June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Overview and Technical Summary Reports

Mr. Robert Miguel, Chairman
Ak-Chin Indian Community
42507 West Peters & Nall Road
Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Chairman Miguel:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Trial Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition,
concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

Copies of the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports are enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Caroline Antone, Cultural Resource Manager (with enclosures) (same as addressee)
RYEdlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYEdlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Jon Shumaker, Archaeologist
Natural Resources Department
Arizona Public Service
P.O. Box 53933, M.S. 3372
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3933

Dear Mr. Shumaker:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent”
be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Andy Laurenzi, Southwest Field Representative
Archaeology Southwest
300 North Ash Alley
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Mr. Laurenzi:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Matthew Behrend, Archaeology Cultural Affairs Specialist
Arizona State Land Department
1616 West Adams Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Behrend:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Ruben Ojeda, Manager, Right-of-way Section (same as addressee)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
ccc:
Matthew Behrend, Archaeology Cultural Affairs Specialist, mbehrend@azland.gov
April Sewequaptewa-Tutt, Archaeological Projects Specialist, asewequaptewa-tutt@azland.gov
Crystal Carrancho, Archaeological Projects Specialist, ccarrancho@azland.gov
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Dr. Patrick D. Lyons, Director
Arizona State Museum
P.O. Box 210026
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721-0026

Dear Dr. Lyons:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O'odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community's Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent”
be replaced with "consistent recognition." The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,


Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Ms. Shelby Manney, Cultural Resource Manager
AZDEMA/AZARNG Environmental Office
5636 East McDowell Road, M53309
Phoenix, Arizona 85008-3495

Dear Ms. Manney:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Ms. Amy Sobiech
Tucson Field Office Archaeologist, Gila District
Bureau of Land Management
3201 East Universal Way
Tucson, Arizona 85756

Dear Ms. Sobiech:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent”
be replaced with "consistent recognition." The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Linda Dunlavey, Tucson Field Office Realty Specialist (same as addressee)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 P 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Theodore C. Cooke, General Manager
Central Arizona Project
23636 North 7th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85024

Dear Mr. Cooke:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Bryant Powell, City Manager
City of Apache Junction
300 East Superstition Boulevard
Apache Junction, Arizona 85119

Dear Mr. Powell:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Brad Steinke, Director, Development Services (same as addressee) (with enclosure)
Emile Schmid, City Engineer, Public Works, 575 East Baseline Avenue, Apache Junction, Arizona 85119 (with enclosure)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Rick Miller, Growth Management Director
CLG Contact, Historical Preservation & Revitalization Commission
City of Coolidge
131 West Pinkley Avenue
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Miller:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O'odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent”
be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 ?N 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Harvey Krauss, AICP
City Manager
City of Eloy
628 North Main Street
Eloy, Arizona 85131

Dear Mr. Krauss:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent”
be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. John Wesley, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
City of Mesa
P.O. Box 1466
Mesa, Arizona 85211-1466

Dear Mr. Wesley:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email Lsloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Overview and Technical Summary Reports

Mr. Stephen Roe Lewis, Governor
Gila River Indian Community
P.O. Box 97
Sacaton, Arizona 85147

Dear Governor Lewis:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Trial Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition,
concurrency dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report. Copies of the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports are enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Barnaby Lewis, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85147 (with enclosures)
Kyle Woodson, Director, Cultural Resource Management Program, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85147 (with enclosures)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwiswima, Director
Cultural Preservation Office
Hopi Tribe
P.O. Box 123
Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwiswima:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent”
be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Scott Bender, Pinal County Engineer
Public Works Department
Pinal County
P.O. Box 727 (or 31 N. Pinal Street, Bldg. F)
Florence, Arizona 85132

Dear Mr. Bender:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent”
be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:
STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Peter Yucupicio, Chairman
Pascua Yaqui Tribe
7474 South Camino de Oeste
Tucson, Arizona 85746

Dear Chairman Yucupicio:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Veronica La Motte Darnell, Office of the Attorney General, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, 7777 South Camino Huivisim, Building C, Tucson, Arizona 85757 (with enclosure)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X  
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L  
North–South Corridor Study  
Continuing Section 106 Consultation  
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Sean Heath, Chief  
Environmental Resource Management Division  
Phoenix Area Office  
Bureau of Reclamation  
6150 West Thunderbird Road  
Glendale, Arizona 85306

Dear Mr. Heath:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term "culturally coherent" be replaced with "consistent recognition." The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Dave Gifford, Archaeologist (with enclosure) (same as addressee)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Terry Rambler, Chairman
San Carlos Apache Tribe
P.O. Box 0
San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (with enclosure)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Mike Urton, General Manager
San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District
120 South 3rd Street
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Urton:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Ferris Begay, Project Manager
San Carlos Irrigation Project
13805 North Arizona Boulevard
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Begay:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist/Archaeologist
State Historic Preservation Office
1100 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email l.sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:
STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Overview and Technical Summary Reports

Mr. Delbert Ray, Sr., President
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear President Ray:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Trial Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition,
concurrency dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report. Copies of the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports are enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Angela Garcia-Lewis, Cultural Preservation Compliance Supervisor, 10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, Arizona 85256 (with enclosures)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm

ecc:
Angela Garcia-Lewis, Cultural Preservation Compliance Supervisor, angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov, (with enclosures)
Shane Anton, Cultural Preservation Program Manager, Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov, (with enclosures)
Martha Martinez, NAGPRA Coordinator, Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov, (with enclosures)
ARIZONA DIVISION

June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Ms. Vivian Burdette, Chairwoman
Tonto Apache Tribe
Tonto Apache Reservation #30
Payson, Arizona 85541

Dear Chairwoman Burdette:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc: Wally Davis, Jr., Cultural & NAGPRA Representative (with enclosure) (same as addressce)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Overview and Technical Summary Reports

Mr. Peter Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Mr. Joe Joaquin, Cultural Resource Specialist
Cultural Affairs Office
Tohono O'odham Nation
P. O. Box 837
Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Messrs. Steere and Joaquin:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O'odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community's Trial Historic Preservation Officer requested
a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report. Copies of the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports are enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosures

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Ms. Jennifer Evans, CLG Contact-Grants Coordinator
Town of Florence
P.O. Box 2670
Florence, Arizona 85132

Dear Ms. Evans:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. John Kross, Town Manager
Town of Queen Creek
22350 South Ellsworth Road
Queen Creek, Arizona 85142

Dear Mr. Kross:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical
summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary
report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any
questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project
in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at
(602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Brett Burningham, Planning Administrator (with enclosure) (same as addressee)
Chris Dovel, Town Engineer (with enclosure) (same as addressee)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Ms. Cheryl Eamick, Land Resources Manager
Tucson Electric Power Company
88 East Broadway Boulevard, Mail Stop HQE613
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Ms. Eamick:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (1-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Alexander Popovici, Manager
Industry & Public Projects
Union Pacific Railroad
631 South 7th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Dear Mr. Popovici:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent”
be replaced with "consistent recognition." The reports have been revised accordingly. In addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe's approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm

ecc:
Sayeed Hani  SHani@azdot.gov
Jason Pike  JPike@azdot.gov
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Ms. Linda Marianito, Environmental Manager
Western Area Power Administration
615 South 43rd Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85009

Dear Ms. Marianito:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Sean Berry, Regional Preservation Official/Archaeologist, Western Area Power Administration, P.O. Box 6457, Phoenix, Arizona 85005 (with enclosure)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Chris Coder, Tribal Archaeologist
Yavapai-Apache Nation
2400 West Datsi Street
Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Mr. Coder:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly. In
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
June 22, 2016

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr., President
Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
530 East Merritt Street
Prescott, Arizona 86301-2038

Dear President Jones:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Corps has declined to participate in Section 106 consultation for this project (Tucker [Corps] to Sloat [ADOT] April 25, 2016 email).

In prior consultation, the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to the Four Southern O’odham tribes for review and comment and the TCP technical summary report was provided to the other consulting parties for review and comment. The Gila River Indian Community’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer requested a minor change to the text on page 4 of both reports, that the term “culturally coherent” be replaced with “consistent recognition.” The reports have been revised accordingly.
addition, concurrence dates for the Four Southern Tribe’s approval of the TCP technical summary report have been updated in the abstract and on page 3 of the TCP technical summary report.

A copy of the revised technical summary report is enclosed for your files. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email Lsloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Ms. Linda Ogo, Director, Culture Research Department (with enclosure) (same as addressee)
RYedlin
LSloat (EM02)
RYedlin:cdm
April 10, 2017

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Arizona Division
4000 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Dear Ms. Karla Petty,

The Ak-Chin Indian Community received your letter dated March 28, 2017 regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) proposal to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from State Route 202 (SR 202) eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment.

We also received a copy of the following reports, Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) Evaluation of Proposed Alternative Alignments for the North-South Corridor (NSC) Project, Pinal County, Arizona and Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona. Thank you for enclosing the reports for our review.

At this time, as part of our Continuing Section 106 Consultation and due to the location of the proposed project we will defer all comments to as well as concur with the Tohono O’Odham Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office located in Sells, Arizona.

If you should have any questions, please contact Ms. Bernadette Carra, CRS-Land Management at (520) 568-1337 or Mrs. Caroline Antone, Cultural Resources Manager at (520) 568-1372. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Miguel, Chairman
Good Evening Lori,

I did have a chance to re-read the document and you are correct in that Gila River has taken the lead on this project. I apologize for overlooking that on the document. Please disregard the letter of comment and concurrence on behalf of the Tohono O'Odham Nation. Enjoy your evening!!!😊

Respectfully,
Bernadette C. Carra
Cultural Resources Department
CRS-Land Management
bcarra@ak-chin.nsn.us
Direct: 520-568-1337
Mein: 520-568-1365

Ms. Carra,

For this project, the GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes. I know the letter FHWA mailed is long and sometimes pieces of information can be missed. The second paragraph, on the first page, that lists the consulting parties, at the end of that paragraph the letter defines the GRIC as the lead. Also, and I can provide you a copy if you like, GRIC has informed FHWA that they are the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Lori

Lori C. Sloat
Historic Preservation Specialist
Environmental Planning Group
Arizona Department of Transportation
Phone: (602) 712-6971
Fax: (602) 712-3066
lsloat@azdot.gov

www.azdot.gov
Good Afternoon Lori, due to the project location and never being informed that a lead tribe was designated. The letters are in support of the sister Tribes in regards to the Four Southern Tribes. The project impacts both the Tohono O’Odham Nation and the Gila River Indian Community land management area. As well as a very small part of Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community land management area. Please let me know if there is a designated lead on behalf of the Four Southern Tribes and I will defer future comments and concurrences to them specifically.

Bernadette C. Carra

> On Jun 21, 2017, at 3:24 PM, Lori Sloat <LSloat@azdot.gov> wrote:
> 
> Dear Ms. Carra,
> 
> Good afternoon. I wanted to follow-up with you on the Section 106 consultation from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for the Class III survey and Traditional Cultural Properties Evaluation report for the project listed in the subject bar.
> 
> I have attached for your review a copy of the Section 106 letter from FHWA along with two responses received from Chairman Miguel. Both of the responses are dated April 10, 2017. One response defers to the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) and the other response defers to the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON).
> 
> I am seeking clarification on this issue. Is the Ak-Chin Indian Community deferring to both GRIC and TON?
> 
> I appreciate your time and I look forward to hearing back from you.
> 
> Thanks,
> 
> Lori
> 
> Lori C. Sloat
> Historic Preservation Specialist
> Environmental Planning Group
> Arizona Department of Transportation
> Phone: (602) 712-6971
> Fax: (602) 712-3066
> LSloat@azdot.gov <mailto:LSloat@azdot.gov>
> 
> [adot_enviro_svc_color]
> 
> ________________________________
> 
> Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the person(s)/entity(ies) named above and may contain confidential/privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email, and delete or destroy all copies plus attachments.
> 
> .
> 
> <image001.png>
> <999-A(365) AKChin.pdf>
> <999-A(365) AKChin_response defer to GRIC.pdf>
> <999-A(365) AKChin_response defer to TON 4.10.2017.pdf>
Tribal Consultation Response Letter

Date: 07/08/2016
Contact Name: Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator
Company: PTVWA-AZ Division
Address: P.O. Box 393
4000 North Central Avenue, Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Dear Sir or Madam: North-South Corridor Study - Revised TCP Technical Summary Report

Under Section 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, we are replying to the above referenced project. Please see the appropriate marked circle, including the signatures of Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), and the concurrence of the Chairman of the San Carlos Apache Tribe:

- **NO INTEREST/NO FURTHER CONSULTATION/NO FUTURE UPDATES**
  We refer to the Tribe(s) located nearest to the project area.

- **CONCURRENCE WITH REPORT FINDINGS & THANK YOU**

- **REQUEST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
  I require additional information in order to provide a finding of effect for this proposed undertaking, i.e. Project description ___ Map ___ Photos ___ Other ______________

- **NO EFFECT**
  I have determined that there are no properties of religious and cultural significance to the San Carlos Apache Tribe that are listed on the National Register within the area of potential effect or that the proposed project will have no effect on any such properties that may be present.

- **NO ADVERSE EFFECT**
  Properties of cultural and religious significance within the area of effect have been identified that are eligible for listing in the National Register for which there would be no adverse effect as a result of the proposed project.

- **ADVERSE EFFECT**
  I have identified properties of cultural and religious significance within the area of potential effect that are eligible for listing in the National Register. I believe the proposed project would cause an adverse effect on these properties. Please contact the THPO for further discussion.

We were taught traditionally not to disturb the natural world in a significant way, and that to do so may cause harm to oneself or one’s family. Apache resources can be best protected by managing the land to be as natural as it was in pre-1870s settlement times. Please contact the THPO if there is a change in any portion of the project, especially if Apache cultural resources are found at any phase of planning and construction. Thank you for contacting the San Carlos Apache Tribe, your time and effort is greatly appreciated.

**DIRECTOR/THPO:**

Vernelda J. Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Date 07/11/2016

**CONCURRENCE:**

Terry Rambler, Tribal Chairman
Date 07/12/16
Tribal Consultation Response Letter

Date: 06/29/16
Contact Name: Karla S. Petty
Company: U.S. Department of Transportation, Arizona Division
Address: 4000 N. Central Ave Suite 1500 Phoenix, Az 85012
Project Name/#: STP-999-A(365)X Tracs No. 999 PN-000 H-7454 01L

Dear Sir or Madam:

Under Section 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, we are replying to the above referenced project. Please see the appropriate marked circle, including the signatures of Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), and the concurrence of the Chairman of the San Carlos Apache Tribe:

☐ NO INTEREST/NO FURTHER CONSULTATION/NO FUTURE UPDATES
   We refer to the Tribe located nearest to the project area.

☐ CONCURRENCE WITH REPORT FINDINGS & THANK YOU
   We support the work with the Four Southern Tribes.

☐ REQUEST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
   I require additional information in order to provide a finding of effect for this proposed undertaking, i.e. Project description __ Map __ Photos __ Other ____________________________

☐ NO EFFECT
   I have determined that there are no properties of religious and cultural significance to the San Carlos Apache Tribe that are listed on the National Register within the area of potential effect or that the proposed project will have no effect on any such properties that may be present.

☐ NO ADVERSE EFFECT
   Properties of cultural and religious significance within the area of effect have been identified that are eligible for listing in the National Register for which there would be no adverse effect as a result of the proposed project.

☐ ADVERSE EFFECT
   I have identified properties of cultural and religious significance within the area of potential effect that are eligible for listing in the National Register. I believe the proposed project would cause an adverse effect on these properties. Please contact the THPO for further discussion.

