

Attachment 1

Tribal Consultations

**Records of Communications/Meeting
Notes**

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION / MEETING NOTES

Materials Distributed

Agenda

Graphics of ground-penetrating radar results

Graphics of alternatives A, K, and L

CLIENT/AGENCY CONSULTATION:

PROJECT BRIEFING WITH HANK GOBIN, TULALIP TRIBES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2008, 3:00 PM – 5:00 PM

TULALIP CULTURAL RESOURCES OFFICES, TULALIP

- Hank Gobin, Tulalip Tribes, Cultural Resources Manager
- Margaret Kucharski, WSDOT/520 Environmental Lead
- Ken Juell, WSDOT/UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
- Phillip Narte, WSDOT/SR 520 Project Tribal Liaison
- Sharon Feldman, Consultant/SR 520 Built Environment Lead
- Paul Bucich, Consultant/SR 520 Stormwater Lead

Graphics of eastside project

Animations of ground-penetrating time slices

Program description map

Key Guidance and Input

As is described in more detail below, Hank Gobin, Tulalip Tribes Cultural Resources Manager, provided the following key guidance and input:

- Concerns include protection of the environment, avoidance of impacts associated with cultural and natural resources, and honor and respect of the tribes.
- Agencies and tribes should work together to update processes and improve procedures and consultation, particularly during the early phase.
- Project team should proceed with proposal for investigations on Foster Island.
- Tribe would not be able to provide a response regarding stormwater impacts to Foster Island. The Tribe needs more information about the area and particulars of the proposed stormwater facilities.

Meeting Notes

After introductions, Hank began the meeting by raising tribal concerns: avoidance of environmental impacts, protection of the environment, honor of the tribal history, and respect of the Tulalip

people. He understands that agencies need to follow processes and procedures; however, many of the procedures are more than 50 years old and do not reflect tribal interests. Hank stated that Washington State has the lowest level of environmental and cultural protection in the country, and tribes and agencies should work together to update these procedures. Hank mentioned protection of historic sites, tribal interests, water quality, runoff, and fisheries. He mentioned John McCoy's Bill #1495¹. He also talked about the need for tribes to be involved early during project scoping. This was specifically an issue on the development of the I-5 corridor.

Margaret thanked Hank for his time and input, and introduced the purpose of the meeting: to discuss the ground-penetrating radar results at Foster Island and the investigation's next steps, to discuss the SR 520 Bridge replacement options and potential impacts to Foster Island, and to obtain the Tribe's input.

Ground-Penetrating Radar (GPR)

Ken walked Hank through the presentation handouts describing the following: changes in the shape of Foster Island over the past 150 years, bathymetry differences documented on maps, GPR expert Dean Goodman's experience, GPR technology and software, and difference in time-slices and results of GPR.

GPR may prove useful at providing information about the shorelines of two historic islands that are now considered Foster Island, and the 250-foot wide geographic gap between them. The team is exploring the idea of moving the bridge alignment north to thread the roadway between the two historic islands. If possible, potential impacts to a Foster Island would be avoided or greatly minimized.

Due to understory vegetation, the open grassy area on Foster Island north of the 520 bridge was scanned. Ken pointed out three large areas that have no anomalies (in dark blue on the horizontal "time-slices"), and multiple, small red and orange-colored areas that are the anomalies. Ken added that the GPR team used two different antennas (270 and 400 MHz), and both provided very similar results – the distribution of anomalies and areas devoid of anomalies are identical. This suggests the GPR data is of high quality.

Ken described the next steps to learn more about the geomorphology of the historic shoreline of the north island through manual excavation in areas where GPR found no anomalies. Those areas, shown in dark blue, are least likely to have cultural features such as burials, because no disturbances displayed as anomalies are found within them. The area scanned by the GPR appears to cover the northern and western half of the historic north island. Once the shoreline elevation is identified and mapped on the western shore of the North Island, WSDOT can use the elevation data to

¹ This bill required that Washington's tribal history be taught in the common schools. Passed and signed into law in 2005.

extrapolate where the shoreline is on the south side of the North Island. That would identify the northern end of the 250-foot gap between the islands. The design then could study whether the main roadway alignment can be moved further north than planned and miss the two historic islands.

Charlie Hodges would lead the field work and Jones & Stokes would assist. Ken requested Hank's feedback on the proposal.

Phillip asked Hank about burials at Foster Island, particularly about whether Hank expected there to be burials below ground in the same place where individuals would have been originally placed as tree burials.

Hanks advised that tree burials likely stopped with the coming and influence of Catholic Missionaries beginning in 1859. Thereafter, most people would have been buried below ground in caskets. The small pox epidemics likely also resulted in mass graves, but also scattered bones on the surface when no one survived to bury the others. Such epidemics may have affected the type and numbers of burials at Foster Island.

The area may have also been used as a summer fishing camp.

Ken added that some tribal members did not relocate to reservations immediately in 1859, and could have continued to use the area for burials.

Hank approved of the project team's proposal to delineate the shoreline of the historic north island. He concurred with performing the excavation work as well as GPR work. The information would provide a sense of Seattle history and topography. He was concerned about how Foster Island had changed over the years with the water level impacts, and noted that tribal consultation was not performed during that time. He emphasized the importance of protection and enhancement of the environment – including stormwater, fisheries, habitat, and water quality. His concerns are not just tribal concerns, but are important to all people.

Supplemental Draft EIS Design Options and Stormwater

Using the graphics, Sharon and Paul described the design options developed through the mediation process. Currently, no stormwater treatment exists on the 520 Bridge, and the team is planning to include both basic and enhanced treatment. Paul explained that the team has information about salmon spawning areas and they are trying to avoid these areas. Paul focused on stormwater facilities that could be associated with those options.

Stormwater facility impacts could include installing a treatment facility at Foster Island, including a constructed wetland if the existing roadway alignment were available by moving the roadway to the north, pumping stormwater to a facility near MOHAI, or using Basic Treatment BMPs on the bridge and discharging into the Bay.

Options A and K would have the most impact or potential impact to Foster Island. Any stormwater option on Foster Island would require access for maintenance – either by road or barge.

Hank said that he could not respond regarding the appropriate level of impact to Foster Island. He said the project team needs more information about Foster Island to make sure the work would not have any effect.

Hank expressed interest in the natural resources issues, and requested the project team contact the fisheries department. Hank said he would follow up with an appropriate contact at the department.

Ken discussed the project team's goal to evaluate Foster Island as a traditional cultural property, and requested Hank's input about the island. Hank responded positively to the idea, but said he is unfamiliar with the history of the island. He expressed interest in a field work visit for himself or his staff.

Project Update

Margaret provided Hank with a few project updates, including that she has joined the SR 520 Program team and will continue to communicate with Hank. Steve Boch will be retiring from his position at FHWA, and the team will be assigned a new federal lead. Margaret briefly summarized the status and schedule of the SR 520 corridor projects, and noted that the team will be initiating tribal consultation on the SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project. The project team thanked Hank for the meeting, before adjourning.

Action Items

- Margaret will follow up with Hank about a field visit once a schedule is determined.
- Margaret will follow up with Hank about the Tribe's natural resources contact.

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION / MEETING NOTES

CLIENT/AGENCY CONSULTATION:

PROJECT BRIEFING WITH LAURA MURPHY AND KAREN WALTER, MUCKLESHOOT INDIAN TRIBE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2008, 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM

MUCKLESHOOT TRIBAL OFFICES, AUBURN

- Laura Murphy, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Archaeologist
 - Matina Brown, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Cultural Monitor
 - Karen Walter, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division, Watersheds/Land Use Team Leader
 - Margaret Kucharski, WSDOT/520 Environmental Lead
 - Ken Juell, WSDOT/UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
 - Phillip Narte, WSDOT/SR 520 Project Tribal Liaison
 - Sharon Feldman, Consultant/SR 520 Built Environment Lead
 - Paul Bucich, Consultant/SR 520 Stormwater Lead
-

Materials Distributed

Agenda

Graphics of ground-penetrating radar results

Graphics of alternatives A, K, and L

Graphics of eastside project

Program description map

Key Guidance and Input

As is described in more detail below, Laura Murphy and Karen Walter provided the following key guidance and input:

- Project team should proceed with proposal for investigations on Foster Island.
- Laura could not provide a response regarding impacts to Foster Island. She needs to follow up with the Committee, and advised that avoidance or minimization of impacts would be preferable. Karen said the Tribe could ask that the bridge alignment be elevated.

Meeting Notes

After introductions, Laura added that Warren KingGeorge could not attend the meeting, but he is interested in the cultural resources issues – especially the ground-penetrating radar results.

Margaret introduced the purpose of the meeting: to discuss the ground-penetrating radar results at Foster Island and the investigation's next steps, to discuss the SR 520 Bridge replacement options and potential impacts to Foster Island, and to obtain the

Tribe's input. Since the last team meeting with Laura was in 2005, Margaret provided a general status update of the SR 520 program.

Laura requested a summary of archaeological issues and assessment completed to date.

Ken explained that a Draft EIS, which included a cultural resources report, was released in August 2006. An inventory of historic resources was completed to support that documentation. Currently, the SR 520 corridor includes two separate, independent projects. On the west side of Lake Washington, historic resources include:

- Roanoke (neighborhood) Historic District,
- Montlake (neighborhood) Historic District,
- Chittenden Locks and Ship Canal District (listed, includes the Montlake Cut),
- Montlake Bridge
- NOAA NW Fisheries Building (contributes to Montlake District),
- Seattle Yacht Club and
- UW Canoe House.

On the east side, historic resources include two private homes and a school. For archaeological site identification, the project team performed shovel-probes and backhoe trenching in the ROW, and found and partially delineated the Miller Street Landfill. Elsewhere exposed probes and trenches found historic and recent fill directly over lakebed sediments or peat. No historic waterfront appears to be present in the 520 study area, although the possibility remains at the historic mouth of Arboretum Creek (on Lake Washington Blvd). A human patella was recovered from a shovel probe in the Miller Street Landfill. Hospital waste was found nearby, suggesting the kneecap was from an amputation. The Miller Street Landfill is the only known archaeological site in the SR 520 corridor.

Laura asked what happened with the patella.

Ken explained the bone was collected from the shovel probe, and then re-buried near the original location after a 2 by 2 meter excavation unit determined it was an isolated skeletal element.

Ken stated that the team intends to evaluate Foster Island as a traditional cultural property, and to investigate the historic shoreline at the mouth of east Arboretum Creek where Charlie Chesiahud is said to have had a longhouse. WSDOT wants to know if the longhouse is in the ground disturbance area, once the latter becomes fully known

Ken explained that for the Pontoon Project, IDD #1 had been fully investigated for archaeological resources. Significant Native American resources are not likely because the site historically was intertidal and upper subtidal, and a sonic-coring program demonstrated that it was always so during the last 9,000 years or so.

There is a Hooverville in the northern quarter of the property, which would be fully investigated if the property is selected as the preferred alternative.

Laura asked if the SR 520 corridor area had been studied sufficiently. Ken responded positively, but said the next step was to further investigate the existing resources - Foster Island and Miller Street Landfill.

Ground-Penetrating Radar (GPR)

Ken walked Laura and Karen through the presentation handouts describing the following: changes in the shape of Foster Island over the past 150 years, bathymetry differences documented on maps, GPR expert Dean Goodman's experience, GPR technology and software, and difference in time-slices and results of GPR.

GPR may prove useful at providing information about the shorelines of two historic islands that are now considered Foster Island, and the 250-foot wide geographic gap between them. The team is exploring the idea of moving the bridge alignment north to thread the roadway between the two historic islands. If possible, potential impacts to a Foster Island would be avoided or greatly minimized.

Laura asked how you can see underneath areas where GPR identifies anomalies. Ken explained that you can't see under the anomalies, such as the gravel path. Ken pointed out anomalies in the northwest corner of the survey area, and explained that those may be associated with the water table. Other anomalies may be natural features - log debris or root wads – or other.

Unfortunately elevation (z coordinates) was not recorded for the grid points and E-W transect end points prior to the GPR survey. It turns out that Goodman's software can correct for surface elevation and produce graphics that show true depth. Elevation-corrected graphics also can be used to do 3-dimensional shape analysis of the anomalies. Ken said WSDOT wants to produce elevation-corrected images and perform intensive shape analysis before exploring any anomalies. WSDOT will also consult with all the concerned tribes prior to excavating into any anomalies.

The team proposes that the next steps include: on-site topographic mapping to collect elevation data (z coordinates) of all grid intersections and E-W transect end points, so that GPR images can be used to explore stratigraphy and to do shape analysis. Ken also said WSDOT wants to do geomorphology in the northern Foster Island, entirely within the GPR scanned area, to identify the location and depth of the historic shoreline(s) of what was the North Island. The geomorphology would involve excavating narrow trenching to expose stratigraphy to look for the shorelines (probably identified as sloping lines of pebbles and sands, larger particles tossed in the surf). Because of understory vegetation, WSDOT scanned what appears to be the north and western half of the historic North Island.

Once the shoreline is identified and mapped in fine detail on the west side, the position of the shoreline around the southern end of the North Island could be extrapolated. WSDOT then can know where the northern end of the gap is between the North and South Islands, and see if the mainline can be realigned to go between the two historic islands. All geomorphology trenches would be excavated in the “dark blue” areas shown on the GPR maps – areas of very low to no return of radar waves. The probability of encountering cultural features, such as burials, would be very low in the dark blue areas, because no anomalies are located there.

Laura said the GPR information is interesting and cutting-edge. She asked how the project can be sure about the data.

Ken said the fact that two different radar antennae were used – 270 an 400 MHz – and that they produced highly similar distributions of anomalies and areas devoid of anomalies suggests that data quality is high. If WSDOT were to encounter a burial, however, they would stop immediately and notify the tribes. WSDOT would not want to move the burial until it is determined it could not be avoided. The tribes also are welcome to observe any and all fieldwork. Charlie Hodges will lead the field work and Jones & Stokes will assist.

Laura approved of the team’s proposal to further investigate areas that showed no anomalies in the GPR survey. She was also interested in an invitation to observe the field work activities.

Supplemental Draft EIS Design Options and Stormwater

Using the graphics, Sharon and Paul described the design options coming out of the mediation process. Paul focused on the stormwater facilities that could be associated with the three options, A, K, and L as of this date. Stormwater facility impacts could include installing a treatment facility at Foster Island, including a constructed wetland if the existing roadway alignment were available by moving the roadway to the north, pumping stormwater to a facility near MOHAI, or using Basic Treatment BMPs on the bridge and discharging into the Bay. This final option would not be able to meet the dissolved copper treatment requested by NMFS. Options A and K would have the most impact or potential impact to Foster Island. Any stormwater option on Foster Island would require access for maintenance – either by road or barge.

Laura emphasized that the severity of potential impacts was very different than the Tribe understood from several years ago. Previously, the Tribe understood the impacts on Foster Island would be limited to pier locations, and had agreed to those impacts, as long as the locations were explored for archaeological resources. Due to the potential change in impacts based on the three alternatives described, Laura would need to discuss the new design options with the Cultural Committee. She advised that avoidance or minimization of impacts would be preferable – such as under Option L.

Karen added that the Tribe could ask for a higher bridge alignment in the vicinity of Foster Island, different from the design options coming from the mediation group, which could change the need for stormwater facilities on Foster Island. She also added that a barge may minimize impacts to Foster Island but, in exchange, raise other environmental issues such as wetland impacts.

Margaret asked Laura what she needed from the team to prepare for the Committee meeting, such as graphics or project staff. Laura responded that assistance may be useful, such as a smaller group of project staff. The project team thanked Laura and Karen for the meeting, before adjourning.

Action Items

- Margaret will follow up with Laura about a field visit once a schedule is determined.
- Margaret will follow up with Laura about preparing for a Committee meeting, and about following up with Warren.

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION / MEETING NOTES

CLIENT/AGENCY CONSULTATION:

PROJECT BRIEFING WITH DENNIS LEWARCH, SUQUAMISH TRIBE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2008, 2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

520 PROGRAM OFFICES, SEATTLE

- Dennis Lewarch, Suquamish Tribe, THPO
 - Margaret Kucharski, WSDOT/520 Environmental Lead
 - Ken Juell, WSDOT/UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
 - Phillip Narte, WSDOT/SR 520 Project Tribal Liaison
 - Sharon Feldman, Consultant/SR 520 Built Environment Lead
 - Paul Bucich, Consultant/SR 520 Stormwater Lead
-

Materials Distributed

Agenda

Graphics of ground-penetrating radar results

Graphics of alternatives A, K, and L

Graphics of eastside project

Animations of ground-penetrating radar time slices

Program description map

Key Guidance and Input

As is described in more detail below, Dennis Lewarch, Suquamish Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), provided the following key guidance and input:

- Project team should proceed with proposal for investigations on Foster Island.
- Dennis does not consider Foster Island to be a TCP for the Suquamish Tribe. [To be confirmed internally with tribal staff].
- Dennis advised the team to minimize impacts and footprint on Foster Island – most importantly to human remains if any are located during further GPR / Archaeological analysis.

Meeting Notes

After introductions, Margaret introduced the purpose of the meeting: to discuss the ground-penetrating radar results at Foster Island and the investigation's next steps, to discuss the SR 520 Bridge replacement options and potential impacts to Foster Island, and to obtain the Tribe's input.

