6.7 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Canyon Power Plant (CPP) will consist of a nominal 200-megawatt (MW) simple-cycle plant, using four natural gas-fired General Electric LM 6000PC Sprint combustion turbines and associated infrastructure. The project site is located at 3071 East Miraloma Avenue, in a City of Anaheim (COA)-designated industrial zone.

The CPP and associated construction laydown areas will be located on approximately 10 acres of disturbed land located at 3071 East Miraloma Avenue. Main access to the CPP site will be at the southeast corner of the project site from East Miraloma Avenue. A second gated entrance will be accessible via East Miraloma Avenue with a third gate off the alley to the east of the site. (Total land disturbance will be approximately 10 acres.)

The existing CPP site is predominantly paved (concrete and asphalt). Principal land use for the site was food catering for a fleet of approximately 75 to 100 trucks, formerly operated by Orange County Food Service. Onsite structures include a kitchen/warehouse building, maintenance garage (9 service bays), truck wash facility (5 bays), two ice manufacturing buildings, several storage sheds, and an outdoor truck repair shop which includes storage lockers and petroleum products, all of which will be demolished as a part of the CPP project.

The following activities are not part of the CPP project:

- Three residential houses along East Miraloma Avenue have recently been removed and are not a part of this Application for Certification (AFC). The COA Risk Manager and Fire Department determined that the residential units posed security and fire risks, and therefore they were removed. A letter from the COA Risk Manager to the Public Utilities Department is included in Appendix Q.
- Soil remediation activities associated with Phase I, Phase II, and Supplemental Phase II reports. The COA, now as owner of the property, has determined that it will conduct any soil remediation activities to limit its environmental liability for future uses of the site. These activities will occur regardless of whether the CPP project obtains a CEC license.
- Installation of a temporary, 8-foot-high security fence around the perimeter of the entire 10-acre site.
- General maintenance activities including site cleanup and trash removal.

The project will include the construction and/or installation of the following components:

- **Proposed CPP site.** In addition to the four natural gas-fired GE LM 6000PC Sprint gas turbines, the plant will include generator step-up transformers (GSUs), a 69 kilovolt (kV) switchyard, onsite fuel gas compressors, a gas pressure control and metering station, a packaged chilled water system for combustion turbine engine (CTG) power augmentation

with associated heating ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC)-type four-cell cooling tower, selective catalytic reduction system (SCR) emission control systems, and other associated plant infrastructure.

- **Gas Pipeline.** Natural gas will be provided via a new 3,240-foot-long, 12-inch, and 350 pounds per square inch gauge (psig) gas line owned and maintained by SoCal Gas Company (SCGC), which will be connected to new onsite fuel gas compressors that will be part of the CPP facility. From the CPP site, this new pipeline will run approximately 580 feet east in East Miraloma Avenue to Kraemer Boulevard, then north 2,660 feet in Kraemer Boulevard to East Orangethorpe Avenue to connect into SCGCs transmission line L-1218 in East Orangethorpe Avenue. (Total land disturbance will be 0.219 acre.)
- **Process water.** Process water for the project will be recycled water supplied from the Orange County groundwater replenishment system (GWRS) via a new 2,185-foot-long, 14-inch pipeline utilizing a new offsite booster pump station. The water pipeline will run east of the site on the north side of East Miraloma Avenue for 1,850 feet to the new pumping station located north of the curb in the COA-owned easement of East Miraloma Avenue, then north 210 feet in new easement from the Orange County Water District (OCWD), then 125 feet easterly in new easement to the GWRS line on the western side of the Carbon Canyon Diversion Channel. There, it will connect to the 60-inch-diameter GWRS recycled water line at an existing 36-inch stub up. (Total land disturbance for both line and pumping station will be 0.246 acre.)
- **Electrical interconnection.** Underground 69 kV cables will connect from GSUs to the onsite switchyard, which will use gas-insulated switchgear (GIS). There will be four new underground 69 kV circuits leaving the site. Two will proceed underneath and to the south side of East Miraloma Avenue approximately 100 feet to rise up and connect to the existing 69 kV overhead Vermont-Yorba lines via two new transition structures. The second two 69 kV underground circuits will proceed eastward approximately 4,000 feet in East Miraloma Avenue, turn south on Miller, then proceed approximately 3,000 feet to connect to the Dowling-Yorba 69 kV line at East La Palma Avenue. (Total land disturbance for both sets of cables will be 0.489 acre.)
- **Communications.** Fiber optic cable will run in a common trench with the approximately 7,000-foot 69 kV electric cables, where it will tie into existing underground fiber optic cable for the supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system.

This section assesses the potential impact to cultural resources, which includes archaeological and historical objects, sites and districts, historic buildings and structures, cultural landscapes, and sites and resources of concern to local Native Americans and other ethnic groups.

The purpose of this cultural resources study is to inventory cultural resources in the vicinity of the Canyon Power Plant (CPP) site and identify any potential project-related impacts to

cultural resources. Records of correspondence with local Native Americans are included in the Technical Report (Confidential Appendix D). All other information contained in Confidential Appendix D can be found here in Section 6.7.

All cultural resources work for this project was carried out under the direct supervision of an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation (National Park Service [NPS], 1983 [36 CFR Part 61]), and is consistent with the procedures for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), set forth at 36 CFR 800 and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Work was also conducted in compliance with the California Energy Commission's (CEC's) "Instructions to the California Energy Commission Staff for the Review of and Information Requirements for an Application for Certification" (CEC, 1992) and "Rules of Practice and Procedure and Power Plant Site Regulations" (CEC, 1997), and "Rules of Practice and Procedure and Power Plant Site Certification Regulations Revisions, 04-SIT-2" (CEC, December 14, 2006).

Detailed below are descriptions of project components; baseline conditions for prehistory, history, and ethnography; results of coordination with the Native American community; record searches; field surveys; and assessments of potential impacts (direct and indirect) on cultural resources on a component-by-component basis. The results of this study indicate that no adverse project-related impacts to significant cultural resources are anticipated for the project. Appropriate mitigation measures are also set forth below to ensure site avoidance and/or proper treatment of cultural resources in the event of discovery.

6.7.1 Affected Environment

6.7.1.1 Study Area

The CPP will be located in the COA, Orange County, California. The project site is located in an industrial area and is bounded by Miraloma Avenue to the south, a commercial diner to the east, and industrial uses to the west and north. The property is situated between Kraemer Boulevard and Blue Gum Street, the Santa Ana River is located south of the property, and Carbon Creek traverses north of the property in an east/west direction. The project site may be identified on the USGS Orange 7.5 minute quadrangle map, Township 4 South, Range 9W. The universal transverse mercator (UTM) coordinate for the project center is 11 420249 m/E, 3746719 m/N.

6.7.1.2 Site Description

The site is characterized by one 10-acre parcel located on East Miraloma Avenue, as well as three linear impact areas identified as the following:

- 69 kV cables: Consists of approximately 7,000 feet of buried electric cable, traversing east of the project site in Miraloma Avenue and south in North Miller Street
- Gas line: Consists of approximately 3,240 feet, traversing east of the project site in Miraloma Avenue and north in Kraemer Boulevard
- Water lines: Consists of approximately 2,185 feet, traversing east of the project site in Miraloma Avenue and northward within the Miller Basin property in Miraloma Avenue

The total project area including both the main parcel and the linears totals approximately 11 acres.

6.7.1.3 Natural History

The project area is located in a region that today is primarily characterized by industrial development situated on what once was an alluvial plain which received run-off from the San Gabriel Mountains. The area is characterized by the large Santa Ana River as well as smaller creeks and tributaries.

Natural habitats have been almost entirely displaced by industrial development. Prior to development, the river and adjacent alluvial plain setting of the area would have supported a number of flora and fauna.

6.7.1.4 Soils and Geology

The CPP project site is located in the northern portion of the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province. The Peninsular Ranges is one of the largest geologic units in western North America and extends from the Los Angeles Basin, south of the Santa Monica Mountains, to the tip of Baja California. The province consists of an uplifted, tilted fault block that is characterized by northwest-trending mountain ranges and valleys (see Figure 6.7-1, Physiographic Provinces of California – Location of the Project Site).

The project site is located within the southeastern portion of the Central Block of the Los Angeles Basin. The ground surface is represented by a broad, low-relief, essentially flat plain. The Newport-Inglewood fault trends northwest-southeast approximately nine miles southwest of the project site and constitutes the western edge of the Central Block. The northern portion of the Central Block is represented by the Whittier Fault, approximately eight miles northeast of the project site at the base of the Puente Hills.

The project site is currently developed with buildings and asphalt parking and loading areas. The project site slopes gently downward to the northwest and southeast at an estimated gradient of less than 2 percent, with an estimated three- to five-foot elevation differential across the approximately 10-acre site.

6.7.1.4.1 Onsite Soils. The project site is located in the alluvial plain of the Santa Ana River. Near-surface soils consist of artificial fill extending to depths of one to two feet. The fill soils generally consist of very loose to loose fine silty sands, with occasional traces of clay. The underlying alluvium consists of very loose to medium dense fine sands, fine to medium sands with occasional layers of silty fine sand, and fine sandy silt. A layer of clay was encountered at two borings at depths of 42 to 52 feet. Groundwater was not encountered at any of the eight soil borings, which extended to depths of 60 feet.

6.7.1.5 Disturbance within the Study Area

The project site and Area of Potential Effects (APE) established for the project area consist of a built environment with modern disturbance. The 10-acre parcel slated for development for the CPP is comprised of modern, box-style structures and paved parking facilities. The linear areas slated for utility construction in support of the project are located on existing rights-of-way and concrete sidewalks. The proposed natural gas pipeline will involve the use of jack and bore construction techniques under Carbon Creek, with the construction of one pit on each side of the creek to facilitate the operation of the jack and bore equipment. The proposed jack and bore launching pit is approximately 15 feet wide by 50 feet long and the receiving pit is approximately 15 feet wide by 20 feet long. Both pits are approximately 26.5 feet deep to place the casing 5 feet below the culvert base.

6.7.1.6 Prehistory (Prior to 1542)

The region of Orange County was home to Native American population groups for at least 8,000 years. The native ecological environment consisted of a large basin surrounded by the mountains and river and stream drainages, which were prime locations for Native American food processing and village sites. Prehistoric archaeological sites are often covered by three or more feet of topsoil, often protecting sites even after an area has become highly urbanized, particularly in areas with shallow building foundations, parks, parking lots, and roads. However, prehistoric sites occasionally can be found on the surface in urbanized areas that have not been extensively disturbed. Several regional cultural chronologies have been developed for the Orange County area (Rogers 1941; Wallace 1955; Meighan 1959).

The region of Anaheim encompassing the project site was home to Native American population groups for at least 11,000 years. The native ecological environment consisted of a large basin surrounded by the San Gabriel Mountains and river and stream drainages, which were prime locations for Native American food processing and village sites.

The following is a cultural chronology of the Native American habitation of southern California. Noted Anthropologist William Wallace first developed this chronology in 1955. Since then, various chronologies suggested for several regions of California have been published. However, all of these regional chronologies were based on Wallace's version,

with only minor changes. Wallace's 1955 chronology remains among anthropological and archaeological scholars as a standard cultural chronology for the prehistoric habitation of southern California.[1]

6.7.1.6.1 Early Man Horizon. From the end of the Pleistocene (11,000 B.C.) to approximately 6,000 B.C., archaeological assemblages attributed to this horizon area were characterized by large projectile points and scrapers, leaf-shaped knives, and crescents. The limited data available suggest that prehistoric populations focused on hunting and gathering, moving from region to region in small nomadic groups. Early archaeological sites in southern California associated with this period are characterized as dating to the Paleoindian Period.