We were taught traditionally not to disturb the natural world in a significant way, and that to do so may cause harm to oneself or one’s family. Apache resources can be best protected by managing the land to be as natural as it was in pre-1870s settlement times. Please contact the THPO, if there is a change in any portion of the project, especially if Apache cultural resources are found at any phase of planning and construction. Thank you for contacting the San Carlos Apache Tribe, your time and effort is greatly appreciated.

DIRECTOR/THPO: Vernelda J. Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer 06/29/2016

CONCURRENCE: Terry Rambler, Tribal Chairman 06/30/16

cc:
July 28, 2016

Lori Sloat  
ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration  
4000 North Central Avenue, Suite 1500  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: North-South Corridor Study TRACS No. 999 PN00 H7454 01L

Dear Ms. Lori Sloat,

The Ak-Chin Indian Community received your letter on July 1, 2016 requesting consultation for proposed undertaking to construct a new north-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 between the Towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona.

At this time, due to the location of the proposed undertaking we will defer all comments and consultation to the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office in Sacaton, Arizona.

If you have any questions please contact Miss Mary Soliz, Cultural Specialist at 520-568-1337 or Caroline Antone, Cultural Resources Manager at 520-568-1372. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Miguel, Chairman  
Ak-Chin Indian Community
March 15, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Supplemental Class I and Built Environment Reports

Mr. Scott Bender
Pinal County Engineer
Pinal County
P.O. Box 727
Florence, Arizona 85132

Dear Mr. Bender:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility that connects the growing communities in central Pinal County with U.S. Route 60 and Interstate 10. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the north-to-south transportation facility. The project consists of multiple proposed action corridor alternatives that include segment options throughout, including the No-Action Alternative, which will be evaluated in the draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Each action corridor alternative is approximately 1,500 feet wide. The action corridor alternatives are divided into four segments that allow shifts from the east to the west, or from the west to the east, with the addition of two transition areas. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office, Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona Game and Fish Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. The Gila River Indian Community is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.
Cultural resources studies for the project have included a Class I overview (Graves et al. 2011), a targeted Class III survey (Hall et al. 2017), a built environment evaluation (Thompson and Gregory 2017), a traditional cultural property overview (Darling 2016), and a traditional cultural property evaluation (Darling 2017). As these studies were nearing completion, ADOT and FHWA decided to convert the project-level National Environmental Policy Act EIS process to a Tier 1-level EIS, in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality regulations codified at 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.02. On October 3, 2016, a revised Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register.

Because the alternatives had continued to shift, the project-level inventories of archaeological and built environment resources (historic buildings and structures) within the proposed action corridor alternatives required updating in support of the Tier 1-level EIS alternative analysis. No new Class III survey is required for the Tier 1 EIS.

Recently, a supplemental Class I report was prepared by HDR as reported in Supplemental Class I Cultural Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Stewart and Brodbeck 2018). A copy of the report is enclosed for your review and comment.

The report summarizes 85 cultural resources that are located within the 1,500-foot-wide Tier 1 action corridor alternatives. Of these 85 sites, 38 previously were determined National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible, 17 previously were determined not eligible for the NRHP, and 30 are unevaluated at this time.

Additionally, HDR completed a report on the built environment entitled Supplemental Inventory of Historic Buildings, Structures, and Districts for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Brodbeck 2018). A copy of the report is enclosed for your review and comment.

The built environment report describes 12 previously determined NRHP eligible structures and 42 historic buildings. A single building previously was determined NRHP eligible, 16 were determined not eligible, and 25 are unevaluated.
Please review the enclosed reports and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the supplemental Class I and built environment reports, please indicate your concurrences on the signature lines below. FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the recommended action corridor alternatives or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature for Pinal County Concurrence Supplemental Class I Report, STP-999-A(365)X]

[Signature for Pinal County Concurrence Built Environment Report, STP-999-A(365)X]

Enclosures

ecc:
R Yedlin
J Heilman

3/31/2018

3/31/2018
March 15, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Supplemental Class I and Built Environment Reports

Mr. Bryant Powell, City Manager
City of Apache Junction
300 East Superstition Boulevard
Apache Junction, Arizona 85119

Dear Mr. Powell:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility that connects the growing communities in central Pinal County with U.S. Route 60 and Interstate 10. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the north-to-south transportation facility. The project consists of multiple proposed action corridor alternatives that include segment options throughout, including the No-Action Alternative, which will be evaluated in the draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Each action corridor alternative is approximately 1,500 feet wide. The action corridor alternatives are divided into four segments that allow shifts from the east to the west, or from the west to the east, with the addition of two transition areas. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office, Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona Game and Fish Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. The Gila River Indian Community is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.
Cultural resources studies for the project have included a Class I overview (Graves et al. 2011), a targeted Class III survey (Hall et al. 2017), a built environment evaluation (Thompson and Gregory 2017), a traditional cultural property overview (Darling 2016), and a traditional cultural property evaluation (Darling 2017). As these studies were nearing completion, ADOT and FHWA decided to convert the project-level National Environmental Policy Act EIS process to a Tier 1-level EIS, in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality regulations codified at 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.02. On October 3, 2016, a revised Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register.

Because the alternatives had continued to shift, the project-level inventories of archaeological and built environment resources (historic buildings and structures) within the proposed action corridor alternatives required updating in support of the Tier 1-level EIS alternative analysis. No new Class III survey is required for the Tier 1 EIS.

Recently, a supplemental Class I report was prepared by HDR as reported in Supplemental Class I Cultural Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Stewart and Brodbeck 2018). A copy of the report is enclosed for your review and comment.

The report summarizes 85 cultural resources that are located within the 1,500-foot-wide Tier 1 action corridor alternatives. Of these 85 sites, 38 previously were determined National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible, 17 previously were determined not eligible for the NRHP, and 30 are unevaluated at this time.

Additionally, HDR completed a report on the built environment entitled Supplemental Inventory of Historic Buildings, Structures, and Districts for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Brodbeck 2018). A copy of the report is enclosed for your review and comment.

The built environment report describes 12 previously determined NRHP eligible structures and 42 historic buildings. A single building previously was determined NRHP eligible, 16 were determined not eligible, and 25 are unevaluated.
Please review the enclosed reports and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with
the adequacy of the supplemental Class I and built environment reports, please indicate your
concurrences on the signature lines below. FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at
this time. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the recommended
action corridor alternatives or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic
Preservation Specialist Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for City of Apache Junction Concurrence
Supplemental Class I Report, STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Signature for City of Apache Junction Concurrence
Built Environment Report, STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

cc:
Emile Schmid, City Engineer, Public Works, City of Apache Junction, 575 East Baseline
Avenue, Apache Junction, Arizona 85119 (with enclosures)
Larry Kirch, Director, Development Services (with enclosures) (same as addressee)

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
March 15, 2017

Mr. Sean Heath, Chief
Environmental Resource Management Division
Phoenix Area Office
Bureau of Reclamation
6150 West Thunderbird Road
Glendale, Arizona 85306

Dear Mr. Heath:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility that connects the growing communities in central Pinal County with U.S. Route 60 and Interstate 10. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the north-to-south transportation facility. The project consists of multiple proposed action corridor alternatives that include segment options throughout, including the No-Action Alternative, which will be evaluated in the draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Each action corridor alternative is approximately 1,500 feet wide. The action corridor alternatives are divided into four segments that allow shifts from the east to the west, or from the west to the east, with the addition of two transition areas. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office, Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona Game and Fish Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. The Gila River Indian Community is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.
Cultural resources studies for the project have included a Class I overview (Graves et al. 2011), a targeted Class III survey (Hall et al. 2017), a built environment evaluation (Thompson and Gregory 2017), a traditional cultural property overview (Darling 2016), and a traditional cultural property evaluation (Darling 2017). As these studies were nearing completion, ADOT and FHWA decided to convert the project-level National Environmental Policy Act EIS process to a Tier 1-level EIS, in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality regulations codified at 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.02. On October 3, 2016, a revised Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register.

Because the alternatives had continued to shift, the project-level inventories of archaeological and built environment resources (historic buildings and structures) within the proposed action corridor alternatives required updating in support of the Tier 1-level EIS alternative analysis. No new Class III survey is required for the Tier 1 EIS.

Recently, a supplemental Class I report was prepared by HDR as reported in Supplemental Class I Cultural Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Stewart and Brodbeck 2018). A copy of the report is enclosed for your review and comment.

The report summarizes 85 cultural resources that are located within the 1,500-foot-wide Tier 1 action corridor alternatives. Of these 85 sites, 38 previously were determined National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible, 17 previously were determined not eligible for the NRHP, and 30 are unevaluated at this time.

Additionally, HDR completed a report on the built environment entitled Supplemental Inventory of Historic Buildings, Structures, and Districts for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Brodbeck 2018). A copy of the report is enclosed for your review and comment.

The built environment report describes 12 previously determined NRHP eligible structures and 42 historic buildings. A single building previously was determined NRHP eligible, 16 were determined not eligible, and 25 are unevaluated.
Please review the enclosed reports and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the supplemental Class I and built environment reports, please indicate your concurrences on the signature lines below. FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the recommended action corridor alternatives or the project in general, please feel free to contact ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Rebecca Yedlin

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

3/20/2018
Date

Signature for Bureau of Reclamation Concurrence
Supplemental Class I Report, STP-999-A(365)X

Signature for Bureau of Reclamation Concurrence
Built Environment Report, STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

cc:
Dave Gifford, Archaeologist, Phoenix Area Office (with enclosures) (same as addressee)

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Ms. Shelby Manney, Cultural Resource Manager
AZDEMA/AZARNG Environmental Office
Arizona Army National Guard
5636 E. McDowell Rd., M53309
Phoenix, Arizona 85008-3495

Dear Ms. Manney:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezl [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith
[Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavía [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwiswma [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

______________________________  _________________________
Signature for AANG Concurrence       Date
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Robert Miguel, Chairman
Ak-Chin Indian Community
42507 W. Peters and Nall Road
Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Chairman Miguel:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urtom [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovich [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey and Figure I.1 on page 2 in the TCP evaluation). The TCP evaluation and the Class III pedestrian survey reports are enclosed for your review and comment. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The TCP evaluation, entitled “Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) Evaluation of Proposed Alternative Alignments for the North-South Corridor (NSC) Project, Pinal County, Arizona” (Darling 2017) identified two TCPs. The TCPs, NRHP eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 3.
Both the TCP evaluation and Class III survey report include known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in these two reports.

This letter also serves to inquire whether the TCP evaluation report can be sent to the remaining consulting parties. Can this report in its entirety be sent as is?

Through the TCP evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments discussed in the TCP evaluation would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin, through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Based on the information identified through these studies, FHWA and ADOT are evaluating avoidance alternatives. FHWA and ADOT have scheduled a follow-up meeting on March 28, 2017 with the Four Southern Tribes to discuss and identify avoidance alternatives.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed reports, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the reports, the use of the archaeological site names in the reports, that the TCP evaluation report can be sent to the remaining consulting parties as is, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

---

Signature for Ak-Chin Indian Community Concurrence       Date
STP-999-A(365)X

cc:
Ms. Caroline Antone, Cultural Resource Manager, 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road, Maricopa, Arizona 85138 (with enclosures)
Ms. Bernadette Carra, Cultural Specialist, 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road, Maricopa, Arizona 85138 (with enclosures)

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Bryant Powell, City Manager
City of Apache Junction
300 E. Superstition Blvd.
Apache Junction, Arizona 85119

Dear Mr. Powell:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use,
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

____________________________________  ______________________________
Signature for City of Apache Junction Concurrence  Date
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

cc:
Brad Steinke, Director, Development Services, 300 E. Superstition Blvd., Apache Junction, Arizona 85119 (w/enclosures)
Emile Schmid, City Engineer, Public Works, 575 E. Baseline Ave., Apache Junction, Arizona 85119 (w/enclosures)

ecc:
Ryedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

SP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Chris Watkins, Archaeological Services
Arizona Public Service
Natural Resources Department
P.O. Box 53933, M.S. 3372
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3933

Dear Mr. Watkins:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith...
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for APS Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Andy Laurenzi, Southwest Field Representative
Archaeology Southwest
300 North Ash Alley
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Mr. Laurenzi:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai–Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezol [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

---

Signature for Archaeology Southwest Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

eecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Matthew Behrend, Archaeology Cultural Affairs Specialist
Arizona State Land Department
1616 West Adams St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Behrend:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [Mesa]) to Petty [FHWA], March 30, 2014), Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], March 30, 2014), and the Four Southern Tribes (FRS) (Letters from GRIC to Petty [FHWA], March 30, 2014).
[FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwiswnma [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urtom [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty  
Division Administrator

---

Signature for ASLD Concurrence  
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

cc:  
Mr. Ruben Ojeda, Manager, Right-of-way Section, 1616 W. Adams St., Phoenix, Arizona 85007

c:  
Mr. Matthew Behrend  mbehrend@azland.gov  
Ms. April Sewequaptewa-Tutt  asewequaptewa-tutt@azland.gov  
Ms. Crystal Carrancho  ccarrancho@azland.gov  
RYedlin  
LSloat
ARIZONA DIVISION
4000 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500
Phone: (602) 379-3646
Fax: (602) 382-8998
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/azdiv/index.htm

March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Dr. Patrick D. Lyons, Director
Arizona State Museum
University of Arizona
P.O. Box 210026
Tucson, Arizona 85721-0026

Dear Dr. Lyons:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

__________________________________________  ________________________________
Signature for ASM Concurrence                  Date
STP-999-A(365)X
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cce:
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March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Ms. Amy Sobiech, Tucson Field Office Archaeologist
Bureau of Land Management
Gila District
3201 East Universal Way
Tucson, Arizona 85756

Dear Ms. Sobiech:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith
[Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwisimna [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

__________________________  ____________________________
Signature for BLM Field Manager Concurrence          Date
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

cc:
Leslie A. Uhr, Tucson Field Office Land Law Examiner, 3201 East Universal Way, Tucson, Arizona 85756

ecc:
RYedlin
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March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Mr. Theodore C. Cooke, General Manager
Central Arizona Project
23636 North 7th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85024

Dear Mr. Cooke:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrency was received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

---

Signature for CAP Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

c: RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Rick Miller, Growth Management Director
CLG Contact, Historical Preservation and Revitalization Committee
City of Coolidge
131 West Pinkley Avenue
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Miller:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Converences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezelt [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith...
[Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwiswima [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UP RR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovich [UP RR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled "Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona" (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

______________________________
Signature for City of Coolidge Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

______________________________
Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Harvey Krauss, AICP, City Manager
City of Eloy
628 North Main Street
Eloy, Arizona 85131

Dear Mr. Krauss:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for City of Eloy Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Ms. Jennifer Evans, CLG Contact-Grants Coordinator
Town of Florence
P.O. Box 2670
Florence, Arizona 85132

Dear Ms. Evans:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezell [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
[FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwiswima [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for Florence Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Stephen Roe Lewis, Governor
Gila River Indian Community
P.O. Box 97
Sacaton, Arizona 85147

Dear Governor Lewis:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O‘odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitez [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO
(Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwisiwma [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey and Figure I.1 on page 2 in the TCP evaluation). The TCP evaluation and the Class III pedestrian survey reports are enclosed for your review and comment. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The TCP evaluation, entitled “Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) Evaluation of Proposed Alternative Alignments for the North-South Corridor (NSC) Project, Pinal County, Arizona” (Darling 2017) identified two TCPs. The TCPs, NRHP eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 3.
Both the TCP evaluation and Class III survey report include known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in these two reports.

This letter also serves to inquire whether the TCP evaluation report can be sent to the remaining consulting parties. Can this report in its entirety be sent as is?