Dennis mentioned that Tom Ostrom was the fisheries contact at the Suquamish Tribe, and he would forward information from the meeting to Tom. In April, Tom had communicated that the Suquamish Tribe does not have usual & accustomed areas in Lake Washington and would defer to the Muckleshoot Tribe on fisheries issues. However, the Tribe was still interested in impacts to fisheries issues because they do fish on the Sound and the salmon travel to and from the Sound and Lake Washington. The Tribe does have treaty rights just outside of the Chittenden Locks in Shilshole.

Ground-Penetrating Radar (GPR)

Ken walked Dennis through the presentation handouts describing the following: changes in the shape of Foster Island over the past 150 years, bathymetry differences documented on maps, GPR expert Dean Goodman's experience, GPR technology and software, and difference in time-slices and results of GPR.

As the first phase of work, the open grassy area on Foster Island north of the 520 bridge was scanned. Areas in other parts of Foster Island have not been investigated because heavy understory vegetation would have to be removed prior to scanning. Ken pointed out three large areas that have no anomalies (in dark blue on the horizontal "time-slices"), and multiple, small red and orange-colored areas that are the anomalies. Ken added that the GPR team used two different antennas (270 and 400 MHz), and both provided very similar results – the distribution of anomalies and areas devoid of anomalies are identical. This suggests the GPR data is of high quality.

Ken explained that GPR may prove useful at providing information about the shorelines of two historic islands that are now considered Foster Island, and the 250-foot wide geographic gap between them. The team is exploring the idea of moving the bridge alignment north to thread the roadway between the two historic islands. If possible, potential impacts to Foster Island would be avoided or greatly minimized.

The area scanned by the GPR appears to cover the northern and western half of the historic North Island. Once the shoreline elevation is identified and mapped on the western shore of the North Island, WSDOT can use the elevation data to extrapolate where the shoreline is on the south side of the North Island.

For the second phase of work, Ken described the next steps to learn more about the geomorphology of the historic shoreline of the north island through manual excavation in areas where GPR found no anomalies. Those areas, shown in dark blue, are least likely to have cultural features such as burials, because no disturbances displayed as anomalies are found within them. Charlie Hodges would lead the field work and Jones & Stokes would assist.

The second work phase also would collect elevation data for the GPR grid points, so that the GPR data can be corrected for elevation. Then in the future 3-D shape analysis can be done on the anomalies to determine which ones should be carefully investigated by manual excavation.

Margaret asked Dennis for feedback on the proposal.

Dennis approved of the proposal and of the work that the team has been doing. He said that the Suquamish Tribe doesn't consider Foster Island to be a TCP associated with their Tribe. The Tribe did not bury their people on the Island; Suquamish burials would be located near Old Man House on Bainbridge Island. The Lakes Duwamish people would have used Foster Island. He said he would confirm that with Robert Purser and other tribal elders.

Phillip asked Dennis about burials at Foster Island, particularly about whether Dennis expected there to be burials below ground in the same place where individuals would have been originally placed as tree burials.

Dennis responded that tree burials probably stopped after the 1860s. He also mentioned that the small pox epidemics of the 1800s would have resulted in quick burials. The first small pox epidemics in the northwest started in the 1700s with the arrival of the Spanish.

Margaret said the field work is planned for early December to early January, and Dennis expressed interest in a field visit.

Supplemental Draft EIS Design Options and Stormwater

Margaret provided Dennis with some background about the mediation process. Using the graphics, Sharon described the three design options being developed through that process: A, K, and L. Paul focused on stormwater facilities that could be associated with those options. Currently, no stormwater treatment exists on the 520 Bridge, and the team is planning to include both basic and enhanced treatment.

Stormwater facility impacts could include installing a treatment facility at Foster Island, including a constructed wetland if the existing roadway alignment were available by moving the roadway to the north, pumping stormwater to a facility near MOHAI, or using Basic Treatment BMPs on the bridge and discharging directly into the Bay. Option L would have the least impact or potential impact to Foster Island. Any stormwater option on Foster Island would require access for maintenance.

Paul explained that the team has information about salmon spawning areas and they are trying to avoid these areas.

Margaret asked Dennis for his feedback about impacts to Foster Island.

Dennis responded that the team needs to obtain information about geomorphology in the area, to delineate the historic shorelines, and do more GPR scanning to help identify if burials exist. Overall, he advised the team to minimize impacts and footprint on Foster Island – most importantly to human remains. He agreed that because of low elevation topography, there is a low probability of finding human remains on the historic north island.

Project Update

Margaret provided Dennis with a few project updates. Margaret briefly summarized the status and schedule of the SR 520 corridor projects, and noted that the team will be initiating tribal consultation on the SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project. Dennis indicated that the Suquamish Tribe would not be as interested in areas east of Lake Washington, but asked the team to keep him updated. Margaret asked who would be the tribal contact regarding oral history interviews, and Dennis indicated that he is the point of contact and that he would identify who to interview.

Phillip added that the Tribe had expressed concern about the Pontoon Construction Project – specifically about moving pontoons through the locks during the salmon runs, and about storing the pontoons in the Puget Sound area.

The project team thanked Dennis for the meeting, before adjourning.

Action Items

- Margaret will follow up with Dennis about a field visit in early December.
- Dennis will follow up with Robert Purser about the Suquamish Tribe and Foster Island.
- Dennis will be the POC for the Suquamish Tribe for the oral history interviews.

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION / MEETING NOTES

CLIENT/AGENCY CONSULTATION:

PROJECT BRIEFING WITH STEVEN MULLEN AND MATT BAERWALD,
SNOQUALMIE TRIBE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 2008, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

SNOQUALMIE TRIBAL OFFICES, SNOQUALMIE

- Steven Mullen, Snoqualmie Tribe, GIS Assistant/Field Monitor (Cultural/Natural Resources Contact)
 - Matt Baerwald, Snoqualmie Tribe, Water Quality Specialist
 - Ray Mullen, Snoqualmie Tribe, Cultural Resources Director
 - Ken Juell, WSDOT/UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
 - Margaret Kucharski, WSDOT/520 Environmental Lead
 - Ken Juell, WSDOT/UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
 - Phillip Narte, WSDOT/SR 520 Project Tribal Liaison
 - Sharon Feldman, Consultant/SR 520 Built Environment Lead
 - Paul Bucich, Consultant/SR 520 Stormwater Lead
-

Materials Distributed

Agenda

Graphics of ground-penetrating radar results

Graphics of alternatives A, K, and L

Graphics of eastside project

Animations of ground-penetrating radar time slices

Program description map

Key Guidance and Input

As is described in more detail below, Steven Mullen, Snoqualmie Tribe provided the following key guidance and input:

- Project team should proceed with proposal for investigations on Foster Island.
- Ray Mullen and Steven Mullen advised to avoid the island or to minimize impacts. Steven advised not to pursue Option K. Ray Mullen stated the Tribe would see serious problems with Option K. The Tribe would accept a proposal that moves the alignment north to avoid the historic southern island.
- Steven Mullen is unaware of current tribal memories or uses of Foster Island. [To be confirmed with oral history records.]

Meeting Notes

After introductions, Margaret introduced the purpose of the meeting: to discuss the ground-penetrating radar results at Foster Island and the investigation's next steps, to discuss the SR 520 Bridge replacement options and potential impacts to Foster Island, and to obtain the Tribe's input.

Ground-Penetrating Radar (GPR)

Ken walked Steven through the presentation handouts describing the following: changes in the shape of Foster Island over the past 150 years, bathymetry differences documented on maps, GPR expert Dean Goodman's experience, GPR technology and software, and the results of GPR as shown in radargrams (profiles) and time-slices (horizontal or plan maps).

As the first phase of work, the open grassy area on Foster Island north of the 520 bridge was scanned. Areas in other parts of Foster Island have not been investigated because heavy understory vegetation would have to be removed prior to scanning. Ken pointed out three large areas that have no anomalies (in dark blue on the horizontal "time-slices"), and multiple, small red and orange-colored areas that are the anomalies. Ken added that the GPR team used two different antennas (270 and 400 MHz), and both provided very similar results – the distribution of anomalies and areas devoid of anomalies are identical. This suggests the GPR data is of high quality.

Ken explained that GPR may prove useful at providing information about the shorelines of two historic islands that are now considered Foster Island, and the 250-foot wide geographic gap between them. The team is exploring the idea of moving the bridge alignment north to thread the roadway between the two historic islands. If possible, potential impacts to historic Foster Island would be avoided or greatly minimized.

The area scanned by the GPR appears to cover the northern and western half of the historic North Island. Once the shoreline elevation is identified and mapped on the western shore of the North Island, WSDOT can use the elevation data to extrapolate where the shoreline is on the south side of the North Island.

Phillip asked Steven about burials at Foster Island, particularly about whether the Tribe knew anything about burials below ground versus tree burials.

Steven responded that he was unaware of any current tribal memories of Foster Island. The group discussed the influence of Christianity on burial practices. Steven mentioned the later post-treaty burials associated with the Snoqualmie Tribe would be located east of Lake Washington. They would have abandoned use of the west side of Lake Washington in favor

of Lake Sammamish, and that ground burials would be more likely found in the latter vicinity.

Steven suggested that the Duwamish Tribe may have more information, and asked if the project team had contacted the Tribe. Ken explained that the project had met the Chairwoman Hansen prior to the GPR work, that she had approved the work, and that the 520 team is intending to meet with Chairwoman Hansen to present results and ask for comment on the next phase of geoarchaeological work on Foster Island.

For the second phase of work, Ken described the next steps to learn more about the geomorphology of the historic shoreline of the north island through manual excavation in areas where GPR found no anomalies. Those areas, shown in dark blue, are least likely to have cultural features such as burials, because no disturbances displayed as anomalies are found within them. Charlie Hodges would lead the field work and Jones & Stokes would assist. The field work is planned around December and January. The geomorphology fieldwork is intended to identify stratigraphic positioning of the historic shoreline of the northern island. That would potentially be enough information for the design engineers to use to explore realignment of the new main roadway.

Margaret asked the Tribe for feedback on the proposal.

Steven supported the proposal and confirmed interest in a field visit. He expressed interest in the technology, and he remarked how it's changed archaeology and made subsurface investigations more certain.

Ken said he thought the approach was extremely useful because it changed the search for subsurface cultural features, including burials if present, from one of random sampling to one of strategic design. Instead of excavating a series of random excavation units, archaeologists could carefully explore the anomalies because they could "see" where they were before beginning to excavate.

Supplemental Draft EIS Design Options and Stormwater

Margaret provided some background about the mediation process. Using the graphics, Sharon described the three design options being developed through that process: A, K, and L. Paul focused on stormwater facilities that could be associated with those options. Currently, no stormwater treatment exists on the 520 Bridge, and the team is planning to include both basic and enhanced treatment.

Stormwater facility impacts could include installing a treatment facility at Foster Island, including a constructed wetland if the existing roadway alignment were available by moving the roadway to the north, pumping stormwater to a facility near MOHAI, or using Basic Treatment BMPs on the bridge and discharging directly into the Lake. Option L would have the least impact or potential impact to Foster Island. Any stormwater option on Foster Island would require

access for maintenance – likely via road. Recently, the team determined a barge would likely not be feasible on the east and west of Foster Island due to shallow water and extensive aquatic vegetation. Access on the North Island would require building a landing and roadway across the island to the treatment facilities. Paul mentioned that the team was exploring options for innovative stormwater treatment as well.

Matt asked about the water quality event that the stormwater system will be designed for on the structure.

Paul responded that it would be designed to treat 91% of a 2-year event, anything else would be discharged directly into the Lake without treatment.

Margaret asked Steven for his feedback about impacts to Foster Island.

Phillip mentioned that this is not the only chance for tribal comment. The options would be going through the environmental process and a Supplement Draft EIS would be released for public comment.

Margaret confirmed that a Supplemental Draft EIS would be released at the end of 2009. She also clarified that the project team came to obtain early feedback from the tribe to be considered as the team moves forward and to assist with identifying fatal flaws.

Steven's preference was avoidance (i.e. divert traffic around the Lake or reinstate the ferry system across); however, he understood that was not feasible for the project team. He suggested not building Option K, because it would have the most disturbance. Ray Mullen requested the project leave the island alone. However – if the project could move the alignment north of the south island, the tribe could accept that because the realignment would avoid the two historic islands.

Chairman Joseph Mullen passed by the meeting in progress and stayed and listened for 10 to 15 minutes. During the presentation of design Options, he asked Ken Juell if the tunnels across Foster Island had been removed from design. Ken said yes they had. The Chairman said "That's good", expressing relief with that decision.

Sharon asked about the Tribe's feelings of Foster Island's nomination as a traditional cultural property. Ray said that the Tribe would support the idea.

Margaret asked about the Tribe's connection to Foster Island and it's meaning for the Tribe. Ray mentioned that there are some stories of travel through that area but he had nothing in writing, just vague memories of discussions with tribal elders. Ray and Steven could not recall who told the stories.

Ken asked if tribal members use the area.

Ray couldn't provide a definitive response and doesn't know of any recent activities, but he noted that Foster Island is an area of concern for elders. The Snoqualmie creation story is not associated with Foster Island. Steven suggested that the area may be more utilized by the Duwamish Tribe. Steven and Ray offered to check and follow up about tribal connection to the island. He mentioned that they will be moving their archives, which could provide an opportunity to look through them for references to Foster Island.

Phillip said that if the project were to go through the nomination process, the project would need oral history information from tribal members.

Margaret mentioned that the project would be doing additional oral history interviews over the next year and asked who the appropriate contact person was. Steven said it should be him.

Project Update

Margaret said that the team recently initiated tribal consultation on the SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, and Steven confirmed receiving the letter. Sharon explained the SR 520 Eastside Project, walking Steven through the maps. Margaret asked about any cultural resources that the team should consider, and Steven replied that there didn't seem to be any issues and the project area looked highly disturbed. Ken added that BOAS did shovel probes in the area, which found nothing and did confirm extensive disturbance to the soil profile during construction, and that he would continue with the cultural resources assessment for the SR 520 Eastside Project EA.

The project team thanked the Tribe for the meeting, before adjourning.

Action Items

- Margaret will follow up with Steven about a field work visit.
- Steven and Ray will follow up with the project team about tribal oral history regarding Foster Island.
- Steven will be the POC for the Snoqualmie Tribe for the oral history interviews.

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION / MEETING NOTES

CLIENT/AGENCY CONSULTATION:
PROJECT BRIEFING WITH CHAIRWOMAN CECILE HANSON,
DUWAMISH TRIBE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2008, 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM

DUWAMISH TRIBAL OFFICES, WEST SEATTLE

- Chairwoman Cecile Hansen, Duwamish Tribe
 - Ken Juell, WSDOT/UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
 - Margaret Kucharski, WSDOT/520 Environmental Lead
 - Phillip Narte, WSDOT/SR 520 Project Tribal Liaison
 - Sharon Feldman, Consultant/SR 520 Built Environment Lead
-

Materials Distributed

Agenda
Graphics of ground-penetrating radar results
Graphics of alternatives A, K, and L
Graphics of eastside project
Animations of ground-penetrating radar time slices
Program description map

Key Guidance and Input

As is described in more detail below, Chairwoman Hansen, Duwamish Tribe provided the following key guidance and input:

- She preferred avoidance to Foster Island [by not building the project or disturbing Foster Island] but understood that the project needs to progress forward.
- She is unaware of current tribal knowledge or uses of Foster Island, but Tom Speer may have additional information.

Meeting Notes

Chairwoman Hansen discussed the current attempts and difficulties of the Duwamish Tribe to obtain federal recognition. She mentioned that the Tribe was looking for an anthropological researcher to assist in the case against the federal government. According to Chairwoman Hansen, the federal government claims that two years of the tribal history from the 1920's are not documented. She said that the Duwamish Tribe is not federally recognized and doesn't have any rights, and as a result, no one cares about the Tribe's concerns and feedback.

Margaret emphasized that WSDOT does want to listen to her concerns and feedback, regardless of the Tribe's federal recognition.

She added that WSDOT has been in communication and meeting with Chairwoman Hanson on projects such as SR 520 and AWW.

Chairwoman Hanson acknowledged that Margaret was very persistent about communicating with her.

After introductions, Margaret introduced the purpose of the meeting: to discuss the ground-penetrating radar results at Foster Island and the investigation's next steps, to discuss the SR 520 Bridge replacement options and potential impacts to Foster Island, and to obtain the Tribe's input.

Ground-Penetrating Radar (GPR)

Ken briefly walked Chairwoman Hansen through the presentation handouts describing the following: changes in the shape of Foster Island over the past 150 years, bathymetry differences documented on maps, GPR technology and software, and the results of GPR as shown in radargrams (profiles) and time-slices (horizontal or plan maps).

Chairwoman Hansen asked what caused changes to the area of Foster Island. Ken explained the changes were due to the locks and water fluctuations. Chairwoman Hansen mentioned how the Black River impacted a Duwamish village near Renton.²

As the first phase of work, the open grassy area on Foster Island north of the 520 bridge was scanned. Areas in other parts of Foster Island have not been investigated because heavy understory vegetation would have to be removed prior to scanning. Ken pointed out three large areas that have no anomalies (in dark blue on the horizontal "time-slices"), and multiple, small red and orange-colored areas that are the anomalies. Ken added that the GPR team used two different antennas (270 and 400 MHz), and both provided very similar results – the distribution of anomalies and areas devoid of anomalies are identical. This suggests the GPR data is of high quality.