6.7.1.6.2 Milling Stone Horizon. This horizon is characterized by the appearance of hand-stones and milling-stones and dates between approximately 6,000 B.C. to 1,000 B.C. Artifact assemblages during the early Milling Stone period reflect an emphasis on plant foods and foraging subsistence systems. During this time the subsistence and settlement practices of people living in southern California began to shift in response to the changing environmental conditions associated with increasing aridity. Inland populations generally exploited grass seeds, which became the primary subsistence activity. Artifact assemblages are characterized by choppers and scraper planes but generally lack projectile points. The appearance of large projectile points in the latter portion of the Milling Stone Horizon suggests a more diverse subsistence economy. The shift in environmental conditions caused Native Americans living in the region to be increasingly dependent on seeds and acorns for subsistence, which is reflected by greater frequencies of groundstone artifacts (hand manos and metates) in archaeological sites (Wallace, 1955). New technological innovations were also expressed in the archaeological record, with the larger projectile points associated with early occupations slowly replaced with smaller arrowheads.

6.7.1.6.3 Intermediate Horizon. Dated from 1,000 B.P. to A.D. 750, the Intermediate Horizon represents a period of transition for prehistoric Native American groups. Little is known about the people of this period, especially those occupying inland southern California. Archaeological site assemblages possess many attributes of the Milling Stone Horizon. In addition, however, these sites generally contain large stemmed (or notched) projectile points and portable mortars and pestles. Around 2,500 B.P., the region saw another major shift in technological innovation with the introduction of the bow and arrow, which is identified by the appearance of very small projectile points in archaeological assemblages (William Self Associates [WSA], 1999). In addition, the appearance of increased quantities of bone tools, and increased reliance on the mortar and pestle, typify this time period. Ceramics also became widely used during this period.

[1] Wallace, William J., 1955. A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal Archaeology. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11(3); 214-230.

6.7.1.6.4 Late Prehistoric Horizon. From A.D. 750 to Spanish contact in A.D. 1769, the Late Prehistoric Horizon reflects an increased technological sophistication and diversity. The period probably began sometime around the B.C./A.D. transition, but probably expanded culturally around 500 A.D. with the introduction of the bow and arrow. The end of the period is recognized as the end of the 18th century, when the Spanish mission system was fully implemented. During the Late Prehistoric period, the ethnographic Gabrielino lived in large villages along the southern California coastline. This period is characterized by the presence of small projectile points, which imply the use of bow and arrow, as opposed to spear. In addition, site assemblages also include steatite bowls, asphaltum, grave goods, and elaborate shell ornaments. Utilization of bedrock milling slicks is prevalent throughout this horizon. Also, an increase in hunting efficiency and widespread exploitation of acorns provided reliable and storable food resources. These innovations seem to have promoted greater sedentism. Meighan (1954) first characterized the Late Prehistoric Period in southern California.

6.7.1.7 Ethnography

6.7.1.7.1 Gabrieleño (Tongva). The Tongva/Gabrieleño are a Native American people who traditionally inhabited the area in and around the northern portion of Orange County (encompassing the project site). Tongva means "people of the earth" in the Tongva language, a language in the Uto-Aztecan family. The Tongva are also often referred to as the Gabrieleño/Tongva or Gabrielino/Tongva tribe. Following the Spanish custom of naming local tribes after nearby missions, they were called the Gabrieleño, Gabrieleño, or San Gabrieleño in reference to Mission San Gabriel Arcangel (see Figure 6.7-2, Native California Languages and Tribes, Canyon Power Plant).

These Native Americans known as the Gabrieleño spoke a language that falls within the Cupan group of the Takic subfamily of the Uto-Aztecan language family. This language family is extremely large and includes the Shoshonean groups of the Great Basin. Given the geographic proximity of Tongva/Gabrieleño and Serrano bands living in the area and the linguistic similarities, ethnographers have suggested that they shared the same ethnic origins. Correspondingly, these groups will be referred to as the Gabrieleño in this document. The Gabrieleño are considered one of the most distinctive tribes in all of California, occupying a large area that was bordered on the west by Topanga and Malibu, the San Fernando Valley, the greater Los Angeles basin, and the coastal strip south to Aliso Creek, south of San Juan Capistrano. Gabrieleño territory extended from the San Bernardino Mountains to the islands of Catalina, San Clemente, and San Nicolas and occupied most of modern day Los Angeles and Orange Counties, which is incredibly fertile land. Very little is known about early Tongva social organization because the band was not studied until the 1920s and had already been influenced by missionaries and settlers.

Kroeber's (1925) work indicates that the Tongva were a hierarchically ordered society with a chief who oversaw social and political interactions both within the Tongva culture and with other groups. The Tongva had multiple villages ranging from seasonal satellite villages to larger more permanent villages. Resource exploitation was focused on village-centered territories and ranged from hunting deer, rabbits, birds, and other small game to sea mammals. Fishing for freshwater fish, saltwater mollusks, and crustaceans and gathering acorns and various grass seeds were also important. Fishing technology included basket fish traps, nets, bonefish hooks, harpoons, and vegetable poisons, and ocean fishing was conducted from wooden plank canoes lashed and asphalted together.

Tongva houses were large, circular, thatched and domed structures of tule, fern, or carrizo that were large enough to house several families. Smaller, ceremonial structures were also present in the villages and were used in a variety of ways. These structures were earth-covered, and different ones were used as sweathouses, meeting places for adult males, menstrual huts, and ceremonial enclosures (*yuva'r*).

The coastal Tongva are among the few New World peoples who regularly navigated the ocean. They built seaworthy canoes, called *ti'at*, using planks that were sewn together, edge to edge, and then caulked and coated with either pine pitch or, more commonly, the tar that was available either from the La Brea Tar Pits or asphaltum that had washed up on shore from offshore oil seeps. The *ti'at* could hold as many as 12 people and all of their gear and all of the trade goods they were carrying to trade with other people, either along the coast or on one of the Channel Islands. The Tongva canoed out to greet Spanish explorer Juan Cabrillo when he arrived off the shores of San Pedro in 1542. Modern place names with Tongva origins include: Pacoima, Tujunga, Topanga, Rancho Cucamonga, Azusa, and Cahuenga.

The name of their creation deity, Quaoar, has been used to name a large object in the Kuiper belt. A 2,656-foot summit in the Verdugo Mountains, in Glendale, has been named *Tongva Peak*. The *Gabrieleño Trail* is a 32-mile path through the Angeles National Forest.

6.7.1.7.2 <u>Juaneño (Acjachemen)</u>. The CPP project area is also located adjacent to the traditional the territory occupied during the Late Prehistoric period and into the present day by the Native American society commonly known as the Juaneño (Kroeber, 1925:636). For this reason a cultural summary of the Juaneño has been provided below.

The name "Juaneño" is the name given to the Native American group who were incorporated into the Mission San Juan Capistrano; therefore, the name does not necessarily identify a specific ethnic or tribal group. Many contemporary Juaneño, who identify themselves as descendents of the indigenous society living in the local San Juan and San Mateo Creek drainage areas, have adopted the indigenous term *Acjachemen,* after one of their traditional village place names.

Linguistically, the Acjachemen language is a dialect of the larger Luiseño language. This language is derived from the Takic family, part of the Uto-Aztecan linguistic stock. Acjachemen villages and territory extended from Las Pulgas Creek in northern San Diego County up into the San Joaquin Hills of Orange County's central coast, and from the Pacific Ocean into the Santa Ana Mountains. The core of their population occupied the drainages of two large creeks, San Juan Creek (and its major tributary, the Trabuco), and San Mateo Creek (combined with the San Onofre, which emptied into the ocean at the same point). The highest concentration of villages was along the lower San Juan where the Mission San Juan Capistrano was situated (O'Neil, 2002:68-78).

The Acjachemen resided in permanent, well-defined villages and associated seasonal camps. Each village contained 35 to 300 persons; these consisted of a single lineage in the smaller villages, and of a dominant clan joined with other families in the larger towns. As Boscana said of the Acjachemen, "all the rancherias were composed of a single relationship" (1933:33). Each clan/village had its own resource territory and was politically independent, yet maintained ties to others through economic, religious, and social networks in the immediate region. There were three hierarchical social classes: the elite class consisting of chiefly families, lineage heads, and other ceremonial specialists; a "middle class" of established and successful families; and finally, there were people of disconnected or wandering families and captives of war (Bean, 1976:109-111).

Juaneno leadership consisted of the *Nota*, or clan chief, who conducted community rites and regulated ceremonial life in conjunction with the council of elders, or *puuplem*, which was made up of lineage heads and ceremonial specialists in their own right. This body discussed and decided upon matters of the community, which were then carried out by the Nota and his staff. The hereditary village chief held an administrative position that combined and controlled religious, economic, and warfare powers. While the placement of residential huts of a village was not regulated, the ceremonial enclosure (*vanquesh*) and the chief's home could generally be found in the center (Boscana, 1933:37). He had an assistant who acted as messenger and who had important religious duties as well. There was an advisory council, which consisted of ritual specialists and shamans, each with his own special area of knowledge about the environment or ritual magic. These positions were hereditary, with each man training a successor from his own lineage or family who demonstrated the necessary leadership abilities.

Traditionally, the Juaneño has been described as being a strongly patrilineal society, and residence has been regarded as patrilocal, but recent study of the Mission San Juan Capistrano sacramental registers has indicated a number of births at the mother's village as well as at third villages (O'Neil, 2002); though patrilocality was traditionally the norm. Polygyny was practiced, but most likely only by chiefs and *puuls* with ceremonial positions who had larger economic roles within the community (Boscana, 1933:44). Divorce was not easy, but possible; divorcees and widows could remarry, the latter preferably to a

classificatory "brother" of her deceased husband. Important lineages were allied through marriage, and reciprocally useful alliances were arranged between groups of differing ecological niches.

As summarized by Bean and Shipek (1978:552), plant foods were, by far, the greatest part of the traditional diet. Acorns were the most important single food source; two species were used locally. Villages were located near water sources necessary for the leaching of acorns, which was a daily occurrence. As an almost daily staple, the acorn mush, or *weewish*, could be fixed in various ways, such as in gruel, as cakes, or fried; sweetened with honey or sugar-laden berries; and made into stew with greens and meat. Grass seeds were the next most abundant plant food used. Other important seeds were manzanita, sunflower, sage, chia, lemonade berry, wild rose, holly-leaf cherry, prickly pear, lamb's-quarter, and pine nuts. Seeds were parched, ground, and cooked as mush in various combinations according to taste and availability, much in the manner as *weewish*. Greens such as thistle, lamb's-quarters, miner's lettuce, white sage, and clover were eaten raw or cooked or sometimes dried for storage. Cactus pods and fruits were also eaten. Thimbleberries, elderberries, and wild grapes were eaten raw or dried for later cooking. Cooked yucca buds, blossoms, and pods provided a sizable addition to the community's food resources. Bulbs, roots, and tubers were dug in the spring and summer and usually eaten fresh. Mushrooms and tree fungus provided a significant food supplement and were prized as delicacies. Various teas were made from flowers, fruits, stems, and roots for medicinal cures as well as beverages.

The principal game animals were deer, rabbit, jackrabbit, woodrat, mice, ground squirrels, antelope, quail, dove, ducks, and other birds. Most predatory animals were avoided as food, as were tree squirrels and most reptiles. Trout and other fish were caught in the streams, while salmon were available when they ran in the larger creeks. Predominantly a coastal people, the Acjachemen made extensive use of marine foods in their diet. Sea mammals, fish, and crustaceans were hunted and gathered from both the shoreline and the open ocean, using reed and dugout canoes. Shellfish were the most heavily used resource, including abalone, turbans, mussels, and others from the rocky shores; some clams, scallops, and univalves from the sandy beaches; and *Chione*, bubble shells, and others gathered from the estuaries.