Through the TCP evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments discussed in the TCP evaluation would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin, through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Based on the information identified through these studies, FHWA and ADOT are evaluating avoidance alternatives. FHWA and ADOT have scheduled a follow-up meeting on March 28, 2017 with the Four Southern Tribes to discuss and identify avoidance alternatives.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed reports, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the reports, the use of the archaeological site names in the reports, that the TCP evaluation report can be sent to the remaining consulting parties as is, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email Lsloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for GRIC Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

cc:
Mr. Barnaby Lewis, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85147 (with enclosures)
Dr. Kyle Woodson, Director, Cultural Resource Management Program, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85147 (with enclosures)

cce:
RYedlin
Lsloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwiswima, Director
Hopi Tribe
Cultural Preservation Office
P.O. Box 123
Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwiswima:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith...
[Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014, City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwaniwisima [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovich [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for Hopi Tribe Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Mr. John Wesley, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
City of Mesa
P.O. Box 1466
Mesa, Arizona 85211-1466

Dear Mr. Wesley:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezell [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for City of Mesa Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Ms. Sue Masica, Regional Director
National Park Service, Intermountain Region
12795 Alameda Parkway
Denver, Colorado 80225

Dear Ms. Masica:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezl [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovići [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

__________________________________________  ________________
Signature for NPS Concurrence                  Date
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Scott Bender, Pinal County Engineer
Pinal County
Public Works Department
P.O. Box 727
Florence, Arizona 85132

Dear Mr. Bender:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North–South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitzel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith
[Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
[FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO
(Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to
Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty
[FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavía [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC
(Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwisiwma
[Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos
Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty
[FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical
summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was
provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty
[FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26,
2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26,
2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty
[FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath
[Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP
(Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to
Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016);
UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovich [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email
stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to
Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern
Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to
discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On
August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT,
Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT
committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP
evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for
400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed
previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III
survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The
TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes
have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office
through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently
being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been
completed.

The Class III survey, entitled "Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-
Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona"
(Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic
Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in
Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area
could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for Pinal County Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Peter Yucupicio, Chairman
Pascua Yaqui Tribe
7474 S. Camino de Oeste
Tucson, Arizona 85746

Dear Chairman Yucupicio:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovich [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

__________________________________________
Signature for PYT Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

__________________________________________
Date

cc:
Ms. Veronica La Motte Darnell, Office of the Attorney General, 7777 S. Camino Huivisim, Bldg. C, Tucson, Arizona 85757 (w/enclosures)

ecc:
Ms. Veronica La Motte Darnell  Veronica.L.Darnell@sascuayqui-nsn.gov (w/enclosures)
RYedlin
LSloat
ARIZONA DIVISION

4000 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500
Phone: (602) 379-3646
Fax: (602) 382-8998
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/azdiv/index.htm

March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Mr. John Kross, Town Manager
Town of Queen Creek
22350 S. Ellsworth Road
Queen Creek, Arizona 85142

Dear Mr. Kross:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezol [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

---

Signature for Town of Queen Creek Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

cc:
Mr. Brett Burningham, Planning Administrator, 22350 S. Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, Arizona 85142 (w/enclosures)
Mr. Chris Dovel, Town Engineer, 22350 S. Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, Arizona 85142 (w/enclosures)

cce:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Sean Heath, Chief
Environmental Resource Management Division
Bureau of Reclamation - Phoenix Area Office
6150 West Thunderbird Road
Glendale, Arizona 85306

Dear Mr. Heath:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitzel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith
[Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014, City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwisiwma [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for Reclamation Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

cc:
Dave Gifford, Archaeologist, Phoenix Area Office, 6150 W. Thunderbird Road, Glendale, Arizona 85306-4001 (w/enclosures)

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Terry Rambler, Chairman
San Carlos Apache Tribe
P.O. Box 0
San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezl [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating that the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for San Carlos Apache Tribe Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

cc:
Ms. Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, P.O. Box 0, San Carlos, Arizona 85550 (w/enclosures)

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Mr. Mike Urton, General Manager
San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District
120 South 3rd Street
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Urton:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Confluences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty  
Division Administrator

[Signature]

Signature for SCIDD Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Ferris Begay, Project Manager
San Carlos Irrigation Project
13805 N. Arizona Blvd.
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Begay:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrency were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [Mesa], April 10, 2014), and the National Park Service (NPS) (May 16, 2014). The proposed project is consistent with the goals and principles of the Heritage Act, and the environmental and cultural resources identified as significant in the Programmatic Agreement are not anticipated to be threatened or adversely affected by the proposed project.
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

______________________________
Signature for SCIP Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist
Arizona State Parks
State Historic Preservation Office
1100 W. Washington St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitzele [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith...
[Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavía [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwiswima [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for SHPO Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
ARIZONA DIVISION

March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Mr. Delbert Ray, Sr., President
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Route 1, Box 216
10005 E. Osborn Road
Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear President Ray:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezol [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
[FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), Hopi Tribe (Kuwaanwisima [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey and Figure I.1 on page 2 in the TCP evaluation). The TCP evaluation and the Class III pedestrian survey reports are enclosed for your review and comment. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The TCP evaluation, entitled “Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) Evaluation of Proposed Alternative Alignments for the North-South Corridor (NSC) Project, Pinal County, Arizona” (Darling 2017) identified two TCPs. The TCPs, NRHP eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 3.
Both the TCP evaluation and Class III survey report include known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in these two reports.

This letter also serves to inquire whether the TCP evaluation report can be sent to the remaining consulting parties. Can this report in its entirety be sent as is?

Through the TCP evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments discussed in the TCP evaluation would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin, through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Based on the information identified through these studies, FHWA and ADOT are evaluating avoidance alternatives. FHWA and ADOT have scheduled a follow-up meeting on March 28, 2017 with the Four Southern Tribes to discuss and identify avoidance alternatives.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed reports, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the reports, the use of the archaeological site names in the reports, that the TCP evaluation report can be sent to the remaining consulting parties as is, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Ms. Angela Garcia-Lewis, Cultural Preservation Compliance Supervisor, Cultural Preservation Program, 10005 E. Osborn Rd., Scottsdale, Arizona 85256 (with enclosures)

ecc:
Ms. Angela Garcia-Lewis angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov (w/enclosures)
Mr. Shane Anton Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov (w/enclosures)
Ms. Martha Martinez Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov (w/enclosures)
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Ms. Vivian Burdette, Chairwoman
Tonto Apache Tribe
Tonto Apache Reservation #30
Payson, Arizona 85541

Dear Chairwoman Burdette:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA]), and City of Scottsdale (Berger [Scottsdale] to Petty [FHWA], April 2, 2014).
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovic [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

______________________________  ______________________
Signature for TAT Concurrence  Date
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

cc:
Mr. Wally Davis, Jr., Cultural & NAGPRA Representative, Tonto Apache Reservation #30, Payson, Arizona 85541 (w/enclosures)

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Ms. Cheryl Eamick, Senior Environmental and Land Use Planner
Tucson Electric Power Company, a UNS Energy Corporation
88 E. Broadway Blvd., Mail Stop HQW603
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Ms. Eamick:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], August 1, 2014).
[FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwisewma [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

______________________________
Signature for TEPC Concurrence  
STP-999-A(365)X

______________________________
Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Peter Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Mr. Jefford Francisco, Cultural Resource Specialist
Tohono O’odham Nation
Cultural Affairs Office
P. O. Box 837
Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Messrs. Steere and Francisco:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezal [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014),
BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwisiwma [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Mr. Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], March 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey and Figure I.1 on page 2 in the TCP evaluation). The TCP evaluation and the Class III pedestrian survey reports are enclosed for your review and comment. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The TCP evaluation, entitled “Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) Evaluation of Proposed Alternative Alignments for the North-South Corridor (NSC) Project, Pinal County, Arizona”
(Darling 2017) identified two TCPs. The TCPs, NRHP eligibility recommendations, and
management recommendations are detailed in Table 3.

Both the TCP evaluation and Class III survey report include known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in these two reports.

This letter also serves to inquire whether the TCP evaluation report can be sent to the remaining consulting parties. Can this report in its entirety be sent as is?

Through the TCP evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments discussed in the TCP evaluation would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin, through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Based on the information identified through these studies, FHWA and ADOT are evaluating avoidance alternatives. FHWA and ADOT have scheduled a follow-up meeting on March 28, 2017 with the Four Southern Tribes to discuss and identify avoidance alternatives.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed reports, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the reports, the use of the archaeological site names in the reports, that the TCP evaluation report can be sent to the remaining consulting parties as is, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for TON Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

ccc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Alexander Popovici, Manager Industry and Public Projects
Union Pacific Railroad
631 South 7th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Dear Mr. Popovici:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezeli [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for UPRR Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
Vicki Bever  vbever@azdot.gov
Sayeed Hani  SHani@azdot.gov
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Ms. Linda Marianito, Environmental Manager
Western Area Power Administration
615 S. 43rd Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85009

Dear Ms. Marianito:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
[FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (KwawanWiswima [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty  
Division Administrator

_________________________  ________________________
Signature for Western Concurrence  Date
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

cc:
Mr. Scan Berry, Regional Preservation Official / Archaeologist, P.O. Box 6457, Phoenix, Arizona 85005 (w/enclosures)

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North—South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Chris Coder, Tribal Archaeologist
Yavapai-Apache Nation
2400 W. Datsi St.
Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Mr. Coder:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezl [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urrton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email L.Sloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

______________________________  ____________________________
Signature for YAN Concurrence   Date
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation Reports

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr., President
Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
530 E. Merritt St.
Prescott, Arizona 86301-2038

Dear President Jones:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) [ADOT] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014).
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovich [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe Concurrence

STP-999-A(365)X

cc: Ms. Linda Ogo, Director, Culture Research Department, 530 E. Merritt St., Prescott, Arizona 86301-2038 (w/enclosures)

ccc: RYedlin
LSloat
April 10, 2017

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Arizona Division
4000 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: STP-999-A(365)X
   TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
   North-South Corridor Study
   Continuing Section 106 Consultation
   Reports

Dear Ms. Karla Petty,

The Ak-Chin Indian Community received your letter dated March 28, 2017 regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) proposal to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from State Route 202 (SR 202) eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment.

We also received a copy of the following reports, Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) Evaluation of Proposed Alternative Alignments for the North-South Corridor (NSC) Project, Pinal County, Arizona and Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona. Thank you for enclosing the reports for our review.

At this time, as part of our Continuing Section 106 Consultation and due to the location of the proposed project we will defer all comments to as well as concur with the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office located in Sacaton, Arizona.

If you should have any questions, please contact Ms. Bernadette Carra, CRS-Land Management at (520) 568-1337 or Mrs. Caroline Antone, Cultural Resources Manager at (520) 568-1372. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Miguel, Chairman
Ak-Chin Indian Community
Mr. Matthew Behrend, Archaeology Cultural Affairs Specialist
Arizona State Land Department
1616 West Adams St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Behrend:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Paseua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrency was received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), and the Arizona State Museum (ASM) to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014).
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-2 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature for ASLD Concurrence] [Date]

Enclosures

cc:
Mr. Ruben Ojeda, Manager, Right-of-way Section, 1616 W. Adams St., Phoenix, Arizona 85007

dcc:
Mr. Matthew Behrend  mbehrend@azland.gov
Ms. April Sewequaptewa-Tutt  asewequaptewa-tutt@azland.gov
Ms. Crystal Carrancho  ecarrancho@azland.gov
RYedlin
LSloat
Hi Lori,

I have attached the signed concurrence from ASLD. Please note that ASLD only reviewed survey and site content for the portions of the project which are partially or wholly on State Trust land.

I have the following technical comments:

1) Maps in Appendix A would benefit from a small inset map highlighting the location of each map within the overall project area.
2) A number of pages in the report contain content scaled at 8.5x11 but are printed on 11x17 paper.
3) References to “state trust land” (or similar) should be changed to “State Trust land” throughout the report.

Thanks,

Matt

Matthew Behrend, M.A., Manager, Archaeology Unit
Arizona State Land Department
1616 West Adams Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.542.2679 (Office)
480.751.7352 (Cell)
mbehrend@azland.gov
Archaeological Records Office staff reviewed the report identified below and request revision to the report.

Date: 18 April 2017

Revised: --

Re
STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Report Title
“Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” dated March 17, 2017

Revision request(s) noted by ✓ or bold text, or both

USGS quad map(s)  Include quad map name(s) in the legends for Figures A-2 through A-7.
Include 1:24,000-scale map(s) ✓ Figures A-2 through A-7

Depict new site boundary(ies)
Depict updated site boundary(ies)
Depict survey boundary(ies)

Include a research design in report

Fieldwork dates

TRS

Site(s) within or overlap existing site(s) ✓ AZ U:15:874(ASM) is in the same location as AZ U:15:146(ASM).

Incorrect ASM Site Number used in report map(s)

ASM Accession Number
We prefer to have the ASM Accession Number included in the report.

Include map(s), table, or text in individual site descriptions that clearly identify landownership

Proposed site treatment

NRHP recommendation

Other
1) Some of the sites have extents of recorded archaeology that fall outside of current site boundaries. This constitutes site boundary updates. Include discussion of such in the text at least for those sites that are on State lands and update the site cards.

2) The boundary for AZ U:15:60(ASM) as depicted in Figure 6-76 is not recorded in the Archaeological Records Office. Include discussion of how the boundary was derived and update the site card.
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature for Florence Concurrence]

STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ccc:
RYedlin
LSloat
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature]  
Signature for Florence Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

4/20/17
Date

Enclosures

ccc: 
RYedlin
LSloat
April 4, 2017

Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator
U. S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
4000 North Central Avenue, Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

RE: STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L, North-South Corridor Study, Continuing Section 106 Consultation, Reports

Dear Ms. Petty,

The Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office (GRIC-THPO) has received your consultation package dated March 23, 2017. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to develop and construct a new north-to-south transportation corridor linking United States Highway 60 (US 60) (Apache Junction, Arizona) to Interstate 10 (I-10) between Picacho and Eloy, Pinal County, Arizona. The corridor study will also include State Route 24 (SR24) connecting southeast metropolitan Phoenix to the North-South corridor.

The FHWA and ADOT continue to assess and evaluate avoidance alternatives for the North-South Corridor. A Class III archaeological survey has been conducted for portions of the corridor. By no means can this survey be considered a complete survey of the project area. A Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) evaluation report has also been prepared. Both reports have been submitted for Section 106 review. All of the reports that have been submitted for Section 106 review for the North South Corridor, will form the basis and guide additional archaeological and ethnographic research of the corridor when a preferred alternative is chosen.

The FHWA and ADOT are also seeking information regarding the use of archaeological site names in reporting documents such as archaeological survey reports. It is the position of the GRIC-THPO that archaeological site names such as Casa Grande, Mesa Grande, Pueblo Grande, Snaketown, Escalante, Grewe, Adamsville, Los Guanacos, La Ciudad, Los Muertos, Poston Butte, just a small example, are site names established within past archaeological literature and lore. Those names will always be with us and have become part of the nomenclature of modern archaeological work and research whether we agree or not to use these names. Archaeological site names the GRIC-THPO objects too are The Wile E. Coyote Site, This Isn’t It, The Rabid Site, The Parking Lot Site, The Nothing Site, The Billboard Site, The Car Site and The Machaca Site, are but a small example of unfortunate archeological site names. The use of these names are demeaning, rude and disrespectful to our Ancestors and to the O’Odham. These names can even taint, diminish, and minimize the importance of the collections that are obtained from our Ancestors’ homes. Archaeologists giving these names to archaeological sites is an unacceptable practice and forms the basis of the Four Southern Tribes of Arizona objection to the use of disrespectful, thoughtless site names. The use of these kinds of archaeological site names
should not be used in any FHWA and ADOT cultural resource management documents. If there are questions or concerns about rather or not an archaeological site name should be used, additional consultation with the GRIC-THPO or other Tribes should be considered.

