Jamie Lai, P.E. July 19, 2010
Project Manager
Department of Public Works
Transit Planning Division
200 South Anaheim Boulevard, Suite 276
Anaheim, California 92805

Re: Cultural Resources Letter Report for the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC).

Dear Ms. Lai,

This letter report includes a summary of the Draft Phase I Archaeological Resources Survey Report (November, 2009) and examines the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 form completed for the Big "A" Scoreboard at Angel Stadium. The DPR 523 form is confidential and is not attached to this report. Additional information presented in this report is based on numerous site visits and literary searches conducted by Kleinfelder.

The Draft Phase I Archaeological Resources Survey Report discusses the ARTIC project description, regulatory setting, cultural and paleontological background, survey methodology, and study findings and conclusions. The study findings are as follows:

- No new surficial cultural resources were observed within the ARTIC site during the Phase I archaeological resources survey for ARTIC.
- ARTIC is located in an area that may contain the presence of cultural and paleontological resources.
- Archaeological and paleontological monitoring by a qualified archaeologist and paleontologist is recommended for all initial ground disturbing construction-related activities.

The DPR 523 form for the Big "A" Scoreboard provides a detailed description and historical background of the potential resource. A summary of the information presented in this form is included below:

- The Big "A" Scoreboard was completed in 1966 and stood 230 feet tall, the tallest structure in Orange County.
- In 1979, the Big "A" Scoreboard was relocated to its present location in the eastern portion of the stadium parking lot adjacent to SR-57.
- Aside from its relocation, alterations include a replaced electronic marquee with metal panel infilling occurring around its edges, the covering over of a digital temperature readout originally centered below the marquee, the addition of a metal ladder at the inner face of the west structural member; the addition of light standards to the back of the marquee box, and paint colors; the structure itself repainted from white to red, with the halo repainted from gold to silver.
- The period of significance for the Big "A" Scoreboard, 1966-1979, ends with its relocation.

- The Big “A” Scoreboard may be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criterion 1, 2, and 3.

The DPR 523 form for the Big “A” Scoreboard did not include the current environmental setting surrounding the scoreboard. The Big “A” Scoreboard is currently located in a parking lot between Angel Stadium of Anaheim and SR-57. Cars, trucks, and other machinery drive past the scoreboard at various times of day, as well as park underneath and around it. On game days, the Big “A” Scoreboard is surrounded and the entire parking lot is packed with people wandering around and cars lined up one next to the other. Fireworks are set off around Angel Stadium of Anaheim and the Big “A” Scoreboard on game days as well.

Please let me know if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Robert Motschall, Ph. D.

DRAFT
PHASE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES SURVEY REPORT

Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center Project
City of Anaheim,
Orange County, California

Prepared for:

Jennifer Bergener
Rail Program Manager
Orange County Transportation Authority
600 South Main Street
Orange, CA 92868

Prepared by:

ICF Jones & Stokes
811 West 7th Street, Suite 800
Los Angeles, California 90017
Contact: Catharine M. Wood, RPA
213/627-5376

NADB Data: USGS 7.5-minute Anaheim, CA Quadrangle Map, T4S, R10W, Sec 25, Cajon de Santa Ana and USGS 7.5-minute Orange, CA Quadrangle Map, T4S, R10W, Sec 25
Resources: 30-176663/30-176664 and 30-100402
Keywords: ARTIC

November 2009

This document should be cited as:

ICF Jones & Stokes

2009 Phase I Archaeological Resources Survey Report for the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center Project, City of Anaheim, Orange County, CA. Draft. November. (ICF J&S 305.09.) Los Angeles, CA. Prepared for: Orange County Transportation Authority, Orange, CA.

Contents

Appendices

Figures

Acronyms

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ARTIC	Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center
BNSF	Burlington Northern Santa Fe
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
I-5	Interstate 5
LOSSAN corridor	Los Angeles-to-San Diego rail corridor
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OCTA	Orange County Transportation Authority
PRC	Public Resources Code
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SR-55	State Route 55
SR-57	State Route 57
U.S. 101	U.S. Highway 101
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey

Summary of Findings

ICF Jones & Stokes completed a Phase 1 archaeological resources survey for a regional multi-modal transportation center, the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC), proposed by the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) and the City of Anaheim. OCTA and the City of Anaheim propose to construct ARTIC on a 15-acre site located in Anaheim and bounded by Katella Avenue, Douglass Road, State Route 57 (SR-57), and the Santa Ana River, and bisected by the Los Angeles-to-San Diego rail corridor (LOSSAN corridor). (See Figure 1, Regional Vicinity Map)

This study was conducted in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to identify the presence of potentially significant cultural resources (prehistoric and/or historic-era archaeological resources) that may be adversely affected by the proposed project.

Prior to field investigations, ICF Jones & Stokes archaeologist Catharine Wood conducted a literature and records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), located at California State University, Fullerton. The records search included a review of all available cultural resource reports and site records for an area within a 1-mile radius of the project area. The results of this literature and records search indicated that two cultural resources have been recorded within a 1-mile radius of the project area: a granite mano (30-100402) and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway alignment features (formerly the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway) (30-176663/30-176664). The survey assessment completed in 2002 of the existing railroad tracks and associated features found a lack of historical integrity in the property and therefore concluded that it was ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (Ballester and Tang 2002a and 2002b).

ICF Jones & Stokes also contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and requested a review of the sacred lands files. The NAHC responded on September 10, 2009, stating that a search of their sacred lands database did not yield any sacred lands or traditional cultural properties within the immediate project area. The NAHC provided a list of twelve Native American contacts in Orange County. Letters describing the project area and indicating the project location were sent to these Native American representatives on September 11, 2009. No responses have been received as of November 13, 2009.

In addition, Catharine Wood also performed a Phase I archaeological resources pedestrian survey of the project area on September 16, 2009. The results of the archaeological survey were negative; no new surficial cultural resources were observed within the project area. However, even though the project area is currently urbanized, it is located in an alluvial outwash plain of the Santa Ana River that forms the eastern boundary of the project site. The project area in the past had been open land used for agricultural purposes. Before the channelization of the Santa Ana River, the project area was crossed by many tributaries and smaller creeks flowing

from the canyons in a meandering northeast-to-southwest direction down to the coast. These abundant sources of water represent an ideal location for prehistoric and historic use. The flow of water and accumulation of sediments over time may have buried evidence of past occupations in the project area. Therefore, there is a potential for buried cultural resource deposits to exist beneath previously disturbed and developed land surfaces. Furthermore, previous archaeological studies conducted less than 1/8 mile from the project site have determined the vicinity to be sensitive for archaeological resources.

Archaeological monitoring by a qualified archaeologist is recommended for all initial ground-disturbing construction-related activities. If cultural materials (prehistoric or historic artifacts) are encountered during construction, work will stop in the vicinity of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the material and recommend further action, if necessary. Design of a treatment plan and consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer may be required to appropriately mitigate any unanticipated discoveries. Treatment measures typically include development of avoidance strategies, capping with fill material, or mitigation of impacts through data recovery programs, such as excavation or detailed documentation, or other mitigation measures, following standard archaeological procedures. During cultural resources monitoring, if the qualified archaeologist determines that the sediments being excavated are previously disturbed or unlikely to contain significant cultural materials, the archaeologist can specify that monitoring be reduced or eliminated. In accordance with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are exposed during construction, no further disturbance will occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) 5097.98. Construction must halt in the area of the discovery of human remains, the area must be protected, and consultation and treatment should occur as prescribed by law.

The results of the paleontological records search indicated that the study area/project site is located in an area that may contain the presence of such resources. Paleontological resources have been unearthed in the nearby area; therefore, mitigations are recommended to implement the proposed project.

A qualified paleontological monitor will be on call during construction activities. If paleontological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work will stop within 50 feet of the find until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures. Treatment measures may include full-time monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during construction-related ground-disturbing activities. The qualified paleontological monitor will retain the option of reducing monitoring if, in his or her professional opinion, the sediments being monitored were previously disturbed. Monitoring may also be reduced if potentially fossiliferous units are not present or, if present, are determined by qualified paleontological personnel to have a low potential to contain fossil resources. The monitor will be equipped to salvage fossils and samples of sediments as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and will be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. Recovered specimens will be prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation, which would include the washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates. Specimens will be curated into a professional, accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable storage. A report

of findings, with an appended itemized inventory of specimens, will be prepared; this report will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts on paleontological resources.