By 1873, a government report (Ames, 1873) recorded about 40 Juaneño associated with Mission San Juan Capistrano. Many people and families with mixed Spanish/Mexican and Juaneño heritage were not recorded, however, and several Indian villages still existed in the interior valleys (Wheeler, 1879). During this same era, the priests at Mission San Juan Capistrano served a circuit-riding ministry to these interior villages to the south and on the other side of the Palomar Mountains. A wave of migration by Juaneño out of San Juan occurred in 1880 to 1900 as towns in northern Orange County started to form and needed laborers.

As late as the 1930s, some 300 Mission-descended Indians were known to be living in the Orange County area. Today a number of Indians whose ancestors were associated with Mission San Juan Capistrano still reside in the local area. Acjachemen interest in their own history has increased in recent decades, and a considerable body of evidence tracing that history has been amassed. There is currently a petition for federal recognition filed by the Juaneño Band of Mission Indians (Acjachemen Nation).

6.7.1.8 Historic Setting

6.7.1.8.1 Spanish Mission Period (1769 to 1833). While Spanish explorers had traveled along North America's western shore since the mid-15th century, Europeans did not permanently settle the area of Alta California (differentiating from Baja, or lower, California) until the end of the 18th century. In an effort to block Russian fur traders from moving further south along the California coast (the Spanish believed they controlled the entire west coast of the Western Hemisphere), the Spanish constructed a presidio (fortification) in Monterey near present-day San Francisco. In 1769, to re-supply the Monterey Presidio, an expedition from Baja California led by Gaspar de Portola encamped in what is now Orange County, on July 22; they named this area "Santa María Magdalena," after the Saint Mary Magdalene's name day (Case, 1974).

In 1775, as the Spanish mission system expanded (both as an effort to Christianize the local Native population and to form a string of Spanish settlements along the coast of California), the Viceroy of New Spain, Don Antonio María de Bucareli y Ursúa, authorized the construction of a mission approximately halfway between the already constructed Mission San Diego de Alcalá (San Diego) and Mission San Gabriel Arcángel (Los Angeles). The name for this new mission was called "San Juan Capistrano," purportedly named after a 15th century theologian and a "warrior priest," who resided in the Abruzzo region of Italy. The mission was constructed in a strategic location: adjacent to the coast and a Native American village (*Sajavit*), which would provide the mission with not only converts (neophytes) but also with a source of labor to supply the mission with food and other goods (Robinson, 1964; Case, 1974).

Not even a year into its founding, the Gabrielinos (the name given to the Native population in the area) attacked Mission San Juan Capistrano (other missions, including the San Diego presidio, were attacked as well in this year) putting Spain's tenuous hold on Alta California in jeopardy. A year after abandoning the mission, the Spanish returned and constructed a new mission three miles west of the Gabrielino village *Acágcheme*, which was located between the Trabuco and San Juan Rivers.

In 1784, three aging veterans of the Portola expedition were given large land grants by Governor Pedro Fages for their service to the Spanish crown. The largest grant, which totaled 300,000 acres, was given to Manual Pérez Nieto. Nieto's grant included present-day Long

Beach and nearly a dozen other communities. The rancho boundaries were approximately the "Santa Ana and San Gabriel rivers and from the sea to and including some of the hill land on its northeastern frontier" (Case, 1974). The other land grants were given to José Domínguez and Jose María Verdugo (Robinson, 1964).

Nieto's grant bordered Dominguez's Rancho San Pedro to the west and property held by the mission to the north and east. The present COA was within proximity to the boundaries of the Nieto grant. Nieto built an adobe dwelling southwest of present-day Whittier (Robinson, 1964) and had cattle and horses (at least 15,000 to 20,000), corrals, and "cultivated land" on the property (Robinson, 1964). Nieto and his heirs feuded with the mission over property boundaries and heads of cattle for several years. In 1804, Nieto passed away and his grant was eventually subdivided among his heirs into five tracts: Los Cerritos, Los Coyotes, Las Bolsas, Los Alamitos, and Santa Gertrudis.

6.7.1.8.2 Mexican Independence (1833 to 1848). In 1821, Mexico established its independence from Spain. Independence from Spain was a catalyst for Mexico to secularize the Alta and Baja California missions, in order to obtain vast amounts of Mission land. During this time, the Spanish nobility (Dons) were often awarded large ranchos after petitioning the Mexican government. On January 6, 1831, Governor Jośe María Echeandia announced the secularization of a number of missions, and by 1834, all the missions were secularized. The area of the project site was once part of what became one of the largest ranchos in what is now Orange County, which was granted to Juan Pacifico Ontiveros.

Juan Patricio Ontiveros was born in 1795 in Los Angeles and was the son and grandson of Spanish soldiers deployed at the Spanish Mission San Gabriel (Figure 6.7-3). Juan Patricio Ontiveros became the *mayordomo* (a retired military person who is employed by a mission to look after the agricultural operations) of Mission San Juan Capistrano and *encargado de justicia* (justice officer) for the Los Nietos Rancho. By 1825, Juan Patricio was employed with the Rancho Santa Gertrudes, another Nieto rancho, which was partially within present-day Orange County. During this tenure he realized that a large area of land beyond that of Nieto's Los Nietos and Los Coyotes Ranchos had not been granted by the Mexican government. Unfortunately for Juan Patricio, neighboring rancho owners including Nieto objected to his acquisition of the land. In 1835, Juan Patricio died before being granted a rancho. However, his son Juan Pacifico Ontiveros reapplied for the grant in 1836. Several months later in 1837, Governor Alvarado granted to Juan Pacifico Ontiveros 35,790 acres of land known as Rancho San Juan Pacifico, but he changed the name to Rancho San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana (Figure 6.7-4) (Orange County Genealogical Society, 1969). In 1841, Juan Pacifico constructed his adobe on the Rancho San Juan Cajon.

6.7.1.8.3 American Period (1848 to Present). In 1845, the U.S. and Mexican War began during the presidency of James K. Polk. The United States annexed Texas and in 1846

invaded Mexico. The U.S. focus on territorial expansion was primarily on the west coast and included the Oregon territory, the Texas territory, and California.

In 1848, the United States was victorious over the Mexican Army and signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, thereby acquiring all Mexican territory north and west of the Rio Grande and Gila Rivers, which included Texas, New Mexico territory, and Alta California. The treaty was signed at Campo Cahuenga, adjacent to present day Highway 101, near the Hollywood Bowl. All of the original Spanish and Mexican land grants, according to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, were to be recognized by the United States government. This of course, required the establishment of a land office, surveyors to delineate the boundaries, time, and other resources. Many of the Mexican land claims were not recorded for more than 20 years, leaving many landholders in a fiscal limbo as they had to prove their land was legally granted to them.

California was admitted as a state in 1848. The discovery of gold near Sutter's Fort, as well as in other parts of California, caused a mass migration of predominately Anglo-Americans (other northern Europeans and Chinese also migrated in vast numbers creating a shift in the social character that had defined California a century earlier).

During this time, Juan Pacifico Ontiveros made efforts to acquire land in the central coast of California. In 1855, he sold a 1,000-acre portion of his San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana rancho to a group of German settlers, and in 1855 began preparations for moving to the Santa Maria Valley. His son Juan Nicolas and daughter-in-law remained on the San Juan Cajon rancho, 3,900 acres of which Juan Pacifico had to them in 1863. This land was subsequently transferred to Juan Patricio's brother-in-law Augustus Langenberger in 1864 for a sum of $3,480.

By 1856, Juan Pacifico had relocated to the Santa Maria Valley where his father-in-law, who had received a 9,000-acre Mexican land grant in 1837, sold the Rancho Tepusquet to him. The remaining lands of the Rancho San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana, not in the possession of Don Juan Pacifico's heirs, were sold to Abel Stearns, who was the United States Surveyor General for California. Stearns had acquired the Rancho by 1873, and formalized the Rancho San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana land holdings in on May 21, 1877, in which the rancho is recorded as 35,970.92 acres (http://www.sos.ca.gov/archives/level3_ussg3.html) (Figure 6.7-5).

6.7.1.8.4 <u>Founding of Anaheim</u>. Anaheim was founded by George Hansen, who immigrated from Austria during the California Gold Rush in 1848, and August Langenberger, a Hanoverian German who had already established himself on the Rancho San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana. Hansen had tried his hand at gold mining and then he moved to Los Angeles in 1853 and became a civil engineer and surveyor. Hansen had once surveyed Rancho San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana (Figure 6.7-6), thereby providing him with some

knowledge of the landscape outside of Los Angeles. Langenberger had moved to the Ontiveros rancho and eventually married into the Ontiveros family. Langenberger was not an original shareholder of the soon-to-come German colony of Anaheim, but was acquainted with Hansen, and he eventually became a merchant and hotel-keeper in the community.

John Frohling was a German settler (and a musician) who first immigrated to New York and then arrived in California by 1850. Frohling and an associate, Charles Kohler, had established themselves in Los Angeles and by 1852, had started a vineyard comprised of 3,000 plantings. To further their business enterprise, the two established a wine shop in San Francisco in 1854. Here, they met Otto Weyse, another German settler, who was editor of the San Francisco *Democrat* and interested in establishing a German colony in California (*Ibid*).

In 1857, a group of Germans led by Hansen, Frohling, and Weyse organized the Los Angeles Vineyard Society for the stated purpose of "starting a cooperative vineyard" (Raup, 1944:124).With Hansen as the lead planner, the organization began planning the formation of a community comprised of 50 stockholders, each receiving 20 acres of land. Of these 20 acres, eight acres would be reserved for wine growing. By the mid-19th century, wine growing became the second most profitable source of income in the Los Angeles region (Raup, 1944:134). More importantly, the move towards an agriculturally based economy in an area historically known for cattle ranching based on large-scale landholdings was a clear shift in the economics of southern California (Raup, 1959). Another local German viniculturalist, William Wolfskill, who was also successful in the wine growing industry, provided the stock for the Anaheim vineyards. Wolfskill started growing grape vines in the Los Angeles area by the 1830s and along with Frenchman Jean Louis Vignes, was one of California's original vintners (Carosso, 1949:79).

On January 15, 1858, the Los Angeles Vineyard Society stockholders voted to name their community *Annaheim* (German for home on the [Santa] Ana [River]) (Raup, 1944:126), and within a year the name was shortened *Anaheim*. Soon after, Hansen had the town site laid-out upon the traditional European system of square lots and a central plaza (or common area) (see Figure 6.7-7). This planned layout was environmentally efficient, since the plan of the streets was aligned to allow maximum water flow from the Santa Ana River through an irrigation system (Raup, 1959:65). Hansen constructed an irrigation channel measuring six miles in length, which was excavated from the Santa Ana River and paralleled Juan Pacifico Ontiveras' smaller irrigation ditch, to the town site. In addition to this main canal, the city contained five-foot wide and two-foot deep canals or conductor ditches spanning several miles, and over 300 miles of minor ditching (MacArthur, 1958:23). In an effort to keep cattle from grazing in the vineyards, Hansen had the entire city and city lots surrounded by willows to act as a natural fence. Unfortunately, the willows sapped the entire water system dry and the willows were eventually cut-down for firewood.

In 1876, Anaheim was incorporated and the Los Angeles Vineyard Society released all of its rights to the canals, ditches, and other water conveyances to the Anaheim Water Company. Although each stockholder held stock in the Anaheim Water Company when they acquired their property (50 shares of land equated to 50 shares in the Water Company), these stocks were non-transferable (at least not without transferring the deed to the land as well).

