

4.14. Cultural and Historic Resources

4.14.1. Introduction

The following section includes a summary of cultural and historic resources as presented in the January 2006 EA (Jones & Stokes 2006). Clarification of impacts and mitigation measures is presented below to address public comments received on the proposed action as presented in the January 2006 EA.

The County received 11 public comments regarding cultural and historic resources, (Appendix 3, category Cultural, Historic 90.0 and 90.1).

4.14.2. What cultural and historic resources exist in the project area?

The January 2006 EA presented a detailed accounting of historic resources in the project area, including Appendix E to that document, Cultural Resource Assessment. The assessment identified 16 potential historic properties in the project Area of Potential Effect (APE). The evaluation of these properties addressed the properties' eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) based on the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, developed by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Of the 16 historic properties evaluated for listing in the National Register, five were determined to be eligible for listing. Four of the five properties are eligible under criterion C of the National Register, in the area of architecture, as well-preserved examples of locally distinctive farmsteads in Spokane Valley. One of the five properties, 8101 East Bigelow Gulch Road, meets the requirements for eligibility through National Register Criterion A, which applies to the property's association with past events contributing to the development of the community (e.g., agriculture).

One of the comments received on historic resources stated that the Karl Paulson farmstead is not eligible for the National Register and that the property is not subject to 4(f) regulations. As stated above, this property was identified as one of five properties meeting the criteria for eligibility for listing. WSDOT and the Washington State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) have recognized the property as eligible for listing in the National Register.

Several comments received on cultural and historical resources of the January 2006 EA stated that there was no analysis conducted regarding evidence of indigenous settlement in the area.

As described in Appendix E of the January 2006 EA, a component of the cultural resources report was a review of known archaeological resources within the APE. The report presented in Appendix E was an addendum to the *Cultural Resources Assessment of Spokane County's Proposed Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Realignment Project* (Axon et al. 2001) prepared by Archaeological and Historical Services of Eastern Washington University. The Archaeological and Historical Services initial report (Axon et al. 2001) contained a detailed description of the project area's ethnographic resources, Spokane County's and the project area's historical evolution, and potential areas of archaeological concern.

This revised EA includes a modification to the APE was made to reflect additional project information and changes in the proposed action that occurred since the January 2006 EA. These changes included the addition of the Bigelow/Forker Interchange (Figure 2-4), the Forker Road Modification south of Jacobs Road (Figure 2-5), and proposed wetland mitigation in the vicinity of Palmer Road (Figure 4.4-1).

A pedestrian reconnaissance of the three areas was conducted in March 2007, the results of which are presented in an addendum cultural resources report (Jones & Stokes 2007) located in Appendix 5. In summary, the pedestrian reconnaissance in March 2007 identified several isolated historic bottles near the intersection of Bigelow Gulch and Forker Roads, one historic refuse scatter along the proposed Forker Road Modification portion of the APE, and an abandoned stretch of old Bigelow Gulch Road west of Palmer Road. None of these sites appear to be eligible for listing in the National Register.

4.14.3. What regulations apply to cultural and historic resources?

“Cultural resources” as used in this document refers to all historical and archaeological resources, regardless of significance. Laws and regulations dealing with cultural resources are described below.

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, sets forth national policy and procedures regarding historic properties, defined as districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects included in or eligible for the National Register. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on such properties and to allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation the opportunity to comment on those undertakings, following regulations issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (36 CFR 800). On January 1, 2004, a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement among the Advisory Council, the Federal Highway Administration, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and WSDOT went into effect for WSDOT projects, both state and local, with Federal Highway Administration involvement.

The Programmatic Agreement takes the place of the Advisory Council’s regulations (36 CFR 800) streamlining the Section 106 process and delegating certain responsibilities to WSDOT.

4.14.4. How were potential effects evaluated?

Efforts to identify cultural resources within the project area consisted of conducting a record search, archival research, pedestrian survey, and contacting affected tribal representatives and other interested parties. For the proposed action, surveys have been undertaken and documentation prepared in accordance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Identification of Historic Properties (48 CFR 44716), using personnel who meet the Secretary of Interior’s Professional Standards (48 CFR 22716) in the fields of prehistoric archaeology, historic archaeology, architectural history, and history. For the purposes of this document, the broad pool of cultural resources within the project area that require evaluation for National Register eligibility may be categorized into one major type, as follows:

- Archaeological Resources, which include resources that represent important evidence of past human behavior, including portable artifacts such as arrowheads or tin cans; non-portable “features” such as cooking hearths, foundations, and privies; or residues such as food remains and charcoal. Archaeological remains can be virtually any age, from yesterday’s trash to prehistoric deposits thousands of years old.

For the purposes of this analysis, an impact was considered to be significant and to require mitigation if it would result in removal or otherwise adversely affect listed historic or recorded archaeological resources.

4.14.5. What impacts would the Urban Connector Alignment have on cultural and historic resources?

Proposed Action

How would construction affect cultural and historic resources?

Based upon the research conducted and evaluation of the buildings in the project area, five historic properties were determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register. Eleven of the properties are determined ineligible for listing in the National Register due to lack of integrity, especially in regards to historic materials. SHPO and WSDOT concluded that there is a No Adverse Effect on the five historic properties found eligible for listing in the National Register (DAHP correspondence 2004).

A design modification that is part of the proposed action is a reduced-width right-of-way for a 0.14-mile portion of the alignment right-of-way from west of

Jensen Road to just east of Argonne Road. The width has been reduced from 120 to 80 feet and shifted slightly south to avoid the historic Karl Paulson Farmstead at 8101 East Bigelow Gulch Road. This design modification would result in total avoidance of the historic farmstead.

Please refer to Section 4.14 of the January 2006 EA for additional analysis of impacts of construction on cultural and historic resources. With regard to the historic resources identified during the March 2007 fieldwork effort, these three sites appear to be not eligible for listing in the National Register.

How would operation affect cultural and historic resources?

Operation of the proposed action would not adversely affect known cultural and/or historic resources in the project area. Once construction is complete, no long-term operational impacts on the resources would be likely.

Indirect Impacts

No indirect effects are anticipated from the proposed Urban Connector Alignment.

Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures

- If cultural materials are discovered during construction, the “Plan and Procedures for Dealing with the Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources...” for the project will be implemented and all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area will be diverted until a qualified archaeologist can assess the context and integrity of the find.
- If significant cultural resources are discovered (e.g., human skeletal remains, prehistoric stone tools, and/or historic deposits), the “Plan and Procedures for Dealing with the Unanticipated Discovery of Human Skeletal Remains...” for the project will be implemented and Spokane County, and if necessary, any affected Native American Tribe and SHPO will be immediately contacted. All Native American graves on private or public lands are protected under Washington State law (RCW 27.44).

Analysis of the effects of the proposed action on cultural and historical resources in the project vicinity indicates that none would rise to a level of significance. Concurrence with “No Adverse Effect” of the proposed action to the resources is anticipated from OAHF. The mitigation referenced in this section was considered in combination with mitigation measures listed in Section 4.14.3, Bigelow Gulch Road EA dated January 2006 in reaching this conclusion.

No Action

How would construction affect cultural and historic resources?

No cultural or historic resource would be impacted under the No Action Alternative, since there would be no change to current site conditions.

How would operation affect cultural and historic resources?

There would be no impact associated with operation of the existing roadway.