The FHWA is not presenting a finding of effect for this undertaking at this time. The GRIC-THPO does not agree that the TCP evaluation report should be distributed to any “remaining consulting parties.” Who are the remaining consulting parties? The GRIC-THPO also does not agree with distribution of the Class III report to any “remaining consulting parties.” The GRIC-THPO agrees that there may be adverse effects to Adamsville Ruin, Florence Village and its cemeteries, and to a TCP. The reports are acceptable cultural resource management reporting documents and we agree with the Register eligibility determinations for the sites. The use of the site names such as Adamsville Ruin, Poston Butte, Escalante, and Casa Grande are acceptable to the GRIC-THPO. In general, the use of archaeological site names should be subject to additional consultation. This issue should also be discussed in follow-up meetings.

The GRIC-THPO will continue to participate as lead in the consultation process of this undertaking. The proposed project area is within the ancestral lands of the Four Southern Tribes (Gila River Indian Community; Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community; Ak-Chin Indian Community and the Tohono O’Odham Nation).

Thank you for consulting with the GRIC-THPO on this project. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me or Archaeological Compliance Specialist Larry Benallie, Jr. at 520-562-7162.

Respectfully,

Barnaby V. Lewis
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Gila River Indian Community
April 3, 2017

Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
4000 North Central Ave., Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: North-South Corridor Study

Dear Ms. Petty,

Thank you for your correspondence dated March 23, 2017, with an enclosed cultural resources survey report, regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) proposed new 45 mile long north-south highway from US 60 near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 between Picacho and Eloy. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to earlier identifiable cultural groups throughout Arizona, including the Hohokam prehistoric cultural group in southern Arizona. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of our ancestral sites and Traditional Cultural Properties, and we consider the archaeological sites of our ancestors to be “footprints” and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate the FHWA and ADOT’s continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

In the enclosed letter dated July 8, 2011, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office reviewed the Class I Cultural Resources Inventory report and stated we understood that 313 cultural resources have been identified in the 24% of the study area has been previously surveyed. Therefore we determined that this proposal is likely to adversely affect cultural resources significant to the Hopi Tribe. In the enclosed letter dated December 5, 2011, we stated that we understood that alignment alternatives were being developed. In the enclosed letter dated January 28, 2014, we supported the Gila River Indian Community’s request for an adequate assessment of their Traditional Cultural Properties in the project area, and in a letter dated April 22, 2016, we reviewed the Traditional Cultural Properties overview.

We have now reviewed the enclosed cultural resources survey report that identifies 16 National Register eligible prehistoric sites. We understand FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives and not making a finding of project effect at this time. Therefore, we request continuing consultation on this proposal including being provided with any proposed treatment plans for review and comment. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgart at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. Thank you again for your consideration.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Lydia J. Kawanwisiwma, Director
Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

Enclosures: July 8 and December 5, 2011, January 28, 2014, April 22, 2016 letters
xc: Lori Sloat, Arizona Department of Transportation
Ariziona State Historic Preservation Office
April 22, 2016

Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division  
4000 North Central Ave., Suite 1500  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: North-South Corridor Study

Dear Ms. Petty,

Thank you for your correspondence dated April 18, 2016, regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) proposed new 45 mile long north-south highway from US 60 near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 between Picacho and Eloy. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to earlier identifiable cultural groups throughout Arizona, including the Hohokam prehistoric cultural group in southern Arizona. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of our ancestral sites and Traditional Cultural Properties, and we consider the archaeological sites of our ancestors to be “footprints” and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate the FHWA and ADOT's continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

In the enclosed letter dated July 8, 2011, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office reviewed the Class I Cultural Resources Inventory report and stated we understood that 313 cultural resources have been identified in the 24% of the study area has been previously surveyed. Therefore we determined that this proposal is likely to adversely affect cultural resources significant to the Hopi Tribe and stated that we looked forward to receiving additional information regarding project scope, alternatives, and historic properties, for review and comment as it becomes available. In the enclosed letter dated December 5, 2011, we stated that we understood that alignment alternatives are being developed, and that we will support the alternative that adversely affects the fewest National Register eligible prehistoric sites. In the enclosed letter dated January 28, 2014, we supported the Gila River Indian Community’s request for an adequate assessment of their Traditional Cultural Properties in the project area. We have now reviewed the enclosed Traditional Cultural Properties overview.

We appreciate continuing consultation to assist us in determining which alternative may adversely affect the fewest National Register eligible prehistoric sites, and we continue to look forward to receiving copies of the cultural resources surveys of the areas of potential effect for review and comment. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgart at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. Thank you again for your consideration.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Lester S. Kuwanwiswma, Director  
Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

Enclosures: July 8 and December 5, 2011, January 28, 2014 letters
xc: Lori Sloat, Arizona Department of Transportation; Barnaby Lewis, Gila River Indian Community  
Arizona State Historic Preservation Office
January 28, 2014

Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
4000 North Central Ave., Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: North-South Corridor Study

Dear Ms. Petty,

Thank you for your correspondence dated January 21, 2014, regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) proposed new 45 mile long north-south highway from US 60 near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 between Picacho and Eloy. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to earlier identifiable cultural groups throughout Arizona, including the Hohokam prehistoric cultural group in southern Arizona. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of our ancestral sites and Traditional Cultural Properties, and we consider the archaeological sites of our ancestors to be “footprints” and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate the FHWA and ADOT’s continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

In a letter dated July 8, 2011, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office reviewed the Class I Cultural Resources Inventory report and stated we understood that 313 cultural resources have been identified in the 24% of the study area has been previously surveyed. Therefore we determined that this proposal is likely to adversely affect cultural resources significant to the Hopi Tribe and stated that we looked forward to receiving additional information regarding project scope, alternatives, and historic properties, for review and comment as it becomes available. In a letter dated December 5, 2011, we stated that we understood that alignment alternatives are being developed, and that we will support the alternative that adversely affects the fewest National Register eligible prehistoric sites.

We support the Gila River Indian Community’s request for an adequate assessment of their Traditional Cultural Properties in the project area. And we reiterate that to assist us in determining which alternative may adversely affect the fewest National Register eligible prehistoric sites, we look forward to receiving copies of the cultural resources surveys of the areas of potential effect for review and comment. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgart at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. Thank you again for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Leigh L. Kuwanwiswma, Director
Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

xc: Erin Bodine, Arizona Department of Transportation
Barnaby Lewis, Gila River Indian Community
Arizona State Historic Preservation Office
December 5, 2011

Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
4000 North Central Ave., Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: North-South Corridor Study

Dear Ms. Petty,

Thank you for your correspondence dated November 16, 2011, regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) proposed new 45 mile long north-south highway from US 60 near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 between Picacho and Eloy. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to prehistoric cultural groups throughout Arizona, including the Hohokam prehistoric cultural group in southern Arizona. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of prehistoric archaeological sites and Traditional Cultural Properties, and we consider the archaeological sites of our ancestors to be “footprints” and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate the FHWA and ADOT’s continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

In the enclosed letter dated July 8, 2011, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office reviewed the Class I Cultural Resources Inventory report and stated we understand that 313 cultural resources have been identified in the 24% of the study area has been previously surveyed. Therefore we determined that this proposal is likely to adversely affect cultural resources significant to the Hopi Tribe and stated that we looked forward to receiving for review and comment additional information regarding project scope, alternatives, and historic properties, as it becomes available.

We now understand that alignment alternatives are being developed, and we will support the alternative that adversely affects the fewest National Register eligible prehistoric sites. Therefore, to assist us in determining which alternative may adversely affect the fewest National Register eligible prehistoric sites, we look forward to receiving copies of the cultural resources surveys of the areas of potential effect for review and comment. If National Register eligible prehistoric sites are identified that will be adversely affected by project activities, we request continuing consultation on any proposed treatment plans. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgant at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. Thank you again for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Leigh I. Nakoowisiwma, Director
Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

Enclosure: August 8, 2011 letter to FHWA
xc: Erin Bodine, Arizona Department of Transportation
Arizona State Historic Preservation Office
July 8, 2011

Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
4000 North Central Ave., Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: North-South Corridor Study

Dear Ms. Petty,

Thank you for your correspondence dated June 28, 2011, with an enclosed Class I Cultural Resources Inventory, for the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) proposed new 45 mile long north-south highway from US 60 near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 between Picacho and Eloy. The Hopi Tribe claims cultural affiliation to prehistoric cultural groups throughout Arizona, including the Hohokam prehistoric cultural group in southern Arizona. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office supports the identification and avoidance of prehistoric archaeological sites and Traditional Cultural Properties, and we consider the archaeological sites of our ancestors to be “footprints” and Traditional Cultural Properties. Therefore, we appreciate the FHWA and ADOT’s continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has reviewed the enclosed Class I Cultural Resources Inventory report and we understand that 313 cultural resources have been identified in the 24% of the study area has been previously surveyed. We further understand that FHWA is not making a determination of project effect at this time because the majority of the study area has not been surveyed for cultural resources. However, upon review of the Class I Inventory, we have determined that this proposal is likely to adversely affect cultural resources significant to the Hopi Tribe. Therefore, we look forward to receiving for review and comment additional information regarding project scope, alternatives, and historic properties, as it becomes available.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgart at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. Thank you again for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Leigh J. Kwanwisiewma, Director
Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

xc: Linda Davis, Arizona Department of Transportation
Arizona State Historic Preservation Office
March 23, 2017

Mr. Sean Heath, Chief
Environmental Resource Management Division
Bureau of Reclamation - Phoenix Area Office
6150 West Thunderbird Road
Glendale, Arizona 85306

Dear Mr. Heath:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concessions were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled "Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona" (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Rebecca Yedlin

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature for Reclamation Concurrence]

STP-999-A(365)X

[Date]

Enclosures

cc:
Dave Gifford, Archaeologist, Phoenix Area Office, 6150 W. Thunderbird Road, Glendale, Arizona 85306-4001 (w/enclosures)

cc:
RYedlin
LSloat
Wow, you captured that very well. Perfect.

Thanks

On Fri, Mar 31, 2017 at 10:07 AM, Lori Sloat <LSloat@azdot.gov> wrote:

Dave,

Thank you for talking with me today about the targeted Class III survey for the North-South Corridor Study project.

Please correct me if I misunderstood anything as I recap our conversation below.

You expressed concern that the survey did not relocate AZ U:14:416(ASM) and AZ U:5:12(ASU), Frogtown. Based on previous work conducted along the CAP - salvage archaeology was conducted, surface collections took place, so that just because there is not a surface manifestation of a site, this does not mean there is not a subsurface manifestation of the site - especially upstream from the CAP because of deposition. You also reiterated the work Reclamation is doing – revisiting sites and evaluating sites.

Although the Class III targeted survey did not relocate these two sites within the 400-foot alignments, you will concur with the adequacy of the report after you check with your supervisor about the sites names, but will look at survey information provided for this project along/near the CAP (on Reclamation land) more closely as the project progresses.

Again, I appreciate your time and assistance.

Lori

Lori C. Sloat
Historic Preservation Specialist
Environmental Planning Group
Arizona Department of Transportation
Phone: (602) 712-6971
Fax: (602) 712-3066
lsloat@azdot.gov

www.azdot.gov

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the person(s)/entity(ies) named above and may contain confidential/privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email, and delete or destroy all copies plus attachments.

--
Dave Gifford
Bureau of Reclamation, Phoenix Area Office
Cultural Resource Management
6150 W. Thunderbird Rd.
Glendale, AZ 85306
623-773-6262 (Office)
928-699-5674 (Cell)
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Mr. Terry Rambler, Chairman
San Carlos Apache Tribe
P.O. Box 0
San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezlel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Rebecca Yedlin

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature]

Signature for San Carlos Apache Tribe Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

[4/5/17]

Date

cc: Ms. Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, P.O. Box 0, San Carlos, Arizona 85550 (w/enclosures)

ecc: RYedlin
LSloat
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Mr. Mike Urton, General Manager
San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District
120 South 3rd Street
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Urton:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty...
[FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwiswma [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urtun [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled "Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona" (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature]
Signature for SCIDD Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures
ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat

[Signature]
Date
5/10/2017
Ms. Sloat,
On behalf of the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), attached is the signed Concurrence letter, agreeing to the adequacy of the NRHP report for the current stage of your Section 106 compliance for the ADOT North/South Corridor project.

I am writing this email to add a few comments to my signed response:
Please note that it is the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCP), also a consulting party in this process, who oversees the federal Right of Way on behalf of the US Government and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As we discussed on the phone earlier, I'm pretty sure you are already aware of this relationship and the respective responsibilities of SCIDD and SCIP. SCIDD wishes to remain a consulting party, as we maintain, and in many cases, operate, the canals and laterals mentioned as linear structures in the report. It is critical, therefore, that SCIDD remain informed all along this process, as it is our responsibility to review any construction plans or other activities which may interfere with our operation and maintenance responsibilities. Additionally, SCIDD is contractor with the Bureau of Reclamation for rehabilitation of the SCIP in the Coolidge-Florence area, so it is vital we communicate on each other's future plans.

Between the Northside Canal, mentioned as a Historic Linear Structure in the NSCS Class III Survey Area, and the Florence-Casa Grande Canal, mentioned outside the NSCS Class III Survey Area, are numerous sub-laterals of the SCIP system which may have historic significance, and may be crossed by one or more of the alternative routes considered for the NS Corridor. While I understand it may be somewhat premature to bring up the subject of these sub-laterals, I thought it best to bring to light sooner rather than later, and we anticipate their inclusion in future, more refined, cultural reports.

Thank you, Lori, for your consideration of these comments. Please email or phone any time for clarification.

J. Michael (Mike) Urton
General Manager
San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District
520-723-5408 x 15
Mike.urton@scidd.com
Good morning Lori, following up with the email you requested regarding subject project captioned above. BIA/SCIP currently does not have a NEPA/Archaeologist support person at this time. We anticipate have contracted support on staff within the next 2-4 weeks. SCIP will be in touch shortly thereafter with a reply to your correspondence.

Call me if you have any questions, my contact information is listed below.

thanks

*******************************************************************************
Ferris (Ed) Begay
Project Manager
San Carlos Irrigation Project
13805 N. Arizona Blvd.
Coolidge, AZ 85128
Phone: (520) 723-6225
Fax: (520) 723-6272
*******************************************************************************

Warning: This email (including any attachments) may contain Privacy Act Data/Sensitive Data which is intended only for the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable laws. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any distribution or copy of this email is strictly prohibited.
Me Sloat,

Please coordinate directly with SCIP to avoid any confusion.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

-------- Original message --------
From: Mike Urton <Mike.Urton@scidd.com>
Date: 5/10/17 11:52 AM (GMT-07:00)
To: LSloat@azdot.gov
Cc: Lisa Howard <lhoward@geairoinc.com>, "Begay, Clarence" <clarence.begay@bia.gov>, Sally Van Arsdale <Sally.VanArsdale@scidd.com>
Subject: Class III CRS N/S Corridor

Ms. Sloat,

On behalf of the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), attached is the signed Concurrence letter, agreeing to the adequacy of the NRHP report for the current stage of your Section 106 compliance for the ADOT North/South Corridor project.

I am writing this email to add a few comments to my signed response:

Please note that it is the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), also a consulting party in this process, who oversees the federal Right of Way on behalf of the US Government and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As we discussed on the phone earlier, I’m pretty sure you are already aware of this relationship and the respective responsibilities of SCIDD and SCIP.

SCIDD wishes to remain a consulting party, as we maintain, and in many cases, operate, the canals and laterals mentioned as linear structures in the report. It is critical, therefore, that SCIDD remain informed all along this process, as it is our responsibility to review any construction plans or other activities which may interfere with our operation and maintenance responsibilities. Additionally, SCIDD is contractor with the Bureau of Reclamation for rehabilitation of the SCIP in the Coolidge-Florence area, so it is vital we communicate on each other’s future plans.