The cooperative spirit of the colony ceased to exist upon the transfer of rights to the Water Company, except on those instances when the community came together to clean the canals or mop-up after the flooding episodes of the Santa Ana River. While Anaheim was a community founded upon the European principles and philosophy of a utopian and humanitarian socialist community, Anaheim was ultimately a business venture based upon one principal cash crop or industry: wine-making. The shortsightedness over water issues would cause serious problems for the community by the third quarter of the 19th century. For the remainder of the 19th century, the Anaheim community found itself in a struggle to acquire more water for its growing population, bringing it into conflict with surrounding water companies (including the Cajon Irrigation Company and the Semi-Tropical Company) and farming communities (Raup, 1944; Carosso, 1949).

This reliance on water, however, did not slow the economic growth of Anaheim. In 1861, wine-growers produced 75,000 gallons of wine and by 1884, 1.25 million gallons were produced by over fifty wineries and were being exported from the community (including from the entrepreneur August Langenberger) (Raup, 1944:134; MacArthur, 1958:29). Anaheim's wine operation became so successful that Anaheim Wine Growers Association opened stores in San Francisco and New York City.

In 1868, the community grew from its initial 1,165 acres to 3,200 acres. By the 1880s the Anaheim Immigration Association was formed in order to advertise and welcome more landowners to the community. The population grew to nearly 1,200 people within less than a decade of Anaheim's founding. In addition to wine, Raup (1944:134) points out that Anaheim was also a large exporter of wool and only Los Angeles exceeded it in terms of commerce for the county.

In 1884, Anaheim's economy took a disastrous downturn when a wine fungus blighted and nearly destroyed the entire community's vineyards. The Dreyfus winery, which had spent $40,000 to upgrade their wine facility in the early 1880s and produced nearly ten tons of grapes per acre, was hit hard by the wine fungus. In 1885, they produced six tons of grapes and in 1886 had produced only one wagon full of grapes for a total of sixteen acres (Raup, 1944:136). To overcome their misfortunes, the viticulturalists made a quick transition to growing other fruits, finally settling on the Valencia orange, but only after many unsuccessful attempts growing other types of oranges.

6.7.1.8.5 Southern Pacific Railroad Enters Anaheim. The Southern Pacific Railroad built the first railroad in the area, extending its tracks south from Los Angeles to Anaheim in 1875, and providing a boost to the shipping and packaging of the area's agricultural products. The Southern Pacific Railroad held a monopoly in Southern California until 1885, when the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe (AT and SF) pushed its tracks over the Cajon Pass. Competition brought a burst of advertising and a sharp drop in ticket prices, setting off a great real estate boom throughout the region. New towns and subdivisions sprang up by the dozens as tourists and settlers poured into southern California, and existing communities grew rapidly. However, in less than two years the boom had collapsed, and with it, many of the new towns such as Carlton, San Juan-by-the-Sea, St. James, and other "paper towns" which faded away. Others towns, such as Fullerton, Buena Park, and El Toro, survived.

6.7.1.8.6 Founding of Orange County. A burst of economic growth and local pride during 1886 to 1888 led to the official creation of the County of Orange on August 1, 1889.[2] Sources indicate that the County's name originated in 1871, well before oranges were even thought of as a cash crop and was originally called Richland in 1871. When the County was going through the process of splitting from Los Angeles County (Orange County is essentially the lower one-third of the original Los Angeles County), many names were suggested, including the County of Anaheim. However, with the increased immigration rate, the Anaheim Committee (the organization tasked with coming up with the name) suggested Orange as an effort to promote a more Mediterranean feeling (Sleeper, 1974). After a protracted delay, and many state legislative arguments over the name of the county, including the County of Santa Ana, the incorporation of Orange County was finally approved in 1889. Unfortunately for Anaheim, which lobbied to be the County seat, Santa Ana was chosen to be the County seat. The proposed county line, originally drawn along the San Gabriel River, would have enabled Anaheim to be in the middle of the County and by default become the County seat. However, the county line was drawn further south along Coyote Creek.

Throughout the remainder of the 1800s Anaheim's population and farming economy continued to grow. The grape industry never revived after the blight in the mid-1880s. Instead the cultivation of oranges, lemons, limes, apricots, apples, pears, peaches, plums, quince, olives, nectarines, figs, and pomegranates was established (Paule, 1952:37). Some cattle grazing still took place along with dairy farming at the southern and northern ends of Orange County (Orange County, n.d.).

6.7.1.8.7 Industrialization of Anaheim in the 20th Century. Agriculture remained the main industry of Anaheim from the beginning of the 20th century through the 1950s. In addition to the large variety of fruit grown in the region, an array of vegetables was cultivated along with corn, barley, wheat, rye, oats, flax, potatoes, sugar cane, and sugar beats. During the first half of the 20th century, Anaheim's population slowly grew. Much of

[2] http://www.ocgov.com/recorder/Archives/forms/history%20of%20orange%20county.pdf.

the population and many agricultural products were affected by major flooding episodes in 1916 and 1938. Following the Flood of 1938, it seemed Anaheim was ready to explore other economies which could increase the community's commerce.

Prior to World War II, Anaheim residents promoted their community as "industry-friendly." During the 1920s, Anaheim was the first city south of Los Angeles to have a Planning Commission, and in 1924 the Community Industrial Land Company was formed (MacArthur, 1959: 243). The first industries developed in Anaheim were generally based around agriculture, shipping, and meat production. Such industries included the Community Industrial Land Company which sold developable land to Mutual Orange Distributors for a juice and concentrate factory and to General Electric for the production of Glyptal, a paint base.

During World War II the establishment of military bases allowed Orange County to become associated with the war-time efforts and economies, and several military installations such as El Toro Marine Corps Air Station, Los Alamitos Naval Weapons Station, and the Santa Ana Army Air Base. As a result, Anaheim became a popular residential area for military personnel and their families (many of whom chose to stay in southern California and Orange County at the conclusion of the war). The influx of families and need for housing in the area spurred Anaheim's residential development, resulting in agricultural areas being quickly developed into tract homes in the north, south, and east parts of the community.

Businesses and industries were drawn to Anaheim during the post-World War II era due to the large available workforce, its proximity to Los Angeles, and its temperate climate. Anaheim also owned and operated all of its own utilities and subsequently could negotiate lower rates to large companies as an incentive for them to move to the city (COA, n.d.). As Anaheim's population grew exponentially and contained a large amount of decommissioned military personnel, the aeronautical industry found it a well-suited home. Autonetics, a division of North American Aviation (later becoming Rockwell International), was based in Anaheim and employed thousands of residents. In addition to being a pioneer in the aviation industry, Autonetics was also a leader in the development of microcomputers (Boeing, n.d.). Other industries soon followed, and Autonetics was joined by Nortronics, Dixie Cup, Essex Wire, US Electrical Motors, Menasha Container Corporation, and American Hardware.

In the early 1950s, Anaheim started centering its industrial area near the northeast border of the community. In 1956, Anaheim annexed from Orange County the area where the APE and E. Miraloma Avenue (then known as Anaheim Road) were located as part of the Northeast Annexation No. 2-A (Figure 6.7-8). Through the Northeast Annexation No. 2-A, Anaheim intended to separate and distance its residents' homes from the noxious problems associated with industrial uses, while increasing Anaheim's financial base and visibility as a manufacturing and industrial leader. In 1957, Autonetics became the anchor of this annexation and was located less than one mile northeast of the APE (at 3370 Miraloma

Avenue) (Figure 6.7-9). By 1961, the industrial area of northeast Anaheim was bound by the Santa Ana River, Highway 91 (then known as State Street/Riverside Freeway), and the AT & SF Railroad. This area included major present-day industrial corridors such as Kraemer Boulevard (then known as Dowling Avenue) and La Palma Avenue. The visual and physical character of the northeast part of Anaheim transformed from agricultural-based to industry- and manufacturing-based during the 1950s through 1970s. It was common for large factory buildings to be located alongside agricultural facilities (such as the vicinity near the APE).

The transformation of Anaheim from an agricultural community to an industrial area (post-World War II) triggered the construction of new roads and freeways across the city. Interstate 5 was constructed through the middle of the city in the early 1950s and enabled a quick commute from Anaheim to the Los Angeles metropolitan area. In 1961, Highway 91 was completed and runs adjacent to the industrial zone in the northeast of the city (where the APE is located) and connects the Orange County to Riverside County and Los Angeles County.

6.7.1.8.8 Disneyland. On July 17, 1955, Disneyland opened in a previously rural 160-acre area of Anaheim. The Walt Disney Company chose Anaheim as the location of Disneyland since large plots of undeveloped land necessary for Walt Disney's vision of the park were not available near the Disney studios in Burbank. Anaheim was an ideal location for the new amusement park based on its proximity to metropolitan Los Angeles by freeway and the availability of inexpensive land.[3] Also, Anaheim, which was still rural in contrast to Los Angeles, reminded Walt Disney of his small town home in the Midwest. Disneyland was constructed in just under a year, from 1954 to 1955, and although the opening of the park was impacted by a severe heat wave, it would forever change the economy of Anaheim. From Disneyland's opening day to the present day, Anaheim's economy has been predominately based around tourism. Disneyland quickly became a major employer within the city and a vast array of restaurants and hotels opened in response to the surge of tourism, both local and international, in the city.

6.7.1.9 Native American Consultation

URS contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on August 20, 2007 and requested a list of known sacred lands within the project area and a list of any Most Likely Descendants (MLDs) who may have knowledge of known sacred sites and Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) that may be affected by this undertaking. The NAHC responded on August 23, 2007 and stated that they have no listings of known sacred lands within the project area. In addition to the response letter, the NAHC also supplied an MLD contact list. These MLDs were sent a notification of the proposed undertaking on September 27, 2007, with a request that they respond with any known cultural resources, TCPs, or Sacred Lands

[3] http://www.justdisney.com/disneyland/history.html

within the project area. Copies of this correspondence are provided in the confidential technical report (Confidential Technical Appendix D).

A follow up call was conducted on November 14, 2007. Sonia Johnston, Tribal Vice Chairperson for the Juaneno Band of Mission Indians indicated that the tribe wishes to be contacted in the event of any newly discovered prehistoric archaeological sites in addition to identified human remains which may be identified during the project. Johnston further indicated that the Juaneno MLD, Alfred Cruz should be notified of these discoveries.

On November 14, 2007, Laurie Solis phoned Alfred Cruz to follow up to a letter sent by Solis on September 5, 2007. This letter requested any information that Cruz may have in regard to Native American Sacred Sites, burials, or archaeological sites within or within close proximity to the project site. Alfred Cruz returned Ms. Solis' phone call on November 15, 2007 at approximately 2:00 p.m. Cruz indicated that the tribe wishes to be contacted in the event prehistoric archaeological sites or human remains are identified in the course of the project.

6.7.1.10 Key Personnel Qualifications

The key cultural resource personnel who performed an assessment of the potential for cultural resources to be impacted by the proposed project (Confidential Appendix D) and AFC are:

- Laurie Solis, MA (URS Project Archaeologist)
- Brent Leftwich, doctoral candidate (URS Staff Archaeologist)
- Jeremy Hollins, MA (URS Architectural Historian)
- Rand Herbert, MAT (JRP Architectural Historian)
- Cheryl Brookshear, MS (JRP Architectural Historian)

The above individuals meet the professional standards of the Secretary of the Interior for this work (Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation, National Park Service, 1983).

6.7.1.11 Background Research

6.7.1.11.1 Archaeology. A cultural resource records search for the project was conducted on August 23, 2007 by URS Project Manager, Cultural Resource Specialist, Laurie Solis. The records search was undertaken at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), housed at California State University Fullerton.

The record search was designed to determine whether any of the following potential resources to occur within a 1-mile radius of the APE:

- Previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites
- Previously recorded historic structures
- California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) listed properties
- NRHP-listed properties
- Local landmarks and monuments

A review of the existing archaeological survey information indicated that the project area had not previously undergone archaeological survey.

6.7.1.11.2 Previous Surveys and Studies. The SCCIC has five cultural resource surveys and studies on file that have been conducted within a 1-mile radius of the proposed project site. Reference and general information on the previous surveys are provided in Table 6.7-1.

