tracks that cross the study area were installed after 1980 as part of the realignment of tracks at Taylor Yard. Since the tracks are less than 45 years of age, they were not evaluated for historic significance.

UPRR Property (APN 5445-004-803) and LACMTA Property (APN 5445-004-903): These parcels do not contain any built structures. Although UPRR tracks extend through the properties, the tracks were constructed after 1980, according to historic aerial images, and are therefore less than 45 years old. These parcels were not evaluated for historic significance.
Results and Conclusions

Application of Adverse Effect Criteria (Section 106)

An adverse effect is found when an undertaking alters, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify it for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property’s eligibility for the NRHP. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative.

The 36 CFR Section 800.5(a)(2) examples of adverse effects are listed below.

(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of a property.

(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, or provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR Part 68) and applicable guidelines.

(iii) Removal of a property from its historic location.

(iv) Change in the character of a property’s use or physical features that contribute to its historic significance within its setting or the introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of a property’s significant historic features.

(v) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property’s historic significance.

Impacts Discussion (CEQA)

Thresholds of Significance

An adverse effect on cultural resources would occur if construction and/or operation of the project would result in the following:

- Substantially affect the integrity of NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible structures through physical destruction or alteration.
- Destroy sensitive cultural resources.
Finding

Because no historical resources were identified in the project APE/study area, there would be no impacts (CEQA) or adverse effects (Section 106) on the historical resources.

Conclusion

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to support the proposed project’s compliance with CEQA and Section 106. CEQA requires public or private projects financed or approved by public agencies to be assessed to determine the effects on historical resources and unique archaeological resources and provide guidance for determining the significance of impacts.

In compliance with CEQA and Section 106 guidelines, no historical resources were identified in the study area that would be eligible the NRHP, CRHR, or local listing. Because no historical resources were identified, the proposed project would result in no impact under Section 15064.5(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines. In addition, the project would result in a finding of “no historic properties affected” for the purposes of Section 106.

Mitigation

Because no historical resources were identified in the study area, mitigation is not applicable.
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