Ken explained that GPR may prove useful at providing information about the shorelines of two historic islands that are now considered Foster Island, and the 250-foot wide geographic gap between them. The team is exploring the idea of moving the bridge alignment north to thread the roadway between the two historic islands. If possible, potential impacts to historic Foster Island would be avoided or greatly minimized.

Chairwoman Hansen asked if the project construction was funded. Ken said he heard that the project was anticipated to cost about \$3.9 billion.³ Margaret said the important aspect is that environmental

² The Duwamish lived along the Black River. The Black River dried up after Lake Washington levels dropped with the opening of the Montlake Cut.

³ This figure reflects anticipated funding, not committed funding.

analysis is fully funded, which is why the project can address issues now and not wait for construction funding. Chairwoman Hansen raised concerns that public projects, such as replacement of Alaskan Way Viaduct, take so long and do not get built.

Chairwoman Hansen asked if Foster Island was already disturbed. Ken confirmed that the area had been logged and smoothed, but how extensive and how deep the disturbance is isn't known.

Phillip asked Chairwoman Hansen about the Tribe's use and knowledge of Foster Island. Chairwoman Hansen said that the Tribe did several performances on Foster Island, at the request of MOHAL. If other tribal members were going to Foster Island, she was not aware of their practices. She had heard that Foster Island was an area for earth burials. She said that Tom Speer is writing about the Duwamish Tribe, including Foster Island, but mentioned that he is a volunteer not a tribal member.

For the second phase of work, Ken described the next steps to learn more about the geomorphology of the historic shoreline of the north island through manual excavation in areas where GPR found no anomalies. Those areas, shown in dark blue, are least likely to have cultural features such as burials, because no disturbances displayed as anomalies are found within them.

Chairwoman Hansen asked about the depth of excavation. Ken mentioned that the work could be as deep as 4 to 6 feet, but 2 to 3 feet deep will probably be sufficient.

Chairwoman Hansen said that she was not thrilled with disturbing Foster Island, but understood that progress continues. She would be concerned if burials were found. She mentioned an example from another project that found human remains. Though her preference is to leave remains undisturbed, she has accepted moving remains to an established cemetery in the past. The Snoqualmie Tribe has assisted the Duwamish before, providing a reburial location.

Phillip asked Chairwoman Hansen if Foster Island was associated with the tribal creation story. She responded that the creation story is associated with the Duwamish River, not Foster Island.

Phillip asked about the Tribe's use of Foster Island. Chairwoman Hansen responded that the Duwamish people lived along Lake Union, which is significant to them. She did not know more about Foster Island, except that the Duwamish people traveled through the area.

Margaret said that the project would follow up with Chairwoman Hansen with the result of archaeological work and would communicate with her about findings. Ken offered to take her to Foster Island to show her the anticipated work areas, and invited her to visit the island during the field work.

Supplemental Draft EIS Design Options and Stormwater

Using the graphics, Sharon described the three design options being developed through that process (Options A, K, and L) and the stormwater facilities that could be associated with those options. Stormwater facility impacts could include installing a treatment facility at Foster Island, including a constructed wetland if the existing roadway alignment were available by moving the roadway to the north, pumping stormwater to a facility near MOHAI, or using Basic Treatment BMPs on the bridge and discharging directly into the Lake.

While Sharon was describing Option K, Chairwoman Hansen asked about impacts to MOHAI. Sharon responded that MOHAI would be demolished under all options, and the museum was moving to another location on Lake Union.

Sharon and Margaret asked Chairwoman Hansen for her feedback about the options. Chairwoman Hansen responded that her preference would be to avoid building the bridge altogether, but she seemed open to the idea of moving the alignment north and invited the team to come back if the alignment was moved. She expressed concern over burials. She mentioned that the area across the street from the tribal offices was important to the Tribe.

Margaret said that this would not be the Tribe's only opportunity for input on the project; however, the team wanted to meet now to understand tribal concerns early and know about any fatal flaws, as the options move forward.

Before adjourning, Margaret followed up about Chairwoman Hansen on two additional issues. Margaret said the project is planning to conduct oral history interviews next year, and asked who the team should coordinate with at the tribe. Chairwoman Hansen said that should be Cindy Williams. Margaret also let Chairwoman Hansen know that the team is starting consultation on the SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, and asked about the Tribe's interest. Chairwoman Hansen confirmed that she wants to continue to receive information.

Chairwoman Hansen provided additional comments. She mentioned that the east and south part of Mercer Island are known to have negative spirits. She raised concerns over recent reconfiguration of I-5 near Tacoma.

She also invited the team to attend the opening celebration of the longhouse on January 3rd.

The project team thanked Chairwoman Hansen for the meeting.

Action Items

- Margaret will follow up with Chairwoman Hansen about a field work visit.

- Cindy Williams will be the POC for the Duwamish Tribe for the oral history interviews.
- Margaret will follow up with Tom Speer.
- Margaret/Ken will review past information received from historian David Buerge.

Tribal Consultation Letters

Copies of the following letter #1-1 were sent to the following individuals:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
4/8/2009	SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project, Seattle, King County, Washington, Area of Potential Effect	Julie Meredith SR 520 Program Director WSDOT	<p>Ralph Sampson, Jr., Chair Yakama Nation P.O. Box 151 Toppenish, WA 98948</p> <p>Cecile Hanson, Chair Duwamish Tribe 4717 West Marginal Way Seattle, WA 98106</p> <p>Charlotte Williams, Chair Muckleshoot Tribe 39015 172nd Ave SE Auburn, WA 98092</p> <p>Joseph Mullen, Chair Snoqualmie Tribe PO Box 969 Snoqualmie, WA 98065</p> <p>Leonard Forsman, Chair Suquamish Tribe P.O. Box 498 Suquamish, WA 98292</p> <p>Melvin R. Sheldon, Chair Tulalip Tribes 6700 Totem Beach Road Marysville, WA 98271</p> <p>Ralph Smapson, Jr., Chair Yakama Nation P.O. Box 151 Toppenish, WA 98948</p>	<p>LTR #016</p> <p>LTR #017</p> <p>LTR #018</p> <p>LTR #019</p> <p>LTR #020</p> <p>LTR #021</p> <p>LTR #022</p>



Letter #1-1

**Re: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Seattle, King County, Washington
Area of Potential Effects (APE)**

Per provisions of 36 CFR 800.3(a), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Sound Transit are proposing an undertaking to address an identified transportation need in Seattle, King County, Washington. The SR 520 bridges are vulnerable to earthquakes and windstorms and must be replaced. The Bridge Replacement and HOV Project will replace the SR 520 bridges, and include other transit, HOV and community enhancements.

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project is one component of the SR 520 Program. The other projects within the program are: SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, Pontoon Construction Project, and Lake Washington Urban Partnership. The project described in this letter extends from the SR 520 interchange with I-5 to 92nd Avenue NE in Yarrow Point. The project would tie in to the Eastside Transit and HOV Project at Evergreen Point Road; restriping would occur from Evergreen Point Road to 92nd Avenue NE.

Project Description

A Draft EIS published in August 2006 evaluated No Build, 4-Lane, and 6-Lane alternatives for the SR 520 corridor. The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project being evaluated in a Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) is a 6-Lane Alternative that would rebuild SR 520 between I-5 and Medina, including replacement of the Evergreen Point Bridge across Lake Washington. The SDEIS currently underway will evaluate three design options for the 6-Lane Alternative in Seattle that were developed by a mediation group in 2007 and 2008, in addition to the No Build Alternative. The mediation group included elected officials, local, federal and state agencies,

neighborhood representatives, local organizations and WSDOT. This process focused on west side interchange options and how each design option might affect neighborhoods, traffic, and the environment. Mediation participants also considered the effects to the Washington Park Arboretum and the University of Washington.

The mediation group developed three designs that were included in their 2008 project impact plan and WSDOT will further analyze all three in a NEPA Supplemental Draft EIS consistent with the WSDOT environmental process. The most significant differences are located in the vicinity of the Montlake neighborhood, and figures of the three options in this area are included in Appendix A of this submission. Appendix A also includes a schematic vicinity map. The three designs are:

- **Option A** - Most similar to today's configuration, with the addition of a second Montlake drawbridge over the Montlake Cut (Option A figure).
- **Option K** - Includes a tunnel under the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange below the SR 520 roadway (Option K figure).
- **Option L** - Includes a diagonal drawbridge over the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange above the SR 520 roadway (Option L figure).

Elements common to each option include:

- Two general-purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction (6-Lanes between I-5 and Medina).
- A bicycle and pedestrian path on the north side of SR 520.
- A reversible direct HOV access ramp at the I-5/SR 520 connection.
- Variable speed signs.
- Lids at I-5, 10th Avenue E and Delmar Drive E

More details about each design option are available on the Program's webpage:
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/brhpdesign.htm>

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

Pursuant to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), we are consulting with the Yakama Nation about the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. Enclosed (Appendix B) please find maps that illustrate the proposed APE for this project. The proposed APE includes all known areas of impact for all three (3) design options, which includes bridges, tunnels, roadway widening, several intersection improvements that include roadway widening, lids, and ADA-approved pedestrian walkways and upgrades, and known staging, temporary storage, and storm water management facilities. If there are any changes to the project, we will notify your office and provide additional information, including revised APE maps.

Built Environment

The APE for this project includes one parcel on either side of all areas of impact and ground disturbance. This approach is consistent with the APE determination for the former SR 520 project, with which your office concurred in 2005. For areas where only restriping will occur,

such as on parts of Interstate-5, we are only including the highway right-of-way. The APE will account both for direct and indirect effects to historic properties. Direct effects may include demolition and alteration to historic properties, while potential indirect effects can be both during construction and subsequent operations, caused by noise, dust and dirt, vibration, change of setting, or other factors. All historic buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts constructed prior to 1971 will be evaluated and documented. Further, based on our ongoing consultation with your office, we have included the Washington Park Arboretum in the APE, and will determine eligibility and project effects, both positive and negative, as part of our evaluation

Electronic copies of Historic Property Inventory Database forms will be prepared for all properties that have not been surveyed within the last five years. Any properties surveyed within the last five years will be checked in the field to verify condition and integrity. Database inventory forms will be updated as necessary.

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological sites could be disturbed directly or destroyed by the project within the portion of the APE where construction activities will occur. Therefore, WSDOT has delineated a limits-of-construction (combined-option) to consider potential direct effects to archaeological historic properties. WSDOT plans to continue archaeological investigations to examine all areas either not included in the APE defined for the Draft EIS (2006), or purposefully not included at that time pending more detailed design plans that specifically identified ground disturbance locations (Foster Island). WSDOT intends to use background research, ethnographic study, field investigations, and evaluation of the project area's geomorphology over time to identify archaeological historic properties and to assess the probability of encountering subsurface archaeological remains within the limits of construction. If encountered, archaeological sites will be recorded on DAHP archaeological site inventory forms.

Much of the construction portion of the APE was subjected to subsurface investigations during the Draft EIS process. Only one archaeological site, the Miller Street Landfill (45KI760), was identified. Foster Island is known to have been a burial ground of local Lakes Duwamish Indians, and has been identified as a culturally sensitive landform. WSDOT plans to use geophysical remote sensing, possibly other sophisticated techniques, and traditional archaeological investigations to identify potential burials on the Island (if present) in order to avoid or greatly minimize disturbance to them.

The archaeological portion of the APE also includes a vertical element in order to consider all potential effects from ground disturbance. The vertical APE is defined as either the full vertical limit of proposed construction, or the depth to consolidated glacial sediments, whichever is shallower. The latter part of the definition assumes that glacial sediments either pre-date all human occupation in the Puget Sound region, or would have been deposited after ice sheets scoured the landform and removed any physical evidence of pre-glacial human occupation.

Other Consulting Parties

Because of the size and scope of this project, WSDOT has contacted several groups to participate as Section 106 consulting parties for this project, per provisions in 36 CFR 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i). As

of today, the following groups have accepted (in writing or by phone) the invitation to participate in the Section 106 process as consulting parties:

- Washington Trust for Historic Preservation
- Eastlake Community Council
- Historic Bridge Foundation
- University of Washington
- Montlake Community Club
- Seattle Yacht Club
- Docomomo.WEWA
- Historic Seattle
- Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

The City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods, Historic Preservation Office is also a Section 106 consulting party, since the City of Seattle is a Certified Local Government (CLG). As consulting parties, these organizations will have the opportunity to comment on the APE, identification of historic properties within the APE, and the determination of adverse effects to historic properties. Further, they will be invited to participate in developing measures to mitigate adverse effect to historic properties, if any are necessary. These organizations will be allotted a 30 day review period to comment.

Continuing Consultation

The APE includes all known structures scheduled for demolition (such as on- and off-ramps), as well as known detours, shooflies, staging, and laydown areas. However, not all locations have been selected at this point. We will certainly consider these areas to be within the APE once they have been determined.

Thank you for your time and attention to this project. We look forward to continuing consultation with the Yakama Nation on this project, and to your comments on our proposed APE. We respectfully request your comments by May 11, 2009. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Architectural Historian Connie Walker Gray at 206-716-1138, or grayc@wsdot.wa.gov, or Archaeologist Ken Juell at 206-464-1236, or juellk@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,



Julie Meredith, P.E.
SR 520 Program Director

cc: Randy Everett, Federal Highway Administration,
Andrea Tull, Sound Transit, w/ attachments
Ken Juell, WSDOT UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
Marsha Tolon, WSDOT 520 Environmental Lead
Scott Williams, WSDOT Cultural Resources Program Manager

Attachment 2

Agency Consultations

Correspondence – Area of Potential Effect



Washington State
Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program



I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

April 6, 2009

Allyson Brooks, Ph.D.
Director, Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
1063 S. Capitol Way, Suite 106
Olympia, WA 98504-8343
MS-48343

**Re: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Seattle, King County, Washington
Area of Potential Effects (APE)**

Dear Dr. Brooks:

Per provisions of 36 CFR 800.3(a), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Sound Transit are proposing an undertaking to address an identified transportation need in Seattle, King County, Washington. The SR 520 bridges are vulnerable to earthquakes and windstorms and must be replaced. The Bridge Replacement and HOV Project will replace the SR 520 bridges, and include other transit, HOV and community enhancements.

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project is one component of the SR 520 Program. The other projects within the program are: SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, Pontoon Construction Project, and Lake Washington Urban Partnership. The project described in this letter extends from the SR 520 interchange with I-5 to 92nd Avenue NE in Yarrow Point. The project would tie in to the Eastside Transit and HOV Project at Evergreen Point Road; restriping would occur from Evergreen Point Road to 92nd Avenue NE.

Project Description

A Draft EIS published in August 2006 evaluated No Build, 4-Lane, and 6-Lane alternatives for the SR 520 corridor. The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project being evaluated in a Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) is a 6-Lane Alternative that would rebuild SR 520 between I-5 and Medina, including replacement of the Evergreen Point Bridge across Lake Washington. The SDEIS currently underway will evaluate three design options for the 6-Lane Alternative in Seattle that were developed by a mediation group in 2007 and 2008, in addition to the No Build Alternative. The mediation group

included elected officials, local, federal and state agencies, neighborhood representatives, local organizations and WSDOT. This process focused on west side interchange options and how each design option might affect neighborhoods, traffic, and the environment. Mediation participants also considered the effects to the Washington Park Arboretum and the University of Washington.

The mediation group developed three designs that were included in their 2008 project impact plan and WSDOT will further analyze all three in a NEPA Supplemental Draft EIS consistent with the WSDOT environmental process. The most significant differences are located in the vicinity of the Montlake neighborhood, and figures of the three options in this area are included in Appendix A of this submission. Appendix A also includes a schematic vicinity map. The three designs are:

- **Option A** - Most similar to today's configuration, with the addition of a second Montlake drawbridge over the Montlake Cut (Option A figure).
- **Option K** - Includes a tunnel under the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange below the SR 520 roadway (Option K figure).
- **Option L** - Includes a diagonal drawbridge over the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange above the SR 520 roadway (Option L figure).

Elements common to each option include:

- Two general-purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction (6-Lanes between I-5 and Medina).
- A bicycle and pedestrian path on the north side of SR 520.
- A reversible direct HOV access ramp at the I-5/SR 520 connection.
- Variable speed signs.
- Lids at I-5, 10th Avenue E and Delmar Drive E

More details about each design option are available on the Program's webpage:
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/brhpdesign.htm>

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

Pursuant to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), we are consulting with your office about the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. Enclosed (Appendix B) please find maps that illustrate the proposed APE for this project. The proposed APE includes all known areas of impact for all three (3) design options, which includes bridges, tunnels, roadway widening, several intersection improvements that include roadway widening, lids, and ADA-approved pedestrian walkways and upgrades, and known staging, temporary storage, and storm water

management facilities. If there are any changes to the project, we will notify your office and provide additional information, including revised APE maps.