TABLE 6.7-1
PREVIOUSLY CONDUCTED CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEYS

Study Number	Author	Date/Title	Within the Study Area?	Positive or Negative for Cultural Resources?
OR-1836	Padon, B.	1998 Cultural Resource Review for Groundwater Replenishment System Program EIR/Tier I/EIS, Orange County Water District and County Sanitation Districts of Orange County (literature review only)	No	Negative
OR-2501	Conkling, McLean, Sturm	1994 Cultural Resources Assessment for Five Vacant Lots and 42 Potentially Historic Buildings within the Northeast Anaheim Redevelopment Area, Orange County, California	Did not evaluate the project site	Negative
OR-2572	McKenna et al (2002b)	2002 California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Historic Property Survey Report – Negative Findings (Orangethorpe Avenue between Kraemer Blvd., and the BNSF Railway)	No	Negative
OR-2591	McKenna et al (2002a)	2002 Caltrans Historic Property Survey Report – Negative Findings (Kraemer Blvd., between the northern city limit and Miraloma Ave.)	No	Negative
OR-3111	McKenna et al (2002c)	2002 Caltrans Negative Archaeological Survey Report (Miraloma Avenue, on the east side of Kraemer Blvd.)	No	Negative

6.7.1.11.3 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources within Approximately One Mile Radius.

Archaeological Resources. Four prehistoric archaeological resources were identified within a one-mile radius of the project site. These sites are described below.

Ora-517. Recorded 3/25/1976 by L. Tadlock, this site consisted of one disturbed human burial. This site was completely disturbed and removed by a backhoe during trenching operations. No other artifactual material was discovered. This burial was not located within the APE and the area of the discovery will not be affected by the proposed project.

Ora-428. Recorded by Hall and Cooley (1973a) on 7/30/1973, this site consisted of seven manos, two metate fragments, and one piece of bone. The artifacts were located near the west base of a small hill, which had been graded. Some of the material may now be embedded in the road. This property is not located within the APE and will not be impacted by the proposed project.

Ora-429. Recorded by Hall and Cooley (no date on site record; assume same as above; 1973b), this site consisted of one bifacial mano and half of a metate slab. No other remarks indicated. This property is not located within the APE and will not be impacted by the proposed project.

Ora-430. Recorded by Hall and Cooley on 7/30/1973, this site consisted of one large slab metate and one unifacially pecked mano. No other remarks are indicated. This property is not located within the APE and will not be impacted by the proposed project.

30-001670. This site was identified as a Historic Period Refuse Deposit (HPRD) and was discovered while monitoring a trench for the Orange County Water District Groundwater Replenishment System. The site consisted of 42 bottles and jars, one radio tube, and two faunal specimens dating from the late 1930s to the early 1940s. The site was recorded by Wendy Jones in 2006. This property will not be impacted by the proposed project.

30-001671. This site was identified as an HPRD and was discovered while monitoring a trench for the Orange Country Water District Groundwater Replenishment System. The site consisted of 65 bottles and jars, 24 ceramic artifacts, one shell button, seven marbles, and one light bulb. Other items included automobile parts, a cast iron stove leg, several flatware items, a shoe sole, and a plastic comb. These items dated to the mid 1940s. The site was recorded by Wendy Jones in 2006. This property will not be impacted by the proposed project.

6.7.1.11.4 Built Environment – Historic Structures. URS conducted background research to arrive at a general understanding of the history of the region and project area utilizing local literature, examining historic maps, aerial photographs, local and county histories,

directories, and various websites. In addition, URS conducted research at the Orange County Historical Society and Orange County Assessor's Office. Sanborn Maps were not available for the project area, and therefore are not provided in this analysis.

In addition, JRP Historical Consulting examined standard sources of information that list and identify known and potential historical resources to determine whether any buildings, structures, objects, districts, or sites had been previously recorded or evaluated in or near the project study area. JRP reviewed the NRHP, CRHR, California Historical Landmarks, and California Points of Historical Interest lists. A search of the SCCIC for *Anaheim Historic Resource Evaluations for 3053, 3065, and 3065A Miraloma Avenue, Anaheim, Orange County California* completed on August 23, 2007 located three locally significant buildings. JRP also contacted the Orange County Planning Department and Orange County Historical Society who referred inquiries to the COA Historic Preservation Office.

JRP conducted research at a variety of libraries and repositories including: California State Library, Sacramento; Shields Library, University of California, Davis; Orange County Archives, Santa Ana; University of California, Irvine; and the Local History Room, Fullerton Public Library. The Anaheim Local History Room of the Anaheim Public Library and the Anaheim Museum were closed for renovations during this period. JRP also contacted the Anaheim Historical Society, but had not received a response as of October 9, 2007.

Mike Sands, Neighborhood Preservation Coordinator, searched the records of the COA Historic Preservation Office, and found that no previously recognized resources were recorded. However, the office has nine properties in the area marked for evaluation that are listed in Table 6.7-2.

TABLE 6.7-2
PROPERTIES PLANNED FOR EVALUATION BY THE COA

Address	Direction from Project	Approximate Distance from Project	Approximate Distance from Linear (if Less than Project)
2831 E. Coronado St.	Southwest	3,323 ft.	
3006 E. Coronado St.	Southwest	1,523 ft.	
1373 N. Miller St.	Northeast	3,877 ft.	975 ft.
1401 N. Miller St.	Northeast	4,057 ft.	1,650 ft.
3233 E. Miraloma Ave.	East	2,215 ft.	0 ft.
1397 N. Jefferson St.	East-northeast	7,477 ft.	3,600 ft.
2983 E. Miraloma Ave.	West	600 ft.	
2901 La Jolla St.	Northwest	2,492 ft.	
2901 La Jolla St.	Northwest	2,167 ft.	

Source: JRP HRER, October 2007

The property located at 3233 E. Miraloma Avenue is the only property that would be affected by the project and has been evaluated as a part of this project. No properties adjacent to the project site or along the project's linear routes have been previously identified as potential historic resources, nor do any properties appear to have been previously evaluated for listing in the NRHP or CRHR.

Three historic period structures were previously identified within one mile of the proposed project site and were previously evaluated for historic significance. None of the properties below were deemed eligible for listing as an historic resource in the NRHP, though two of these structures may be eligible for local listing. None of the structures listed below would be impacted by the proposed project.

***Placentia Orange Growers Association Building (30-176707)*.** The Placentia Orange Growers Association Building is located approximately 0.75-mile north of the APE at 207 A-E Crowther Avenue, Placentia, CA. This property was recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Forms by Judith Marvin and Nicole Pletka (2003c). The building is a large reinforced concrete warehouse with stucco siding and a flat, composition-clad roof and was constructed in 1935 in the Moderne style. The DPR Form indicates this property was evaluated and considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP, but may be locally significant. This property will not be impacted by the proposed project.

***Bradford Brothers Packinghouse (30-176706)*.** The Bradford Brothers Packinghouse is located approximately 0.75-mile north of the APE at 100 E. Santa Fe Avenue, Placentia, CA. This property was recorded on DPR Forms by Judith Marvin and Nicole Pletka (2003b). The building is a reinforced concrete warehouse building with stucco siding and an irregular composition clad roof. The building was constructed in 1922, with a seventy-foot addition and basement added in 1929, and another addition in 1989. This property was evaluated and considered ineligible for listing in the NRHP because of lack of integrity, but may be locally significant. This property will not be impacted by the proposed project.

***Placentia Co-operative Orange Association (30-176705)*.** The Placentia Co-operative Orange Association is located approximately 0.75-mile north of the APE at 220 E. Santa Fe Avenue, Placentia, CA. This property was recorded on DPR Forms by Judith Marvin and Nicole Pletka (2003a). The building is a rectangular shape with stucco siding and a flat roof and was constructed in a Zigzag Moderne style in 1930. This property was evaluated and determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP because of lack of integrity, but it may be locally significant. This property will not be impacted by the proposed project.

6.7.2 Field Survey

A Phase I Archaeological Survey was conducted on August 21, 2007 and completed on October 3, 2007. The survey was conducted by Laurie Solis, M.A. and Brent Leftwich, M.A.

The survey for the CPP site was conducted by walking the site in a zigzag pattern, spaced 5 meters apart. Linear portions of the project site were surveyed in a tandem fashion. The project area was surveyed in its entirety. All areas of exposed soil and bioturbated (soils turned or aerated by the actions of plant growth and animal movement) soil were closely examined for the presence of archaeological and cultural resources. No archaeological sites were encountered.

6.7.2.1 Survey Methodology and Coverage

6.7.2.1.1 Methodology.

Archaeology. An APE was determined for the project site which consists of the immediately affected area, plus a 200-foot buffer (see Figure 6.7-10, CPP Area of Potential Effects [APE]). The APE for this project includes all project components, including laydown areas, plant site, and linears. The APE plus a 200-foot buffer was surveyed for all project components. By doing so, URS exceeded the buffer requirement for linear components.

The exposed surface sediments of the project area were significantly disturbed. The project site and associated linears appear to have suffered from erosion, bioturbation, modern human activity, the built environment, gravel cover, pavement, and landscaping. Other disturbances include the modern deposition of household and industrial refuse within the project site that include plastics, paper, wire, and wood. Little vegetation is present, with the exception of some ornamental trees and some grass cover adjacent to sidewalks along the main rights-of-way. Due to the extent of the paved environment, ground visibility was 0 to 20 percent. No archaeological sites were identified during the survey.

Built Environment. JRP conducted a historic resource survey for the built environment of the APE on September 26 and 27, 2007. JRP identified one property over 45 years old within the project APE. This property is located at 3233 E. Miraloma Avenue. JRP evaluated this property for historic significance under CEQA and recorded this property on a California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form. The property at 3233 E. Miraloma Avenue does not meet the criteria necessary to be considered historically significant or eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR.

3233 E. Miraloma Avenue – Architectural Description. The residence located at 3233 E. Miraloma Avenue was constructed in 1935, and was later expanded to 2,494 feet following the 1938 flood. The segment of E. Miraloma Avenue at the subject property narrows fifteen feet at the parcel, reflecting the original parcel lines on that side of the road. The property is a two-story, Spanish Eclectic style residence which has an irregular plan, unadorned stucco siding and red American Spanish tile roof with exposed eaves. The main portion of the house is two stories with an end gable roof with louvered vent. A nearly enclosed two-story porch

with a hip roof stretches across the front (south façade). The second story has nearly square openings and the first floor has an arcade of three arched and one rectangular opening.

A porte cochere with arched top extends from the east side of the house and has a flared wing wall to the east with a shed roof. Two short stairs connect the porte cochere to the first floor porch and main entrance. To the east and north are single-story wings with low-pitched gable roofs. The fenestration is irregular. The windows are wood frame casements varying from two to five lights, while the first floor focal windows have molded segmental pediments. The second story has two slightly recessed double-hung windows. The front door is made of wood and has an arched screen door.

The property's detached garage to the northeast of the house has a square plan. The garage is covered with stucco and has a composite shingle hipped roof with tile ridge accent. The garage has two modern overhead doors with four six-light, arched-top decorative windows in each, and roofed shed which is attached midway along the eastern edge. The shed is sided with vertical boards and has a large metal frame-sliding window on the east, and a second on the south. A shade pavilion is located between the drainage channel and the residential complex. Metal poles painted green support it. It has a corrugated metal shed roof and two panels of wood lattice on the western side. A two-foot tall, light-colored brick fence topped by flat red tiles surrounds the residence and garage. Three-foot brick piers are located approximately every twenty feet. See Figure 6.7-11 for a photograph and sketch map of the property.