Between the Northside Canal, mentioned as a Historic Linear Structure in the NSCS Class III Survey Area, and the Florence-Casa Grande Canal, mentioned outside the NSCS Class III Survey Area, are numerous sub-laterals of the SCIP system which may have historic significance, and may be crossed by one or more of the alternative routes considered for the NS Corridor. While I understand it may be somewhat premature to bring up the subject of these sub-laterals, I thought it best to bring to light sooner rather than later, and we anticipate their inclusion in future, more refined, cultural reports.
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Mr. Bryant Powell, City Manager
City of Apache Junction
300 E. Superstition Blvd.
Apache Junction, Arizona 85119

Dear Mr. Powell:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai–Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
[FHWA], February 3, 2014), SCIP (Begay [SCIP] to Petty [FHWA], February 3, 2014), SHPO (Jacobs [SHPO] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Town of Florence (Melvin [Florence] to Petty [FHWA], March 11, 2014), Town of Queen Creek (Kross [Queen Creek] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TEPC (Bonavia [TEPC] to Petty [FHWA], March 10, 2014); GRIC (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], February 28, 2014), the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwiswima [Hopi] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), San Carlos Apache Tribe (Rambler [San Carlos Apache Tribe] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), TON (Steere [TON THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 7, 2014), and YAN (Ogo [YAN] to Petty [FHWA], April 15, 2014).

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and an built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use.
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for City of Apache Junction Concurrency
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

cc:
Brad Steinke, Director, Development Services, 300 E. Superstition Blvd., Apache Junction, Arizona 85119 (w/enclosures)
Emile Schmid, City Engineer, Public Works, 575 E. Baseline Ave., Apache Junction, Arizona 85119 (w/enclosures)

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat

29 Mar 2017
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Mr. Harvey Krauss, AICP, City Manager
City of Eloy
628 North Main Street
Eloy, Arizona 85131

Dear Mr. Krauss:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature for City of Eloy Concurrence]

STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosures

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat

APR 04 2017

3/29/2017
March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist
Arizona State Parks
State Historic Preservation Office
1100 W. Washington St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith...
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.
The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

---

Signature for SHPO Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date 13 April 17

Enclosures

cc: Lori Sloat, ADOT

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
ARIZONA DIVISION

4000 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500
Phone: (602) 379-3646
Fax: (602) 382-8998
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/azdiv/index.htm

March 23, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Reports

Ms. Linda Marianito, Environmental Manager
Western Area Power Administration
615 S. 43rd Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85009

Dear Ms. Marianito:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picaacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the North-South Corridor Study area. Concurrences were received from AANG (Ladd [AANG] to Petty [FHWA], April 3, 2014), ASM (Pitezel [ASM] to Petty [FHWA], February 22, 2014), ASLD (Ross [ASLD] to Petty [FHWA], February 25, 2014), BLM-TFO (Sobiech [BLM] to Petty [FHWA], January 28, 2014), Reclamation (Smith [Reclamation] to Petty [FHWA], January 31, 2014), City of Mesa (Wesley [Mesa] to Petty
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016).

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identification of avoidance alternatives.

Currently FHWA and ADOT are identifying avoidance alternatives. In the meantime, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the larger NSC Study area (see Figure A-1 on page A-3 in the Class III survey). The Class III pedestrian survey report is enclosed for your review and comment. The TCP evaluation is being reviewed by the Four Southern Tribes. After the Four Southern Tribes have reviewed the TCP evaluation, a version of the TCP evaluation will be sent to your office through continuing Section 106 consultation. The built environment survey report is currently being revised and will be sent out for Section 106 consultation once revisions have been completed.

The Class III survey, entitled “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona” (Hall et al. 2017) identified 24 cultural resources. The resources, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations, and management recommendations are detailed in Table 1. In addition, 12 cultural resources previously recorded within the Class III survey area could not be located. These resources and management recommendations are detailed in Table 2.

The Class III survey report includes known archaeological site names. FHWA and ADOT are aware of a new policy being drafted that would stipulate that cultural resource reports only use
archaeological site numbers and not include site names. This letter is consulting with your office on the use of the known archaeological site names in the Class III survey report.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report, the Tables, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report, the use of the archaeological site names in the report, and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature] 3.29.17
Signature for Western Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Sean Berry, Regional Preservation Official / Archaeologist, P.O. Box 6457, Phoenix, Arizona 85005 (w/enclosures)

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat

APR 04 2017
April 17, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North–South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation

Mr. Stephen Roe Lewis, Governor
Gila River Indian Community
P.O. Box 97
Sacaton, Arizona 85147

Dear Governor Lewis:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

FHWA and ADOT are in receipt of the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC)-Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO), Barnaby Lewis’s response; letter dated April 4, 2017, to continuing Section 106 consultation for the North-South Corridor Study project. FHWA provided through this continuing Section 106 consultation, on March 23, 2017, a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) evaluation report for review and comment, a Class III survey report for review and comment, inquired whether the TCP evaluation could be sent to the remaining consulting parties, and the use of the archaeological site names in both the TCP evaluation and Class III report.

Mr. Lewis’ response on April 4, 2017, inquired “Who are the remaining consulting parties?” As mentioned in the previous consultation letter, the consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the GRIC, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC
is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes. Please find enclosed a list of all consulting parties to assist you with your review.

Mr. Lewis said that the GRIC-THPO does not agree that the TCP evaluation should be sent to the remaining consulting parties. FHWA would like to inquire, if the TCP evaluation were redacted or a technical summary of the TCP evaluation developed, would it be possible to send this redacted version or technical summary to the remaining consulting parties?

Mr. Lewis also said that the GRIC-THPO does not agree that the Class III survey should be distributed to the remaining consulting parties. FHWA followed the standard Section 106 process and the Class III survey report was distributed to the remaining consulting parties on March 23, 2017, the same date the Class III survey was sent to the GRIC-THPO. As part of the standard Section 106 process, only ethnographic studies and TCP reports are not distributed to all consulting parties.

Mr. Lewis acknowledged that the use of site names such as Adamsville Ruin, Poston Butte, Escalante, and Casa Grande are acceptable to the GRIC-THPO.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. If you agree that a redacted version or a technical summary of the TCP evaluation can be distributed to the remaining consulting parties, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. FHWA will submit the redacted version of technical summary to the Four Southern Tribes for review prior to distribution. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Lori Sloat at (602) 712-6971 or email LSloat@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

---

Signature for Gila River Indian Community Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

cc:
Mr. Barnaby Lewis, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85147 (with enclosures)
Dr. Kyle Woodson, Director, Cultural Resource Management Program, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85147 (with enclosures)

ecc:
RYedlin
LSloat
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Robert Miguel, Chairman
Ak-Chin Indian Community
42507 West Peters & Nall Road
Maricopa, Arizona 85138

Dear Chairman Miguel:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Ms. Bernadette Carra, Cultural Specialist, Ak-Chin Indian Community, 42507 W. Peters and Nall Road, Maricopa, Arizona (with enclosure)

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Bryant Powell, City Manager
City of Apache Junction
300 East Superstition Boulevard
Apache Junction, Arizona 85119

Dear Mr. Powell:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Emile Schmid, City Engineer, Public Works, 575 East Baseline Avenue, Apache Junction, Arizona, 85119 (with enclosure)
Larry Kirch, Director, Development Services, 300 East Superstition Boulevard, Apache Junction, Arizona, 85119 (with enclosure)

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Chris Watkins, Archaeological Services
Arizona Public Service
P.O. Box 53933, M.S. 3372
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3933

Dear Mr. Watkins:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ecc:  
RYedlin  
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Andy Laurenzi, Southwest Field Representative
Archaeology Southwest
300 North Ash Alley
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Mr. Laurenzi:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignment, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cce:  
RYedlin  
JHeilman
Mr. Mathew Behrend, Cultural Resources Section Manager  
Arizona State Land Department  
1616 West Adams Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Behrend:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ecc:
Matthew Behrend mbehrend@azland.gov
April Sewequaptewa-Tutt asewequaptewa-tutt@azland.gov (with enclosure)
Crystal Carrancho ccarrancho@azland.gov (with enclosure)
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Dr. Patrick Lyons, Director
Arizona State Museum
University of Arizona
P.O. Box 210026
Tucson, Arizona 85721-0026

Dear Dr. Lyons:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

\[Signature\]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Ms. Shelby Manney
Cultural Resource Manager, AZDEMA/AZARNG Environmental Office
Arizona Army National Guard
5636 E. McDowell Rd., M53309
Phoenix, AZ 85008-3495

Dear Governor Lewis:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Ms. Amy Sobiech, Tucson Field Office Archaeologist
Bureau of Land Management
3201 East Universal Way
Tucson, Arizona 85756

Dear Ms. Sobiech:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Leslie A. Uhr, Land Law Examiner, Tucson Field Office, Bureau of Land Management, 3201 East Universal Way, Tucson, Arizona 85756 (w/out enclosures)

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Theodore C. Cooke, General Manager
Central Arizona Project
2363 North 7th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85024

Dear Mr. Cooke:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email [JHeilman@azdot.gov](mailto:JHeilman@azdot.gov).

Sincerely yours,

![Signature]

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ccc:  
RYedlin  
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 17454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Rick Miller, Growth Management Director
CLG Contact, Historic Preservation and Revitalization Committee
City of Coolidge
130 West Central Avenue
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Miller:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(36)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Harvey Krauss, AICP, City Manager
City of Eloy
628 North Main Street
Eloy, Arizona 85131

Dear Mr. Krauss:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cce:
RYedlin
JHeilman
Ms. Jennifer Evans, CLG Contract-Grants Coordinator  
Town of Florence  
P.O. Box 2670  
Florence, Arizona 85132  

Dear Ms. Evans:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Final County, Arizona (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Stephen Roe Lewis, Governor
Gila River Indian Community
P.O. Box 97
Sacaton, AZ 85147

Dear Governor Lewis:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unified States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Barnaby Lewis, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, P.O. Box 2193, Sacaton, Arizona 85147 (with enclosure)
Kyle Woodson, Director, Cultural Resource Management Program, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85147 (with enclosure)

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwiswma, Director
Hopi Tribe
Cultural Preservation Office
P.O. Box 123
Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwiswma:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tuscon Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
R Yedlin
J Heilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. John Wesley, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
City of Mesa
P.O. Box 1466
Mesa, Arizona 85211-1466

Dear Mr. Wesley:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
ARIZONA DIVISION

September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Ms. Sue Masica, Regional Director
National Park Service, Intermountain Region
12795 Alameda Parkway
Denver, Colorado 80225

Dear Ms. Masica:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman

JHeilman@azdot.gov
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Scott Bender, Pinal County Engineer
Pinal County
P.O. Box 727
Florence, Arizona 85132

Dear Mr. Bender:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FIIWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Robert Valencia, Chairman
Pascua Yaqui Tribe
7474 South Camino de Oeste
Tucson, Arizona 85746

Dear Chairman Valencia:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O‘odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Veronica La Motte Darnell, Office of the Attorney General, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, 7777 South Camino Huivism, Building C, Tucson, Arizona 85757 (with enclosure)
David Perez, Executive Assistant to Chairperson, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, 7474 South Camino de Oeste, Tucson, Arizona 85746 (with enclosure)

ecc:
Veronica La Motte Darnell Veronica.L.Darnell@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. John Kross, Town Manager
Town of Queen Creek
22350 South Ellsworth Road
Queen Creek, Arizona 85142

Dear Mr. Kross:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Chris Dovel, Town Engineer, 22350 South Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, Arizona, 85142 (with enclosure)
Brett Burningham, Planning Administrator, 22350 South Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, Arizona, 85142 (with enclosure)

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRAC No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Sean Heath, Chief
Environmental Resource Management Division
Bureau of Reclamation – Phoenix Area Office
6150 West Thunderbird Road
Glendale, Arizona 85306

Dear Mr. Heath:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Dave Gifford, Archaeologist, Phoenix Area Office, Bureau of Reclamation, 6150 West Thunderbird Road., Glendale, Arizona, 85306 (with enclosure)

cce:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Terry Rambler, Chairman
San Carlos Apache Tribe
P.O. Box O
San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, San Carlos Apache Tribe, P.O. Box 0, San Carlos, Arizona 85550 (with enclosure)

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Mike Urton, General Manager
San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District
120 South 3rd Street
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Urton:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Final County, Arizona (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
Mr. Ferris Begay, Project Manager  
San Carlos Irrigation Project  
13805 North Arizona Boulevard  
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Begay,

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist
Arizona State Parks
State Historic Preservation Office
1100 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SHPO-2010-1454

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in
Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.

As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Enclosure

deer:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 P1 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class II: Survey Report

Mr. Delbert Ray, Sr., President
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Route 1, Box 216
10005 East Osborn Road
Scottsdale, Arizona 85256

Dear President Ray:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

cc:
Angela Garcia-Lewis, Cultural Preservation Compliance Supervisor, Cultural Preservation Program, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, 10005 East Osborn Road., Scottsdale, Arizona 85256 (with enclosure)

ccc:
Angela Garcia-Lewis angela.garcia-lewis@smmic-nsn.gov (with enclosure)  
Shane Anton Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov (with enclosure)  
Martha Martinez Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov (with enclosure)  
RYedlin  
JHeilman
ARIZONA DIVISION

September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Ms. Jeri DeCola, Chairwoman
Tonto Apache Tribe
Tonto Apache Reservation #30
Payson, Arizona 85541

Dear Chairwoman DeCola:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Wally Davis, Jr., Cultural and NAGPRA Representative, Tonto Apache Reservation #30, Payson, Arizona 85541 (with enclosure)

cc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class II Survey Report

Ms. Cheryl Eamick, Senior Environmental and Land Use Planner
Tucson Electric Power Company, a UNS Energy Corporation
88 East Broadway Boulevard, Mail Stop HQW603
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Ms. Eamick:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ecc:  
RYedlin  
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Peter Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Mr. Jefford Francisco, Cultural Resource Specialist
Tohono O'odham Nation
Cultural Affairs Office
P. O. Box 837
Sells, Arizona 85634

Dear Messrs. Steere and Francisco:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Alexander Popovici, Manager Industry & Public Projects
Union Pacific Railroad
631 South 7th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Dear Mr. Popovici:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ecc:
Vicki Bever at vbever@azdot.gov (w/enclosure)
Sayeed Hani at SHani@azdot.gov (w/enclosure)
Jorge Vasquez at JVasquez@azdot.gov (w/enclosure)
RYedlin
JHeilman
In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Ms. Sallie Diebolt, Chief, Arizona Branch
Regulatory Division, Los Angeles District
US Army Corps of Engineers
3636 North Central Avenue, Suite 900
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-1939

Attn: Jesse M. Rice, ADOT Liaison, Regulatory Branch

Dear Ms. Diebolt:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in
Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.

As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Fall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Enclosure

ccc:  
RYedlin  
JHeilman
ARIZONA DIVISION

September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Ms. Linda Marianito, Environmental Manager
Western Area Power Administration
615 South 43rd Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85009

Dear Ms. Linda Marianito:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Sean Berry, Regional Preservation Official/Archaeologist, P.O. Box 6457, Phoenix, Arizona, 85005 (with enclosure)

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Chris Coder, Tribal Archaeologist
Yavapai-Apache Nation
2400 West Datsi Street
Camp Verde, Arizona 86322

Dear Mr. Coder:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tchono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cce:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr., President
Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
530 East Merritt Street
Prescott, Arizona 86301-2038

Dear President Jones:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (Ak-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.
As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

cc:
Linda Ogo, Director, Culture Research Department, 530 East Merritt Street, Prescott, Arizona 86301-2038 (with enclosure)

dcc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
October 9, 2017

Karla S. Petty  
Division Administrator  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration  
Arizona Division  
4000 North Central Avenue  
Suite 1500  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: STP-999-A(365)X  
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L  
North-South Corridor Study  
Continuing Section 106 Consultation  
Class III Survey Report

Dear Ms. Karla Petty,

The Ak-Chin Indian Community received your letter dated September 13, 2017 regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) proposal to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from State Route 202 (SR 202) eastward to the North-South Corridor (NSC) alignment.

