

8-4.14 CULTURAL RESOURCES

8-4.14.1 Setting

Section 4-14.1 of the Final EIR describes the prehistoric and historic setting for the San Fernando Valley.

8-4.14.2 Impact Analysis Methodology and Evaluation Criteria

This cultural resources analysis addresses only historical resources because there would be no impact on archaeological or paleontological resources given that: (1) all areas along the Rapid Bus routes have been fully disturbed by previous construction activities, and (2) construction activities required to establish Rapid Bus stops and transit signal priority would be very minor and would require only minimal disturbance of the ground surface.

8-4.14.2.1 Area of Potential Effects

For historic resources, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) defines the Area of Potential Effects (APE) as the “geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist,” and this definition is adequate for compliance with CEQA.

For the Revised FEIR, the APE of each project alternative is the same for both archaeological and historic resources. None of the APEs includes any railroad ROW or easements; each APE consists entirely of the alternative’s particular Rapid Bus routes and stops. The APE ranges from 100 feet wide (along most of the Rapid Bus routes) to as wide as 250 feet (at stop locations).

For all three Rapid Bus alternatives, the routes would be located along existing Metro bus routes, except for a short segment along Chandler Boulevard. Historically, each of the Rapid Bus route streets has been used for local bus routes. For all three Rapid Bus alternatives, the entire APE has been highly disturbed by urban uses, and no part exists in its natural state.

8-4.14.3 Impacts

8-4.14.3.1 Archaeological Resources

The Rapid Bus routes for all three alternatives are located on existing Metro bus routes, with the Chandler Boulevard segment exception, on well-traveled public streets. The operation of Rapid Bus routes on these roadways would not be a change from current conditions, and would not affect archeological resources. In addition, for all three Rapid Bus alternatives, any excavation required for construction activities at Rapid Bus stop locations would be very shallow – approximately five feet for pole placement. This minimal disturbance would not affect the ground such that it would be likely that archeological resources would be uncovered. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.



8-4.14.3.2 Historical and Architectural Resources

8-4.14.3.2.1 Evaluation Criteria

The criteria for determining impacts on historic properties under CEQA are in the Public Resources Code (PRC) §15064.5. A project is typically found to have a significant effect under CEQA if it causes a change in an otherwise eligible property that would prevent its inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Examples of changes include, but are not limited to, physical damage to or alteration of the property, moving the property, introducing visual or audible elements that jeopardize the characteristic for which the property is deemed eligible for listing, and causing neglect and deterioration of the property.

8-4.14.3.2.2 Historical Resources for Final EIR

For the Final EIR, archival research was conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center based on its California Historical Resources Inventory System (CHRIS). Eligibility criteria of both the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources were used, as well as several other information sources. In addition, an architectural historian and a railroad historian conducted field surveys of the Final EIR APE.

One historic property that had previously been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties (NRHP) was identified. In addition, two properties were identified that appear eligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the Final EIR analysis concluded that the proposed BRT project would have no adverse effect on the three properties.

The impact analysis methodology and evaluation criteria are summarized in Section 4-14.2 of the Final EIR, and detailed in the *Request for Determination of Eligibility and Effects Report*.¹

8-4.14.3.2.3 Historical Resources for Revised FEIR

For the three Rapid Bus alternatives being evaluated in this Revised FEIR, no archival research was conducted; a windshield investigation was undertaken to identify historical properties and architectural resources. No historic properties were observed that would be affected by locating Rapid Bus stops at the designated locations. None of the City of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Overlay Zones is located in the Valley. There are numerous individually identified historical resources in the Valley as reported in the City's Historic-Cultural Monument Report as compiled in **Table 8-4.14-1** (Historic-Cultural Monuments). Historic resources in the Valley that were clearly not within the APE of the Rapid Bus routes are not listed.

^{1/} *Request for Determination of Eligibility and Effects Report for the San Fernando Valley East-West Transit Corridor*, prepared for the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority by Myra L. Frank & Associates, Inc., May 2001.