***3233 E. Miraloma Avenue – Historic Description*.** The area northeast of Anaheim where 3233 E. Miraloma Avenue is now located was part of the *San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana* grant given to Juan Pacifico Ontiveros in 1837. Juan Pacifico Ontiveros had successfully defended his grant in court, but determined to move to an area with less pressure to sell. He sold 1,165 acres to the Los Angeles Vineyard Society to form the Anaheim Colony in 1857. The land northeast of Anaheim was given to Juan Pacifico's sons who sold it to Augustus Langenberger. Daniel Kraemer purchased nearly 4,000 acres and began farming. Most of the land to the north and south was a part of Stearns' Ranches and was developed through the land boom of the 1880s.

The Kraemer Tract was divided into eleven blocks with Daniel Kraemer's sons, Henry, Jonathan, Samuel, Edward and Benjamin, owning northern blocks. Blocks along the river were sold to individual investors. To make the land marketable as farmland, it required better transportation to markets. Samuel Kraemer worked with Placentia businessmen to bring an Atchison Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad line through the area. The line was complete in 1910. In anticipation of the railroad, the Golden State Realty Company and the Anaheim Land Syndicate purchased Block K through the center of the tract and subdivided it into ten-acre lots in 1906. The company advertised for salesmen as far away as Washington D.C. hoping to attract government employees to the new Golden State Tract. H.W. Reynolds and

A.W. Boerstler attempted to market a portion of the property as Placentia Acres. They subdivided 80 acres into lots just under an acre in 1911.

The area south of Placentia had been sparsely populated in 1900. The census district included the entire area north of Anaheim and listed farmers and related occupations. In 1910 the population along the entire length of Anaheim Road (now Miraloma Avenue) had grown to thirteen households. Oil had been located at Brea north of Anaheim in 1882. In the early twentieth century oil exploration extended along the hills north of Anaheim. Oil was discovered in Placentia, a former Stearns Rancho, in 1919 at the Chapman No. 1 well. The result was a land and housing boom in Placentia northwest of the study area. The settlement previously known for the *Societas Fraternia*, a group advocating a raw vegetarian diet, became an incorporated oil town in 1926. Oil field labor lived among the agricultural families in the area between Placentia and Anaheim. A small Mexican enclave, La Jolla, grew at the corner of La Jolla Street and Blue Gum Street. Even with the discovery of oil the area between Orangethorpe Avenue and La Palma Avenue was still planted in orange trees. Placentia Acres was abandoned and the lots were combined into new tracts suitable for orange groves. Earl B. Tally and Mary A. Tally created Tract 944, where 3233 Miraloma is located, in 1935 combining portions of the former Placentia Acres to create an approximately 10-acre orange orchard. The house at this location was built shortly after and expanded greatly after the 1938 flood, adding two wings and a garage.

None of the buildings or structures identified within the APE for the CPP appears to meet the criteria for listing in the NRHP or the CRHR. All buildings or structures 50 years or older within the study area, including each parcel surrounding the project site, received evaluation. A windshield survey of the linear routes was conducted to identify potentially significant properties, which resulted in the identification of one property over 50 years old. This property received evaluation, but does not meet the criteria for significance under CEQA. None of the evaluated structures less than 50 years of age meet the criteria for significance under CEQA. Therefore, none of the buildings in the study area or along the linears appear to be significant historic properties subject to Section 106, nor do they appear to be historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

The residences at 3053, 3065, and 3065A E. Miraloma Avenue on assessor's parcel 344-221-03 were recorded and evaluated within the past five years. None of them appeared to meet criteria for listing in the NRHP or CRHR and are not historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.

6.7.3 Environmental Consequences

CEC regulations require that the COA undergo various environmental resource assessments (i.e., cultural, paleontological, biological, etc.) as part of this AFC. This AFC is written in compliance with CEQA and CEC Guidelines, and serves as CEQA environmental

documentation. Under CEQA, the potential impacts of the project upon cultural resources must be evaluated. Although not considered a federal undertaking, the project has been assessed with regard to the requirements of NRHP and its implementing regulations set forth as 36 CFR 800.

6.7.3.1 Federal-level Mandates

The legal frameworks for addressing cultural resources at the federal level are similar to those at the state level. The four criteria for evaluation by the NRHP, which are listed below, are identified in 36 CFR 60.4 and are in accordance with the regulations outlined in 36 CFR 800 established by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).

Those resources that exhibit significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture are present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and are evaluated at the federal level based on the following criteria:

A. Resources that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history

B. Resources that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past

C. Resources 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 lack individual distinction

D. Resources that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (36 CFR 60.4)

These evaluating criteria are used to help determine what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment (36 CFR 60.2).

In addition, the Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1976 (16 USC) provides for coordination with the Secretary of the Interior when a federally licensed undertaking may cause irreparable damage to significant cultural resources.

6.7.3.2 State-level Mandates

6.7.3.2.1 California Public Resources Code. Public Resources Code, Section 5020.1 defines several terms, including the following:

- **Historical resource:** Historical resource includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific,

economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

- **Substantial adverse change:** Substantial adverse change means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of an historical resource would be impaired.

Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1 establishes a CRHR, sets forth criteria to determine significance, defines eligible properties, and lists nomination procedures.

Public Resource Code, Section 5097.5 states that any unauthorized removal or destruction of archaeological or paleontological resources on sites located on public lands is a misdemeanor. As used in this section, public lands means lands owned by, or under the jurisdiction of, the state, or any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof.

Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98 defines procedures for notification of discovery of Native American artifacts or remains and for the disposition of such materials.

Public Resources Code, Section 5097.99 prohibits obtaining or possessing Native American artifacts or human remains taken from a grave or cairn and sets penalties for these actions.

Public Resource Code, Section 5097.991 states that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq, CEQA requires the analysis of potential environmental impacts of proposed projects and requires application of feasible mitigation measures.

Public Resources Code, Section 21083.2 states that the lead agency determines whether a project may have a significant effect on unique archaeological resources; if so, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall address these resources. If a potential for damage to unique archaeological resources can be demonstrated, such resources must be avoided; if they cannot be avoided, mitigation measures shall be required. The law also discusses excavation as mitigation, discusses the costs of mitigation for several types of projects, sets time frames for excavation, defines unique and non-unique archaeological resources, provides for mitigation of unexpected resources, and sets financial limitations for preparation of the section.

Public Resources Code, Section 21084.1 indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource; the section further defines a historic resource and describes what constitutes a significant historic resource.

Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98 specifies that if the county coroner determines that discovered human remains are of Native American origin, the coroner is required to contact the NAHC, which is then required to determine the MLD to inspect the burial and to make recommendations for treatment.

6.7.3.2.2 CEQA Guidelines. CEQA Section 15064 states that in evaluating the significance of effect caused by a project, the Lead Agency shall consider the direct and indirect physical changes in the environment that may be caused by the undertaking. Under CEQA Section 15064.5(b)(1), a project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource if the change includes "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired." In other words, a project has a substantial impact on an historical resource if this impact diminishes those qualities that make the resource eligible for the California or National Registers.

In many cases, determination of a resource's eligibility to the NRHP or CRHR (or its uniqueness) can be made only through extensive research. As such, the best alternative to preserve historic resources is the "no action alternative." However, because this alternative is not always feasible, any project should consider alternatives or mitigation measures to lessen the impacts to these resources. Where possible, and to the maximum extent feasible, impacts to resources should be avoided. If, as the project proceeds, it proves impossible to avoid cultural resources, formal eligibility evaluation will be undertaken. If the resource meets the criteria of eligibility to the NRHP, it will be formally addressed under Section 106 of the NHPA. If the resource meets the criteria of eligibility to the CRHR, it will be formally addressed under Sections 15064.5 and 15126.4 of CEQA.

All resources encountered during the mitigation and monitoring phases of the CPP, with the exception of isolated artifacts and isolated features that appear to lack integrity or data potential, will be evaluated for significance per CRHR and CEQA criteria described above. If a resource is found to be significant, then it will be avoided through alterations in project design when feasible. In the event that avoidance of cultural resources is not possible via project design modifications, appropriate mitigation measures will be developed, in accordance with appropriate regulations and consultation with the CEC.

6.7.3.2.3 Warren – Alquist Act (WAA). The Warren-Alquist Act (WAA) requires that cultural resource studies be performed as an element of the application for certification for power facilities. Section 25520 requires that applications describe the projected impacts of a facility upon historic resources. Section 25527 prohibits the construction of facilities in locations where they may impact historic or aesthetic resources unless the construction of the facility is consistent with the use of said locations, there are no substantial adverse impacts, and permission of the agency (if any) having ownership and/or control of the land is obtained. Section 25529 requires that any facilities constructed on lands containing historic

or aesthetic resources set aside a portion of the property to allow the continued use of said resource. In addition, the WAA references the Public Utilities Code, section 1002, which states that historical and aesthetic values are to be one of the factors considered by the Public Utilities Commission in granting certifications.

6.7.3.3 Local Mandates

The COA's municipal code addresses the treatment of cultural resources identified and recorded within the COA. The municipal code defines the boundaries of the Anaheim Colony Historic District (Chapter 18.92) and requires that specific plans within Anaheim should consider properties of historical value (Chapter 18.72).

The County of Orange General Plan (Chapter 6) identifies areas of sensitivity for historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources within the County. The County works to conserve cultural resources through identifying areas of open space lands which are then preserved and used for public education. Articles 2 and 9 of the County of Orange Codified Ordinances establish policies for the protection of historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources in the county.

Table 6.7-3 presents a summary of the various legal and regulating authorities that govern the protection of cultural resources.

6.7.3.4 CPP Site

The CPP portion of the project site planned for the plant area consists of the full eastern half of the project site. The plant site area is comprised of the Orange County Food Service property. This property consists of a large box-shaped industrial building that faces Miraloma Avenue, associated paved surface parking area, temporary storage buildings, fencing, and minimal landscaping in the form of grass and ornamental trees. Almost 100 percent of this portion of the property is covered with pavement and concrete that obstructs the view of native soils. Ground visibility of this portion of the project site during the archaeological survey was at 0 percent.

The Orange County Food Service building and associated features do not appear on the 1959 aerial photograph of the property, but do appear on the 1970 aerial photograph of the property. Therefore, it appears that the Orange County Food Service building and associated features were constructed between 1959 and 1970. Prior to the current condition of the property, the project plant site consisted of citrus groves.