Chapter 1. Introduction

The proposed ARTIC project is on a 15-acre site within the city of Anaheim. The project site is bounded by Katella Avenue to the north, Douglass Road to the west, SR-57 to the south, and the Santa Ana River to the east, and is bisected by the LOSSAN corridor (see Figures 1 and 2).

OCTA, in partnership with the City of Anaheim, proposes to design and construct the ARTIC project. This transit center would replace the existing Metrolink/Amtrak station that was built in 1982.

In 2005, OCTA initiated its Regional Gateways Program. The purpose of this program is to convert key Metrolink stations into regional gateways. The program aims to upgrade station infrastructure where feasible to accommodate high-speed train service, expand stations for regional travel, and modify stations for improved access to other transportation systems, such as bus and shuttle systems. Also in 2005, the OCTA Board of Directors approved a program to increase Metrolink service in Orange County. Simultaneously, the state identified Anaheim as the southern terminus for the first phase of the California High-Speed Train[1] and the only Orange County stop.

The projected increased ridership, implementation of the rail expansion programs, limited ability to expand the existing Anaheim Station, and the need for connections enabling travelers to transfer from one mode of transit service to another at a regional hub prompted the ARTIC project. OCTA and the City of Anaheim entered into to an agreement to jointly design and environmentally clear the ARTIC project. In 2006, OCTA purchased 13.5 acres of land as a potential future site for ARTIC. This Phase 1 archaeological resources survey report was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the CEQA, the NEPA, and the California Office of Historic Preservation 1990 guidelines and presents the following information:

- description of the proposed project;
- project location and setting;
- regulatory setting;
- background information regarding the environmental, cultural, and historical setting of the project site;
- field methods; findings, conclusions, and recommendations; and
- the sources used in the identification of archaeological, ethnographic, and paleontological resources.

[1] High-speed rail service connecting southern California to Sacramento and San Francisco Bay area in northern California.

This assessment was prepared by ICF Jones & Stokes archaeologist Catharine M. Wood, RPA, and was reviewed and edited by senior archaeologists Mark Robinson and Michael Beaver, PhD. These ICF Jones & Stokes archaeologists are qualified under the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards. The report was edited by Jan Ostashay, Cultural Resources Team Leader, and Elizabeth Irvin, Technical Editor.

Chapter 2. Project Description/Undertaking

DEFINITION OF THE PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

This report analyzes the following alternatives:

- the No-Build Alternative,
- Build Alternative 1: Proposed ARTIC Project,
- Build Alternative 2: ARTIC at Existing Station Site, and
- Build Alternative 3: Reduced Development Alternative.

These alternatives are described in detail below.

No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative assumes that the proposed ARTIC project would not be constructed and that the expansion and addition of transportation services planned to occur after Phase 1 of the ARTIC project would be accommodated at the existing Anaheim Station.

Tracks and Platforms

At the existing Anaheim Station there are two tracks separated by approximately 20 feet, and two 800-foot-long, 16-foot-wide side platforms. The station complies with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, providing concrete ramps and an underpass for safe access to the platforms.

The track and platforms would not be altered or improved under the No-Build Alternative. These platforms would not be adequate to handle the increased ridership expected on Metrolink and Amtrak, especially when the station becomes a transfer point to other modes of transportation. The access to Anaheim Station would not be altered or improved under the No-Build Alternative.

Terminal Facilities

At the existing Anaheim Station, there is an Amtrak terminal building with station amenities and luggage facilities south of the tracks. A small communications building, extensive landscaping, and electric vehicle charging stations are also located in this area. Stairs, ramps, and an underpass provide access to the platforms.

The terminal facilities would not be altered or improved under the No-Build Alternative.

Station Area Access

Access to the station is from the intersection of Katella Avenue at Sportstown, adjacent to The Grove of Anaheim. The intersection is controlled by a traffic signal. A two-lane internal roadway within the Angel Stadium parking area wraps around The Grove's designated parking area and continues to the station parking area.

The access to Anaheim Station would not be altered or improved under the No-Build Alternative.

Surrounding Roadway System

Katella Avenue provides the primary arterial access to the existing station. It also provides access for Angel Stadium and the Honda Center. From west of Interstate 5 (I-5) to State Route 55 (SR-55), Katella Avenue currently carries approximately 49,000 vehicles per day between State College Boulevard and SR-57 (in the vicinity of the existing Anaheim Station), and approximately 26,000 to 31,100 vehicles between SR-57 and Main Street (in the vicinity of the proposed ARTIC site). Katella Avenue is classified in the Orange County Master Plan of Arterial Highways as a Smart Street with six to eight lanes.

The surrounding roadway system would not be altered or improved under the No-Build Alternative. While Katella Avenue does experience some congestion during peak commute periods, it is a high-capacity, regionally significant arterial. Before and after events at Angel Stadium or the Honda Center (or both), Katella Avenue is subject to congestion localized to the area surrounding these facilities' access locations. Events are intermittent, and the duration of congestion associated with these events is usually brief. The City of Anaheim implements event management strategies to streamline the entry and discharge of vehicles to and from the facilities to minimize impacts to traffic flow along affected arterials, including Katella Avenue.

Pedestrian Access

There are no defined pedestrian routes from south, east, or west of the existing Anaheim Station. Pedestrians can use sidewalks along Katella Avenue and State College Boulevard to the boundaries of the Angel Stadium parking area. From there, pedestrians must make their way through the parking area to the station, located along the northern edge of the Angel Stadium parking area. North of the station, there is a pedestrian walkway connecting Katella Avenue and the adjacent commercial and office development to the station. Pedestrians cross the railroad tracks via a pedestrian tunnel.

Under the No-Build Alternative, pedestrian access would not be altered or improved.

Parking

The existing Anaheim Station has approximately 408 parking spaces, which are currently over 90% occupied on a typical weekday. This parking is provided for in the lease agreement between the City of Anaheim and Angel Stadium. Under the No-Build Alternative, no additional parking would be provided.

Build Alternative 1: Proposed ARTIC Project

ARTIC is envisioned to be a regional transportation gateway for Orange County. The City of Anaheim and OCTA are working collaboratively on this three-phase facility, which would be built over a 20-year period. ARTIC would be integrated into a joint mixed-use development as part of the Platinum Triangle redevelopment area.

The proposed ARTIC site is bounded by Katella Avenue on the north, the Santa Ana River on the east, SR-57 on the south, and Douglass Road on the west. The LOSSAN rail corridor crosses the site near its southern limits. The project area also includes Douglass Road, from just north of Katella Avenue to the Angel Stadium entrance, small portions of Katella Avenue at the Douglass Road intersection, the LOSSAN rail corridor between approximately Katella Avenue and the Santa Ana River (including the Douglass Road bridge), and the existing Anaheim Station (see Figure 3).

Development of the ARTIC facility is anticipated as an opportunity for potential joint development and other private sector cost sharing and/or revenue sharing arrangements. New and expanded transportation services would be incorporated into ARTIC in the following three phases:

- Phase 1: Initial Transit Facility (2010–2013)
- Phase 2: 2020 Buildout (2014–2020)
- Phase 3: Ultimate Buildout (2021–2030)

This Phase I archaeological resources survey report analyzes Phase 1 at the project level, and Phases 2 and 3 at the program level, with additional or supplemental environmental documents required to complete the NEPA and CEQA compliance process.

Phase 1 would include the initial transit facility and is anticipated to be completed in 2013. This phase would convert the 13.58-acre OCTA-owned site and the 2.2-acre city-owned site into a fully functioning regional transportation hub on the east side of SR-57, southeast of the existing Anaheim Station.

Phase 2 would provide incremental improvements corresponding with transportation services coming on line, increased demand at the facility, and possible expansion of transit-oriented retail, mixed-use commercial development, civic space, and transit-supporting facilities. This phase anticipates that the California High-Speed Train and Anaheim Fixed Guideway will become operational, using and/or connecting with the ARTIC facility.

Phase 3 represents the buildout of the ARTIC site through joint development and other private-sector cost sharing and/or revenue sharing arrangements.

During Phase 2 or 3, OCTA may choose to locate a regional transportation communication center at ARTIC as part of the mixed-use development.

Tracks and Platforms

The proposed ARTIC project would include realignment of the existing LOSSAN corridor mainline tracks and relocation of the platforms. ARTIC would provide a center platform (25.83 feet wide), serving two tracks spaced 35.5 feet apart. There would also be a side platform (25.83 feet wide) serving one track on the south side of the corridor. The additional track would serve as a storage/layover track, provide additional capacity during special events, or serve as a mainline track to meet future Metrolink/Amtrak capacity. The existing mainline tracks would be realigned under the SR-57 overpass to provide for the new platform location. All tracks would have train-boarding capacity at the platforms.