Built Environment

The APE for this project includes one parcel on either side of all areas of impact and ground disturbance. This approach is consistent with the APE determination for the former SR 520 project, with which your office concurred in 2005. For areas where only restriping will occur, such as on parts of Interstate-5, we are only including the highway right-of-way. The APE will account both for direct and indirect effects to historic properties. Direct effects may include demolition and alteration to historic properties, while potential indirect effects can be both during construction and subsequent operations, caused by noise, dust and dirt, vibration, change of setting, or other factors. All historic buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts constructed prior to 1971 will be evaluated and documented. Further, based on our ongoing consultation with your office, we have included the Washington Park Arboretum in the APE, and will determine eligibility and project effects, both positive and negative, as part of our evaluation

Electronic copies of Historic Property Inventory Database forms will be prepared for all properties that have not been surveyed within the last five years. Any properties surveyed within the last five years will be checked in the field to verify condition and integrity. Database inventory forms will be updated as necessary.

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological sites could be disturbed directly or destroyed by the project within the portion of the APE where construction activities will occur. Therefore, WSDOT has delineated a limits-of-construction (combined-option) to consider potential direct effects to archaeological historic properties. WSDOT plans to continue archaeological investigations to examine all areas either not included in the APE defined for the Draft EIS (2006), or purposefully not included at that time pending more detailed design plans that specifically identified ground disturbance locations (Foster Island). WSDOT intends to use background research, ethnographic study, field investigations, and evaluation of the project area's geomorphology over time to identify archaeological historic properties and to assess the probability of encountering subsurface archaeological remains within the limits of construction. If encountered, archaeological sites will be recorded on DAHP archaeological site inventory forms.

Much of the construction portion of the APE was subjected to subsurface investigations during the Draft EIS process. Only one archaeological site, the Miller Street Landfill (45KI760), was identified. Foster Island is known to have been a burial ground of local Lakes Duwamish Indians, and has been identified as a culturally sensitive landform.

WSDOT plans to use geophysical remote sensing, possibly other sophisticated techniques, and traditional archaeological investigations to identify potential burials on the Island (if present) in order to avoid or greatly minimize disturbance to them.

The archaeological portion of the APE also includes a vertical element in order to consider all potential effects from ground disturbance. The vertical APE is defined as either the full vertical limit of proposed construction, or the depth to consolidated glacial sediments, whichever is shallower. The latter part of the definition assumes that glacial sediments either pre-date all human occupation in the Puget Sound region, or would have been deposited after ice sheets scoured the landform and removed any physical evidence of pre-glacial human occupation.

Other Consulting Parties

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), WSDOT and FHWA presently are consulting with five Native American tribes, including the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, the Suquamish Tribe, the Snoqualmie Tribe, the Tulalip Tribes, and the Yakama Nation. We also are consulting with the non-federally recognized Duwamish Tribal Community. All tribes and tribal organizations, except for the Yakama Nation, have shown strong interest in the project and the SR 520 Program, and are actively involved with consultation. WSDOT will forward to you all correspondence we receive from tribes regarding this project.

Because of the size and scope of this project, WSDOT has contacted several groups to participate as Section 106 consulting parties for this project, per provisions in 36 CFR 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i). In a letter dated March 2, 2009, the SR 520 project team invited several agencies, groups, and organizations to participate as consulting parties, and asked these parties to acknowledge their interest by March 18, 2009. As of today, the following groups have accepted (in writing or by phone) the invitation to participate in the Section 106 process as consulting parties:

- Washington Trust for Historic Preservation
- Eastlake Community Council
- Historic Bridge Foundation
- University of Washington
- Montlake Community Club
- Seattle Yacht Club
- Docomomo WEWA
- Historic Seattle
- Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

The City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods, Historic Preservation Office is also a Section 106 consulting party, since the City of Seattle is a Certified Local Government (CLG). As consulting parties, these organizations will have the opportunity to comment on the APE, identification of historic properties within the APE, and the determination of adverse effects to historic properties. Further, they will be invited to participate in

developing measures to mitigate adverse effect to historic properties, if any are necessary. These organizations will be allotted a 30 day review period to comment.

Continuing Consultation

The APE includes all known structures scheduled for demolition (such as on- and off-ramps), as well as known detours, shooflies, staging, and laydown areas. However, not all locations have been selected at this point. We will certainly consider these areas to be within the APE once they have been determined.

Thank you for your time and attention to this project. We look forward to continuing consultation with your office on this project, and to your comments on our proposed APE. We respectfully request your comments by May 7, 2009. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 206-464-1236, email juellk@wsdot.wa.gov, or Connie Walker Gray, UCO Architectural Historian, at 206-716-1138, email grayc@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,



Connie Walker Gray
WSDOT Architectural Historian



Ken Juell
WSDOT Archaeologist

Cc: Randy Everett, Federal Highway Administration, w/ attachments
Andrea Tull, Sound Transit, w/ attachments
Rebecca McAndrew, US Army Corps of Engineers, w/ attachments
Diane Lake, US Army Corps of Engineers, w/ attachments
Karen Gordon, City of Seattle Historic Preservation Officer, w/ attachments
Marsha Tolon, WSDOT 520 Environmental Lead, w/o attachments
Scott Williams, WSDOT Cultural Resources Program Manager, w/o attachments.

Copies of the following letter #2-1 were sent to the following individuals:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
4/8/2009	SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Seattle, King County, Washington Area of Potential Effects (APE)	Julie Meredith SR 520 Program Director WSDOT	<p>Karen Gordon, Supervisor City of Seattle Historic Preservation Division PO Box 94649 Seattle, WA 98124-4649</p> <p>Eugenia Woo Docomomo WEWA PO Box 70245 Seattle, WA 98127</p> <p>President Eastlake Community Council 117 E. Louisa Street, PMB #1 Seattle, WA 98102</p> <p>Doug Jackson, President Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks PO Box 9884 Seattle, WA 98109</p> <p>Kitty Henderson, Executive Director Historic Bridge Foundation PO Box 66245 Austin, TX 78766</p> <p>Kathleen Brooker, Executive Dir. Historic Seattle Preservation Foundation The Dearborn House 1117 Minor Avenue Seattle, WA 98101</p> <p>Jon Decker, AIA Montlake Community Club 2311 16th Avenue Seattle, WA 98112</p> <p>Leonard Garfield, Executive Dir. Museum of History and Industry (MOHAI) 2700 24th Avenue E Seattle, WA 98112</p> <p>Barry Thom, Acting NW Regional Administrator National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 7600 Sand Point Way NE Seattle, WA 98115-0070</p> <p>John Gaines, President Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council 1108 E Edgar Street Seattle, WA 98102</p> <p>Commodore Thomas F. Foti Seattle Yacht Club 1807 Hamilton Street Seattle, WA 98112</p>	<p>LTR #023</p> <p>LTR #024</p> <p>LTR #025</p> <p>LTR #026</p> <p>LTR #027</p> <p>LTR #028</p> <p>LTR #029</p> <p>LTR #030</p> <p>LTR #031</p> <p>LTR #032</p> <p>LTR #033</p>

Copies of the following letter #2-1 were sent to the following individuals:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
4/8/2009	SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Seattle, King County, Washington Area of Potential Effects (APE)	Julie Meredith SR 520 Program Director WSDOT	<p>Jennifer Meinser, Executive Dir. The Washington Trust for Historic Preservation 1204 Minor Avenue Seattle, WA 98101</p> <p>Theresa Doherty Assistant Vice President for Regional Affairs Office of Regional Affairs The University of Washington Box 351243 Seattle, WA 98195-1243</p> <p>Deborah Andrews Washington Park Arboretum Foundation 2300 Arboretum Drive E Seattle, WA 98112</p>	<p>LTR #034</p> <p>LTR #035</p> <p>LTR #036</p>



Letter #2-1

**Re: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Seattle, King County, Washington
Area of Potential Effects (APE)**

Dear

Per provisions of 36 CFR 800.3(a), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Sound Transit are proposing an undertaking to address an identified transportation need in Seattle, King County, Washington. The SR 520 bridges are vulnerable to earthquakes and windstorms and must be replaced. The Bridge Replacement and HOV Project will replace the SR 520 bridges, and include other transit, HOV and community enhancements.

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project is one component of the SR 520 Program. The other projects within the program are: SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, Pontoon Construction Project, and Lake Washington Urban Partnership. The project described in this letter extends from the SR 520 interchange with I-5 to 92nd Avenue NE in Yarrow Point. The project would tie in to the Eastside Transit and HOV Project at Evergreen Point Road; restriping would occur from Evergreen Point Road to 92nd Avenue NE.

Project Description

A Draft EIS published in August 2006 evaluated No Build, 4-Lane, and 6-Lane alternatives for the SR 520 corridor. The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project being evaluated in a Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) is a 6-Lane Alternative that would rebuild SR 520 between I-5 and Medina, including replacement of the Evergreen Point Bridge across Lake Washington. The SDEIS currently underway will evaluate three design options for the 6-Lane Alternative in Seattle that were developed by a mediation group in 2007 and 2008, in addition to the No Build Alternative. The mediation group included elected officials, local, federal and state agencies, neighborhood representatives, local organizations and WSDOT. This process focused on west side interchange options and how each design option might affect neighborhoods, traffic, and the environment. Mediation participants also considered the effects to the Washington Park Arboretum and the University of Washington.

The mediation group developed three designs that were included in their 2008 project impact plan and WSDOT will further analyze all three in a NEPA Supplemental Draft EIS consistent with the WSDOT environmental process. The most significant differences are located in the vicinity of the Montlake neighborhood, and figures of the three options in this area are included in Appendix A of this submission. Appendix A also includes a schematic vicinity map. The three designs are:

- **Option A** - Most similar to today's configuration, with the addition of a second Montlake drawbridge over the Montlake Cut (Option A figure).
- **Option K** - Includes a tunnel under the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange below the SR 520 roadway (Option K figure).
- **Option L** - Includes a diagonal drawbridge over the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange above the SR 520 roadway (Option L figure).

Elements common to each option include:

- Two general-purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction (6-Lanes between I-5 and Medina).
- A bicycle and pedestrian path on the north side of SR 520.
- A reversible direct HOV access ramp at the I-5/SR 520 connection.
- Variable speed signs.
- Lids at I-5, 10th Avenue E and Delmar Drive E

More details about each design option are available on the Program's webpage:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/brhpdesign.htm>

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

Pursuant to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), we are consulting with you about the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. Enclosed (Appendix B) please find maps that illustrate the proposed APE for this project. The proposed APE includes all known areas of impact for all three (3) design options, which includes bridges, tunnels, roadway widening, several intersection improvements that include roadway widening, lids, and ADA-approved pedestrian walkways and upgrades, and known staging, temporary storage, and storm water management facilities. If there are any changes to the project, we will notify your office and provide additional information, including revised APE maps.

Built Environment

The APE for this project includes one parcel on either side of all areas of impact and ground disturbance. This approach is consistent with the APE determination for the former SR 520 project, with which your office concurred in 2005. For areas where only restriping will occur, such as on parts of Interstate-5, we are only including the highway right-of-way. The APE will account both for direct and indirect effects to historic properties. Direct effects may include demolition and alteration to historic properties, while potential indirect effects can be both during construction and subsequent operations, caused by noise, dust and dirt, vibration, change of setting, or other factors. All historic buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts constructed prior to 1971 will be evaluated and documented. Further, based on our ongoing consultation with

your office, we have included the Washington Park Arboretum in the APE, and will determine eligibility and project effects, both positive and negative, as part of our evaluation

Electronic copies of Historic Property Inventory Database forms will be prepared for all properties that have not been surveyed within the last five years. Any properties surveyed within the last five years will be checked in the field to verify condition and integrity. Database inventory forms will be updated as necessary.

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological sites could be disturbed directly or destroyed by the project within the portion of the APE where construction activities will occur. Therefore, WSDOT has delineated a limits-of-construction (combined-option) to consider potential direct effects to archaeological historic properties. WSDOT plans to continue archaeological investigations to examine all areas either not included in the APE defined for the Draft EIS (2006), or purposefully not included at that time pending more detailed design plans that specifically identified ground disturbance locations (Foster Island). WSDOT intends to use background research, ethnographic study, field investigations, and evaluation of the project area's geomorphology over time to identify archaeological historic properties and to assess the probability of encountering subsurface archaeological remains within the limits of construction. If encountered, archaeological sites will be recorded on DAHP archaeological site inventory forms.

Much of the construction portion of the APE was subjected to subsurface investigations during the Draft EIS process. Only one archaeological site, the Miller Street Landfill (45KI760), was identified. Foster Island is known to have been a burial ground of local Lakes Duwamish Indians, and has been identified as a culturally sensitive landform. WSDOT plans to use geophysical remote sensing, possibly other sophisticated techniques, and traditional archaeological investigations to identify potential burials on the Island (if present) in order to avoid or greatly minimize disturbance to them.

The archaeological portion of the APE also includes a vertical element in order to consider all potential effects from ground disturbance. The vertical APE is defined as either the full vertical limit of proposed construction, or the depth to consolidated glacial sediments, whichever is shallower. The latter part of the definition assumes that glacial sediments either pre-date all human occupation in the Puget Sound region, or would have been deposited after ice sheets scoured the landform and removed any physical evidence of pre-glacial human occupation.

Other Consulting Parties

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), WSDOT and FHWA presently are consulting with five Native American tribes, including the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, the Suquamish Tribe, the Snoqualmie Tribe, the Tulalip Tribes, and the Yakama Nation. We also are consulting with the non-federally recognized Duwamish Tribal Community. All tribes and tribal organizations, except for the Yakama Nation, have shown strong interest in the project and the SR 520 Program, and are actively involved with consultation.

Because of the size and scope of this project, WSDOT contacted several groups to participate as Section 106 consulting parties for this project, per provisions in 36 CFR 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i). In a letter dated March 2, 2009, the SR 520 project team invited several agencies, groups, and

organizations to participate as consulting parties, and asked these parties to acknowledge their interest by March 18, 2009. As of today, the following groups have accepted (in writing or by phone) the invitation to participate in the Section 106 process as consulting parties:

- Washington Trust for Historic Preservation
- Eastlake Community Council
- Historic Bridge Foundation
- University of Washington
- Montlake Community Club
- Seattle Yacht Club
- Docomomo.WEWA
- Historic Seattle
- Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

The City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods, Historic Preservation Office is also a Section 106 consulting party, since the City of Seattle is a Certified Local Government (CLG). As consulting parties, these organizations will have the opportunity to comment on the APE, identification of historic properties within the APE, and the determination of adverse effects to historic properties. Further, they will be invited to participate in developing measures to mitigate adverse effect to historic properties, if any are necessary. These organizations will be allotted a 30 day review period to comment.

Continuing Consultation

The APE includes all known structures scheduled for demolition (such as on- and off-ramps), as well as known detours, shooflies, staging, and laydown areas. However, not all locations have been selected at this point. We will certainly consider these areas to be within the APE once they have been determined.

Thank you for your time and attention to this project. We look forward to continuing consultation with you on this project, and to your comments on our proposed APE. We respectfully request your comments by May 11, 2009. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Architectural Historian Connie Walker Gray at 206-716-1138, or grayc@wsdot.wa.gov, or Archaeologist Ken Juell at 206-464-1236, or juellk@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,



Julie Meredith, P.E.
SR 520 Program Director

Cc: Randy Everett, Federal Highway Administration
Andrea Tull, Sound Transit
Karen Gordon, City of Seattle Historic Preservation Officer
Ken Juell, WSDOT UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
Marsha Tolon, WSDOT 520 Environmental Lead
Scott Williams, WSDOT Cultural Resources Program Manager



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project



Letter #2-2

**Re: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Seattle, King County, Washington
Area of Potential Effects (APE)**

Dear

Per provisions of 36 CFR 800.3(a), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Sound Transit are proposing an undertaking to address an identified transportation need in Seattle, King County, Washington. The SR 520 bridges are vulnerable to earthquakes and windstorms and must be replaced. The Bridge Replacement and HOV Project will replace the SR 520 bridges, and include other transit, HOV and community enhancements.

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project is one component of the SR 520 Program. The other projects within the program are: SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, Pontoon Construction Project, and Lake Washington Urban Partnership. The project described in this letter extends from the SR 520 interchange with I-5 to 92nd Avenue NE in Yarrow Point. The project would tie in to the Eastside Transit and HOV Project at Evergreen Point Road; restriping would occur from Evergreen Point Road to 92nd Avenue NE.

Project Description

A Draft EIS published in August 2006 evaluated No Build, 4-Lane, and 6-Lane alternatives for the SR 520 corridor. The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project being evaluated in a Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) is a 6-Lane Alternative that would rebuild SR 520 between I-5 and Medina, including replacement of the Evergreen Point Bridge across Lake Washington. The SDEIS currently underway will evaluate three design options for the 6-Lane Alternative in Seattle that were developed by a mediation group in 2007 and 2008, in addition to the No Build Alternative. The mediation group included elected officials, local, federal and state agencies, neighborhood representatives, local organizations and WSDOT. This process focused on west side interchange options and how each design option might affect neighborhoods, traffic, and the environment. Mediation participants also considered the effects to the Washington Park Arboretum and the University of Washington.

The mediation group developed three designs that were included in their 2008 project impact plan and WSDOT will further analyze all three in a NEPA Supplemental Draft EIS consistent with the WSDOT environmental process. The most significant differences are located in the vicinity of the Montlake neighborhood, and figures of the three options in this area are included in Appendix A of this submission. Appendix A also includes a schematic vicinity map. The three designs are:

- **Option A** - Most similar to today's configuration, with the addition of a second Montlake drawbridge over the Montlake Cut (Option A figure).
- **Option K** - Includes a tunnel under the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange below the SR 520 roadway (Option K figure).
- **Option L** - Includes a diagonal drawbridge over the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange above the SR 520 roadway (Option L figure).