While agricultural activities do impact surface and subsurface soils, these activities generally do not impose major disturbance to subsurface soils, due to the nature of planting and tilling activities related to cultivation. In addition, paved areas such as alleyways and parking lots do not necessitate the disturbance of subsurface soils, since asphalt and concrete is generally

TABLE 6.7-3
LEGAL AND REGULATORY AUTHORITIES

AFC Section	Authority	Administering Agency	Requirements/Compliance
6.7.2.2	National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); 42 USC 4321-4327; 40CFR section 1502.25	Lead Federal Agency	Analysis of federal environmental impacts on federal lands or for projects requiring federal money, assistance, and/or permits.
6.7.2.2	Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1976 (16 USC)	Secretary of the Interior	Provides for coordination with the secretary when a Federally licensed undertaking may cause irreparable damage to significant cultural resources.
6.7.2.2	American Indian Religious Freedom Lead Federal Agency Act of 1979 (42 USC 1996)	Lead Federal Agency	Establishes U.S. Government policy to protect and preserve traditional religious beliefs and practices.
6.7.2.2	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (25 USC 3001)	Lead Federal Agency	Establishes mechanism for right of American Indian tribes to claim ownership of human remains and certain cultural items.
6.7.2.2	Secretary of the Interior's Standards, September 29, 1983.	Lead Federal Agency	Establishes standards for the gathering and treatment of data related to cultural resources.
6.7.2.1	The Warren-Alquist Act §§ 25520, 25527, 25529	CEC	Requires that cultural, historic, and aesthetic resources be taken into account in consideration of an application for certification. Requires that a portion of any such resources on public land be set aside for public access.
6.7.2.1	California Environmental Quality Act CEC (CEQA) Section 15064.5; California Public Resources Code § 5024, 5024.5, and 21083.2; Title 14, CCR § 15126	CEC	Formal findings by the lead state agency regarding project-related impacts to important cultural resources and unique paleontological resources.
6.7.2.1	Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 25523(A), CCR §§ 1752, 1752.5, 2300-2309, and Chapter 2, Subchapter 5, Article 1, Appendix B, Part (i)	CEC	Special consideration of unique historical, archaeological, and cultural sites.
6.7.2.1	Cal. Health & Safety Code § 7050.5	County Coroner (Medical Examiner)	Determination of origin of human remains and coordination with NAHC

TABLE 6.7-3 (CONTINUED)
LEGAL AND REGULATORY AUTHORITIES

AFC Section	Authority	Administering Agency	Requirements/Compliance
6.7.2.1	Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 5024.1	State Historical Resources Commission	Establishes the California Register of Historic Resources and procedures for nominating sites to the register.
6.7.2.1	Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 5097.5	Orange County Planning Department and Native American Heritage Commission	Prevent unauthorized removal of archaeological resources on public lands.
6.7.2.1	Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 5097.94 and 5097.98.21	Orange County Planning Department and Native American Heritage Commission	Prevent unauthorized removal of archaeological resources on public lands.
6.7.2.3	County of Orange General Plan	Orange County Planning Department	Calls for adherence to CEQA cultural resources regulations within Orange County.
6.7.2.3	COA Municipal Code	COA Planning Department	Addresses the treatment of cultural resources identified and recorded in Anaheim. Requires consideration of properties of historical value.

paved over a smoothed soil surface, thereby leaving a substantial portion of the subsurface soils intact.

Planned construction for the plant site area consists of a two-story facility, comprised of structures, below- and aboveground infrastructure for the power plant (such as combustion turbine generator, demineralizers, transfer pumps, water coolers, hydrocarbon drain tanks), surface parking, vehicle access roads, and a plant perimeter wall (see Figure 3-7). A maximum excavation depth of 20 feet is planned for the CPP site, to account for soil compaction, and foundation construction.

6.7.3.5 Laydown Area

The project site laydown area consists of the full western half of the CPP project site. The laydown area is comprised of a two-parcel residential property which previously held three residential structures, a large paved surface parking lot, two narrow access roads/alleys, and a large gravel-covered lot. Approximately 50 percent of the laydown area is covered with pavement or concrete, approximately 25 percent is covered with gravel, and the remainder 25 percent consists of the former residential property and exposes native soils.

Prior to the current condition of the property, the project laydown area consisted of citrus groves, and in the 1950s the three residential structures adjacent to Miraloma Avenue began

to occupy the southern portion of the laydown area. As late as 1970, the northern half of the laydown area consisted of citrus groves.

While agricultural activities do impact surface and subsurface soils, these activities generally do not impose major disturbance to subsurface soils, due to the nature of planting and tilling activities related to cultivation. In addition, paved areas such as alleyways and parking lots do not necessitate the disturbance of subsurface soils, since asphalt and concrete is generally paved over a smoothed soil surface. In addition, structures dating 45 years or older, such as those previously occupying the project laydown area, did not generally disturb more than a few feet of topsoil, as evident by aboveground foundations, thereby leaving a substantial portion of the subsurface soils intact.

Planned construction for the laydown area consists of facility construction in the southern portion adjacent to Miraloma Avenue, surface parking, plant perimeter wall, and site preparation for the remainder of the laydown area. A maximum excavation depth of 20 feet is planned for the laydown area, to account for soils compaction.

6.7.3.6 Linears

The 69 kV buried underground cables run approximately 7,000 feet, traversing east of the project site along Miraloma Avenue and south along North Miller Street. The communication line is part of the 69 kV line duct bank that follows Miraloma Avenue and Miller Street. The proposed 69 kV cable is located along an existing right-of-way within a built environment. This area is covered with pavement and concrete, with the exception of a landscaped grass area adjacent to Miller Basin and a very small area of heavily disturbed surface soils adjacent to the Carbon Canyon Diversion Channel. Prior to the current condition of the property, the project plant site consisted of citrus groves. A maximum excavation depth of 20 feet is planned for the 69 kV buried underground cables.

The natural gas line runs approximately 3,240 feet traversing east of the project site along Miraloma Avenue and north along Kraemer Boulevard. The proposed natural gas line is located along an existing right-of-way within a built environment. This area is covered with pavement and concrete, with the exception of a landscaped grass area adjacent to Miller Basin and a very small area of heavily disturbed surface soils adjacent to Carbon Canyon Creek. Prior to the current condition of the property, the project plant site consisted of citrus groves. A maximum excavation depth of 20 feet is planned for the natural gas line.

The water line consists of 2,185 feet, traversing east of the project site along Miraloma Avenue and northward and inside the property boundaries of Miller Basin on Miraloma Avenue. The proposed sewer/water line is located along an existing right-of-way within a built environment. This area is covered with pavement and concrete, with the exception of landscaped grass areas adjacent to Miller Basin and a dirt road within the Miller Basin

property. Prior to the current condition of the property, the project plant site consisted of citrus groves. A maximum excavation depth of 20 feet is planned for the sewer/water line.

6.7.3.7 Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources if the project would do the following:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5 of CEQA
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of CEQA
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (See Section 5.8 regarding impacts to paleontological resources)
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries

6.7.3.8 Archaeology

Investigations in the vicinity of the project site have detected six archaeological sites, including sites that were determined to be historical resources. Because the project site and vicinity are known to be archaeologically sensitive, the potential exists for unanticipated finds of archaeological resources during ground-disturbing activities associated with project implementation, even though portions of the site near the ground surface have previously been disturbed. Since excavation activities for the APE would be 20 feet (at maximum depth), these ground disturbing activities could pose an impact to archaeological resources of a prehistoric or historic nature. Such resources must be considered significant under the criterion specified in Section 15064.5(a)(3)(D) of the CEQA Guidelines (may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history). Therefore, the potential for damage to, or destruction of, these cultural resources would be a potentially significant impact.

6.7.3.9 Built Environment

A residence at 3233 E. Miraloma Avenue was recorded as a part of this report. Located along East Miraloma Avenue between Miller Street and Kraemer Boulevard, the residence does not appear to meet the criteria for significance for the NRHP or CRHR.

6.7.3.9.1 Criterion A. The residence does not appear to be significant for its association with the industrial development of northeast Anaheim or earlier agricultural production (Criterion A or 1). The residence at 3233 E. Miraloma Avenue was constructed near the peak of orange production in Orange County, but did not make a significant contribution to the

expansion of the crop. Instead the residence is an example of a house with a small orchard once found throughout Orange County.

6.7.3.9.2 Criterion B. Under Criterion B the residences are not associated with any significant individuals. The properties are not directly associated with the Kraemers or the early real estate companies. Later residents were typical operators of an orange orchard at 3233 E. Miraloma Avenue.

6.7.3.9.3 Criterion C. Under Criterion C the residence is a modest example of its architectural style. The residence located at 3233 E. Miraloma Avenue is of the Spanish Eclectic style made popular by the San Diego Panama-California Exposition of 1915, and is found throughout California. The house has the arcaded lower porch, arched windows, stucco walls, and tile roof associated with the style. The structure does not have rich details such as focal windows, decorative tile, ironwork, or the low-relief ornament around the doors and windows characteristic of better examples of this type of structure. In addition, extensive alterations to the building following the flood in 1938 place the building at the very end of the stylistic period.

The alterations have also resulted in unusual and atypical massing; the main two-story portion of the house creates a varied roofline, but the roofline variations are not as integrated as those in excellent examples of this style. The square arcade of the second-floor porch also alters the massing and disturbs the association with the Spanish Eclectic style.

6.7.3.9.4 Criterion D. In rare instances, buildings themselves can serve as sources of important information about historic construction materials or technologies (Criteria D or 4). However, this residence does not appear to be a principal source of important information in this regard.

6.7.3.9.5 Non-significant Resource. This property has been evaluated in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act using criteria described in 36 CFR 30 and in accordance with Section 15064.5(a) (2)-(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, using the criteria outlines in Section 5024.1 of the California Public Resources Code, and does not appear to be a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, there are no anticipated direct or indirect impacts to historic resources.

6.7.3.10 Human Remains

No formal cemeteries are known to have occupied the project site; therefore, any human remains encountered would likely come from prehistoric archaeological or historical archaeological contexts. As described above, the potential exists for archaeological resources to be present and for excavation during construction activities to disturb these resources, and it is possible that human burials could be associated with potential finds. As indicated, human remains have been identified less then a mile from the project site. Since excavation activities

for the APE would be 20 feet (at maximum depth), these ground-disturbing activities could pose an impact to informal human burials of a prehistoric or historic nature.

Human burials, in addition to being potential archaeological resources, have specific provisions for treatment in Section 5097 of the California Public Resources Code. Disturbing human remains could violate the health code, as well as destroy the resource, which would constitute a potentially significant impact. To reduce this impact, and as required by law, mitigation measures have been provided which specify provisional mitigation measures if human remains are discovered on the project site.

6.7.3.11 Cumulative Impacts

Section 6.18, Cumulative Impact Analysis, presents information on other projects that could affect resources in addition to the proposed project. The reader is referred to that section for details regarding each of these projects and their impacts.

Each of the projects discussed in Section 6.18 was assessed in conjunction with the CPP to ascertain the potential contribution of CPP to cumulative impacts to cultural resources in the region. This analysis determined that cumulative impacts from the CPP project on regional cultural resources is limited because mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce project-related impacts on any newly discovered resources (e.g., buried archaeological sites) to a less-than-significant level. In the event that a significant buried archaeological site is encountered during construction, data recovery and/or site avoidance would ensure that the information content of the site would be retained. The mitigation measures would reduce the cumulative impacts the CPP project would have on cultural resources.

6.7.4 Mitigation

6.7.4.1 Mitigation of Construction-related Impacts

No archaeological sites were identified during the pedestrian survey of the project site. There were no prehistoric or historic artifacts identified during the pedestrian survey. Subsurface testing to identify cultural deposits was not undertaken during the pedestrian survey. The project is located in an inland basin, near the Santa Ana River and other water sources. The project area and associated linears historically consisted of orange groves and other crops during and were subject to seasonal plowing and tilling. Despite this disturbance there is a possibility for intact stratigraphic horizons containing prehistoric or historic period cultural resources. Four prehistoric archaeological sites and two historic-period archaeological sites have been located within one mile of the project site. Deeper deposits have a higher probability of containing cultural resources due to the lack of modern disturbance.

6.7.4.2 Mitigation for Resources Discovered during Construction

Construction and construction personnel will be instructed to halt their activities in the vicinity of newly discovered archaeological materials or remains. In the event of unanticipated discoveries of previously unknown cultural resources, a qualified archaeologist shall evaluate the find for significance and, if necessary, recommend further mitigation measures pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5. Archaeological mitigation training will be provided for construction personnel. The Orange County Coroner shall be contacted in the even human remains are discovered during construction activities.

6.7.5 Specific Mitigation Measures

The proposed project may pose an impact to cultural resources, given its close proximity to natural water sources, and the number of archaeological sites within a one-mile radius of the project site. However, mitigation measures have been provided that would reduce the potential impacts to cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. The mitigation measures and procedures described below would apply to any cultural resource within the identified APE for the proposed project. The CEC approved Cultural Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (CRMMP) will prepare and implemented. With implementation of the Applicant-committed CRMMP containing the mitigation measures listed below, no significant unavoidable impacts to known cultural resources are anticipated to occur.