Table 8-4.14-1: Historic-Cultural Monuments

Monument No.	Monument Name	Address	On Rapid Bus Route?	Nearest Rapid Bus Stop and Distance and Direction of Monument from Rapid Bus Stop
7	Romulo Pico Adobe (Rancho Romulo)	10940 Sepulveda Boulevard	No	¾ mile north of RB-Network stop at Sepulveda & Chatsworth
23	San Fernando Rey Mission	15151 San Fernando Mission Boulevard	No	1 mile north of RB-Network stop at Sepulveda & Chatsworth
152	Faith Bible Church	18531 Gresham Street	No	½ mile south of RB-Network stop at Reseda & Nordhoff; ½ mile north of RB-Network stop at Reseda & Roscoe
290	La Reina Theater	14626 Ventura Boulevard	No	1/10 mile west of RB-Network stop at Ventura & Van Nuys
405	Pacific Electric Picover Railway Station	16710 Sherman Way	YES on RB-3 & RB-5	¼ mile east of RB-3 & RB-5 stop at Sherman & Balboa
484	Oakridge and Grounds	18650 Devonshire Street	YES on RB-Network	¼ mile west of RB-Network stop at Devonshire & Reseda
629	Adams Residence	7400 Tampa Avenue	No	½ mile north of RB-3 & RB-5 stop at Tampa & Sherman
645	Harvester Farms	22049 Devonshire Street	No	½ mile west of the western terminus stop of RB-Network
700	Canoga Park Branch Library	7260 N. Owensmouth Avenue	YES on RB-Network	1/10 mile north of RB-Network stop at Owensmouth and Sherman; ½ mile east of RB-3 & RB-5 stop at Sherman & Topanga Canyon
750	The Munch Box	21532 W. Devonshire Street	No	¼ mile west of the western terminus stop of RB-Network
2179	Toluca Southern Pacific Depot (Lankershim Depot)	11275 Chandler Boulevard	YES on RB-Network RB-3 RB-5	Immediately next to the terminus of the North Hollywood Metro Red Line Station
2393	Los Encinos State Historic Park	16756 Moorpark Street	No	1 mile south of RB-5 stop at Balboa & Burbank



As shown in **Table 8-4.14-1**, two historical monuments (Oakridge and Grounds and Canoga Park Branch Library) are on a RB-Network Rapid Bus route, and one historical monument (the Pacific Electric Railway Station) is on a Rapid Bus route that is common to RB-3 and RB-5. For each alternative, all Rapid Bus routes are located along existing local Metro bus routes, so the operation of Rapid Buses on these roadways would not be a significant change from current conditions. The historical use of these roadways for mass transit is well established, and none of the three Rapid Bus alternatives would change that use. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

Table 8-4.14-1 also shows that only the Lankershim Depot historic/cultural monument is immediately adjacent to a proposed Rapid Bus stop. The monuments that are nearest to a Rapid Bus stop are the Canoga Park Branch Library, which is approximately 1/10 mile north of the RB-Network stop at Owensmouth Avenue and Sherman Way, and the La Reina Theater, which is approximately 1/10 mile west of the RB-Network Rapid Bus stop at Ventura Boulevard and Van Nuys Boulevard. All other monuments are no closer than within ¼ mile of a Rapid Bus stop. The Rapid Bus stops for each alternative would be located on public sidewalks at the far side of the intersection. The short-term construction time required to install the Rapid Bus stop enhancements would not affect any historic monuments, as none is close enough to a stop to be impacted.

The Final EIR's conclusion that the BRT Alternative would not affect any of the three identified historical resources was based primarily on the fact that the BRT Alternative would not change the historical and current use of the APE as a transportation corridor, nor would it intrude visually or audibly on any historic properties.² This rationale can be applied to any historic resource in the analysis of impacts of the three Rapid Bus alternatives being evaluated in this Revised FEIR. The setting of any historic resources that might be identified on one of the Rapid Bus routes through archival research or field surveys would be in a transportation corridor, so there is no need to identify any individual historical resources.

The Rapid Bus routes for all three alternatives are located on existing Metro bus routes, with the Chandler Boulevard exception, on well-traveled public streets. The operation of Rapid Bus routes on these roadways would not be a change from current conditions, and would not affect historical resources. In addition, for all three Rapid Bus alternatives, any excavation required for construction activities at Rapid Bus stop locations would be very shallow – no deeper than five feet for pole placement. This minimal disturbance would not affect the ground such that it would affect any historical resources. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

8-4.14.4 Mitigation Measures

No significant adverse impacts would occur to archaeological or historical resources due to three Rapid Bus alternatives. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

^{2/} The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred with the Final EIR conclusion of no project effect on historic properties.