Passenger amenities on the platforms would likely include, but not be limited to, wayfinding signage and graphics, transit system information, regulatory signs, public address system, close-circuit television, canopies, public art, and benches.

Terminal Facilities

The proposed ARTIC project includes a terminal building and supporting facilities area that would be approximately 380 feet by 220 feet, with the shorter side paralleling the rail corridor. An approximately 39,000-square foot grand plaza would be located directly north of the terminal building. A bus drop off would be located beneath the transit center, providing a minimum of eight bus bays. The bay layout would be in a circular roadway configuration, to allow the drop off to be into a central bus plaza. The bus plaza would be centered under the public hall of the terminal building, which would be accessed by stairs and elevators. Access to the bus plaza would be by an exclusive elevated road.

The terminal building would be an urban-scaled signature structure and the primary contributor to ARTIC's ability to become a recognizable landmark and transportation gateway. The structure would be sized to accommodate Phase 1 operational demand and make reasonable accommodations in anticipation of the spatial requirements of transportation-related operational needs related to expanded services in Phases 2 and 3. The terminal building would be the tallest structure on the site. The arching roof structure is planned to be approximately 190 feet above the finish floor elevation of the public hall and curbside passenger drop-off/pick-up area. Building height is tied to and constrained by the existing and planned top-of-rail elevation along the LOSSAN rail corridor. A passenger concourse is planned to provide pedestrian connections between the terminal building and the rail platforms. The top-of-floor elevation of the concourse would be determined by the operational geometric requirements of fright rail service, Metrolink/Amtrak service, and the planned California High-Speed Train criteria, including the clearances for overhead catenaries.

In general, the materials used for the ARTIC terminal building would be similar to those typically associated with major transportation facilities and other civic structures, where buildings are expected to be low maintenance and have a lifespan longer than typical commercial development (i.e., more than 25 years). The exterior enclosure may include curtain wall glass systems, metal panels, and standard roofing materials. The structure over the terminal building would likely include materials that would have the capability to transmit filtered natural light, collect sunlight to generate electricity, and insulate the space.

In general, the finish material color palette would avoid strong color and result in a timeless character and feel. Brightly colored surfaces would be limited to signage and wayfinding graphics, intended to catch the attention of ARTIC users. Retail signage in the terminal building would be of similar character.

Public Hall

The public hall would function as the primary gathering and processional space through ARTIC and is planned to be located at the intersection of pedestrian pathways that connect rail platforms, bus loading areas, the curbside passenger drop-off/pick-up area, and parking areas. It would be ARTIC's front door and would form the civic face of the building, as viewed from Katella Avenue.

Civic Plaza

Adjacent to the north side of the terminal building would be a civic plaza. It would be integrated with and connected to onsite pedestrian pathways and include functions associated with passenger arrival/departure, such as curbside drop-off/pick-up.

Concourse

The concourse would function as an above-grade (i.e., above street level) pedestrian connector between the public hall and the rail platforms. Generally, the concourse would be directly connected to and an extension of the terminal building. It would extend out over the existing LOSSAN corridor. In Phase 1, the concourse would extend to the southernmost edge of the southbound passenger platform shared by Metrolink and Amtrak. It could be extended to the south in later phases to accommodate California High-Speed Train platforms. The concourse would include vertical circulation elements (stairs, escalators, elevators). It may also include passenger waiting areas, retail, and concessions.

Bus Loading Areas

In order to increase passenger/pedestrian safety and economize the ARTIC site area, terminal building functions would be stacked vertically. Passengers' connecting with buses

would board and alight from platforms that would have direct vertical circulation access to other parts of the terminal building. Locating the bus bays under the main floor of the terminal building would also reduce walking distance and encourage bus-rail transfers.

Angel Stadium Entrance

A secondary station entrance would provide passenger access to Angel Stadium and connections between rail platforms. A pedestrian promenade would be developed to safely accommodate pedestrian movements between the stadium and ARTIC.

Landscape and Hardscape

The ARTIC site would include a landscape area along the eastern boundary, beside the bike trail along the Santa Ana River. This landscape area would preserve a future rail alignment perpendicular to the LOSSAN corridor in the event that a north/south rail or other transportation mode is eventually constructed. (This mode could include the Las Vegas-Anaheim Maglev project. However, at this point, the Maglev project has not identified a funding source, so it is speculative and not included in the project- or program-level analysis.) The landscape area may include onsite pedestrian pathways and could provide pedestrian and bicycle connections between the existing bike trail and ARTIC. With the exception of accommodating bicycle access, lockers, and racks, no recreational uses are envisioned for this space.

Public Art

Public art would be a part of ARTIC and has the potential to beautify and enhance the quality of the overall passenger experience, aid wayfinding, and contribute to the perception of ARTIC as an important civic structure and regional transportation hub.

Station Area Access

Access to the ARTIC station under Build Alternative 1 would include one below-grade (i.e., below street level) access point for the underground parking area and one at-grade (i.e., street-level) driveway for passenger drop off. For the parking structure, drivers would be in the far right (outside) lane on southbound Douglass Road. This lane would descend and cross under Douglass Road directly into the underground parking structure. Drivers who are dropping off passengers would use the far left lane from southbound Douglass Road, turning left and pulling to the north side of the terminal building. In addition, the second lane from the right on southbound Douglass Road would be for buses only and would connect to an overhead busway that would cross over Douglass Road and pull directly into the bus plaza under the terminal building. This access plan would require some adjustments to existing driveways for the commercial development on both sides of Douglass Road, but access to all properties would be maintained.

Surrounding Roadway System

To accommodate the traffic generated by increase transit use of the ARTIC site, the surrounding roadway system would be enhanced.

Douglass Road

Generally, Douglass Road would be widened toward the east in order to minimize impacts to existing business on the west side of the street. This widening would result in the loss of five to ten existing parking spaces and the relocation of two driveways for west side properties. Douglass Road would also be lowered to allow it to pass under the railroad bridge.

On the south end of Douglass Road, between the Angel Stadium entrance and the railroad bridge, four lanes would be maintained, two northbound and two southbound. The sidewalk on the west side of the street would be eliminated, and the eastern sidewalk would be adjacent to the Douglass Road curb and widened to 15 feet.

From the railroad bridge to the ARTIC main entrance, Douglass Road would continue as four lanes, two northbound and two southbound. A southbound left-turn pocket, located approximately 50 feet north of the Douglass Road underpass of SR-57, would be provided for auxiliary entrance to ARTIC lower-level parking. A bus-only flyover would cross over Douglass Road from the outside southbound lane, curving to the east and entering the ARTIC bus plaza. A bus-only driveway would exit the bus plaza to northbound Douglass Road, north of the ARTIC main entrance.

From the ARTIC main entrance to Katella Avenue, Douglass Road would include up to seven lanes:

- two northbound lanes;
- one southbound left-turn lane into the ARTIC main entrance for passenger drop off and pick up;
- two southbound through lanes;
- one bus-only lane (connecting to the elevated busway); and
- one southbound lane connecting to the lower-level undercrossing into the parking garage.

Douglass Road/Katella Avenue Intersection Configuration

At the Douglass Road/Katella Avenue intersection, Douglass Road would be widened south and north of Katella Avenue. This would require acquisition of the buildings and property closest to Douglass Road on the southeast corner of the intersection (but the largest business, J.T. Schmid's Restaurant & Brewery, would remain. Some parking spaces would be eliminated, as well as one driveway. North of Katella Avenue, Douglass Road would be widened toward the

east, affecting sidewalk and landscaping areas but not Honda Center parking. This intersection would result in the following lanes:

- Northbound Douglass Road south of Katella Avenue: three through, two left-turn, one right-turn
- Northbound Douglass Road north of Katella Avenue: two through, one left-turn, one right-turn
- Southbound Douglass Road north of Katella Avenue: one through, one left-turn, one right-turn, one shared through/right-turn
- Southbound Douglass Road south of Katella Avenue: three through

Katella Avenue

No widening of Katella Avenue would be necessary for Phase 1 of the ARTIC project.

Pedestrian Access

Pedestrian walkways are proposed to connect Angel Stadium, ARTIC transit services, parking, Katella Avenue, and the Honda Center. A sidewalk along the east side of Douglass Road would connect the bus plaza, passenger drop-off/pick-up area, and ARTIC parking to the supporting facilities, the civic plaza, Angel Stadium, and the Honda Center. A sidewalk on the west side of Douglass Road would extend from Katella Avenue to Angel Stadium.