Elements common to each option include:

- Two general-purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction (6-Lanes between I-5 and Medina).
- A bicycle and pedestrian path on the north side of SR 520.
- A reversible direct HOV access ramp at the I-5/SR 520 connection.
- Variable speed signs.
- Lids at I-5, 10th Avenue E and Delmar Drive E

More details about each design option are available on the Program's webpage:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/brhpdesign.htm>

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

Pursuant to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), we are consulting with you about the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. Enclosed (Appendix B) please find maps that illustrate the proposed APE for this project. The proposed APE includes all known areas of impact for all three (3) design options, which includes bridges, tunnels, roadway widening, several intersection improvements that include roadway widening, lids, and ADA-approved pedestrian walkways and upgrades, and known staging, temporary storage, and storm water management facilities. If there are any changes to the project, we will notify your office and provide additional information, including revised APE maps.

Built Environment

The APE for this project includes one parcel on either side of all areas of impact and ground disturbance. This approach is consistent with the APE determination for the former SR 520 project, with which your office concurred in 2005. For areas where only restriping will occur, such as on parts of Interstate-5, we are only including the highway right-of-way. The APE will account both for direct and indirect effects to historic properties. Direct effects may include demolition and alteration to historic properties, while potential indirect effects can be both during construction and subsequent operations, caused by noise, dust and dirt, vibration, change of setting, or other factors. All historic buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts constructed prior to 1971 will be evaluated and documented. Further, based on our ongoing consultation with your office, we have included the

Washington Park Arboretum in the APE, and will determine eligibility and project effects, both positive and negative, as part of our evaluation

Electronic copies of Historic Property Inventory Database forms will be prepared for all properties that have not been surveyed within the last five years. Any properties surveyed within the last five years will be checked in the field to verify condition and integrity. Database inventory forms will be updated as necessary.

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological sites could be disturbed directly or destroyed by the project within the portion of the APE where construction activities will occur. Therefore, WSDOT has delineated a limits-of-construction (combined-option) to consider potential direct effects to archaeological historic properties. WSDOT plans to continue archaeological investigations to examine all areas either not included in the APE defined for the Draft EIS (2006), or purposefully not included at that time pending more detailed design plans that specifically identified ground disturbance locations (Foster Island). WSDOT intends to use background research, ethnographic study, field investigations, and evaluation of the project area's geomorphology over time to identify archaeological historic properties and to assess the probability of encountering subsurface archaeological remains within the limits of construction. If encountered, archaeological sites will be recorded on DAHP archaeological site inventory forms.

Much of the construction portion of the APE was subjected to subsurface investigations during the Draft EIS process. Only one archaeological site, the Miller Street Landfill (45KI760), was identified. Foster Island is known to have been a burial ground of local Lakes Duwamish Indians, and has been identified as a culturally sensitive landform. WSDOT plans to use geophysical remote sensing, possibly other sophisticated techniques, and traditional archaeological investigations to identify potential burials on the Island (if present) in order to avoid or greatly minimize disturbance to them.

The archaeological portion of the APE also includes a vertical element in order to consider all potential effects from ground disturbance. The vertical APE is defined as either the full vertical limit of proposed construction, or the depth to consolidated glacial sediments, whichever is shallower. The latter part of the definition assumes that glacial sediments either pre-date all human occupation in the Puget Sound region, or would have been deposited after ice sheets scoured the landform and removed any physical evidence of pre-glacial human occupation.

Other Consulting Parties

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), WSDOT and FHWA presently are consulting with five Native American tribes, including the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, the Suquamish Tribe, the Snoqualmie Tribe, the Tulalip Tribes, and the Yakama Nation. We also are consulting with the non-federally recognized Duwamish Tribal Community. All tribes and tribal organizations, except for the Yakama Nation, have shown strong interest in the project and the SR 520 Program, and are actively involved with consultation.

Because of the size and scope of this project, WSDOT contacted several groups to participate as Section 106 consulting parties for this project, per provisions in 36 CFR 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i). In a letter dated March 2, 2009, the SR 520 project team invited several agencies, groups, and organizations to

participate as consulting parties, and asked these parties to acknowledge their interest by March 18, 2009. As of today, the following groups have accepted (in writing or by phone) the invitation to participate in the Section 106 process as consulting parties:

- Washington Trust for Historic Preservation
- Eastlake Community Council
- Historic Bridge Foundation
- University of Washington
- Montlake Community Club
- Seattle Yacht Club
- Docomomo.WEWA
- Historic Seattle
- Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
- Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks

The City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods, Historic Preservation Office is also a Section 106 consulting party, since the City of Seattle is a Certified Local Government (CLG). As consulting parties, these organizations will have the opportunity to comment on the APE, identification of historic properties within the APE, and the determination of adverse effects to historic properties. Further, they will be invited to participate in developing measures to mitigate adverse effect to historic properties, if any are necessary. These organizations will be allotted a 30 day review period to comment.

Continuing Consultation

The APE includes all known structures scheduled for demolition (such as on- and off-ramps), as well as known detours, shooflies, staging, and laydown areas. However, not all locations have been selected at this point. We will certainly consider these areas to be within the APE once they have been determined.

Thank you for your time and attention to this project. We look forward to continuing consultation with you on this project, and to your comments on our proposed APE. **We respectfully request your comments by May 20, 2009.** If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Architectural Historian Connie Walker Gray at 206-716-1138, or grayc@wsdot.wa.gov, or Archaeologist Ken Juell at 206-464-1236, or juellk@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Julie Meredith, P.E.
SR 520 Program Director

Cc: Randy Everett, Federal Highway Administration
Andrea Tull, Sound Transit
Karen Gordon, City of Seattle Historic Preservation Officer
Ken Juell, WSDOT UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
Marsha Tolon, WSDOT 520 Environmental Lead
Scott Williams, WSDOT Cultural Resources Program Manager

Copies of the following letter #2-3 were sent to the following individuals:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
5/5/2009	SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Seattle, King County, Washington Area of Potential Effects (APE)	Julie Meredith SR 520 Program Director WSDOT	<p>Karen Gordon, Supervisor City of Seattle Historic Preservation Division PO Box 94649 Seattle, WA 98124-4649</p> <p>Brooks Kolb Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks PO Box 9884 Seattle, WA 98109</p>	<p>LTR #056</p> <p>LTR #057</p>



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project



Letter #2-3

**Re: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Seattle, King County, Washington
Area of Potential Effects (APE)**

Dear

Per provisions of 36 CFR 800.3(a), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Sound Transit are proposing an undertaking to address an identified transportation need in Seattle, King County, Washington. The SR 520 bridges are vulnerable to earthquakes and windstorms and must be replaced. The Bridge Replacement and HOV Project will replace the SR 520 bridges, and include other transit, HOV and community enhancements.

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project is one component of the SR 520 Program. The other projects within the program are: SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, Pontoon Construction Project, and Lake Washington Urban Partnership. The project described in this letter extends from the SR 520 interchange with I-5 to 92nd Avenue NE in Yarrow Point. The project would tie into the Eastside Transit and HOV Project at Evergreen Point Road; restriping would occur from Evergreen Point Road to 92nd Avenue NE.

Project Description

A Draft EIS published in August 2006 evaluated No Build, 4-Lane, and 6-Lane alternatives for the SR 520 corridor. The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project being evaluated in a Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) is a 6-Lane Alternative that would rebuild SR 520 between I-5 and Medina, including replacement of the Evergreen Point Bridge across Lake Washington. The SDEIS currently underway will evaluate three design options for the 6-Lane Alternative in Seattle that were developed by a mediation group in 2007 and 2008, in addition to the No Build Alternative. The mediation group included elected officials, local, federal and state agencies, neighborhood representatives, local organizations and WSDOT. This process focused on west side interchange options and how each design option might affect neighborhoods, traffic, and the environment. Mediation participants also considered the effects to the Washington Park Arboretum and the University of Washington.

The mediation group developed three designs that were included in their 2008 project impact plan and WSDOT will further analyze all three in a NEPA Supplemental Draft EIS consistent with the WSDOT environmental process. The most significant differences are located in the vicinity of the Montlake neighborhood, and figures of the three (3) options in this area are included in Appendix A of this submission. Appendix A also includes a schematic vicinity map. The three designs are:

- **Option A** - Most similar to today's configuration, with the addition of a second Montlake drawbridge over the Montlake Cut (Option A figure).
- **Option K** - Includes a tunnel under the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange below the SR 520 roadway (Option K figure).
- **Option L** - Includes a diagonal drawbridge over the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange above the SR 520 roadway (Option L figure).

Elements common to each option include:

- Two general-purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction (6-Lanes between I-5 and Medina).
- A bicycle and pedestrian path on the north side of SR 520.
- A reversible direct HOV access ramp at the I-5/SR 520 connection.
- Variable speed signs.
- Lids at I-5, 10th Avenue E and Delmar Drive E

More details about each design option are available on the Program's webpage:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/brhpdesign.htm>

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

Pursuant to compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), we are consulting with you about the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. Enclosed (Appendix B) please find maps that illustrate the proposed APE for this project. The proposed APE includes all known areas of impact for all three (3) design options, which includes bridges, tunnels, roadway widening, several intersection improvements that include roadway widening, lids, and ADA-approved pedestrian walkways and upgrades, and known staging, temporary storage, and storm water management facilities. If there are any changes to the project, we will notify your office and provide additional information, including revised APE maps.

Built Environment

The APE for this project includes one parcel on either side of all areas of impact and ground disturbance. This approach is consistent with the APE determination for the former SR 520 project. For areas where only restriping will occur, such as on parts of Interstate-5, we are only including the highway right-of-way. The APE will account both for direct and indirect effects to historic properties. Direct effects may include demolition and alteration to historic properties, while potential indirect effects can be both during construction and subsequent operations, caused by noise, dust and dirt, vibration, change of setting, or other factors. All historic buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts constructed prior to 1971 will be evaluated and documented. Further, based on our ongoing consultation with the Seattle Historic Preservation Office, we have included the Washington Park

Arboretum in the APE, and will determine eligibility and project effects, both positive and negative, as part of our evaluation

Electronic copies of Historic Property Inventory Database forms will be prepared for all properties that have not been surveyed within the last five years. Any properties surveyed within the last five years will be checked in the field to verify condition and integrity. Database inventory forms will be updated as necessary.

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological sites could be disturbed directly or destroyed by the project within the portion of the APE where construction activities will occur. Therefore, WSDOT has delineated a limits-of-construction (combined-option) to consider potential direct effects to archaeological historic properties. WSDOT plans to continue archaeological investigations to examine all areas either not included in the APE defined for the Draft EIS (2006), or purposefully not included at that time pending more detailed design plans that specifically identified ground disturbance locations (Foster Island). WSDOT intends to use background research, ethnographic study, field investigations, and evaluation of the project area's geomorphology over time to identify archaeological historic properties and to assess the probability of encountering subsurface archaeological remains within the limits of construction. If encountered, archaeological sites will be recorded on DAHP archaeological site inventory forms.

Much of the construction portion of the APE was subjected to subsurface investigations during the Draft EIS process. Only one archaeological site, the Miller Street Landfill (45KI760), was identified. Foster Island is known to have been a burial ground of local Lakes Duwamish Indians, and has been identified as a culturally sensitive landform. WSDOT plans to use geophysical remote sensing, possibly other sophisticated techniques, and traditional archaeological investigations to identify potential burials on the Island (if present) in order to avoid or greatly minimize disturbance to them.

The archaeological portion of the APE also includes a vertical element in order to consider all potential effects from ground disturbance. The vertical APE is defined as either the full vertical limit of proposed construction, or the depth to consolidated glacial sediments, whichever is shallower. The latter part of the definition assumes that glacial sediments either pre-date all human occupation in the Puget Sound region, or would have been deposited after ice sheets scoured the landform and removed any physical evidence of pre-glacial human occupation.

Other Consulting Parties

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(2), WSDOT and FHWA presently are consulting with five Native American tribes, including the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, the Suquamish Tribe, the Snoqualmie Tribe, the Tulalip Tribes, and the Yakama Nation. We also are consulting with the non-federally recognized Duwamish Tribal Community. All tribes and tribal organizations, except for the Yakama Nation, have shown strong interest in the project and the SR 520 Program, and are actively involved with consultation.

Because of the size and scope of this project, WSDOT contacted several groups to participate as Section 106 consulting parties for this project, per provisions in 36 CFR 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i). In a letter dated March 2, 2009, the SR 520 project team invited several agencies, groups, and organizations to

participate as consulting parties, and asked these parties to acknowledge their interest by March 18, 2009. As of today, the following groups have accepted (in writing or by phone) the invitation to participate in the Section 106 process as consulting parties:

- Washington Trust for Historic Preservation
- Eastlake Community Council
- Historic Bridge Foundation
- University of Washington
- Montlake Community Club
- Seattle Yacht Club
- Docomomo.WEWA
- Historic Seattle
- Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
- Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks

The City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods, Historic Preservation Office is also a Section 106 consulting party, since the City of Seattle is a Certified Local Government (CLG). As consulting parties, these organizations will have the opportunity to comment on the APE, identification of historic properties within the APE, and the determination of adverse effects to historic properties. Further, they will be invited to participate in developing measures to mitigate adverse effect to historic properties, if any are necessary. These organizations will be allotted a 30 day review period to comment.

Continuing Consultation

The APE includes all known structures scheduled for demolition (such as on- and off-ramps), as well as known detours, shooflies, staging, and laydown areas. However, not all locations have been selected at this point. We will certainly consider these areas to be within the APE once they have been determined.

Thank you for your time and attention to this project. We look forward to continuing consultation with you on this project, and to your comments on our proposed APE. **We respectfully request your comments by June 9, 2009.** If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Architectural Historian Connie Walker Gray at 206-716-1138, or grayc@wsdot.wa.gov, or Archaeologist Ken Juell at 206-464-1236, or juellk@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,



Julie Meredith, P.E.
SR 520 Program Director

Cc: Randy Everett, Federal Highway Administration
Andrea Tull, Sound Transit
Karen Gordon, City of Seattle Historic Preservation Officer
Ken Juell, WSDOT UCO Cultural Resources Specialist
Marsha Tolon, WSDOT 520 Environmental Lead
Scott Williams, WSDOT Cultural Resources Program Manager

A copy of the following letter #2-4 was sent to the following individual:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
8/27/2009	Revised Area of Potential Effects Comments SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project	Marsh Tolon WSDOT Environmental Lead	Jon H. Decker Montlake Community Club 2311 16th Avenue East Seattle, WA 98112	LTR #114



Letter #2-4

**RE: Revised Area of Potential Effects Comments
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project**

Dear

Thank you for your letter dated July 30, 2009 and review comments regarding the revised Area of Potential Effect (APE) and property inventory information for the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. Following are our responses to your paraphrased questions. I hope you will find our response adequate, and will contact us if further questions arise.

1. Request for specific information on the potential construction process occurring in the Montlake Community regarding:

a. St. Demetrious Church Fall Festival

Thank you for the reminder to consider how construction activities may affect the annual Fall Festival and to devise ways to either avoid or minimize potential effects. While the church is not included in the APE, any potential effects that construction activities may pose to the Fall Festival at St. Demetrious Church would be considered as part of the proposed project.

b. The inclusion of West Montlake Park and adjacent properties on East Hamlin and East Shelby Streets, and areas east to Montlake Boulevard East, in the APE.

The areas you have defined are part of the eligible Montlake Historic District, which is regarded as one discrete resource. Project activities that cause effect to any part of the district would be viewed as an effect to the district as a whole or as one resource. The APE is drawn with a conservative hand because it encompasses the proposed construction limits and the immediately adjacent properties, which is an area that is inventoried and surveyed. Since parts of the district are already included within the APE, and the district is one historic resource, effects to the entire district would be considered as part of the project analysis. Yet, by drawing the APE close to the

construction limit boundary, WSDOT conserves public funds because it reduces the amount of time and resources spent to inventory properties not likely to be affected by proposed project activities. Elimination of redundancy is always a winning situation.

- c. *The inclusion of the Montlake Historic Business District on 24th Avenue East extending south from McGraw Street to Lynn Street in the APE. Address future access during construction to and from Montlake School during school hours in the proposed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).*

Similar to the reasons outlined in the response for question “b” above, the historic business district on 24th Avenue East will not be included in the APE. However, WSDOT can keep in mind the planning of construction activities to avoid or reduce access conflict with Montlake School during school hours as part of the overall project. If at any time additional construction staging areas are identified in the Montlake area, the APE would be revised to include those areas.

Thank you for your continued participation in this project, and commitment to the Montlake Historic District resources. If you have further questions or comments please contact me by phone at 206.770.3613, or by email at tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov.

You can also refer to the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Web site at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge for updates and information.