The letter stated that the Arizona State Museum (ASM) responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the Arizona State Museum (ASM) accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the Arizona State Museum (ASM) comments. We, also received a digital copy of the revised report titled, “Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona. Thank you for enclosing the report for our review our records.

At this time, as part of our Continuing Section 106 Consultation and due to the Gila River Indian Community being the Lead for the Four Southern Tribes on the proposed project, we will defer all comments to as well as concur with the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office located in Sacaton, Arizona. If you should have any questions, please contact Ms. Bernadette Carra, CRS-Land Management at (520) 568-1337 or (520) 568-1365, thank you.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Miguel, Chairman
Ak-Chin Indian Community
September 13, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist
Arizona State Parks
State Historic Preservation Office
1100 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SHPO-2010-1454

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (AK-Chin), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

After consultation on the traditional cultural property (TCP) overview report and TCP technical summary prepared for the project, the Four Southern Tribes (AK-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON) requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed North-South Corridor project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in
Casa Grande with FHWA, ADOT, Ak-Chin, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT committing to identifying avoidance alternatives.

As FHWA and ADOT were identifying avoidance alternatives, a TCP evaluation, a Class III pedestrian survey, and a built environment survey were completed for 400-foot (ft) alternative alignments within the larger North-South Corridor Study area. On March 23, 2017, the Class III report, titled *Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona* (Hall et al. 2017) was provided to the consulting parties for review and comment.


ASM responded with a request for revisions to the report regarding map scales and labeling, site boundaries, and the ASM accession number. The Class III survey report has been revised per the ASM comments. An electronic copy of the revised report is enclosed for your files.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the project in general, would like to request a hard copy of the report, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cce:
RYedlin
JHeilman

[cc: Jill Heilman]

CONCUR

[Signature]

Arizona State Historic Preservation Office
October 25, 2017

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Arizona Division
4000 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Built Environment Report

Dear Karla S. Petty,

The Ak-Chin Indian Community received your letter dated September 28, 2017 regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment.

The Federal Highway Administration announced through the Federal Register on October 3, 2016 that the North-South Corridor Study was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier I Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on behalf of the lead agencies, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), as a result of fiscal constraints and an interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) planning studies. The letter concluded stating the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is not making a finding of project effect at this time.

We also did receive a copy of the report entitled "Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona". We thank you for enclosing the report for our review and records.

At this time, due to the Gila River Indian Community being the lead for the project and due to the location of the project, the Ak-Chin Indian Community will defer all comments to as well as concur with the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office located in
Sacaton, Arizona. If you should have any questions, please contact Ms. Bernadette Carra, CRS-Land Management at (520) 568-1337 or (520) 568-1365, thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Miguel, Chairman
Ak-Chin Indian Community
Mr. Mathew Behrend, Cultural Resources Section Manager  
Arizona State Land Department  
1616 West Adams Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007  

Dear Mr. Behrend:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management, Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the consultation lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the North-South Corridor Study was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraints and an interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 National Environmental Policy Act planning studies. As part of continuing consultation, a built environment evaluation for the project-level, 400-foot alternative alignments was completed for the alternatives developed previously within the North-South Corridor Study Area that preceded the study’s conversion to a Tier 1 EIS. Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) performed the built environment inventory, which identified historical resources within the alternative alignments and within a 0.25-mile buffer beyond the alignments. The results are reported in Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor.
Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona (Thompson and Gregory 2017), which is enclosed for your review.

SRI evaluated architectural resources on 162 property parcels (see tables below). Building types represented included residential, commercial, agricultural/industrial, and religious. Buildings constructed prior to 1975 were included in the evaluation. The inventory identified 3 properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) individually and as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 7 properties listed as NRHP eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 1 property recommended NRHP-eligible individually and as a contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 8 properties recommended NRHP-eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; and 143 properties as not eligible for NRHP listing. NRHP eligibility recommendations for individual properties are provided in Tables 1 and 2, which list the properties within the 400-foot alignments and within the 0.25-mile buffer, respectively.

Table 1. NRHP Eligibility Recommendations for Properties within the 400-ft Alternative Alignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
<th>Eligibility Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200-31-019E</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200-31-054A</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200-40-0070</td>
<td>802 Southwind Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-40-010A0</td>
<td>1140 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-45-008B</td>
<td>120 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>202-11-0180</td>
<td>2150 W. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>202-18-0030</td>
<td>12710 E. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>202-25-0010</td>
<td>4151 W. Canal Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>202-33-0020</td>
<td>4205 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>202-33-0050</td>
<td>3665 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>202-34-001C</td>
<td>1914 S. Clemans Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>210-04-1200</td>
<td>34631 N. Mountain View Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>400-36-002A</td>
<td>4755 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>400-36-0010</td>
<td>4809 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>401-54-0030</td>
<td>12105 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>401-62-0310</td>
<td>4826 E. Stallion Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>401-71-0040</td>
<td>11125 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>401-86-003B</td>
<td>7101 E. Steele Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>411-13-003C</td>
<td>3110 E. Milligan Road</td>
<td>commercial, agricultural/industrial, residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>411-15-0070</td>
<td>3002 E. Phillips Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>411-16-002A</td>
<td>4741 E. Highway 84</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>411-22-035C</td>
<td>6395 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1960; 1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>411-22-0360</td>
<td>18350 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>411-22-048B</td>
<td>6270 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>411-25-006H</td>
<td>6471 E. Regal Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>411-25-019E</td>
<td>6815 E. Spur Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Year Constructed</td>
<td>Eligibility Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>102-19-0016</td>
<td>2175 W. Southern Avenue</td>
<td>multifamily residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102-19-008A</td>
<td>3587 S. Meridian Drive</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104-22-006T</td>
<td>37642 N. Sierra Vista Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962 (three houses on parcel)</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-34-0030</td>
<td>119 W. Poston Butte Loop</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-43-0070</td>
<td>366 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200-43-0080</td>
<td>382 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>200-43-0090</td>
<td>400 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200-43-0100</td>
<td>414 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200-43-0110</td>
<td>432 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200-43-0120</td>
<td>450 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>200-43-0130</td>
<td>452 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200-43-0140</td>
<td>80 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>200-43-0150</td>
<td>60 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>200-43-0160</td>
<td>40 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>200-43-0170</td>
<td>20 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>200-43-0180</td>
<td>21 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>200-43-0190</td>
<td>41 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>200-43-0200</td>
<td>61 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>200-43-0210</td>
<td>81 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200-43-0220</td>
<td>401 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>200-43-0230</td>
<td>385 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>200-43-0240</td>
<td>369 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>200-43-0250</td>
<td>40 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>200-43-0260</td>
<td>20 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>200-43-0270</td>
<td>370 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>200-43-0280</td>
<td>390 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>200-43-0290</td>
<td>410 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>200-43-0300</td>
<td>430 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>200-43-0310</td>
<td>224 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>200-43-0320</td>
<td>210 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>200-43-0330</td>
<td>190 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>200-43-034A</td>
<td>174 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>200-43-0360</td>
<td>435 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>200-43-0370</td>
<td>415 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>200-43-0380</td>
<td>395 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>200-43-0390</td>
<td>375 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>200-43-0400</td>
<td>372 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>200-43-0410</td>
<td>392 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>200-43-0420</td>
<td>412 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>200-43-0430</td>
<td>432 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>200-43-0440</td>
<td>433 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>200-43-046A</td>
<td>393 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>200-43-0470</td>
<td>220 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>200-44-0470</td>
<td>171 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>225 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>274 W. 11th St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>794 W. 11th St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>344 W. 11th St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>201 N. Bush St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>181 N. Bush St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>325 W. 9th St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>110 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>90 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>70 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55 and 75 N. Bush St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919, 1960</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>55 N. Bush St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>345 W. 11th St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>110 N. Willow St</td>
<td>multifamily</td>
<td>1890–1891, 1900</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>90 N. Willow St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>contributor² (Criteria a and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70 N. Willow St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>71 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1888, ca. 1962</td>
<td>contributor² (Criteria a, b, and c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>149 and 149½ N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1938, 1963–1992</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>30 N. Willow St</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>35 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>30 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>10 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>310 W. Butte Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>140 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>44 S. Willow St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>221 W. Butte Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>contributor² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>88 S. Willow St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>contributor² (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>267 W. Butte Ave, 60 S. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930, 1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>323 W. Butte Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>345 W. Butte Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>120 S. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>190 S. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>individually eligible and contributor² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>177 S. Bush St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>145 S. Bush St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>102 S. Willow St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>contributor² (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>144 S. Willow St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>188 S. Willow St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>individually eligible² (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>240 W. 16th St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>220 W. 16th St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>101 S. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historical B6B</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>202-07-0920</td>
<td>245 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential, commercial</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>202-07-0940</td>
<td>212 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>202-07-0950</td>
<td>230 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>202-07-0960</td>
<td>300 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>202-07-0980</td>
<td>313 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>202-07-0990</td>
<td>233 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>202-07-1008</td>
<td>211 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>202-07-101C</td>
<td>390 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential, commercial</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>202-08-002A</td>
<td>188 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>202-08-002B</td>
<td>407 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>202-08-0030</td>
<td>200 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>202-11-0110</td>
<td>2302 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>202-11-0120</td>
<td>2336 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>202-19-013D</td>
<td>2501 S. Hiscox Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>202-25-005A</td>
<td>12473 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>202-25-007B</td>
<td>10698 E. Vah Kl Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>202-26-0080</td>
<td>12068 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>202-27-0070</td>
<td>9997 E. Vah Kl Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>202-28-003F</td>
<td>10805 E. Vah Kl Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>202-28-0200</td>
<td>3846 E. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>202-29-0040</td>
<td>10946 E. Vah Kl Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>202-29-0050</td>
<td>10998 E. Vah Kl Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>202-29-0590</td>
<td>11974 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>202-29-0600</td>
<td>12022 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>202-29-0610</td>
<td>10863 E. Vah Kl Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>202-32-004C</td>
<td>9983 N. Valley Farms Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1950; 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>202-35-0010</td>
<td>8118 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>400-36-004D</td>
<td>4633 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>400-36-0080</td>
<td>4513 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>400-37-0110</td>
<td>3543 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>400-37-0130</td>
<td>3467 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>411-21-028A</td>
<td>18145 S. Halsey Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>411-22-0270</td>
<td>6085 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1940s</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>411-22-0288</td>
<td>6145 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>411-22-0310</td>
<td>6215 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>411-22-0320</td>
<td>6235 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>411-22-0330</td>
<td>6275 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>411-23-0150</td>
<td>6842 E. Picacho Boulevard</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>411-23-0180</td>
<td>18065 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>411-23-021A</td>
<td>18050 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>411-25-0070</td>
<td>18525 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>411-25-009A</td>
<td>18595 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>411-25-0110</td>
<td>18705 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940; 1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>411-25-023B</td>
<td>6710 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>411-25-023F</td>
<td>6496 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>411-25-023J</td>
<td>6624 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>411-25-0278</td>
<td>6545 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>411-25-029A</td>
<td>6585 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>411-25-0300</td>
<td>6621 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>411-25-0330</td>
<td>6677 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>411-25-0360</td>
<td>6755 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>411-25-0028</td>
<td>18899 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District.
* Listed in the National Register of Historic Places on August 1, 1986.
* Recommended individually eligible and as a contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report and information in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the study in general, or would like to request hard copies of the inventory forms, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Date 9/28/2017

Signature for Arizona State Land Department
Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosure

ecc:
Matthew Behrend mbehrend@azland.gov
April Sewequaptewa-Tutt asewequaptewa-tutt@azland.gov (with enclosure)
Crystal Carrancho ccarrancho@azland.gov (with enclosure)
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 28, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Built Environment Report

Mr. Harvey Krauss, AICP, City Manager
City of Eloy
628 North Main Street
Eloy, Arizona 85131

Dear Mr. Krauss:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the consultation lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the North-South Corridor Study was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraints and an interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 National Environmental Policy Act planning studies. As part of continuing consultation, a built environment evaluation for the project-level, 400-foot alternative alignments was completed for the alternatives developed previously within the North-South Corridor Study Area that preceded the study’s conversion to a Tier 1 EIS. Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) performed the built environment inventory, which identified historical resources within the alternative alignments and within a 0.25-mile buffer beyond the alignments. The results are reported in Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor.
Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona (Thompson and Gregory 2017), which is enclosed for your review.

SRI evaluated architectural resources on 162 property parcels (see tables below). Building types represented included residential, commercial, agricultural/industrial, and religious. Buildings constructed prior to 1975 were included in the evaluation. The inventory identified 3 properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) individually and as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 7 properties listed as NRHP eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 1 property recommended NRHP-eligible individually and as a contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 8 properties recommended NRHP-eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; and 143 properties as not eligible for NRHP listing. NRHP eligibility recommendations for individual properties are provided in Tables 1 and 2, which list the properties within the 400-foot alignments and within the 0.25-mile buffer, respectively.