Parking

ARTIC Phase 1 would require 1,255 parking spaces. The parking spaces would be provided as a combination of surface parking and structured parking. The structured parking would be underground, under the terminal building and the civic plaza. As the ARTIC site is built out in future phases, it is assumed that surface parking would be replaced with buildings with underground parking.

Build Alternative 2: ARTIC at Existing Station Site

Build Alternative 2 assumes that ARTIC and its proposed facilities would be constructed on the site of the existing Anaheim Station. A new terminal and supporting facilities would be constructed to replace the existing terminal, and the existing terminal would remain in service during the construction of the new ARTIC terminal facilities. The new facilities would be located adjacent to and approximately 110 feet south of the LOSSAN corridor in order to accommodate future tracks for the California High-Speed Train. As for Build Alternative 1, parking would be a combination of surface parking and structured parking. There are two

options for the layout of the station under this alternative, depending on where primary access would occur. This alternative is contingent on renegotiation of the station area lease and execution of agreements between OCTA, the City of Anaheim, and Angel Stadium.

Under Build Alternative 2, the project would be phased similarly to the proposed ARTIC project. Phase 1 would include the transit center and associated facilities, as described below. Phase 2 would include additional transportation-related development to accommodate other modes, such as California High-Speed Train and Anaheim Fixed Guideway. Under Phase 3, the ultimate mixed-use buildout would occur on the ARTIC site (the OCTA-owned parcel east of SR-57), separated from the station itself.

Tracks and Platforms

Build Alternative 2 would provide two 15-foot-wide side platforms approximately 1,000 feet in length serving two tracks spaced 21 feet apart. There would be no need to modify the existing tracks in Build Alternative 2. The existing platforms would be extended approximately 200 feet to the east.

New pedestrian access to the platforms would be provided under Build Alternative 2, similar to Build Alternative 1. Pedestrian access would be provided by overpass or underpass structure. However, accommodation of the California High-Speed Train access would need to be considered because it would be located between the Metrolink/Amtrak platforms and the terminal building. Pedestrian access to and from the Honda Center, the office development along Douglass Road, and future development on the ARTIC site would be accommodated at the east end of the platforms. Pedestrian access at the west end of the platforms would accommodate passengers between the platforms and the terminal building, and pedestrians from the development north of the LOSSAN corridor would access the transit center via the existing pedestrian tunnel and walkway.

Terminal Facilities

Build Alternative 2 assumes development of ARTIC to include the same facilities and amenities as proposed in Build Alternative 1, including the terminal building, the public hall, the civic plaza, and the concourse. Under this alternative, the civic plaza would not necessarily align with the public hall, but would be at either end of the terminal building, depending on which option was selected. The concourse would need to span the future California High-Speed Train corridor and accommodate future vertical access to these tracks.

Under Build Alternative 2, the bus loading areas would be surface lots at either end of the terminal building. A separate Angel Stadium entrance would not be required. Some form of landscape and hardscape would be incorporated into the design, but it would not be necessary to reserve a transit corridor for future north/south transportation. Incorporation of public art would occur at this location, as under Build Alternative 1.

Station Area Access

Access to the ARTIC station under Build Alternative 2 would vary depending on which option was selected.

Design Option 1

Primary access to ARTIC under Build Alternative 2, Option 1, would be via Douglass Road. The main entrance to ARTIC would be provided immediately west of the SR-57 overpass and approximately 200 feet east of the gated entrance to Angel Stadium. Secondary access would be at the intersection of Katella Avenue and Sportstown, using the existing two-lane internal circulation roadway, which would be improved and aligned as needed.

Design Option 2

For Build Alternative 2, Option 2, primary access to the site would be from Katella Avenue at Sportstown. An additional entrance only (no exit) would provide direct access to the bus plaza and provide a circulation loop for buses and shuttles to enter from Katella Avenue, circulate through the bus plaza, and return to Katella Avenue. A single internal roadway would continue east of the bus plaza to the parking structure. Ancillary access to the parking structure and the site would be provided via Douglass Road.

Surrounding Roadway System

Douglass Road would be improved to provide two southbound lanes and three northbound lanes. West of the SR-57 overpass structure, southbound Douglass Road would be widened to provide a dedicated right-turn lane into ARTIC. At its intersection with Katella Avenue, Douglass Road would provide two northbound left-turn lanes, one shared through/right-turn lane, and one right-turn lane. There southbound receiving lanes would be provided, transitioning to two southbound lanes in the vicinity of the railroad bridge and under the SR-57 overpass.

Pedestrian Access

As in Build Alternative 1, pedestrian walkways are proposed with Build Alternative 2 to connect Angel Stadium, ARTIC transit services, parking, Katella Avenue, and the Honda Center. A sidewalk along the east side of Douglass Road would connect the Honda Center and the office development along the west side of Douglass Road with the bus plaza and passenger drop-off/pick-up area, the civic plaza, and the terminal building and its supporting facilities. A pedestrian corridor would be developed through the Angel Stadium parking area to connect with the ARTIC terminal area. A pedestrian walkway would be provided between Katella Avenue and the terminal area, parallel to the LOSSAN corridor.

Parking

Depending on the terms of a development agreement with Angel Stadium, parking at ARTIC may be provided exclusively in a parking structure or could include short-term surface parking. Build Alternative 2 would provide approximately 1,100 parking spaces, less than with Build Alternative 1 because it would be unnecessary to provide Honda Center overflow parking.

Build Alternative 3: Reduced Development Alternative

This alternative would include only the transportation-related aspects of the ARTIC project, without some or all of the opportunities for potential joint development and other private-sector cost-sharing and/or revenue-sharing arrangements. Build Alternative 3 would be identical to the proposed ARTIC project for Phase 1, but later phases would only include transportation-related elements, with minimal supporting commercial development within the terminal building.

Chapter 3. Regulatory Setting

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

Two requirements have been established for addressing impacts to archaeological resources; they are PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1. These two sections operate independently of each other to ensure that potential effects on archaeological resources are considered as part of the environmental review process. Section 21083.2 applies to "unique" archaeological resources while Section 21084.1 applies to archaeological sites that are listed in eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Under Section 21083.2 a unique archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it:

1. contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;
2. has a special or particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
3. is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

Section 21083.2 also provides guidance for mitigating impacts to unique archaeological resources that may be damaged by a project. This may be achieved by planning construction to avoid the resource(s); deeding the resource into conservation easements; capping archaeological sites with a layer of soil prior to construction; and/or planning parks, greenspace, etc. to preserve archaeological sites in situ.

Historic Resources

According to CEQA (PRC Section 21084.1), historical resources include any resource listed, or determined eligible for listing, in the CRHR. Properties listed, or determined eligible for listing, in the NRHP, such as those identified in the Section 106 process, are automatically listed in the CRHR. Therefore, all "historic properties" under federal preservation law are automatically "historical resources" under state preservation law. Historical resources are also presumed to be significant if they are included in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in a qualified historical resource survey. Section 21084.1 of CEQA states that a project has a significant adverse environmental impact if the project causes a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

As defined under state law in Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 4850, the term "historical resource" means "any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or which is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural history of California." For the purposes of CEQA, "historical resource" is further defined under PRC Section15064.5 as a "resource listed in, or determined eligible for listing in the California Register." Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines sets forth the criteria and procedures for determining significant historical resources and the potential effects of a project on such resources. Generally, a cultural resource shall be considered by the lead state agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets any of the following criteria for listing in the CRHR:

1. the resource is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
2. the resource is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. the resource embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or represents the work of an important creative individual or possesses high artistic values; or
4. the resource has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The cited statutes and guidelines specify how cultural resources are to be managed in the context of projects such as the proposed project. Briefly, archival and field surveys must be conducted, and identified cultural resources must be inventoried and evaluated in prescribed ways. Prehistoric and historical resources deemed "historically significant" must be considered in project planning and development.

Significant paleontological resources are defined as fossils or assemblages of fossils that are unique, unusual, rare, uncommon, or important to define a particular time frame or geologic strata, or add to an existing body of knowledge in specific areas, in local formations or regionally. Paleontological remains are accepted as non-renewable resources significant to our culture and, as such, are protected under provisions of the Antiquities Act of 1906 and subsequent related legislation, policies, and enacting responsibilities.

In California, fossil remains are considered to be limited, nonrenewable, and sensitive scientific resources. These resources are afforded protection under the following State of California legislation (California Office of Historic Preservation 1983):

- CEQA;
- 13 PRC, Section 21000 et seq., which requires public agencies and private interests to identify the potential adverse impacts and/or environmental consequences of their proposed project(s) to any object or site important to the scientific annals of California (Division 1, PRC: 5020.1[b]);
- Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA (as amended 1 January 1999); and

- State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3), which provides protection for historical (or paleontological) resources by requiring that they be identified and mitigated as historical resources under CEQA. The State CEQA Guidelines define historical resources broadly to include any object, site, area, or place that a lead agency determines to be historically significant.