Sincerely,



Marsha Tolon
WSDOT Environmental Lead

cc: Anita Bowers, MCC President
Jenifer Young, SR 520 Environmental Manager
Connie Walker Gray, WSDOT Cultural Resources Specialist

A copy of the following letter #2-5 was sent to the following individual:

Date	Subject	From	To	Coersp. Ref. No.
8/27/2009	Revised Area of Potential Effects Comments SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project	Marsh Tolon WSDOT Environmental Lead	Larry Sinnott Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks 7043 21st Avenue NE Seattle, WA 98115	LTR #112



Washington State
Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project



Letter #2-5

**RE: Revised Area of Potential Effects Comments
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project**

Dear

Thank you for your email dated July 31, 2009. In reference to your recent phone discussion with the SR 520 Project Architectural Historian Lori Durio, we regret that we had not addressed the issue of Lake Washington Boulevard as an individual historic resource. Not responding to you on this particular issue was an oversight on our end; please accept our apology. Lori will be working with you and gathering information to determine whether or not Lake Washington Boulevard serves as an individual historic resource.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this project, and for your commitment to Olmsted resources in Seattle. If you have further questions or comments please contact me by phone at 206.770.3613, or by email at tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov.

You can also refer to the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Web site at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge for updates and information.

Sincerely,

Marsha Tolon
WSDOT Environmental Lead

cc: Charlie Sundberg, FSOP
Jenifer Young, SR 520 Environmental Manager
Connie Walker Gray, WSDOT Cultural Resources Specialist

A copy of the following letter #2-6 was sent to the following individual:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
8/27/2009	Revised Area of Potential Effects Comments SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project	Marsh Tolon WSDOT Environmental Lead	Eugenia Woo Director of Preservation Services Historic Seattle 1117 Minor Avenue Seattle, WA 98101	LTR #113



Letter #2-6

**RE: Revised Area of Potential Effects Comments
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project**

Dear

Thank you for your participation as a Section 106 consulting party for the SR 520 I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV project. We appreciate your comments on the Historic Property Inventory forms in your letter dated July 31, 2009. Below please find our responses to your comments.

1. Thank you for alerting us about the missing photos for 2561, 2837, and 3201 Evergreen Point Road. Enclosed please find updated forms, with pictures, for those properties.
2. Thank you very much for the additional information about 2810 Montlake Boulevard NE. We will integrate this information into the statement of significance. In addition, according to the King County Assessor's Database, the property address is 2810 Montlake Boulevard NE (not E). We recognize it is confusing, because the street name there is "Montlake Boulevard E." However, we will continue to reference the King County Assessor's property nomenclature.
3. Thank you for the update on the NRHP status of the More Hall Annex (UW Nuclear Reactor) Building. At the time we completed the HPI form, it had not yet been accepted for listing in the NRHP. We have contacted Michael Houser at DAHP to ascertain the current status of the NRHP listing of the More Hall Annex Building.
4. Thank you for alerting us about the pedestrian bridges on Montlake Boulevard NE. We will record those and make determinations of NRHP eligibility. We will submit those to you for comment.
5. Regarding the use of the Historic Property Inventory form National Register Opinion Determination, it is our understanding that listing contributing resources to a potential historic district such as MOHAI (and others) as NRHP eligible is appropriate. As noted on page 46 of the DAHP Database User's Manual, selecting yes "will indicate to DAHP staff that the property may merit consideration for National Register eligibility."

(<http://www.dahp.wa.gov/pages/HistoricSites/documents/UserManual2005.pdf>) This would appear to apply for resources that are either individually eligible, or contributing to an eligible historic district. In the statement of significance, we indicate whether a property is individually eligible or contributing, or both. We do plan to follow up with Megan Duvall for clarification, and will let you know if there are any differences in opinion.

Thank you again for your feedback. We look forward to talking to you soon about potential effects to historic properties. If you have further questions or comments please contact me by phone at 206.770.3613, or by email at tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov.

You can also refer to the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Web site at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge for updates and information.

Sincerely,



Marsha Tolon
WSDOT Environmental Lead

Enclosures

cc: Kathleen Brooker, Executive Director Historic Seattle
Jenifer Young, SR 520 Environmental Manager
Connie Walker Gray, WSDOT Cultural Resources Specialist

A Copy of the following letter #2-7 was sent to the following individual:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
8/27/2009	Revised Area of Potential Effects Comments SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project	Marsh Tolon WSDOT Environmental Lead	C. Fred Roed, Commodore 1807 East Hamlin Street Seattle Yacht Club Seattle, WA 98112	LTR #115



Letter #2-7

**RE: Revised Area of Potential Effects Comments
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project**

Dear

Thank you for your letter dated July 30, 2009, regarding the revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Replacement and HOV Project. We very much appreciate your time and interest in this project as a Section 106 consulting party. We would like to take this opportunity to respond to your remaining comments on the APE.

First, we would like to clarify the areas within Portage Bay that are included in the APE. As the map illustrates, the APE will include the entire Seattle Yacht Club parcel, including the in-water facilities (the docks, piers, and foreshore). As described in our July 16 letter to consulting parties, the revised APE "... Will not include...structures along the shores of Portage Bay, except for what was already included in the APE submitted in April 2009." The entire Seattle Yacht Club property was included in the April 2009 APE, and it continues to be included in the revised APE. I hope this resolves your concern on this issue.

Second, thank you for expressing your concern that the West Montlake Park is not included in the APE. Per your July 30 letter, you are concerned that "...this area would be utilized as a staging area of construction and would then have significant visual impacts, as well as increased dirt and noise, at our historic property and impede our ability to function in our traditional manner. We are also concerned that access [to] our docks and piers would be restricted." I want to assure you that there is no plan to use West Montlake Park as a construction staging area, or to store equipment there, or to affect that property in any way whatsoever with any Option or Sub option. Parks and open space are protected by restrictive federal, state, and local regulations, and while WSDOT generally avoids using park properties for construction staging, the APE would always be drawn to include such areas. Therefore,

there is no potential that this undertaking would affect a historic property on that parcel. Therefore, it is not included in the APE.

Thank you again for your thoughtful comments regarding the Seattle Yacht Club as a historic property. We look forward to continuing consultation with you. If you have further questions or comments please contact me by phone at 206.770.3613, or by email at tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov.

You can also refer to the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Web site at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge for updates and information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Marsha Tolon", is displayed on a light yellow rectangular background.

Marsha Tolon
WSDOT Environmental Lead

Enclosure

cc: Jack A. Austin, SYC
Jenifer Young, SR 520 Environmental Manager
Connie Walker Gray, WSDOT Cultural Resources Specialist

Correspondence – Revised Area of Potential Effect

Copies of the following letter #2-8 were sent to the following individuals:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
7/16/2009	Revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) and Review of Historic Property Inventory Forms I-5 to Medina: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project	Marsha Tolon WSDOT Environmental Lead	Beth Dodrill Docomomo WEWA P.O. Box 70245 Seattle, WA 98127	LTR #080
			Tim Ahlers, President Eastlake Community Council 117 E. Louisa Street, PMB #1 Seattle, WA 98102	LTR #081
			Brooks Kolb, President Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks P.O. Box 9884 Seattle, WA 98109	LTR #082
			Kitty Henderson Historic Bridge Foundation P.O. Box 66245 Austin, TX 78766	LTR #083
			Eugenia Woo Historic Seattle Preservation Foundation 1117 Minor Avenue Seattle, WA 98101	LTR #084
			Kathleen Brooker Historic Seattle Preservation Foundation 1117 Minor Avenue Seattle, WA 98101	LTR #085
			Charlie Sundberg King Co. Historic Preservation Office 400 Yesler St., Suite 510 Seattle, WA 98104	LTR #086
			John Decker Montlake Community Club 2311 16th Avenue Seattle, WA 98112	LTR #088
			John Gaines, President Portage Bay/Roanoke Community Council 1108 E. Edgar St. Seattle, WA 98102	LTR #089
			Ted Lane Portage Bay/Roanoke Community Council 2600 Harvard Avenue E. Seattle, WA 98102	LTR #090
Erin O'Connor Portage Bay/Roanoke Community Council 2612 10th Ave. E Seattle, WA 98102	LTR #091			

Copies of the following letter #2-8 were sent to the following individuals:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
7/16/2009	Revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) and Review of Historic Property Inventory Forms I-5 to Medina: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project		Commodore C. Fred Roed Seattle Yacht Club 1807 Hamlin St. Seattle, WA 98112	LTR #092
			Kimberly Demuth Seattle Yacht Club c/o Entrix 200 First Ave. W, Ste. 500 Seattle, WA 98119	LTR #093
			Kip Cramer Attn: Carol Englizian Seattle Yacht Club 1807 Hamlin St. Seattle, WA 98112	LTR #094
			Jennifer Flatham Seattle Yacht Club c/o Entrix 200 First Ave. W, Ste. 500 Seattle, WA 98119	LTR #095
			Stephanie Brown The City of Seattle P.O. Box 34996 Seattle, WA 98124	LTR #096
			Karen Gordon The City of Seattle P.O. Box 94649 Seattle, WA 98124-4649	LTR #097
			Chris Moore The Washington Trust for Historic Preservation 1204 Minor Ave Seattle, WA 98101	LTR #098
			Jennifer Meisner The Washington Trust for Historic Preservation 1204 Minor Ave Seattle, WA 98101	LTR #099
			Theresa Doherty Office of Regional Affairs 228 Gerberding Hall Box 351243 Seattle, WA 98195-1243	LTR #100
			Paige Miller Washington Park Arboretum Foundation 2300 Arboretum Drive E. Seattle, WA 98112	LTR #101



Letter #2-8

**RE: Revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) and
Review of Historic Property Inventory Forms
I-5 to Medina: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project**

Dear

Thank you for your participation as a Section 106 consulting party for the I-5 to Medina: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. This letter conveys information about two important areas of Section 106 coordination with Docomomo WEWA. One is the revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) developed from consulting party comments, and an invitation to parties to review and comment on the results of our historic resource inventory. In this letter, you will find information on the following:

- Revised APE, based on comments and concerns identified by Section 106 consulting parties. See Attachment 1.
- Historic resource inventory within the APE.
- Request for consulting party comments on the historic inventory by July 31, 2009.
- Suggestions for finding more information.
- Next steps for Section 106 consulting parties.
- A summary of historic resource inventory findings within the APE. See Attachment 2.

Update on the APE

WSDOT, on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), conducted multiple meetings to get consulting party feedback on the APE for this project. These meetings, as well as letters, emails, and phone calls, generated many comments and requests for changes to the APE. Per provisions outlined in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800.16(f)), the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has solicited, discussed, and considered the views of all consulting parties regarding the APE, and will continue to consult throughout the duration of the Section 106 process. As a result of this

consultation, WSDOT has adjusted the APE to accommodate many of the recommendations of the consulting parties. Comments on issues not directly related to the APE (such as potential adverse effects or mitigation) will be addressed later in the Section 106 process.

Attachment 1 of this letter includes the revised APE maps and WSDOT's justification for why the APE was or was not altered. Again, we appreciate your participation in the Section 106 process, and your comments on the APE.

Historic Resource Inventory within the APE

As part of the Section 106 process, we provide you the results of our historic resource inventory. WSDOT has evaluated every built environment resource constructed in or before 1971 within the revised APE. A professional architectural historian, who meets the Secretary of Interior Standards qualifications, has evaluated each property per the National Park Service guidelines for potential National Register of Historic Places eligibility. Each resource has been recorded in the Washington State Historic Property Inventory database administered by the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

The historic property evaluation is based on a "reconnaissance-level" survey, as required by the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and not every detail about each property is captured. **Please review the Historic Property Inventory forms of interest, returning any comments on the forms to me by Friday, July 31, 2009, using the contact information at the end of this letter.**

Comment Instructions

To help in your review of the inventory information, please refer to Attachment 2: Summary of SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Historic Resources Inventory Findings. A reference map is included with the CD containing the Historic Property Inventory forms in PDF format; no paper copies of the forms are available. Please focus your comments according to the two guidelines below:

1. Glaring errors and omissions which may result in a different determination of eligibility; and/or
2. Any information that increases our understanding of a property's historic significance, and may lead to a different determination of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.

Need more information?

For additional information on the historic property survey and inventory, you may refer to the following resources:

- Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation overview of survey and inventory: <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/pages/HistoricSites/Survey.htm>

- The National Park Service guidance on evaluating properties for National Register eligibility: <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb15.pdf>

Next Coordination Steps for Section 106 Consulting Parties

After review of the Historic Property Inventory forms, WSDOT will assess effects to historic properties and draft potential measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate those effects. The SR 520 project team will involve the consulting parties during this process through fall 2009 and winter 2010.

Thank you for your continuing interest in the project and for joining us as a consulting party. If you have further questions or comments please contact me by phone at 206.770.3613, or by email at tolonm@wsdot.wa.gov.

You can also refer to the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Web site at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge for updates and information.

Sincerely,



Marsha Tolon
WSDOT Environmental Lead

Attachments and Enclosures

cc: Jenifer Young, SR 520 Environmental Manager
Connie Walker Gray, WSDOT Cultural Resources Specialist
Matthew Sterner, DAHP Transportation Archaeologist
Scott Williams, WSDOT Cultural Resources Program Manager

Attachment 1: Revised Area of Potential Effects

In May and June 2009, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), conducted multiple meetings to get consulting party feedback on the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. These meetings, as well as letters, emails, and phone calls, generated many comments and requests for changes to the APE. Per provisions outlined in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800.16(f)), WSDOT has solicited, discussed, and considered the views of all consulting parties regarding the APE, and will continue to consult throughout the duration of the Section 106 process. As a result of this consultation, WSDOT has adjusted the APE to accommodate many of the recommendations of the consulting parties.

Below is a summary of the comments and concerns raised by consulting parties about the APE, and WSDOT's response. The revised APE maps (which include the location and NRHP-eligibility of resources within the APE) are located at the end of the summary.

Recommendation that WSDOT include the entire Roanoke Park Historic District within the APE.

WSDOT has expanded the APE to include the entire historic district within the APE.

Recommendation that WSDOT include Lake Washington Boulevard between East Madison Street and 32nd Avenue, as well as Boyer Avenue between 24th Avenue and Lake Washington Boulevard.

WSDOT does not plan to amend the APE to include these two areas. These areas already have traffic that lead to and from the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps. Compared to existing conditions, there is no potential for traffic to cause an adverse effect in these areas, which currently see heavy traffic volumes. Lake Washington Boulevard, Boyer Avenue, 24th Avenue East (north of Galer) and East Madison Street are all classified by the city of Seattle as arterials. Increased traffic has no potential to constitute an effect on historic properties that may be located on Lake Washington Boulevard between E. Madison Street and 32nd Avenue or Boyer Avenue between 24th Avenue and Lake Washington Boulevard.

Recommendation that WSDOT expand the APE to include the Rainier Vista viewshed.

The southwestern-most portion of the Rainier Vista is included in the APE. However, the Rainier Vista was determined not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places in 2003. Although we recognize it as part of the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, the Rainier Vista is not a historic property as defined by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Therefore, we will not adjust the APE to include the Rainier Vista “Fountain to Mountain” viewshed. Please note that the visual resources section of the project’s environmental impact statement will take into consideration the impact that the project will have on viewsheds and scenic features within the project area.

Recommendation that all construction staging areas be included in the APE.

All known staging areas are included within the APE; if additional staging areas are identified, the APE will be modified to account for the new staging areas.

Recommendation that WSDOT include all known haul routes within the APE.

WSDOT has adjusted the APE to include haul routes along non-arterial residential streets. This includes areas not yet within the APE, such as E. Shelby and E. Hamlin Streets, between Montlake Boulevard and McCurdy Park. However, the majority of haul routes are on streets that have been defined as arterials by the city of Seattle. This includes haul routes along 24th Avenue East, Montlake Boulevard, NE Pacific Street, Boyer Avenue East, and Harvard Avenue East.

Arterials have been identified by the city of Seattle in order to accommodate more traffic than local streets. Given the current baseline traffic conditions, temporary increases in truck traffic on arterials during construction would not have the potential to cause adverse effects to adjacent historic properties, if any exist.

The effects of construction truck trips on the local arterial system will be relatively minor for all options. With average construction activity, truck trips would range from 1-2 trips per hour under Option A and Option L, and 1-5 trips per hour under Option K. During peak construction periods, truck trips would range from 2-8 trips per hour under Option A, 2-20 trips per hour under Option K, and 2-12 trips per hour under Option L. The temporary nature of the increased traffic would not have the potential to cause a loss of integrity of the historic properties’ physical characteristics that convey their historic significance.

However, increased truck traffic on local (non-arterial) streets such as E. Shelby and E. Hamlin Streets between 24th Avenue East and McCurdy Park has the potential to cause alterations in the character or use of properties that may be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, we are

now including this area within the APE. Construction truck volumes would increase traffic approximately 10-40 percent on these streets.

WSDOT will be evaluating potential construction impacts from haul routes outside of the Section 106 framework during the NEPA process. If this analysis identifies potential impacts that would result in a loss of integrity to historic properties as defined by Section 106, the APE may be modified to take these impacts into account.

Recommendation that WSDOT include the entire area of Portage Bay (up to the University Bridge) and the Montlake Cut (to Webster Point), including the grounds just north of the Seattle Yacht Club clubhouse.

WSDOT will adjust the APE to include the entire navigable waterways of Portage Bay and the entire Montlake Cut, terminating at the eastern end of the Cut. The adjusted APE will not include additional shoreline docks, house boats, bridges, or other structures along the shores of Portage Bay, except for what was already included in the APE submitted in April 2009.