CUL-1: Archeological Monitoring. The Applicant shall arrange for a qualified professional archaeological monitor to be present during excavation and trenching on the project site and the APE. In addition, all construction personnel shall be informed of the need to stop work in the event of a potential find, until a qualified archaeologist has been provided the opportunity to assess the significance of the find and implement appropriate mitigation measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel will also be informed that unauthorized collection of cultural resources is prohibited.

CUL-2: Evaluation and Documentation. If archaeological resources are discovered during earth-moving activities, all construction activities within 50 feet of the find (or as deemed appropriate by the monitoring archaeologist) shall cease until the archaeologist evaluates the significance of the resource. In the absence of a determination, all archaeological resources shall be considered significant. If the resource is determined to be significant, the archaeologist shall follow the research design set forth in the CEC approved Cultural Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CRMMP). The archaeologist shall complete a report of the excavations and findings, and shall submit the report upon completion to the SCCIC at California State University Fullerton (CSUF), and the COA.

CUL-3: Personnel Training. Archaeological mitigation training will be undertaken for construction personnel in the form of a training session given by the monitoring

archaeologist. In addition, a cultural resource brochure will be provided and available to all construction crew members detailing the necessary procedures for the discovery of archaeological resources within APE.

CUL-4: Protection and Preservation of Remains. The COA will ensure that impacts to cultural resources related to the unanticipated discovery of human remains are reduced to below the level of significance by ensuring that, in the event human remains are encountered, construction in the area of the finding will cease, and the remains will stay in situ pending definition of an appropriate plan. The Orange County Coroner will be contacted to determine the origin of the remains. In the event the remains are Native American in origin, the NAHC will be contacted to determine necessary procedures for protection and preservation of the remains, including reburial, as provided in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(e), "CEQA and Archaeological Resources," CEQA Technical Advisory Series.

6.7.5.1 Significance After Mitigation

- Implementation of CUL-1 to CUL-3 would reduce impacts on archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.
- Implementation of CUL-4 would reduce impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level.

6.7.6 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The analysis of cultural resources for the CPP project determined that significant unavoidable adverse impacts from the CPP project are not anticipated because mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce project-related impacts on any newly discovered resources (e.g., buried archaeological sites) to a less-than-significant level. In the event that a significant buried archaeological site is encountered during construction, data recovery and/or site avoidance would ensure that the information content of the site would be retained. These mitigation measures would limit the significant unavoidable adverse impacts that the CPP project would have on cultural resources.

6.7.7 LORS Compliance

Cultural resource LORS are described below.

The archaeological and historic resource surveys and analysis carried out for the project served to identify cultural resources present within and adjacent to the CPP project site and associated project components, as well as the potential for the project to impact as-yet-unknown cultural resources. The CPP project is considered a state-level undertaking and as such, is subject to state LORS for cultural resources. Any cultural resource potentially affected by the project will be subject to compliance with the provisions outlined in

CEQA/CRHR and possibly Section 106 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). If a cultural resource is discovered during construction and cannot be avoided, a program of site evaluation will be undertaken to ascertain resource significance under CEQA/CRHR and Section 106 of NEPA. If such a resource is determined to be significant, mitigation measures will be implemented in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, and in concert with CEC, the OHP and other agencies as appropriate.

6.7.8 Permit Requirements

At this time no specific permit requirements have been identified at the federal, state, or local levels to perform any cultural resources work that may subsequently be required during the construction or operation phases of the project.

6.7.9 Agency Contacts

In the event that human remains are discovered during construction activities in support of the proposed project, the Orange County Coroner's Office and the NAHC would be contacted in order to determine whether the deceased individual is of Native American descent and the approximate age of the remains.

6.7.10 References

Anaheim History Room. Various Maps, Files, and Directories.

Anaheim Municipal Code. 1974-2007.

Artisans of the Valley. 2007. American Architectural Styles. Available at: http://www.artisansofthevalley.com/ed_aa_styles5.html.

Bean, L.J. 1976. Social Organization in Native California. In Native California: A Theoretical Retrospective, pp. 99–124. Lowell, John Bean and Thomas C. Blackburn, editors. Socorro, Ballena Press; New Mexico.

Bean, Lowell J., and Florence Shipek. 1978. Luiseño. Handbook of North American Indians. California vol. 8. 538-549.

Boeing. 2007. Post War Developments: 1946 to 1956. http://www.boeing.com/history/narrative/n051naa.html (site accessed August 31, 2007).

Boscana, Fr. Gerónimo, O.F.M. 1933. Chinigchinich: A Revised and Annotated Version of Alfred Robinson's Translation of Father Gerónimo Boscana's Historical Account of the Belief, Usages, Customs and Extravagancies of the Indians of this Mission of San Juan Capistrano Called the Acagchemem Tribe. Phil Townsend Hanna, editor. Santa Ana,

California: Fine Arts Press. (Reprinted 1978 Classics in California Anthropology, 3. Malki Museum Press, Morongo Indian Reservation, California.).

Brown, Alan K. 2001. A Description of Distant Roads: Original Journals of the First Expedition into California, 1769–1770, by Juan Crespi. Alan Brown, editor and translator. San Diego State University Press, California.

Brown, Joan; Stephen O'Neal, James W. Steely. 2006. Cultural Resources Reconnaissance For the Village Entrance Project, Laguna Beach, California. SWCA Environmental Consultants, 23392 Madera Road, Mission Viejo, California 92691. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

Bureau of Land Managements Land Patent Details. 2007. Official Federal land Records located at :http://www.glorecords.blm.gov/. Site accessed August 2007.

California Energy Commission (CEC). 1992. *Instructions to the California Energy Commission Staff for the Review of and Information Requirements for an Application for Certification.*

1997. *Rules of Practice and Procedure and Power Plant Site Regulations.*

Carosso, V. P. 1949. Anaheim, California: A Nineteenth Century Experiment in Commercial Viniculture. *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society*, 23(2):78-86.

Case, Walter. 1974. History of Long Beach and vicinity. New York: Arno Press.

City of Anaheim (COA). 2007. A Brief History of Modern Day Anaheim. http://www.anaheim.net/article.asp?id=216#a1950 (accessed August 31, 2007).

Conkling, Steven W., Deborah McLean, and Brad Sturm. 1994. OR-2501: Cultural Resources Assessment for Five Vacant Lots and 42 Potentially Historic Buildings within the Northeast Anaheim Redevelopment Area, Orange County, California. Prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

County of Orange. 2005. General Plan.

2007. Codified Ordinances. 1973-2007.

Gebhard, D. 1977. A Guide to Architecture in Los Angeles & southern California. Peregrine Smith: Santa Barbara.

Hall M. and T. Cooley. 1973a. ORA-428: Archaeological Site Record. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

1973b. ORA-429: Archaeological Site Record. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

Just Disney. 2007. Disneyland's History. http://www.justdisney.com/disneyland/history.html (accessed August 31, 2007).

JRP Historical Consultants. 2007. Historic Resource Inventory and Evaluation, Anaheim Municipal Power Station. Prepared for URS Corporation, 130 Robin Hill Road, Suite 100, Santa Barbara, CA 93117.

Kroeber, Alfred L. 1925. Handbook of the Indians of California. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 78. Washington.

MacArthur, M.Y. 1959. Anaheim "The Mother Colony": Compiled and Written in Honor of the Original Colonists. The Ward Ritchie Press: Los Angeles, California.

Marvin, Judith and Nicole Pletka. 2003a. 30-176705: Building Structure and Object Record for Placentia Co-operative Orange Association. Prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

2003b. 30-176706: Building Structure and Object Record for Bradford Brothers Packing House. Prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

2003c. 30-176707: Building Structure and Object Record for Placentia Orange Growers Association Building. Prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

McAlester, V. and L. 2003. A Field Guide to American Houses. Alfred A. Knopf: New York.

McKenna, Jeanette A., Chuck Ferguson, and M. Abraham McKenna. 2002a. OR-2591: Historic Property Survey Report of Negative Findings, prepared for the California Department of Transportation. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central

Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

2002b. OR-2572: Historic Property Survey Report of Negative Findings, prepared for the California Department of Transportation. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

2002c. OR-3111: Negative Archaeological Survey Report, prepared for the California Department of Transportation. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

Meighan, C.W. 1954. A late complex in Southern California prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 10(2): 215-227.

1959. Californian Cultures and the Concept of an Archaic Stage. *American Antiquity* 24(3): 289-318.

National Park Service. 1983. Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

O'Neil, Stephen. 1988. Their Mark Upon the Land: Native American Place names in Orange County and Adjacent Areas. In Memoirs of the Natural History Foundation of Orange County, Vol. 2, pp. 106–122. Henry C. Koerper, ed. The Natural and Social Sciences of Orange County, Newport Beach, California.

2002. The Acjachemen in the Franciscan Mission System: Demographic Collapse and Social Change. Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, California State University, Fullerton.

O'Neil, Stephen, and Nancy Evans. 1980. Notes on Historic Juaneño Villages and Geographic Features. Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology 2(2):226–232.

Orange County Archives. Various Files and Photograph Collections.

Orange County Assessors Office. Various Records.

Orange County Genealogical Society. 1969. Saddleback Ancestors: Ranco Families of Orange County, California. Orange County Genealogical Society: Orange, California.

Orange County Recorder's Office. 2007. A Brief History of Orange County. http://www.ocgov.com/recorder/Archives/forms/history%20of%20orange%20county.pdf (Site accessed August 31, 2007).

Padon, Beth. 1998. OR-1836: Cultural Resource Review for Groundwater Replenishment System Program EIR/Tier I/EIS, Orange County Water District and County Sanitation Districts of Orange County. Prepared by Discovery Works, Inc. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

Parker, C.E. 1963. Orange County: Indians to Industry. Orange County Title Company: Santa Ana, California.

Paule, D.J. 1952. The German Settlement at Anaheim, a Thesis. University of Southern California, R and E Research Associates: San Francisco, California.

Raup, H.F. 1944. The German Colonization of Anaheim, California. In *University of California Publications in Geography*, Vol. IV 1932-1944, J. B. Leighly and C. O. Sauer (eds.), pp. 123-146. University of California Press: Berkeley, California.

1959. Transformation of Southern California to a Cultivated Land. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 49(3)(2):58-78.

Robinson, W.W. 1964. Long Beach: A Calendar of Events in the Making of a City, Los Angeles: Title Insurance and Trust Company.

Rogers, Malcom J. 1941. Aboriginal Culture Relations between Southern California and the Southwest. *San Diego Museum Bulletin* 5(3):1:6.

Sleeper, J. 1974. How Orange County Got Its Name. An address delivered March 11, 1974 on the occasion of the county's 85th anniversary, in Dept. 1, Superior Court, old Orange County courthouse, the Hon. Franklin G. West presiding.

Tadlock, L. 1976. ORA-517: Archaeological Site Record. Unpublished Literature. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University Fullerton, 800 North State College Blvd, Fullerton, CA.

United States Department of Agriculture. 1955, 1959, and 1970. Orange County Aerial Survey.

United States Geological Survey. 7.5 and 15-minute Topographical Maps. Various Dates and Maps.

United States Surveyor General For California. 2007. Spanish and Mexican Land Grant Maps, 1855-1875, located at http:// www.sos.ca.gov/archives/level3_ussg3.html. Site accessed September 2007.

Wallace, William J. 1955. A Suggested Chronology for Southern California Coastal. Archaeology. in *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 11(3): 214-230.

Wheeler, George, 1879. Annual Report Upon the Geographical Surveys of the One Hundredth Meridian, Vol. 7. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.

Winther, O.O. 1953. The Colony System of Southern California. *Agricultural History*, 27(3): 94-103.

William Self Associates, Inc. (WSA). 1999. Cultural Resources Assessment Report, SFPP Camp Pendleton Pipeline Project, San Diego County, California. Unpublished Report on file at SCIC, San Diego State University, San Diego.