STATE HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION 7050.5

Human remains are also sometimes associated with archaeological sites. According to CEQA, "archaeological sites known to contain human remains shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5." State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that if human remains are exposed during construction no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to PRC 5097.98. Construction must halt in the area of the discovery of human remains, the area must be protected, and consultation and treatment should occur as prescribed by law. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner must contact the NAHC within 24 hours. If Native American human remains are discovered during project construction, it will be necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials that are under the jurisdiction of the NAHC (PRC Section 5097). For remains of Native American origin, no further excavation or disturbance shall take place until: the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American(s) has made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work regarding means of treating or disposing of the human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity, as provided in the PRC Section 5097.98; or the NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendant or the descendant fails to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the NAHC. In consultation with the most likely descendant, the project archaeologist and the project proponent will determine a course of action regarding preservation or excavation of Native American human remains, and this recommendation will be implemented expeditiously. If a most likely descendent cannot be located or does not make a recommendation, the project archaeologist and the project proponent will determine a course of action regarding preservation or excavation of Native American human remains, which will be submitted to the NAHC for review prior to implementation.

CITY OF ANAHEIM REGULATIONS

The City of Anaheim has no specific mechanisms, such as a historic preservation ordinance or preservation element as part of its general plan, for the recognition and preservation of cultural resources within its boundaries. In addition, the city's general plan does not contain any goals or policies that specifically address archaeological and paleontological resources.

Chapter 4. Cultural Background

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The project area is located on the coastal side of the cismontane portion of the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province that extends from Los Angeles County to Baja California. The Santa Ana Range, uplifted along the Whittier-Elsinore fault, is a prominent feature of the skyline between Orange and Riverside Counties. The highest point, at 5,678 feet above mean sea level, is Santiago Peak. This peak and its near neighbor, Modjeska Peak, form a saddle-shaped prominence known as Saddleback (Schoenerr 1992). The project area is located within the Central Block portion of the Los Angeles Basin. The Central Block is a trough filled with thousands of feet of Quaternary and Tertiary sediments. The project area was formed by stream deposits primarily derived from the meandering of the Santa Ana River (Brown 2003). The project area is located in Township 4 South, Range 10 West, Section 25 of the Anaheim, CA 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle map at an elevation of 150 feet above mean sea level.

The surficial sediments where the project site is located were identified as Quaternary Younger Alluvium that is Holocene in age (10,000 to recent). Holocene deposits are too geologically recent to contain fossils and have thus been assigned a low paleontological sensitivity level. However, fossiliferous older Quaternary sediments potentially underlie the Holocene deposits at various depths in the area, as part of the floodplain deposits from the Santa Ana River adjacent the project site to the east. Though these deposits do not usually contain significant vertebrate fossils, at least in the uppermost layers, there has been the recovery of a vertebrate fossil locality in the general vicinity. Therefore, deep excavation work may encounter vertebrate fossils.

PREHISTORIC BACKGROUND

The prehistoric occupation of southern California is divided chronologically into four temporal phases or horizons (Moratto 1984).

Horizon I, or the Early Man Horizon, began at the first appearance of people in the region approximately 12,000 years ago, and continued until about 5,000 B.C. Although little is known about these people, it is assumed that they were semi-nomadic and subsisted primarily on game.

Horizon II, also known as the Millingstone Horizon or Encinitas Tradition, began around 5,000 B.C. and continued until about 1,500 B.C. The Millingstone Horizon is characterized by widespread use of milling stones (manos and metates), core tools, and few projectile points or bone and shell artifacts. This horizon appears to represent a diversification of subsistence

activities and a more sedentary settlement pattern. Archaeological evidence suggests that hunting became less important and that reliance on collecting shellfish and vegetal resources increased (Moratto 1984).

Horizon III, the Intermediate Horizon or Campbell Tradition, began around 1,500 B.C. and continued until about A.D. 600–800. Horizon III is defined by a shift from the use of milling stones to increased use of mortar and pestle, indicating a greater reliance on acorns as a food source. Projectile points become more abundant and, together with faunal remains, indicate increased use of both land and sea mammals (Moratto 1984).

Horizon IV, the Late Horizon, which began around A.D. 600–800 and terminated with the arrival of Europeans, is characterized by dense populations; diversified hunting and gathering subsistence strategies, including intensive fishing and sea mammal hunting; extensive trade networks; use of the bow and arrow; and a general cultural elaboration (Moratto 1984).

ETHNOGRAPHY BACKGROUND

The project area lies within the territory of the Gabrielino Native American people (Bean and Smith 1978). The Gabrielino are characterized as one of the most complex societies in native southern California, second perhaps only to the Chumash, their coastal neighbors to the northwest. This complexity derives from their overall economic, ritual, and social organization (Bean and Smith 1978:538; Kroeber 1925:621).

The Gabrielino, a Uto-Aztecan (or Shoshonean) group, may have entered the Los Angeles Basin as recently as 1,500 B.P. In early protohistoric times, the Gabrielino occupied a large territory, including the entire Los Angeles Basin. This region encompasses the coast from Malibu to Aliso Creek, parts of the Santa Monica Mountains, the San Fernando Valley, the San Gabriel Valley, the San Bernardino Valley, the northern parts of the Santa Ana Mountains, and much of the middle to the lower Santa Ana River. They also occupied the islands of Santa Catalina, San Clemente, and San Nicolas. Within this large territory were more than 50 residential communities with populations ranging from 50 to 150 individuals. The Gabrielino had access to a broad and diverse resource base. This wealth of resources, coupled with an effective subsistence technology, well developed trade network, and ritual system, resulted in a society that was among one of the most materially wealthy and culturally sophisticated cultural groups in California at the time of contact.

The Gabrielino, Juaneño, and Luiseño (of whom the Juaneño are a subgroup) have a history of interaction and border one another's territories at Aliso Creek (Bean and Shipek 1978; Bean and Smith 1978). The Gabrielino and Juaneño are linguistically related as well, forming separate languages under the Cupan group of the Takic language family (Shipley 1978). In addition, the intrusion of Spanish missionaries and subsequent forced relocations of southern California Indians resulted in polyethnic native communities (Bean and Smith 1978). One such community, Genga, was located in the Upper Newport Bay vicinity, according to San Juan Capistrano Mission records (Strudwick 1996). The community of Genga was occupied by Gabrielinos, Juaneños, and Luiseños (Altschul, Gregory, and Doolittle 1998).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Spanish occupation of California began in 1769, at San Diego. Mission San Gabriel was established in the Los Angeles Basin in 1771, and the Los Angeles Pueblo was established as a civilian settlement on September 4, 1781. The Spanish colonization effort of present-day California in the mid-18th century focused on three institutions: the "presidio," the "pueblo," and the mission.

- The presidio was a military base. The Spanish government sent military expeditions to California to explore the region for harbors that could provide secure sites for the presidios. The first recorded contact between the Spanish and the Gabrielino in the Orange County area was during Gaspar de Portola's expedition to Monterey in 1769. The presidios were important for the colonization of an area and the protection of settlers.
- Pueblos were civil settlements that supplied agricultural products and provided an example of proper Spanish society to the natives.
- The missions were the central economic units of the colonial system. The goal of the mission system was to convert the native peoples to Catholicism, gain control of the native population, and establish self-sufficient communities.

The military presence of the presidios supported the missions with a force of arms that helped control the native people. Despite a high death rate among the native population, the combination of the mission priests and the military worked to make the missions productive institutions for many years. In 1776, Franciscan missionaries established Mission San Juan Capistrano, though construction of the mission did not begin until 1797; completion was in 1806. By the early 1800s, Spanish army officers and veterans began receiving large land grants and established cattle ranches or ranchos. In 1809, Jose Antonio Yorba and Juan Pablo Peralta were granted land east of the Santa Ana River, titled Rancho Santiago de Santa Ana. The Yorba and Peralta families raised cattle on their land for a half-century.

In 1821, Mexico won independence from Spain and subsequently became a republic of states. In 1833, the Mexican government secularized the missions and began to redistribute the mission land holdings. The land was redistributed in the form of land grants to individuals who promised to work the land, primarily by raising cattle. Although secularization was intended to distribute the mission lands to the settlers and native population, the large-scale cattle ranchers or rancheros claimed the bulk of the resources, and few Native Americans received land grants. These cattle ranches became the driving force in the economy and the dominant culture of California, including in present Orange County. At the end of the war between Mexico and the United States in 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed, giving control of California to the United States. In 1850, California was admitted as a state of the Union.