There is no potential to affect the character or use of historic properties as defined by Section 106 in the water east of the Montlake Cut out to Webster Point; therefore, that area is not included in the APE. Further, there is no potential to affect historic properties on or near the grounds north of the Seattle Yacht Club, so that area is also not included within the APE.

As described above, we carefully considered each consulting party comment and evaluated them against project construction and design descriptions. We recognize that we were not able to incorporate every recommendation about the APE. However, when we did not incorporate a comment, we did so after thoughtful evaluation and after concluding that the revised APE, as enclosed in this letter, includes all areas where the character or use of historic properties could potentially be affected by this project.

Attachment 2: Summary of Historic Resources Inventory Findings

To help consulting parties review the results of the historic resources inventory performed for the SR 520 I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project, findings from different segments of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) are summarized below.

Historic Resource Survey within the APE

There are five resources within the APE that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP): the Montlake Cut/Lake Washington Ship Canal, the Montlake Bridge, the Seattle Yacht Club, the Arboretum Aqueduct/Sewer Trestle, and the Canoe House (Naval Military Hangar-University Shell House) on the University of Washington campus. Since these are listed, we have not prepared HPI forms for these resources (but they are shown in the enclosed table and maps of resources).

Two resources within the APE have been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by WSDOT within the last year: the James Arnston House (2851 Evergreen Point Road) and the SR 520 Evergreen Point Bridge. An additional resource has been determined not NRHP-eligible by WSDOT in the past year: Helen Pierce House (2857 Evergreen Point Road). DAHP concurred with all three of these determinations. Therefore, we have not included the HPI forms in this submittal.

During the SR 520: I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project historic resource survey, we identified, evaluated, and recorded 230 resources within the APE that were constructed prior to 1972. These have been documented on the Washington State Historic Property Inventory Database. Of these, 149 are eligible for listing in the NRHP, either individually or as contributing resource to the two NRHP eligible historic districts (Roanoke Park and Montlake). The remaining 81 evaluated resources are not eligible for listing in the NRHP, either individually or as contributing resources to historic districts.

Roanoke Park Historic District

The nine-block Roanoke Park Historic District is located between E. Shelby Street on the north, 10th Avenue E. on the east, E. Roanoke Street on the south, and Harvard Avenue E. on the west, and is now completely included within the project APE. This district has been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), is currently listed in the Washington Heritage Register (WHR), and is likely to be listed in the NRHP in the near future.

Per the direction of Dr. Allyson Brooks in the DAHP/UCO coordination meeting on May 20, 2009, and in a meeting at your office with members of the Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Club on May 26, 2009, WSDOT is not recording each individual property within the nine-block Roanoke Park Historic District in the Historic Property Inventory Database. Instead, WSDOT will reference—and include as an appendix in the Cultural Resources report—the NRHP nomination for this resource to assess the character-defining features of the historic property, and then will assess our undertaking's effects on the historic property. Please note, however, that WSDOT has already individually evaluated five historic resources (those closest to the SR 520 right of way) within the Roanoke Park Historic District, and those are included in this submittal. Of these, all five are contributing resources to the NRHP-eligible district, and one is also individually NRHP-eligible.

Montlake Historic District

The potential Montlake Historic District is generally defined as the area between the Lake Washington Ship Canal to the north, Lake Washington Boulevard to the east, Galer (between Lake Washington Boulevard and 24th Avenue East) to the south, Interlaken Boulevard (up to Fuhrman Ave E) to the south and west, and Portage Bay to the north and east. Within the proposed district boundaries, WSDOT evaluated 144 individual resources. 126 properties contribute to the NRHP-eligible district, 35 of which are also individually eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Individually NRHP-eligible Resources Outside of the Historic Districts

Excluding those properties that are located in potential historic districts, the survey identified 17 individually eligible properties within the APE.



Washington State
Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program



I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

Attachment 3: Historic Property Inventory Forms for all resources constructed prior to 1972.

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
1	Harvard Avenue East	1966	1917	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity
2	Harvard Avenue East	1970	1969	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity
3	Harvard Avenue East	1978	1901	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity
4	Harvard Avenue East	1980	1932	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
5	East Boston Street	806	1925	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
6	East Lynn Street	806	1924	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
7	Harvard Avenue East	2324	1959	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity
8	Broadway Avenue E	2343	1906	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered some loss of integrity
9	Broadway Avenue E	2347	1905	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered some loss of integrity
10	Broadway Avenue E	2352 Talder House	1909	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C
11	Broadway Avenue E	2356	1909	Not eligible	Has suffered loss of integrity
12	East Miller Street	904	1911	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered some loss of integrity

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
14	Broadway Avenue E	2412	1910	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
15	East Miller Street	910	1905	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
16	East Miller Street	914	1910	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
17	10th Avenue E	2351	1930	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered some loss of integrity
18	10th Avenue E	2401	1909	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity
19	10th Avenue E	2405	1909	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
20	10th Avenue E	2409	1921	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity
21	10th Avenue E	2413-15	1957; 1905	Not eligible	(two buildings – 1905 and 1957) Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity
22	10th Avenue E	2400	1932	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered some loss of integrity
23	10th Avenue E	2406-08	1962	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
24	10th Avenue E	2412	1910	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
25	Federal Avenue E	2422	1907	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered some loss of integrity

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
27	10th Avenue E	Overpass	1962	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
28	Delmar Drive E	Overpass	1962	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
29	Boyer Avenue E	Overpass	1962	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
30	Delmar Drive E	Bagley View Point	1908; 1970	Not Eligible	Has suffered a significant loss of integrity
31	Between 11 th and 12 th Avenue	Roanoke steps	1908	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
32	Boyer Avenue E	2545 Alden Mason House	1949	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C; Potentially eligible Seattle Landmark
33	Boyer Avenue E	2542	1957	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
34	Boyer Avenue E	2534	1911	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered a significant loss of integrity
35	Boyer Avenue E	2524 Portage Bay condominiums	1958	Not Eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
36	Boyer Avenue E	2518 Kelley House	1909	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C
37	East Roanoke Street	901 Fire Station #22	1965	Eligible	Two buildings on one parcel; Outside of boundaries and period of significance for Roanoke Park historic district; Fire Station #22 is eligible under Criterion C

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
38	Boylston Avenue E.	2515 Denny-Fuhrman (Seward) School	1893; 1899; 1905; 1917	Eligible	Three buildings - Eligible under Criteria A & C Designated Seattle Landmark; 1893/99 building is also listed on the WHR
39	Boylston Avenue E.	2603 Crawford Apartments	1917	Not eligible	Has suffered significant loss of integrity
40	Boylston Avenue E.	2607	1914	Not eligible	Has suffered significant loss of integrity
41	Boylston Avenue E.	2611	1914	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
42	Boylston Avenue E.	2815 Shelby Apartments	1928	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C – Multiple Property Nomination for Seattle Apartment Buildings, 1900-1957
43	Franklin Avenue E	2847 Gilmore House	1907	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C
44	Franklin Avenue E	2901 L' Amourita Apartments	1909	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C - Multiple Property Nomination for Seattle Apartment Buildings, 1900-1957 Designated Seattle Landmark
45	Franklin Avenue E	2919 Franklin Apartments	1927	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C - Multiple Property Nomination for Seattle Apartment Buildings, 1900-1957
46	Franklin Avenue E	2923 Franklin Apartments	1927	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C - Multiple Property Nomination for Seattle Apartment Buildings, 1900-1957
47	Franklin Avenue E	2927	1930	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
		District			completed for this district)
49	Harvard Avenue E	2612	1909	Contributing ¹	Contributing to Roanoke Park potential historic district
50	Broadway Ave E	2601	1912	Contributing	Contributing to Roanoke Park potential historic district
51	East Roanoke Street	950 Roanoke Park	1908	Contributing	Contributing to Roanoke Park potential historic district
52	East Roanoke Street	1004	1907	Contributing	Contributing to Roanoke Park potential historic district
53	East Roanoke Street	1018	1909	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Roanoke Park potential historic district; Individually eligible under Criterion C
54	East Roanoke Street	1106	1965	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
55	East Roanoke Street	1118	1940	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
56	Boyer Avenue E	2608 Queen City Yacht Club	1938	Not eligible	Has suffered a loss of integrity
57	Lake Washington Ship Canal	Montlake Cut	1916	Listed	Listed in the NRHP [Chittenden Locks and Related Features of the Lake Washington Ship Canal multiple property listing]; listed in the WHR; designated Seattle Landmark (No HPI form completed)

¹ "Contributing" denotes those buildings that comprise a historic district, even though they may lack individual distinction, because they contribute to the character of the district. These components must possess integrity individually, as well as add to the district's integrity.

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status		Comments
						(No HPI form completed)
59	East Hamlin Street	1807 Seattle Yacht Club - Main Station	1919	Listed		Listed in the NRHP; listed in the WHR; designated Seattle Landmark (No HPI form completed)
60	Montlake Boulevard NE	2723 NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center	1931	Contributing Eligible		Five buildings – 1931, 1939, 1940, 1965, 1966. 1931 building only - Contributing to Montlake potential historic district; Individually eligible for NRHP under Criteria A & C; Potentially eligible as a Seattle Landmark
			1939; 1940; 1965; 1966	Not contributing		1939 building - Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity 1940 - Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered loss of integrity 1965, 1966 buildings - Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district – outside of period of significance
61	East Hamlin Street	1891	1919	Contributing		Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
62	East Hamlin Street	1893	1932	Contributing Eligible		Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
63	East Hamlin Street	1885	1941	Contributing		Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
64	East Hamlin Street	1888	1920	Contributing		Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
65	East Hamlin Street	1896	1925	Contributing Eligible		Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
67	Montlake Boulevard NE	2815	1914	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
68	East Shelby Street	1897	1926	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
69	East Shelby Street	1887	1922	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
70	East Shelby Street	1894	1937	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
71	Montlake Boulevard NE	2907	1942	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
72	Montlake Boulevard NE	2908	1921	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
73	Montlake Boulevard NE	2904	1921	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
74	East Shelby Street	2112	1921	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
75	East Shelby Street	2118	1926	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
76	East Shelby Street	2122	1934	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
77	East Shelby Street	2126	1915	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
78	East Shelby Street	2132	1955	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district – outside of period of significance and has suffered loss of integrity
79	East Shelby Street	2136	1931	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
81	East Shelby Street	2146	1921	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
82	East Shelby Street	2152	1915	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
83	East Shelby Street	2158	1925	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
84	East Shelby Street	2159 Mary Houlahan House	1914	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district; Individually eligible under Criterion C Designed by Bebb and Gould
85	East Park Drive East	2817	1914; 1940	Contributing	(2 buildings – 1940, 1914) Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
86	East Shelby Street	2153	1970	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district – outside of period of significance
87	East Shelby Street	2147	1926	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
88	East Shelby Street	2143	1923	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
89	East Shelby Street	2137	1923	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
90	East Shelby Street	2133	1920	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
91	East Shelby Street	2127	1920	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
92	East Shelby Street	2121	1925	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
93	East Shelby Street	2117	1926	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
95	Montlake Boulevard NE	2818	1920	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
96	Montlake Boulevard NE	2812	1922	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
97	Montlake Boulevard NE	2810	1915	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
98	East Hamlin Street	2110	1924	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
99	East Hamlin Street	2112	1915	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
100	East Hamlin Street	2122	1926	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
101	East Hamlin Street	2128	1922	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
102	East Hamlin Street	2130	1922	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
103	East Hamlin Street	2136	1926	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
104	East Hamlin Street	2142	1949	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
105	East Hamlin Street	2146	1920	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
106	East Hamlin Street	2150	1930	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
107	East Hamlin Street	2160	1920	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
108	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2720 (aka 2161 E. Hamlin St.) Museum of History and Industry (MOHAI)	1950-52	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
110	East Hamlin Street	2147	1924	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
111	East Hamlin Street	2141	1923	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
112	East Hamlin Street	2137	1925	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
113	East Hamlin Street	2133	1919	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
114	East Hamlin Street	2127	1924	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
115	East Hamlin Street	2121	1927	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
116	East Hamlin Street	2117	1914	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
117	East Hamlin Street	2111	1925	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
118	Montlake Boulevard NE	2740	1920	Not Contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
119	Montlake Boulevard NE	2734	1919	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
120	East Montlake Place East	2625 Union 76 Service Station	1952	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
121	22nd Avenue East	2605 Hop In Grocery	1937	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered significant loss of integrity
122	West Montlake Place East	2575	1951	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district;

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
124	West Montlake Place East	2563	1937	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
125	West Montlake Place East	2553	1936	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district;
126	West Montlake Place East	2521	1937	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district;
127	West Montlake Place East	2511	1931	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district; Individually eligible under Criterion C
128	West Montlake Place East	2507	1929	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district;
129	West Montlake Place East	2501	1931	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district; Individually eligible under Criterion C
130	East Calhoun Street	1618 Montlake Community Center	1935	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district; Individually eligible under Criteria A & C Designated Seattle Landmark
131	20th Avenue East	2552	1937	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
132	West Montlake Place East	2564	1947	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district;
133	East Roanoke Street	2009	1950	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
134	East Roanoke Street	2015	1949	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
135	East Roanoke Street	2023	1952	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
137	East Roanoke Street	2201	1910	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
138	East Roanoke Street	2205	1947	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
139	East Roanoke Street	2209	1921	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
140	East Montlake Place East	2571	1951	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
141	East Louisa Street	2216	1922	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
142	East Louisa Street	2220	1930	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district; Individually eligible under Criterion C
143	East Louisa Street	2226	1926	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district;
144	24th Avenue East	2515	1933	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
145	East Miller Street	2230	1954	Not Contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district – outside of period of significance and has suffered loss of integrity
146	East Miller Street	2233	1934	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
147	24th Avenue East	2459	1934	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
148	24th Avenue East	2455	1939	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
149	24th Avenue East	2415	1924	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
151	24th Avenue East	2412	1919	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
152	24th Avenue East	2416	1919	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
153	East Calhoun Street	2406	1939	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
154	24th Avenue East	2456	1922	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
155	24th Avenue East	2466	1920	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
156	24th Avenue East	2502	1921	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
157	24th Avenue East	2506	1920	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
158	24th Avenue East	2512	1920	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
159	24th Avenue East	2516	1925	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
160	East Louisa Street	2400	1924	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district;
161	24th Avenue East	2556	1925	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
162	24th Avenue East	2553	1959	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - outside of period of significance for Montlake historic district
163	East Roanoke Street	2251	1959	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - outside period of significance
164	East Montlake Place East	2600	1926	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district; Individually eligible under Criterion C

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
166	East Montlake Place East	2610	1926	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district; Individually eligible under Criterion C
167	East Montlake Place East	2616	1938	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
168	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2209	1925	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
169	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2215	1937	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
170	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2219	1929	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
171	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2223	1928	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
172	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2227	1925	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
173	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2231	1927	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
174	24th Avenue East	2616	1926	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
175	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2401	1930	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
176	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2409	1920	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
177	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2415	1922	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
179	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2425	1931	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
180	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2429	1931	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
181	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2433	1930	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
182	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2437	1930	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
183	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2441	1927	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
184	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2445	1927	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
185	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2449	1928	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
186	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2455	1926	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
187	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2459	1927	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
188	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2465	1927	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C
189	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2615	1946	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
190	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2607	1926	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
				Eligible	Individually eligible under Criterion C
192	East Roanoke Street	2559	1928	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
193	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2537	1928	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
194	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2531	1926	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
195	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2525	1927	Not contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
196	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2521	1946	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
197	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2517	1947	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
198	Lake Washington Blvd. E	2511	1948	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
199	East Miller Street	2530	1945	Not Contributing	Not contributing to Montlake potential historic district - has suffered substantial loss of integrity
200	26 th Avenue East	2467	1926	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
201	26 th Avenue East	2463	1925	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
202	26 th Avenue East	2457	1932	Contributing	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district
203	26 th Avenue East	2451	1930	Contributing Eligible	Contributing to Montlake potential historic district Individually eligible under Criterion C

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
204	Arboretum Dr E	2300 Washington Park Arboretum	1903	Eligible	Eligible under Criteria B and C; Includes Arboretum Aqueduct (1912) - Listed in the NRHP [Historic Bridges/Tunnels in Washington State], listed in the WHR, designated Seattle Landmark; and Seattle Japanese Garden (1960) - Designated Seattle Landmark
205	Lake Washington Boulevard in the Washington Park Arboretum	Arboretum Aqueduct aka Arboretum Sewer Trestle	1912	Listed	Listed in the NRHP [Historic Bridges/Tunnels in Washington State]; listed in the WHR; designated Seattle Landmark (No HPI form completed)
206	Lake Washington	Governor Albert D. Rosellini Bridge/ Evergreen Point Bridge	1960-63	Determined Eligible	Eligible under Criteria A and C, and Criteria Consideration G (No HPI form completed)
207	University of Washington	Naval Military Hangar - University Shell House (Canoe House)	1918	Listed	Listed in the NRHP; listed in the WHR (No HPI form completed)
208	1925-59 NE Pacific St. University of Washington Campus	University of Washington Medical Center & Magnuson Health Sciences Building/UW School of Medicine	1947-1973 (and later additions)	Not eligible	Has suffered a significant loss of integrity