### Table 1. NRHP Eligibility Recommendations for Properties within the 400-ft Alternative Alignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
<th>Eligibility Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200-31-019E</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200-31-054A</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200-40-0070</td>
<td>802 Southwind Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-40-010A0</td>
<td>1140 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-45-008B</td>
<td>120 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>202-11-0180</td>
<td>2150 W. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>202-18-0030</td>
<td>12710 E. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>202-25-0010</td>
<td>4151 W. Canal Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>202-33-0020</td>
<td>4205 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>202-33-0050</td>
<td>3665 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>202-34-001C</td>
<td>1914 S. Clemons Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>210-04-1200</td>
<td>34631 N. Mountain View Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>400-36-002A</td>
<td>4755 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>400-36-0010</td>
<td>4809 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>401-54-0030</td>
<td>12105 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>401-62-0310</td>
<td>4826 E. Stallion Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>401-71-0040</td>
<td>11125 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>401-86-003B</td>
<td>7101 E. Steele Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>411-13-003C</td>
<td>3110 E. Milligan Road</td>
<td>commercial, agricultural/industrial, residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>411-15-0070</td>
<td>3002 E. Phillips Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>411-16-002A</td>
<td>4741 E. Highway 84</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>411-22-035C</td>
<td>6395 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1960; 1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>411-22-0360</td>
<td>18350 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>411-22-048B</td>
<td>6270 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>411-25-306H</td>
<td>6471 E. Regal Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>411-25-019E</td>
<td>6815 E. Spur Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Year Constructed</td>
<td>Eligibility Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>102-19-001B</td>
<td>2175 W. Southern Avenue</td>
<td>multifamily</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102-19-008A</td>
<td>3587 S. Meridian Drive</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104-22-006T</td>
<td>37642 N. Sierra Vista Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962 (three houses on parcel)</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-34-0030</td>
<td>119 W. Poston Butte Loop</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-43-0070</td>
<td>366 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200-43-0080</td>
<td>382 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>200-43-0090</td>
<td>400 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200-43-0100</td>
<td>414 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200-43-0110</td>
<td>432 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200-43-0120</td>
<td>450 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>200-43-0130</td>
<td>452 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200-43-0140</td>
<td>80 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>200-43-0150</td>
<td>60 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>200-43-0160</td>
<td>40 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>200-43-0170</td>
<td>20 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>200-43-0180</td>
<td>21 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>200-43-0190</td>
<td>41 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>200-43-0200</td>
<td>61 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>200-43-0210</td>
<td>81 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200-43-0220</td>
<td>401 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>200-43-0230</td>
<td>385 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>200-43-0240</td>
<td>369 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>200-43-0250</td>
<td>40 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>200-43-0260</td>
<td>20 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>200-43-0270</td>
<td>370 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>200-43-0280</td>
<td>390 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>200-43-0290</td>
<td>410 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>200-43-0300</td>
<td>430 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>200-43-0310</td>
<td>224 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>200-43-0320</td>
<td>210 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>200-43-0330</td>
<td>190 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>200-43-0340</td>
<td>174 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>200-43-0350</td>
<td>435 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>200-43-0360</td>
<td>415 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>200-43-0370</td>
<td>395 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>200-43-0380</td>
<td>375 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>200-43-0390</td>
<td>372 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>200-43-0400</td>
<td>392 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>200-43-0410</td>
<td>412 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>200-43-0420</td>
<td>432 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>200-43-0430</td>
<td>433 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>200-43-0440</td>
<td>393 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>200-43-0450</td>
<td>220 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>200-44-0470</td>
<td>171 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Block Number</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>203-44-049A</td>
<td>225 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>203-44-0560</td>
<td>274 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>203-44-0570</td>
<td>294 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>203-44-0590</td>
<td>344 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>203-44-060A</td>
<td>201 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>203-44-060B</td>
<td>181 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>203-44-0610</td>
<td>325 W. 9th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>203-44-0630</td>
<td>110 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>203-44-0640</td>
<td>90 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>203-44-0650</td>
<td>70 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>203-44-0660</td>
<td>55 and 75 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919, 1960</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>203-44-0670</td>
<td>95 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>203-44-0688</td>
<td>345 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>203-44-0700</td>
<td>110 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>multifamily, residential</td>
<td>1890–1891, 1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>203-44-0710</td>
<td>90 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a and c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>203-44-0720</td>
<td>70 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>203-44-0730</td>
<td>71 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1888, ca. 1962</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c), noncontributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>203-44-0750</td>
<td>149 and 149 1/2 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1938, 1963–1992</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>203-44-077C</td>
<td>30 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>203-44-0780</td>
<td>35 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>203-44-0800</td>
<td>30 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>203-44-0810</td>
<td>10 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>203-44-0820</td>
<td>310 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>203-45-007A</td>
<td>140 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>202-07-065A</td>
<td>44 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>202-07-0660</td>
<td>221 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>202-07-0670</td>
<td>88 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>202-07-0680</td>
<td>267 W. Butte Avenue, 60 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930, 1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>202-07-0690</td>
<td>323 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>202-07-0700</td>
<td>345 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>202-07-0720</td>
<td>120 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>202-07-0750</td>
<td>190 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>individually eligible and contributor (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>202-07-0760</td>
<td>177 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>202-07-0770</td>
<td>145 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>202-07-0810</td>
<td>102 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>202-07-0820</td>
<td>144 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>202-07-0830</td>
<td>188 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>202-07-084B</td>
<td>240 W. 16th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>202-07-084C</td>
<td>220 W. 16th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>202-07-0mc</td>
<td>101 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historical 868</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>202-07-0920</td>
<td>245 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential, commercial</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>202-07-0940</td>
<td>212 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>202-07-0950</td>
<td>230 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>202-07-0960</td>
<td>300 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>202-07-0980</td>
<td>313 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>202-07-0990</td>
<td>233 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>202-07-100B</td>
<td>211 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>202-07-101C</td>
<td>390 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential, commercial</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>202-08-002A</td>
<td>188 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>202-08-002B</td>
<td>407 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>202-08-0030</td>
<td>200 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>202-11-0110</td>
<td>2302 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>202-11-0120</td>
<td>2336 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>202-19-013D</td>
<td>2501 S. Hiscox Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>202-25-005A</td>
<td>12473 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>202-25-007B</td>
<td>10698 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>202-26-0080</td>
<td>12068 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>202-27-0070</td>
<td>9997 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>202-28-003F</td>
<td>10805 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>202-28-0200</td>
<td>3846 E. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>202-29-0040</td>
<td>10946 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>202-29-0050</td>
<td>10998 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>202-29-0590</td>
<td>11974 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>202-29-0600</td>
<td>12022 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>202-29-0610</td>
<td>10863 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>202-32-004C</td>
<td>9983 N. Valley Farms Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1950; 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>202-35-0010</td>
<td>8118 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>400-36-0040</td>
<td>4633 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>400-36-0080</td>
<td>4513 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>400-37-0110</td>
<td>3543 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>400-37-0130</td>
<td>3467 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>411-21-028A</td>
<td>18145 S. Halsey Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>411-22-0270</td>
<td>6085 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1940s</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>411-22-0288</td>
<td>6145 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>411-22-0310</td>
<td>6215 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>411-22-0320</td>
<td>6235 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>411-22-0330</td>
<td>6275 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>411-23-0150</td>
<td>6842 E. Picacho Boulevard</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>411-23-0180</td>
<td>18065 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>411-23-021A</td>
<td>18050 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>411-25-0070</td>
<td>18525 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>411-25-009A</td>
<td>18595 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>411-25-0110</td>
<td>18705 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940; 1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>411-25-023B</td>
<td>6710 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>411-25-023F</td>
<td>6496 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report and information in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the study in general, or would like to request hard copies of the inventory forms, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for City of Eloy Concurrence STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosure

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
In Reply Refer To:  
STP-999-A(365)X  
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L  
North-South Corridor Study  
Continuing Section 106 Consultation  
Built Environment Report

September 28, 2017

Mr. Scott Bender, Pinal County Engineer  
Pinal County  
P.O. Box 727  
Florence, Arizona 85132

Dear Mr. Bender:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the consultation lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the North-South Corridor Study was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraints and an interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 National Environmental Policy Act planning studies. As part of continuing consultation, a built environment evaluation for the project-level, 400-foot alternative alignments was completed for the alternatives developed previously within the North-South Corridor Study Area that preceded the study’s conversion to a Tier 1 EIS. Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) performed the built environment inventory, which identified historical resources within the alternative alignments and within a 0.25-mile buffer beyond the alignments. The results are reported in Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>411-25-023J 6624 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>411-25-027B 6545 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>411-25-029A 6585 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>411-25-0300 6521 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>411-25-0330 6677 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>411-25-0360 6755 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>411-26-002B 18899 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District.
* Listed in the National Register of Historic Places on August 1, 1986.
* Recommended individually eligible and as a contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report and information in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignment, the study in general, or would like to request hard copies of the inventory forms, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Date: 10/11/2017

Signature for Pinal County Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosure

ec: RYedlin
JHeilman
In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Built Environment Report

Mr. Terry Rambler, Chairman
San Carlos Apache Tribe
P.O. Box O
San Carlos, Arizona 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the consultation lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the North-South Corridor Study was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraints and an interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 National Environmental Policy Act planning studies. As part of continuing consultation, a built environment evaluation for the project-level, 400-foot alternative alignments was completed for the alternatives developed previously within the North-South Corridor Study Area that preceded the study’s conversion to a Tier 1 EIS. Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) performed the built environment inventory, which identified historical resources within the alternative alignments and within a 0.25-mile buffer beyond the alignments. The results are reported in Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor.
FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report and information in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the study in general, or would like to request hard copies of the inventory forms, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for San Carlos Apache Tribe Concurrence  Date
STP-999-A(365)X

c:
Vermelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, San Carlos Apache Tribe, P.O. Box 0, San Carlos, Arizona 85550 (with enclosure)

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
September 28, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Built Environment Report

Ms. Cheryl Eamick, Senior Environmental and Land Use Planner
Tucson Electric Power Company, a UNS Energy Corporation
88 East Broadway Boulevard, Mail Stop HQW603
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Ms. Eamick:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the consultation lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the North-South Corridor Study was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraints and an interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 National Environmental Policy Act planning studies. As part of continuing consultation, a built environment evaluation for the project-level, 400-foot alternative alignments was completed for the alternatives developed previously within the North-South Corridor Study Area that preceded the study’s conversion to a Tier 1 EIS. Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) performed the built environment inventory, which identified historical resources within the alternative alignments and within a 0.25-mile buffer beyond the alignments. The results are reported in Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor
Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona (Thompson and Gregory 2017), which is enclosed for your review.

SRI evaluated architectural resources on 162 property parcels (see tables below). Building types represented included residential, commercial, agricultural/industrial, and religious. Buildings constructed prior to 1975 were included in the evaluation. The inventory identified 3 properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) individually and as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 7 properties listed as NRHP eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 1 property recommended NRHP-eligible individually and as a contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 8 properties recommended NRHP-eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; and 143 properties as not eligible for NRHP listing. NRHP eligibility recommendations for individual properties are provided in Tables 1 and 2, which list the properties within the 400-foot alignments and within the 0.25-mile buffer, respectively.

Table 1. NRHP Eligibility Recommendations for Properties within the 400-ft Alternative Alignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
<th>Eligibility Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200-31-019E</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200-31-054A</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200-40-0070</td>
<td>802 Southwind Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-40-010A0</td>
<td>1140 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-45-008B</td>
<td>120 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>202-11-0180</td>
<td>2150 W. Adavmsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>202-18-0030</td>
<td>12710 E. Adavmsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>202-25-0010</td>
<td>4151 W. Canal Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>202-33-0020</td>
<td>4205 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>202-33-0050</td>
<td>3665 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>202-34-001C</td>
<td>1914 S. Clemons Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>210-04-1200</td>
<td>34631 N. Mountain View Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>400-36-002A</td>
<td>4755 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>400-36-0010</td>
<td>4809 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>401-54-0030</td>
<td>12105 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>401-62-0310</td>
<td>4826 E. Stallion Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>401-71-0340</td>
<td>11125 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>401-86-003B</td>
<td>7101 E. Steele Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>411-13-003C</td>
<td>3110 E. Milligan Road</td>
<td>commercial, agricultural/industrial, residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>411-15-0070</td>
<td>3002 E. Phillips Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>411-16-002A</td>
<td>4741 E. Highway 84</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>411-22-035C</td>
<td>6395 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1960; 1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>411-22-0360</td>
<td>18350 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>411-22-048B</td>
<td>6270 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>411-25-006H</td>
<td>6471 E. Regal Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>411-25-019E</td>
<td>6815 E. Spur Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Year Constructed</td>
<td>Eligibility Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>102-19-001B</td>
<td>2175 W. Southern Avenue</td>
<td>multifamily</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102-19-008A</td>
<td>3587 S. Meridian Drive</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104-22-006T</td>
<td>37642 N. Sierra Vista Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962 (three houses on parcel)</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-34-0030</td>
<td>119 W. Poston Butte Loop</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-43-0070</td>
<td>366 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200-43-0080</td>
<td>382 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>200-43-0090</td>
<td>400 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200-43-0100</td>
<td>414 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200-43-0110</td>
<td>432 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200-43-0120</td>
<td>450 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>200-43-0130</td>
<td>452 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200-43-0140</td>
<td>80 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>200-43-0150</td>
<td>60 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>200-43-0160</td>
<td>40 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>200-43-0170</td>
<td>20 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>200-43-0180</td>
<td>21 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>200-43-0190</td>
<td>41 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>200-43-0200</td>
<td>61 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>200-43-0210</td>
<td>81 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200-43-0220</td>
<td>401 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>200-43-0230</td>
<td>385 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>200-43-0240</td>
<td>369 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>200-43-0250</td>
<td>40 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>200-43-0260</td>
<td>20 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>200-43-0270</td>
<td>370 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>200-43-0280</td>
<td>390 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>200-43-0290</td>
<td>410 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>200-43-0300</td>
<td>430 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>200-43-0310</td>
<td>224 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>200-43-0320</td>
<td>210 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>200-43-0330</td>
<td>190 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>200-43-034A</td>
<td>174 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>200-43-0360</td>
<td>435 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>200-43-0370</td>
<td>415 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>200-43-0380</td>
<td>395 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>200-43-0390</td>
<td>375 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>200-43-0400</td>
<td>372 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>200-43-0410</td>
<td>392 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>200-43-0420</td>
<td>412 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>200-43-0430</td>
<td>432 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>200-43-0440</td>
<td>433 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>200-43-046A</td>
<td>393 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>200-43-0470</td>
<td>220 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>200-44-0470</td>
<td>171 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>225 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>274 W. 11th St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>294 W. 11th St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>344 W. 11th St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>201 N. Bush St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>181 N. Bush St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>325 W. 9th St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>110 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>90 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>70 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55 and 75 N. Bush St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919, 1960</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>95 N. Bush St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>345 W. 11th St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>110 N. Willow St.</td>
<td>multifamily</td>
<td>1890–1891, 1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>90 N. Willow St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70 N. Willow St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>71 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1888, ca. 1962</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>149 and 149½ N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1938, 1963–1992</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>30 N. Willow St.</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>35 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>30 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>10 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>310 W. Butte Ave.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>140 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>44 S. Willow St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>221 W. Butte Ave.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>88 S. Willow St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>267 W. Butte Ave.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930, 1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>323 W. Butte Ave.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>345 W. Butte Ave.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>120 S. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>190 S. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>177 S. Bush St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>145 S. Bush St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>102 S. Willow St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>144 S. Willow St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>188 S. Willow St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>240 W. 16th St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>220 W. 16th St.</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>101 S. Central Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Use Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>202-07-0920</td>
<td>245 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>202-07-0940</td>
<td>212 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>202-07-0950</td>
<td>230 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>202-07-0960</td>
<td>300 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>202-07-0980</td>
<td>313 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>202-07-0990</td>
<td>223 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>202-07-100B</td>
<td>211 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>202-07-101C</td>
<td>390 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>202-08-002A</td>
<td>188 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>202-08-002B</td>
<td>407 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>202-08-0030</td>
<td>200 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>202-11-011O</td>
<td>2302 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>202-11-012O</td>
<td>2336 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>202-19-013D</td>
<td>2501 S. Hiscox Lane</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>202-25-005A</td>
<td>12473 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>202-25-007B</td>
<td>10698 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>202-26-008B</td>
<td>12068 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>202-27-0070</td>
<td>9997 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>202-28-003F</td>
<td>10809 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>202-28-0200</td>
<td>3846 E. Central Avenue</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>202-29-0040</td>
<td>10946 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>202-29-0050</td>
<td>10998 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>202-29-0590</td>
<td>11974 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>202-29-0600</td>
<td>12022 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>202-29-0610</td>
<td>10863 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>202-32-004C</td>
<td>9983 N. Valley Farms Road</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>202-35-001O</td>
<td>8118 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>400-36-004D</td>
<td>4633 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>400-36-0080</td>
<td>4513 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>400-37-0110</td>
<td>3543 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>400-37-0130</td>
<td>3467 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>411-21-028A</td>
<td>18145 S. Halsey Street</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>411-22-0270</td>
<td>6085 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>411-22-028B</td>
<td>6145 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>411-22-031O</td>
<td>6215 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>411-22-0320</td>
<td>6235 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>411-22-0330</td>
<td>6275 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>411-23-015O</td>
<td>6842 E. Picacho Boulevard</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>411-23-0180</td>
<td>18065 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>411-23-021A</td>
<td>18050 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>411-25-0070</td>
<td>18525 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>411-25-009A</td>
<td>18595 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>411-25-011O</td>
<td>18705 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>1940; 1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>411-25-023B</td>
<td>6710 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>411-25-023F</td>
<td>6496 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>411-25-023J</td>
<td>6624 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>411-25-027B</td>
<td>6545 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>411-25-029A</td>
<td>6585 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>411-25-0300</td>
<td>6621 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>411-25-0330</td>
<td>6677 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>411-25-0360</td>
<td>6755 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>411-26-002B</td>
<td>18899 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report and information in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the study in general, or would like to request hard copies of the inventory forms, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature for Tucson Electric Power Company]

Concurrence

STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosure

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
November 8, 2017

Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
4000 North Central Avenue, Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

RE: STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L, North-South Corridor Study, Continuing Section 106 Consultation, Built Environmental Report

Dear Ms. Petty,

The Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office (GRIC-THPO) has received your consultation letter dated October 24, 2017. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to develop and construct a new north-to-south transportation corridor linking United States Highway 60 (US 60) in Apache Junction, Maricopa County, Arizona, to Interstate 10 (I-10) between Picacho and Eloy, Pinal County, Arizona. The North-South corridor will also link to State Route 24 (SR24) connecting southeast metropolitan Phoenix to the proposed freeway.