Orange County

California counties were delineated in 1850. The 500 residents located in the Santa Ana Valley, of what is now known as Orange County, were included at the time within the

boundaries of Los Angeles County. But as the population and wealth of the Santa Ana Valley began to grow, so too did the sentiment for the formation of a separate and distinct county. A trip to the Los Angeles County seat took many hours over uncertain dirt roads, and there was a growing resentment that the taxes being sent to Los Angeles were not being returned in a fair share of public works (Gass 1988). In 1870, Maximilian Strobel, a resident of the town of Anaheim, introduced to the state legislature a proposal for all the territory south of the San Gabriel River to separate from Los Angeles and become Anaheim County. The proposal was approved by the assembly but died in the senate. However, the concept had so much local support and appeal it would not go away. Over the next 15 years there were half a dozen other attempts to organize a coalition for separation. Names suggested for the new county included Santa Ana, Anaheim, and Orange. These proposals met with opposition in Sacramento, primarily from Los Angeles, which did not want to lose a part of its tax base. In the next round of proposals for county formation, the northern boundary was lowered from the San Gabriel River to Coyote Creek, and in 1889 the proposal was approved for the creation of Orange County. In the same year, the City of Santa Ana was selected by vote as the Orange County seat (Gass 1988).

City of Anaheim

The colony of Anaheim was originally within the southeast portion Los Angeles County before Orange County became its own entity in 1889. The project of fellow Germans Otto Weyse, John Frohling, and George Hansen, Anaheim was founded in 1857 as a German cooperative colony with most of its original settlers relocating, like its three founders, from San Francisco. The land on which the colony was made was originally part of the San Juan Cajon de Santa Ana rancho belonging to Don Bernardo Yorba, who later sold it to Don Pacifico Ontiveras. The 1,165-acre land was purchased by Hansen from Ontiveras for $2,330, $2.00 per acre. Along with an earlier similar colony established in San Bernardino by Mormons, Anaheim was considered one the most successful Southern California start-up colonies of the 19th century (Dickson 1918). Although initially the colony was centered on grapes and winemaking, only one farmer was of the fifty original settlers, which included watch makers, a poet, a musician, a book binder, and a shoe maker, among others (Dickson 1918:30; Merrit 1921). George Hansen was a civil engineer and had surveyed the land on which the colony would be constructed. The city's name is a composition of "Ana" from the nearby Santa Ana River and "heim," German for home.

An early distinguishing feature of the colony was a fence that wrapped its entire perimeter made of 40,000 willow poles spaced 2 feet apart from one another that had taken root to become a living wall and was laterally woven to give the appearance of a stockade (Merrit 1921). As settlers first arrived, Anaheim's first buildings included a 40-foot by 25-foot two-story adobe that may have been pre-existing and was used as a school and assembly hall, the house and office of George Hansen, a store owned by fellow original settler August Langenberger, and a shed used for a butcher shop (Dickson 1918). The Anaheim Colony was accessed by four gates set within the surrounding willow wall at each of the four cardinal points. The North Gate is still preserved today at 775 N. Anaheim Boulevard and has been designated as a California State Landmark (The Planning Center 2003). Today this area of the original colony

comprises the city's downtown and surrounding historic neighborhoods bound by North, South, East, and West Streets.

In its early years, the Anaheim Colony was considered a significant regional wine-growing district, and its vineyard business was called "The Los Angeles Vineyard Company" (Merrit 1921). The company acquired an irrigation easement over Bernardo Yorba's Rancho Canon de Santa Ana that included water rights from the Santa Ana River, and the vineyards were irrigated by a 7.1-mile-long zanja connecting the colony to the river (Schultz 1988 and Merritt 1921). The zanja was dug by fifty Native American Indians, who called the colony "Camp Aleman" ("German Camp").

Hansen divided the community-owned land into vineyard and town lots, devised an irrigation system, and supervised the planting of 400,000 grape vines and many fruit trees (Schultz 1988). The vineyard society conveyed its water rights and irrigation ditches, including the easement from the Santa Ana River, to the Anaheim Water Company. However, this eventually led to hostility and litigation over the use of the water for agricultural purposes. The problems were solved in 1884 with the formation of the Anaheim Union Water Company, incorporating the companies involved in the litigation.

The Anaheim Lighters Company was formed in 1864 and was Orange County's first commercial port at Anaheim Landing, now in Seal Beach, where coastal steamers made weekly stops. By 1869, the Anaheim Wine Growers Association had established depots in San Francisco and New York City to market their product (Schultz 1988).

An 1881 plague decimated the vineyards and in their place almond, walnut, fig, lemon, and notably orange trees were planted (Dickson 1918). The first commercially grown oranges in Orange County were grown in Anaheim, where the growers attributed their success to the local hills, which protected the fruit against the cold winds coming down from the mountains (The Planning Center 2003).

The Southern Pacific Railroad arrived in Anaheim in January of 1875, and the city was incorporated on December 6 of the following year with a population of 881. It was with the appearance of the Santa Fe Railroad in 1887 that Anaheim would see some of the growth experienced by other regions of the southland resulting from the competition between Santa Fe and the Southern Pacific railroad (Merritt 1921). In 1887, the Santa Fe Railroad began plans for the "Surf Line," which would connect Los Angeles to San Diego, running along the Pacific Coast much of the way, and serve as Santa Fe's primary line between these two cities. The line, a portion of which today is located near Angel Stadium, was completed on August 12, 1888 (Duke and Kister 1963).

By 1900, Anaheim had a population of 1,568 people and was a closely knit agricultural community (Westcott 1990). Of all of its various crops, including the chili pepper, which had been grown in abundance in the city from 1890 onward, it was the Valencia Orange that became the city's primary export during this time and throughout the remainder of the twentieth century's first half. The Santa Fe railroad used another of its Orange County lines through the Santa Ana Canyon to San Bernardino and points eastward to ship out oranges grown in Anaheim

and the rest of Orange County (Westcott 1990). Vehicle access from Anaheim to Los Angeles and San Diego was greatly improved with the single-lane paving of the El Camino Real and its designation as U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101) in 1926. By the 1940s, Anaheim's biggest claim was the calling of its name in an oft-repeated skit on the nationally broadcast Jack Benny radio show where Mel Blanc played a Union Station conductor announcing a train leaving for "Anaheim, Azusa, and Cucamonga!"

The Post World War II period was a remarkable boom time for the history of Anaheim. Keenly sensing that a massive wave of transplants was just about to move westward, Anaheim city leaders acted fast in the immediate post-war years to maximize the city's growth potential. In 1945 the City of Anaheim hired Earnest "Earne" Moeller as the manager of its chamber of commerce and in 1950 hired Keith Murdock as city administrator; Murdock later became city manager from 1956 to 1976. Together with Charles Pearson, who served as mayor from 1936 to 1959, these three men are credited with the massive growth of the city, which at one time was the fastest in the United States (Westcott 1990). To facilitate rapid development, the City of Anaheim created various measures including a "super stamp" system in which developers could begin work immediately without plan checks, subject to fixing deficiencies that may be found in later inspections. Aided by the super stamp system, developers constructed numerous housing tracts in the city with thousands of single-family homes, predominately of the Ranch style.

Anaheim city leaders aggressively pursued industry during the post-war era and set aside 20% of the city's land for it (Westcott 1990). The city's first major industrial employer in the post-war era was Kitset locks, which brought 600 jobs to the area beginning in 1948 (Westcott 1990). Northrop became the first aerospace company to establish an electronics division anywhere in southern California when it opened Nortronics Anaheim Division off of Orangethorpe Avenue in 1951 on land that city had only recently annexed (Scott 1993).

The four-lane I-5 freeway was completed in 1954 on what was U.S. 101 through Anaheim, and, like U.S. 101 once did before, it facilitated exposure and easier travel between Anaheim and other major cities. The following year, the crowning moment of Anaheim's post World War II history came on July 18, 1955 when Disneyland theme park, which would become a world-renowned tourist attraction, opened its doors to the public. Only seven weeks after it opened, the park would record its one millionth visitor. The facilitation of Disneyland's construction in Anaheim—it was almost built in Burbank—is largely credited to Earne Moeller and a team under him, who sold Disney on Anaheim and who also helped facilitate the simultaneous selling of numerous citrus and other farms upon which Disneyland would be constructed (Reoyan 2008). Of its five sister resorts and eleven theme parks between them, Disneyland is the only park entirely within the limits of one city (Reoyan 2008). Anaheim and Disney have long had a consistently close relationship over time.