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
210	Campus	Husky Stadium	1920 (with later alterations)	Not eligible	Has suffered a significant loss of integrity
211		Bank of America Arena at Hec Edmundson Pavilion	1928	Not eligible	Has suffered a significant loss of integrity
212		Husky Pool	1939	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
213		Pedestrian Bridge	1938	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
214		Bloedel Hall	1971	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C
215		Winkenwerder Forest Lab	1963	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C
216		Wilson Ceramics Lab	1946	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
217		Wilcox Hall	1963	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
218		More Hall	1946-48	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
219		More Hall Annex (former Nuclear Reactor Building)	1961	Eligible	Eligible under Criteria A and C; Listed in the WHR
220	Power Plant	1909	Not eligible	Has suffered a significant loss of integrity	
221	Plant Operation Annexes 2 - 4	1947; 1956; 1909	Not eligible	Has suffered a significant loss of integrity	
222	University of Washington Club	1960	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C	

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
223		McMahon Hall	1965	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C
224		CENPA Instrument Shop	1948	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
225		North Physics Laboratory	1949	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
226		Burke Gilman Trail	1978	Not eligible	Has suffered a significant loss of integrity
227	42nd Avenue E	2411 Edgewater Condominiums	1938-40	Eligible	Eligible under Criterion C - Multiple Property Nomination for Seattle Apartment Buildings, 1900-1957
228	Evergreen Point Road	3267	1952	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria
229		3261	1941	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
230		3201	1960	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
231		3205	1920	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
232		2857 Helen Pierce House	1920, 1932	Not eligible	Determined not eligible for the NRHP due to alterations causing a loss of integrity, but eligible for the WHR – SHPO concurred on April 15, 2009. (No HPI form included)
233		2849	1935	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
234		2841	1914	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
235		2851 James Arntson	1953	Eligible	Determined eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C – SHPO concurred on April

Summary of Pre-1972 Properties Surveyed in APE

Property ID	Street Name/Location	Street Address/ Property Name	Date of Construction	NRHP Status	Comments
		House			15, 2009. (No HPI form included)
236		2837	1956	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered loss of integrity
237		2651	1958	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity
238		2617	1947	Not eligible	Fails to meet any of the four NRHP criteria and has suffered significant loss of integrity

**Tribal Correspondence – Revised Area
of Potential Effect**

Copies of the following letter #2-9 were sent to the following individuals:

Date	Subject	From	To	Corresp. Ref. No.
7/17/2009	Revised Area of Potential Effects King County, Washington SR 520 I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project	Julie Meredith SR 520 Program Director	Hank Gobin Cultural Resources Manager Tulalip Tribe 6410 23rd Ave NE Tulalip, WA 98271	LTR #102
			Richard Young Environmental Programs/Cultural Resources Tulalip Tribe 6700 Totem Beach Road Marysville, WA 98271	LTR #103
			Melvin R. Sheldon, Chair Tulalip Tribes 6700 Totem Beach Rd. Marysville, WA 98271	LTR #104
			Cecil Hanson, Chair Duwamish Tribe 4717 West Marginal Way Seattle, WA 98106	LTR #105
			Charlotte Williams, Chair Attn: Laura Murphy, Archaeologist Muckleshoot Tribe 39015 172nd Ave. SE Auburn, WA 98092	LTR #106
			Joseph Mullen, Chair Snoqualmie Tribe P.O. Box 969 Snoqualmie, WA 98065	LTR #107
			Leonard Forsman, Chair Suquamish Tribe P.O. Box 498 Suquamish, WA 98292	LTR #108
			Ralph Sampson Jr., Chair Attn: Johnson Meninick, Cultural Resources Yakama Nation P.O. Box 151 Toppenish, WA 98948	LTR #109
			Ralph Sampson, Jr., Chair Attn: Philip Rigdon, Natrual Resources Yakama Nation P.O. Box 151 Toppenish, WA 98948	LTR #110



Letter 2-9

**RE: Revised Area of Potential Effects
King County, Washington
SR 520 I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project**

Dear

This letter describes revisions to the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the SR 520 I-5 to Medina, Bridge Replacement and HOV Project, a proposed undertaking per the provisions of 36 CFR 800.3(a) by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), to address an identified transportation need in Seattle, King County, Washington. WSDOT appreciates continuing consultation with the Duwamish Tribe on this project, and any comments you may offer on our proposed revisions to the APE. **We respectfully request your comments by August 17, 2009.**

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800.16(f)), WSDOT has revised the APE in response to coordination with other consulting parties with interest in historic properties potentially effected by the project. Comments were solicited, discussed, and the views of all consulting parties regarding the APE were considered. WSDOT will continue to consult throughout the duration of the Section 106 process. Because of this consultation, WSDOT adjusted the APE to accommodate many of the recommendations of the consulting parties. Please find enclosed the revised APE map and a summary of consulting party comments and concerns about the APE, along with WSDOT's response. Comments on issues not directly related to the APE (such as potential adverse effects or mitigation) will be addressed late in the Section 106 process.

We carefully considered each consulting party comment and evaluated them against project construction and design descriptions. We were not able to incorporate every recommendation about the APE. However, when we did not incorporate a comment, we did so after thoughtful evaluation and after concluding that the revised APE, as enclosed in this letter, now better

includes all areas where the character or use of historic properties could potentially be affected by this project. Additionally, the revised APE includes areas of known archaeological interest.

We very much appreciate the time the Duwamish Tribe dedicates to evaluating the APE and identifying its limitations. We look forward to continuing Section 106 consultation with you in the upcoming months.

For your reference, Attachment 1 to this letter contains the recommendations, which explain what influenced the revisions to the APE, and the enclosed maps show the revised APE. Attachment 2 includes a project description, list of the current consulting parties, and description of the revised APE.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Architectural Historian Connie Walker Gray at 206-716-1138, or grayc@wsdot.wa.gov, or Archaeologist Ken Juell at 206-464-1236, or juellk@wsdot.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Julie Meredith". The signature is written in a cursive style and is placed over a light yellow rectangular background.

Julie Meredith, P.E.
SR 520 Program Director

Attachments and Enclosures

cc: Randy Everett, Federal Highway Administration,
Connie Walker-Gray, WSDOT Architectural Historian
Ken Juell, WSDOT Cultural Resources Specialist
Marsha Tolon, WSDOT 520 Environmental Lead
Scott Williams, WSDOT Cultural Resources Program Manager

Attachment 1: Revised Area of Potential Effects

In May and June 2009, WSDOT, on behalf of FHWA, conducted multiple meetings to get consulting party feedback on the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for this project. These meetings, as well as letters, emails, and phone calls, generated many comments and requests for changes to the APE. Per provisions outlined in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800.16(f)), WSDOT has solicited, discussed, and considered the views of all consulting parties regarding the APE, and will continue to consult throughout the duration of the Section 106 process. Resulting from this consultation, WSDOT has adjusted the APE to accommodate many of the recommendations of the consulting parties.

Below is a summary of the comments and concerns about the APE, and WSDOT's response. The revised APE maps are located at the end of the summary.

Recommendation that WSDOT include the entire Roanoke Park Historic District within the APE

WSDOT has expanded the APE to include the entire historic district within the APE.

Recommendation that WSDOT include Lake Washington Boulevard between East Madison Street and 32nd Avenue as well as Boyer Avenue between 24th Avenue and Lake Washington Boulevard.

WSDOT does not plan to amend the APE to include these two areas. These areas already have traffic that lead to and from the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps. We are required to compare against existing conditions, and since there is already heavy traffic in these areas, there is no potential for traffic to cause an adverse effect in these areas. Lake Washington Boulevard, Boyer Avenue, 24th Avenue East (north of Galer) and East Madison Street are all classified by the city of Seattle as arterials. Potential increased traffic has no potential to constitute an effect on historic properties that may be located on Lake Washington Boulevard between E. Madison Street and 32nd Avenue or Boyer Avenue between 24th Avenue and Lake Washington Boulevard.

Recommendation that WSDOT expand the APE to include the Rainier Vista viewshed.

The southwestern-most portion of the Rainier Vista is included in the APE. However, the Rainier Vista was determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP in 2003. Although we recognize it as part of the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition (AYP), the Rainier Vista is not a historic property as defined by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Therefore, we will not adjust the APE to include the Rainier Vista "Fountain to Mountain" viewshed. Please note that the visual resources section of the EIS will take into consideration the impact the project will have on viewsheds and scenic features within the project area.

Recommendation that all construction staging areas be included in the APE.

All known staging areas are included within the APE; if additional staging areas are identified, the APE will be modified to account for the new staging areas.

Recommendation that WSDOT include all known haul routes within the APE.

WSDOT has adjusted the APE to include haul routes along non-arterial residential streets. This includes areas not yet within the APE, such as E. Shelby and E. Hamlin Streets, between Montlake Boulevard and McCurdy Park. However, the majority of haul routes are on streets that have been defined as arterials by the city of Seattle. This includes haul routes along 24th Avenue East, Montlake Boulevard, NE Pacific Street, Boyer Avenue East, and Harvard Avenue East.

Arterials have been identified by the city of Seattle in order to accommodate more traffic than local streets. Given the current, baseline traffic conditions, temporary increases in truck traffic on arterials during construction would not have the potential to cause adverse effects to adjacent historic properties, if any exist.

The effects of construction truck trips on the local arterial system will be relatively minor for all options. With average construction activity, truck trips would range from 1-2 trips per hour under Option A and Option L, and 1-5 trips per hour under Option K. During peak construction periods, truck trips would range from 2-8 trips per hour under Option A, 2-20 trips under Option K, and 2-12 trips per hour under Option L. The temporary nature of the increased traffic would not have the potential to cause a loss of integrity of the physical characteristics of historic properties that convey their historic significance.

However, increased truck traffic on local (non-arterial) streets such as E. Shelby and E. Hamlin Streets between 24th Avenue East and McCurdy Park has the potential to cause alterations in the character or use of properties that may be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Therefore, we are now including this area within the APE. Construction truck volumes would increase traffic approximately 10-40 percent on these streets.

WSDOT will be evaluating potential construction impacts from haul routes outside of the Section 106 framework during the NEPA process. If this analysis identifies potential impacts that would result in a loss of integrity to historic properties as defined by Section 106, the APE may be modified to consider these impacts.

Recommendation that WSDOT include the entire area of Portage Bay (up to the University Bridge) and the Montlake Cut (to Webster Point), including the grounds just north of the Seattle Yacht Club clubhouse.

WSDOT will adjust the APE to include the entire navigable waterways of Portage Bay and the entire Montlake Cut, terminating at the eastern end of the Cut. The adjusted APE will not include additional shoreline docks, houseboats, bridges, or other structures along the shores of Portage Bay, except for what was already included in the APE submitted in April 2009.

There is no potential to affect the character or use of historic properties as defined by Section 106 in the water east of the Montlake Cut out to Webster Point; therefore, that area is not included in the APE. Further, there is no potential to affect historic properties on or near the grounds north of the Seattle Yacht Club, so that area is also not included within the APE.

As described above, we recognize that we were not able to incorporate every recommendation on the APE. However, we carefully considered each comment and evaluated them against project construction and design descriptions. When we did not incorporate a comment, we did so after thoughtful evaluation and after concluding that the revised APE, as enclosed in this letter, includes all areas where the character or use of historic properties could potentially be affected by this project.

Attachment 2: Project Description

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project is one component of the SR 520 Program. The other projects within the program are SR 520 Eastside Transit and HOV Project, Pontoon Construction Project, and Lake Washington Urban Partnership. The project described in this letter extends from the SR 520 interchange with I-5 to 92nd Avenue NE in Yarrow Point. The project would tie in to the Eastside Transit and HOV Project at Evergreen Point Road; restriping would occur from Evergreen Point Road to 92nd Avenue NE.

A Draft EIS published in August 2006 evaluated No Build, 4-Lane, and 6-Lane alternatives for the SR 520 corridor. The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project being evaluated in a Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) is a 6-Lane Alternative that would rebuild SR 520 between I-5 and Medina, including replacement of the Evergreen Point Bridge across Lake Washington. The SDEIS currently underway will evaluate three design options for the 6-Lane Alternative in Seattle that were developed by a mediation group in 2007 and 2008, in addition to the No Build Alternative. The mediation group included elected officials, local, federal and state agencies, neighborhood representatives, local organizations and WSDOT. This process focused on interchange options and how each design option might affect neighborhoods, traffic, and the environment. Mediation participants also considered the effects to the Washington Park Arboretum and the University of Washington.

The mediation group developed three designs that were included in their [2008 project impact plan](#) and WSDOT will further analyze all three in a NEPA Supplemental Draft EIS consistent with the WSDOT [environmental process](#). The most significant differences are located in the vicinity of the Montlake neighborhood, and figures of the three options in this area are included in Appendix A of this submission. Appendix A also includes a schematic vicinity map. The three designs are:

- [Option A](#) - Most similar to today's configuration, with the addition of a second Montlake drawbridge over the Montlake Cut (Option A figure).
- [Option K](#) - Includes a tunnel under the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange below the SR 520 roadway (Option K figure).
- [Option L](#) - Includes a diagonal drawbridge over the Montlake Cut and a single point urban interchange above the SR 520 roadway (Option L figure).

Elements common to each option include:

- Two general-purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction (6-Lanes between I-5 and Medina).
- A bicycle and pedestrian path on the north side of SR 520.
- A reversible direct HOV access ramp at the I-5/SR 520 connection.
- [Variable speed signs](#).

- Lids at I-5, 10th Avenue E and Delmar Drive E

More details about each design option are available on the Program's webpage:
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/brhpdesign.htm>

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

Enclosed please find maps that illustrate the revised APE for the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. The proposed APE includes all known areas of impact for all three (3) design options, which includes bridges, tunnels, roadway widening, several intersection improvements that include roadway widening, lids, and ADA-approved pedestrian walkways and upgrades, and known staging, temporary storage, and storm water management facilities. See Attachment 1 for the recommendations which brought revision to the APE.

Built Environment

The APE for this project includes one parcel on either side of all areas of impact and ground disturbance. This approach is consistent with the APE determination for the former SR 520 project, with which your office concurred in 2005. For areas where only restriping will occur, such as on parts of Interstate-5, we are only including the highway right-of-way. The APE will account both for direct and indirect effects to historic properties. Direct effects may include demolition and alteration to historic properties, while potential indirect effects can be both during construction and subsequent operations, caused by noise, dust and dirt, vibration, change of setting, or other factors. All historic buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts constructed prior to 1971 are evaluated and documented. Further, based on our ongoing consultation with your office, we have included the Washington Park Arboretum in the APE, and will determine eligibility and project effects, both positive and negative, as part of our evaluation

Electronic copies of Historic Property Inventory Database forms have been prepared for all properties surveyed within the last five years. Any properties surveyed prior to this effort within the last five years were checked in the field to verify condition and integrity. Database inventory forms will be updated as necessary.

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological sites could be disturbed directly or destroyed by the project within the portion of the APE where construction activities will occur. Therefore, WSDOT has delineated a limits-of-construction (combined-option) to consider potential direct effects to archaeological historic properties. WSDOT plans to continue archaeological investigations to examine all areas either not included in the APE defined for the Draft EIS (2006), or purposefully not included at that time pending more detailed design plans that specifically identified ground disturbance locations (Foster Island). WSDOT intends to use background research, ethnographic study, field investigations, and evaluation of the project area's geomorphology over time to identify archaeological historic properties and to assess the probability of encountering subsurface archaeological remains within the limits of construction. If encountered, archaeological sites will be recorded on DAHP archaeological site inventory forms.

Much of the construction portion of the APE was subjected to subsurface investigations during the Draft EIS process. Only one archaeological site, the Miller Street Landfill (45KI760), was identified. Foster Island is known to have been a burial ground of local Lakes Duwamish Indians, and has been identified as a culturally sensitive landform. WSDOT plans to use geophysical remote sensing, possibly other sophisticated techniques, and traditional archaeological investigations to identify potential burials on the Island (if present) in order to avoid or greatly minimize disturbance to them.

The archaeological portion of the APE also includes a vertical element in order to consider all potential effects from ground disturbance. The vertical APE is defined as either the full vertical limit of proposed construction, or the depth to consolidated glacial sediments, whichever is shallower. The latter part of the definition assumes that glacial sediments either pre-date all human occupation in the Puget Sound region, or would have been deposited after ice sheets scoured the landform and removed any physical evidence of pre-glacial human occupation.

Other Consulting Parties

Because of the size and scope of this project, WSDOT is coordinating with other interested groups as Section 106 consulting parties for this project, per provisions in 36 CFR 800.2(c)(5)(d)(i). The following groups are participating in the project as consulting parties:

- Arboretum Foundation
- Docomomo WEWA
- Eastlake Community Council
- Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks
- Historic Bridge Foundation
- Historic Seattle
- King County Department of Historic Preservation
- Montlake Community Club
- Museum of History and Industry (MOHAI)
- Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council
- Seattle Yacht Club
- University of Washington
- Washington Trust for Historic Preservation

The City of Seattle and King County are Certified Local Government (CLG), and the Historic Preservation Offices of both governments participate as Section 106 consulting party. These organizations were provided opportunity to comment on the APE. Within the capacity as consulting parties to the project under Section 106, the above listed groups will further participate in other areas of consultation including, identification of historic properties within the APE, determination of adverse effects to historic properties, and the development of measures to mitigate adverse effect to historic properties, as necessary.