Throughout the 1950s Anaheim boomed and the citrus and other agriculture that previously defined the city began to disappear. Aggressive annexation increased the size of Anaheim from 2,750 acres in 1947 to 20,000 acres by 1960 (Westcott 1990). From 1950 to 1960, the population of Anaheim skyrocketed 615.7% from 14,556 to 104,184 (Center for Demographic Research 2002). Throughout the 1950s Anaheim and the rest of north Orange County saw a vast expansion of the electronics industry. Hughes opened a major plant in

Fullerton in 1957, and Rockwell opened an electronics plant in Anaheim in 1959. Associated suppliers and related manufacturers opened in conjunction with these companies. By the 1960s and 1970s Orange County had become one of the "[g]reat high technology industrial districts" (Center for Demographic Research 2002).

Primarily because of Disneyland, tourism became a significant economic generator for the city. By 1961 Anaheim was hosting 5 million visitors per year (Luskey 1960). In 1966, Anaheim Stadium, a 45,000-seat ballpark largely funded by the City of Anaheim, became home to the California Angels major league baseball team. An expansion team began in 1961 and was owned by cowboy singer Gene Autry. Prior to calling Anaheim home, the Angels shared Chavez Ravine with the Los Angeles Dodgers—an arrangement that was less than appealing for Autry. Anaheim Stadium was built on 150 acres of former citrus and walnut groves (Westcott 1990). The Angels played their first game in the park on April 9, 1966—an exhibition game that they lost to the San Francisco Giants. Shortly after its opening, the ballpark would become popularly known as "The Big A" for the 230-foot-tall A-shaped scoreboard behind the park's left field area. The scoreboard, which is topped by a 70-foot-diameter halo, mimics the team logo. The Big A scoreboard was the tallest scoreboard ever made and, at 1 million dollars, was one of the most expensive (Anaheim Bulletin 1966). Relocated to a site adjacent the 57 freeway, the sign is a familiar icon for Anaheim and Orange County.

To further capitalize on the local tourism base, in July 1967 the city opened the Anaheim Convention Center across the street from and to the south of Disneyland. Designed by Adrian Wilson Associates, the Anaheim Convention Center was one of the largest such facilities in the country. The complex featured a sculpted, space-age, circular arena with stylized brackets on its roof, each forming the letter A. Like the Big A sign and Disneyland's Matterhorn Mountain, which is readily visible from Interstate 5, the Anaheim Convention Center arena serves as a readily visible landmark associated with Anaheim's post-war boom period.

Throughout the 1970s Anaheim continued its annexations, largely eastward into the Santa Ana Canyon, where the upscale planned community of Anaheim Hills was constructed beginning in 1971. By the 1970s, as in many other major cities, Anaheim's inner city was struggling. Two urban renewal projects—Project Alpha (1973) and Project Omega (1975)—achieved varying degrees of both success and community resistance (Westcott 1990). Though beginning much earlier, a rapid influx of Hispanic immigrants into Anaheim occurred throughout the 1970s. As of the 2000 census, Hispanic immigrants comprised 47% of the city's population, which was larger than any other racial group (Center for Demographic Research 2000). The majority of Anaheim's Hispanic immigrants are from Mexico. Among these are many from the village (rancho) of El Cargadero located in Jerez de Garcia Salinas, Zacatecas, Mexico (Arellano 2008). The majority of this rancho's descendants relocated to Anaheim in a migration that first began in 1918 by individuals fleeing the Mexican Revolution (Arellano 2008). Many initially worked in the citrus fields and then later work in the city's industrial corridor.

In 1993, the new Disney-owned Mighty Ducks hockey team began playing in a newly completed arena called the Arrowhead Pond of Anaheim (today called the Honda Center), and in 2001 Disney opened a second theme park just below Disneyland called Disney's California Adventure. The opening of this park coordinated with the renovation and rebranding of the

immediate vicinity, which is today called the Disneyland Resort, around the two adjacent parks. In the recent past, Anaheim has continued an upward trend in population growth. From 1990 to 2000—the year of the last U.S. census, of cities with populations over 300,000, Anaheim was the number one city in California and number eight nationally in population growth, with an increase of 23.1% (Center for Demographic Research 2000).

Chapter 5. Survey Methodology

As part of the Phase 1 archaeological resources survey work, ICF Jones & Stokes conducted the following:

- an archaeological records search at the SCCIC;
- a review of the sacred lands files maintained by the NAHC;
- Native American consultation;
- a paleontological records search at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Vertebrate Paleontology Section; and
- a field survey of the project area.

These tasks are described below.

RECORDS SEARCH RESULTS

On September 16, 2009, an archaeological records search was conducted at the SCCIC, located at California State University, Fullerton, for the proposed project area. This search included a review of the following sources:

- all available cultural resources surveys and site records recorded at the SCCIC,
- the NRHP,
- the CRHR,
- the California Inventory of Historic Resources,
- California Historical Landmarks, and
- California Points of Historical Interest.

Historic maps and historic aerial photographs of the project area were reviewed as well. The results of the records search indicate that 35 surveys have been conducted within a 1-mile radius of the project site limits. Only one of these, a study conducted in 1975, was located within the project site. Two cultural resources (30-100402 and 30-176663/176664) have been recorded within a 1-mile radius. The BNSF Railway line (30-176663/176664) is within the project site boundaries.

- **30-100402:** An isolated granite mano (Jones 2007). Not considered a historic or unique archaeological resource.
- **30-176663/176664:** BNSF Railway (Formerly Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe). The rail line was recorded in 2002 and, despite the majority of the rail line dating back to the 1880s, it was found that due to more than 100 years of continuous operation, the

rail line retained very little of the characteristics that reflect its historic origin. It was therefore found to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP (Tang and Ballester 2002a and 2002b). The site would not be eligible for listing on the CRHR for these same reasons.

Two archaeological monitoring projects were conducted less than 1/8 mile north of the current project site. In 2002, during archaeological monitoring of construction activities, a large fragment of a Late Prehistoric era mortar or bowl was recovered. The artifact was found in fill material, and its original context was unknown (Kelly, Corsetti, and Brown 2002). During this same monitoring project skeletal remains of a horse were identified buried under approximately one foot of dirt. It was determined that the remains were recent and may have been associated with stables located nearby (Kelly, Corsetti, and Brown 2002). Based on the results of the monitoring project, archaeological monitoring of future excavations was recommended as well as a reevaluation of the sensitivity of the sediments by a qualified paleontologist (Kelly, Corsetti, and Brown 2002).

In 2003, archaeological monitoring for the Westwood College project was conducted. No cultural resources were identified during the monitoring program, but the report stated that due to "the archaeological sensitivity of the area, it is recommended that future ground disturbing activities be monitored by a qualified archaeologist" (Brown 2003).

SUMMARY OF NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

ICF Jones & Stokes contacted the NAHC and requested a review of the sacred lands files. The NAHC responded on September 10, 2009, stating that a search of their sacred lands database did not yield any sacred lands or traditional cultural properties within the immediate project area. The NAHC provided a list of twelve Native American contacts in Orange County. Letters describing the project area and indicating the project location were sent to these Native American representatives on September 11, 2009. No responses have been received as of November 13, 2009.

SUMMARY OF THE PALEONTOLOGICAL RECORDS SEARCH

A paleontological records search was conducted by Dr. Samuel McLeod of the Vertebrate Paleontology Section of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. According to Dr. McLeod, surficial sediments at the project site and in the surrounding area consist of younger terrestrial Quaternary Alluvium, with older terrestrial Quaternary sediments occurring at various depths, as part of the floodplain deposits from the Santa Ana River that flows adjacent to east of the project area. These deposits typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils in the uppermost layers. However, there is a vertebrate fossil locality, LACM 1652, along Rio Vista Avenue, south of Lincoln Avenue and just east of the project area that produced a fossil specimen of sheep, *Ovis*. The closest fossil locality in older Quaternary sediments is LACM 4943, situated almost due east of LACM 1652 along Fletcher Avenue east of Glassell

Street and east of the Santa Ana River. This locality produced a specimen of fossil horse, *Equus*, at a depth of 8–10 feet below the surface (McLeod 2009).

FIELD SURVEY

An archaeological reconnaissance survey of the project area was conducted by an ICF Jones & Stokes qualified archaeologist on September 16, 2009. The project area is developed with existing roads, SR-57, the Metrolink railroad and the BNSF railway alignment, commercial and industrial complexes, the Angel Stadium complex, and landscape vegetation. The Santa Ana River, which forms the eastern boundary of the project site, has been channelized. Ground surface visibility was poor to non-existent, with the majority of the project area being paved and heavily disturbed from development activities.

Chapter 6. Study Findings and Conclusions

CEQA SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

Archaeological Resources

Historic resources, which include prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, may be affected by land use changes and by visual, noise, or atmospheric intrusions beyond the project site. The CEQA Guidelines state that there would be a "substantial adverse change" in the significance of a historical resource when there is physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

- demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the CRHR, as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA; or
- demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to PRC Section 5020.1(k) or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1(g), unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant.

PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1 also address impacts to archaeological resources. These two codes operate independently to ensure that potential effects on archaeological resources are considered as part of the environmental review process. Section 21083.2 applies to "unique" archaeological resources, while Section 21084.1 applies to archaeological resources that are listed on or eligible for listing on the CRHR.

Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources are nonrenewable scientific and educational resources. The legislative framework that covers paleontological resources includes PRC Section 5097.5 and Appendix G (Environmental Checklist Form) of the CEQA Guidelines. Section 5097.5 prohibits the removal or destruction of vertebrate paleontological sites, or any other paleontological feature situated on public lands without prior approval of the public agency in control of those lands. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines includes paleontological resources under the general "Cultural Resources" heading. Projects subject to CEQA must determine whether the project would "directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource."

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

An archaeological records search was conducted at the SCCIC, located at California State University, Fullerton. A Phase I archaeological resources survey of the project area was conducted on September 16, 2009. No new surficial cultural resources were observed within the project area. However, even though the project area is currently urbanized, it is located in an alluvial outwash plain of the Santa Ana River that forms the eastern boundary of the project site. The project area in the past had been open land used for agricultural purposes. Before the channelization of the Santa Ana River, the project area was crossed by many tributaries and smaller creeks flowing from the canyons in a meandering northeast-to-southwest direction down to the coast. These abundant sources of water represent an ideal location for prehistoric and historic use. The flow of water and accumulation of sediments over time may have buried evidence of past occupations in the project area. Therefore, there is a potential for buried cultural resource deposits to exist beneath previously disturbed and developed land surfaces. Furthermore, previous archaeological studies conducted less than 1/8 mile from the project site have determined the vicinity to be sensitive for archaeological resources.

The results of the paleontological records search indicated that the study area/project site is located in an area that may contain the presence of such resources. Paleontological resources have been unearthed in the nearby area; therefore, mitigations are recommended to implement the proposed project.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Archaeological monitoring by a qualified archaeologist is recommended for all initial ground-disturbing construction-related activities. If cultural materials (prehistoric or historic artifacts) are encountered during construction, work will stop in the vicinity of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the material and recommend further action if necessary. Design of a treatment plan and consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer may be required to appropriately mitigate any unanticipated discoveries. Treatment measures typically include development of avoidance strategies, capping with fill material, or mitigation of impacts through data recovery programs, such as excavation or detailed documentation, or other mitigation measures, following standard archaeological procedures. During cultural resources monitoring, if the qualified archaeologist determines that the sediments being excavated are previously disturbed or unlikely to contain significant cultural materials, the archaeologist can specify that monitoring be reduced or eliminated. In accordance with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are exposed during construction, no further disturbance will occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC 5097.98. Construction must halt in the area of the discovery of human remains, the area must be protected, and consultation and treatment should occur as prescribed by law.

A qualified paleontological monitor will be on call during construction activities. If paleontological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work will stop within 50 feet of the find until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures. Treatment measures may include

full-time monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during construction-related ground-disturbing activities. The qualified paleontological monitor will retain the option of reducing monitoring if, in his or her professional opinion, the sediments being monitored were previously disturbed. Monitoring may also be reduced if potentially fossiliferous units are not present or, if present, are determined by qualified paleontological personnel to have a low potential to contain fossil resources. The monitor will be equipped to salvage fossils and samples of sediments as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and will be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. Recovered specimens will be prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation, which would include the washing of sediments to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates. Specimens will be curated into a professional, accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable storage. A report of findings, with an appended itemized inventory of specimens, will be prepared; this report will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts on paleontological resources.

Chapter 7. References Cited

Altschul, J.H., T.L. Gregory, and C.J. Doolittle.
1998 Cultural Setting and Previous Research. In House Pits and Middens: A Methodological Study of Site Structure and Formation Processes at CA-ORA-16, Newport Bay, Orange County, California, edited by D.R. Grenda, C.J. Doolittle, and J.H. Altschul, pp. 13-27. Technical Series No. 69. Statistical Research, Inc., Tucson, Arizona. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Anaheim (CA) Bulletin
1966 "Big Aggie". April 8.

Arellano, G.
2008 Orange County: A Personal History. New York: Scribner, 2008

Bean, L. J., and F.C. Shipek.
1978 Luiseño. In *California*, edited by Robert F. Heizer, pp. 550-563. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8. William C. Sturtevant, general editor, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Bean, L. J., and C. R. Smith.
1978 Gabrielino. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California*, R. F. Heizer (ed.), pp. 538–549. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

Brown, J. C.
2003 *Archaeological Monitoring During Excavations for the Westwood College Project, Anaheim, California*. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Center for Demographic Research.
2002 [City of Anaheim, CA.], Census 2000 Demographic Profile I: Public Law Summary File. Fullerton, CA: Center for Demographic Research, January.

Dickson, L. E.
1918 "The Founding and Early History of Anaheim, California." *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 11: Pp 26-37.

Duke, D., and S. Kister.
1963 *Santa Fe: Steel Rails through California.* San Marino, CA: Golden West Books.

Gass, M.
1988. The Formation of Orange County. In *A Hundred Years of Yesterdays: A Centennial History of the People of Orange County and Their Communities.* Esther R. Cramer, Keith A. Dixon, Diann Marsh, Phil Brigandi and Clarice A. Blamer, editors, pp. 36-37. The Orange County Centennial, Inc., Santa Ana, CA.

Jones, W.
2007. Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record for 30-100402. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Kelly, B, C. Corsetti, and J. C. Brown.
2002 Revised Archeological and Paleontological Monitoring Report for Arena Corporate Center Project, Orange County, California. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Kao, K.
"Orange County Freeways Information." *History of Orange County, California*. http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~kennyk/oc/articles/freeways.html.

Kroeber, A.
1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Bulletin 78, American Bureau of Ethnology. Reprinted in 1976, Dover Publications, Inc., New York.

Luskey Brothers.
1960 *Luskey's 1961 Anaheim Yellow Book*. Anaheim, CA: Luskey Brothers, c.1960.

McLeod, S. A., Ph.D. Vertebrate Paleontology,
2009 Paleontological Resources for the Proposed Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC), in the City of Anaheim, Orange County. September 14. Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.

Merritt, E.B.
1921 "The City of Anaheim" in Armor, Samuel. History of Orange County, CA with biographical sketches of the leading men and women of the county, who have been identified with the growth and development from the early days to the present time. Los Angeles: Historic Record Company.

Moratto, M. J.
1984 *California Archaeology*. Academic Press, Orlando, FL.

Reoyan, A.
2008 "Theme Park in the City: Disneyland and the Aesthetic of the 'Anaheim Resort'." Honors Thesis, Stanford University.

Schoenherr, A. A.
1992 *A Natural History of California*. California Natural History Guides No. 56. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, California.

Schultz, E. J.
1988 "Anaheim" in A Hundred Years of Yesterdays: A Centennial History of the People of Orange County and Their Communities. Esther R. Cramer, Keith A. Dixon, Diann Marsh, Phil Brigandi and Clarice A. Blamer, editors, pp. 70-73. The Orange County Centennial, Inc., Santa Ana, CA.

Scott, A. J.
1993 Technopolis: High-Technology Industry and Regional Development in Southern California. *Berkeley: University of California Press.*

Shipley, W.F.
1978 Native Languages of California. In Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California, R. F. Heizer (ed.), pp. 80-90. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

Strudwick, I.
1996 Department of Parks and Recreation Archaeological Site Record Update for 30-000196. On file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

Tang, T.B., and D. Ballester.
2002a Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record for 30-176663. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

2002b Department of Parks and Recreation Primary Record for 30-176664. On file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.

The Planning Center.
2003 Anaheim General Plan/ Zoning Code Update EIR. Costa Mesa, CA: The Planning Center.

Westcott, J.
1990 *Anaheim: City of Dreams.* Chatsworth, CA: Windsor Publications.

Appendix A. Native American Consultation

Appendix B. Paleontological Records Search

Appendix C. California Historical Resource Inventory List