The FHWA has submitted the report “Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona” prepared by Statistical Research, Incorporated (SRI) for review. SRI documented 162 property parcels. The inventory identified 3 properties that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places; 16 properties that are considered Register eligible; and 143 properties which are not considered Register eligible. No finding of project effect is proposed at this time. The FHWA is seeking concurrence with report adequacy and with determinations of eligibility of the documented architectural resources.

The GRIC-THPO considers the report an adequate reporting document. The GRIC-THPO concurs with the Register eligibility determinations for the documented structures. The proposed project area is within the ancestral lands of the Four Southern Tribes (Gila River Indian Community; Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community; Ak-Chin Indian Community and the Tohono O'Odham Nation).

Thank you for consulting with GRIC-THPO regarding this undertaking. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me or Archaeological Compliance Specialist Larry Benallie, Jr. at 520-562-7162.
Respectfully,

Barnaby V. Lewis
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Gila River Indian Community
In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Built Environment Report

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist/Archaeologist
State Historic Preservation Office
Arizona State Parks
1100 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SHPO-2010-1454

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the consultation lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the North-South Corridor Study was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraints and an interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 National Environmental Policy Act planning studies. As part of continuing consultation, a built environment evaluation for the project-level, 400-foot alternative alignments was completed for the alternatives developed previously within the North-South Corridor Study Area that preceded the study’s conversion to a Tier 1 EIS. Statistical
Research, Inc. (SRI) performed the built environment inventory, which identified historical resources within the alternative alignments and within a 0.25-mile buffer beyond the alignments. The results are reported in Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona (Thompson and Gregory 2017), which is enclosed for your review.

SRI evaluated architectural resources on 162 property parcels (see tables below). Building types represented included residential, commercial, agricultural/industrial, and religious. Buildings constructed prior to 1975 were included in the evaluation. The inventory identified 3 properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) individually and as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 7 properties listed as NRHP eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 1 property recommended NRHP-eligible individually and as a contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 8 properties recommended NRHP-eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; and 143 properties as not eligible for NRHP listing. NRHP eligibility recommendations for individual properties are provided in Tables 1 and 2, which list the properties within the 400-foot alignments and within the 0.25-mile buffer, respectively.

Table 1. NRHP Eligibility Recommendations for Properties within the 400-ft Alternative Alignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
<th>Eligibility Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200-31-019E</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200-31-054A</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200-40-0070</td>
<td>802 Southwind Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-40-010A</td>
<td>1140 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-45-008B</td>
<td>120 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>202-11-0180</td>
<td>2150 W. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>202-18-0030</td>
<td>12710 E. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>202-25-0010</td>
<td>4151 W. Canal Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>202-33-0020</td>
<td>4205 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>202-33-0050</td>
<td>3665 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>202-34-001C</td>
<td>1914 S. Clemans Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>210-04-1200</td>
<td>34631 N. Mountain View Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>400-36-002A</td>
<td>4755 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>400-36-0010</td>
<td>4806 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>401-54-0030</td>
<td>12105 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>401-62-0310</td>
<td>4825 E. Stallion Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>401-71-0040</td>
<td>11125 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>401-86-003B</td>
<td>7101 E. Steele Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>411-13-003C</td>
<td>3110 E. Milligan Road</td>
<td>commercial, agricultural/industrial, residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>411-15-0070</td>
<td>3002 E. Phillips Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>411-16-002A</td>
<td>4741 E. Highway 84</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>411-22-035C</td>
<td>6395 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1960; 1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>411-22-0360</td>
<td>18350 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>411-22-048B</td>
<td>6270 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>411-25-006H</td>
<td>6471 E. Regal Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>411-25-019E</td>
<td>6815 E. Spur Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Year Constructed</td>
<td>Eligibility Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>102-19-001B</td>
<td>2175 W. Southern Avenue</td>
<td>multifamily</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102-19-008A</td>
<td>3587 S. Meridian Drive</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104-22-006T</td>
<td>37642 N. Sierra Vista Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962 (three houses on parcel)</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-34-0030</td>
<td>119 W. Poston Butte Loop</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-43-0070</td>
<td>366 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200-43-0080</td>
<td>382 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>200-43-0090</td>
<td>400 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200-43-0100</td>
<td>414 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200-43-0110</td>
<td>432 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200-43-0120</td>
<td>450 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>200-43-0130</td>
<td>452 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200-43-0140</td>
<td>80 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>200-43-0150</td>
<td>60 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>200-43-0160</td>
<td>40 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>200-43-0170</td>
<td>20 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>200-43-0180</td>
<td>21 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>200-43-0190</td>
<td>41 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>200-43-0200</td>
<td>61 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>200-43-0210</td>
<td>81 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200-43-0220</td>
<td>401 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>200-43-0230</td>
<td>385 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>200-43-0240</td>
<td>369 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>200-43-0250</td>
<td>40 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>200-43-0260</td>
<td>20 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>200-43-0270</td>
<td>370 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>200-43-0280</td>
<td>390 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>200-43-0290</td>
<td>410 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>200-43-0300</td>
<td>430 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>200-43-0310</td>
<td>224 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>200-43-0320</td>
<td>210 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>200-43-0330</td>
<td>190 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>200-43-034A</td>
<td>174 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>200-43-0360</td>
<td>435 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>200-43-0370</td>
<td>415 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>200-43-0380</td>
<td>395 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>200-43-0390</td>
<td>375 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>200-43-0400</td>
<td>372 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>200-43-0410</td>
<td>392 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>200-43-0420</td>
<td>412 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>200-43-0430</td>
<td>432 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>200-43-0440</td>
<td>433 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>200-43-046A</td>
<td>393 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>220 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>171 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>225 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>274 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>294 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>344 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>201 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>181 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>325 W. 9th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>110 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>90 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>70 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55 and 75 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919,</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>95 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>345 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>110 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1890–1891, 1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>90 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>71 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1888, ca. 1962</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>149 and 149½ N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1938, 1963–1992</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>30 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>35 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>30 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>10 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>310 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>140 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>44 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>221 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>88 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>267 W. Butte Avenue, 60 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930, 1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>323 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>345 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>120 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>190 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>individually eligible and (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>177 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>145 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>102 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>144 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>188 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>240 W. 16th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>220 W. 16th Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>101 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>245 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>Residential, commercial</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>212 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>230 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>300 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>313 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>233 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>211 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>390 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>Residential, commercial</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>188 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>407 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>200 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>2302 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>2336 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>2501 S. Hiscox Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>12473 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>Agricultural/Industrial</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>10698 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>12068 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>9997 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>10805 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>3846 E. Central Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>10946 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>10998 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>11974 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>12022 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>10863 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>9983 N. Valley Farms Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1950; 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>8118 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>4633 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>4513 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>3543 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>3467 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>18145 S. Halsey Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>6085 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>ca. 1940s</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>6145 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>6215 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>6235 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>6275 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>6842 E. Picacho Boulevard</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>18065 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>18050 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>18525 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>18595 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>18705 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1940; 1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>6710 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>6496 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>6624 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>6545 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>6585 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>6621 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>6677 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>6755 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>18899 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District.
* Recommended individually eligible and as a contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District.

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report and information in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the study in general, or would like to request hard copies of the inventory forms, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Date: 13 OCT 17

Signaure for SHPO Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosure

ecc:
R.Yedlin
JHeilman

[Signature]
Jill Heilman ADOT

OCT 1 3 2017
September 28, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Built Environment Report

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma, Director
Hopi Tribe
Cultural Preservation Office
P.O. Box 123
Kykotsmovi, Arizona 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwisiwma:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the consultation lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the North-South Corridor Study was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraints and an interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 National Environmental Policy Act planning studies. As part of continuing consultation, a built environment evaluation for the project-level, 400-foot alternative alignments was completed for the alternatives developed previously within the North-South Corridor Study Area that preceded the study’s conversion to a Tier 1 EIS. Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) performed the built environment inventory, which identified historical resources within the alternative alignments and within a 0.25-mile buffer beyond the alignments. The results
are reported in *Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona* (Thompson and Gregory 2017), which is enclosed for your review.

SRI evaluated architectural resources on 162 property parcels (see tables below). Building types represented included residential, commercial, agricultural/industrial, and religious. Buildings constructed prior to 1975 were included in the evaluation. The inventory identified 3 properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) individually and as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 7 properties listed as NRHP eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 1 property recommended NRHP-eligible individually and as a contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 8 properties recommended NRHP-eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; and 143 properties as not eligible for NRHP listing. NRHP eligibility recommendations for individual properties are provided in Tables 1 and 2, which list the properties within the 400-foot alignments and within the 0.25-mile buffer, respectively.

**Table 1. NRHP Eligibility Recommendations for Properties within the 400-ft Alternative Alignments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
<th>Eligibility Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200-31-019E</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200-31-054A</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200-40-0070</td>
<td>802 Southwind Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-40-010A0</td>
<td>1140 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-45-0088</td>
<td>120 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>202-11-0180</td>
<td>2150 W. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>202-18-0030</td>
<td>12710 E. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>202-25-0010</td>
<td>4151 W. Canal Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>202-33-0020</td>
<td>4205 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>202-33-0050</td>
<td>3665 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>202-34-001C</td>
<td>1914 S. Clemans Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>210-04-1200</td>
<td>34631 N. Mountain View Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>400-36-002A</td>
<td>4755 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>400-36-0010</td>
<td>4809 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>401-54-0030</td>
<td>12105 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>401-62-0310</td>
<td>4826 E. Stallion Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>401-71-0040</td>
<td>11125 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>401-86-003B</td>
<td>7101 E. Steele Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>411-13-003C</td>
<td>3110 E. Milligan Road</td>
<td>commercial, agricultural/industrial, residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>411-15-0070</td>
<td>3002 E. Phillips Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>411-16-002A</td>
<td>4741 E. Highway 84</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>411-22-035C</td>
<td>6935 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1960; 1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>411-22-0360</td>
<td>18350 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>411-22-048B</td>
<td>6270 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>411-25-006H</td>
<td>6471 E. Regal Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>411-25-019E</td>
<td>6815 E. Spur Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Year Constructed</td>
<td>Eligibility Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>102-19-001B</td>
<td>2175 W. Southern Avenue</td>
<td>multifamily</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102-19-008A</td>
<td>3587 S. Meridian Drive</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104-22-006T</td>
<td>37642 N. Sierra Vista Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962 (three houses on parcel)</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-34-0030</td>
<td>119 W. Poston Butte Loop</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-43-0070</td>
<td>366 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200-43-0080</td>
<td>382 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>200-43-0090</td>
<td>400 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200-43-0100</td>
<td>414 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200-43-0110</td>
<td>432 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200-43-0120</td>
<td>450 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>200-43-0130</td>
<td>452 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200-43-0140</td>
<td>80 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>200-43-0150</td>
<td>60 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>200-43-0160</td>
<td>40 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>200-43-0170</td>
<td>20 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>200-43-0180</td>
<td>21 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>200-43-0190</td>
<td>41 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>200-43-0200</td>
<td>61 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>200-43-0210</td>
<td>81 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200-43-0220</td>
<td>401 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>200-43-0230</td>
<td>385 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>200-43-0240</td>
<td>369 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>200-43-0250</td>
<td>40 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>200-43-0260</td>
<td>20 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>200-43-0270</td>
<td>370 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>200-43-0280</td>
<td>390 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>200-43-0290</td>
<td>410 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>200-43-0300</td>
<td>430 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>200-43-0310</td>
<td>224 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>200-43-0320</td>
<td>210 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>200-43-0330</td>
<td>190 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>200-43-034A</td>
<td>174 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>200-43-0360</td>
<td>435 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>200-43-0370</td>
<td>415 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>200-43-0380</td>
<td>395 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>200-43-0390</td>
<td>375 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>200-43-0400</td>
<td>372 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>200-43-0410</td>
<td>392 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>200-43-0420</td>
<td>412 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>200-43-0430</td>
<td>432 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>200-43-0440</td>
<td>433 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>200-43-046A</td>
<td>393 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>200-43-0470</td>
<td>220 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>200-44-0470</td>
<td>171 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Status/Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>225 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>274 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>294 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>344 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>201 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>181 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>325 W. 9th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>110 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>90 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>70 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>55 and 75 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919, 1960</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>95 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>345 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>110 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>multifamily, residential</td>
<td>1890–1891, 1900</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>90 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criteria a and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>71 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1888, ca. 1962</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criteria a, b, and c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>149 and 149(^1/2) N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1938, 1963–1992</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>30 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>35 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>30 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>10 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>310 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>140 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>44 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible(^b) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>221 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>88 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>267 W. Butte Avenue, 60 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930, 1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>323 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>345 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>120 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>190 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>individually eligible and contributor(^a) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>177 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>145 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>102 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>contributor(^a) (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>144 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible(^b) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>188 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>individually eligible(^b) (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>240 W. 16th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>220 W. 16th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>101 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>historical 868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>202-07-0920</td>
<td>245 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential,</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>202-07-0940</td>
<td>212 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>202-07-0950</td>
<td>230 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>202-07-0960</td>
<td>300 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>202-07-0980</td>
<td>313 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>202-07-0990</td>
<td>233 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>202-07-100B</td>
<td>211 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>202-07-101C</td>
<td>390 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential,</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>202-08-002A</td>
<td>188 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>202-08-002B</td>
<td>407 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>202-08-003A</td>
<td>200 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>202-11-0110</td>
<td>2302 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>202-11-0120</td>
<td>2335 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>202-19-013D</td>
<td>2501 S. Hiscox Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>202-25-005A</td>
<td>12473 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industria l</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>202-25-007B</td>
<td>10698 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>202-26-0080</td>
<td>12668 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>202-27-0070</td>
<td>9997 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>202-28-003F</td>
<td>10605 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>202-28-0200</td>
<td>3846 E. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>202-29-0040</td>
<td>10546 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>202-29-0050</td>
<td>10598 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>202-29-0590</td>
<td>11974 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>202-29-0600</td>
<td>12022 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>202-29-0610</td>
<td>10663 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>202-32-004C</td>
<td>9983 N. Valley Farms Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1950; 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>202-35-0010</td>
<td>8118 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>400-36-004D</td>
<td>4633 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>400-36-0080</td>
<td>4513 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>400-37-0110</td>
<td>3543 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>400-37-0130</td>
<td>3467 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>411-21-028A</td>
<td>18145 S. Halsey Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>411-22-0270</td>
<td>6085 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1940s</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>411-22-0288</td>
<td>6145 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>411-22-0310</td>
<td>6215 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>411-22-0320</td>
<td>6235 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>411-22-0330</td>
<td>6275 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>411-23-0150</td>
<td>6842 E. Picacho Boulevard</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>411-23-0180</td>
<td>18065 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>411-23-021A</td>
<td>18050 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>411-25-0070</td>
<td>18525 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>411-25-009A</td>
<td>18595 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>411-25-0110</td>
<td>18705 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940; 1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>411-25-023B</td>
<td>6710 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>411-25-023F</td>
<td>6496 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report and information in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the study in general, or would like to request hard copies of the inventory forms, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for Hopi Tribe Concurrence   Date
STP-999-A(365)X

Enclosure

ccc:  
Rydlin
JHeilman

OCT 10 2017
September 28, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRAC No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Built Environment Report

Mr. John Kross, Town Manager
Town of Queen Creek
22350 South Ellsworth Road
Queen Creek, Arizona 85142

Dear Mr. Kross:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the North-South Corridor alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the consultation lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the North-South Corridor Study was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraints and an interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 National Environmental Policy Act planning studies. As part of continuing consultation, a built environment evaluation for the project-level, 400-foot alternative alignments was completed for the alternatives developed previously within the North-South Corridor Study Area that preceded the study’s conversion to a Tier 1 EIS. Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI) performed the built environment inventory, which identified historical resources within the alternative alignments and within a 0.25-mile buffer beyond the alignments. The results are reported in Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor.
**Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona** (Thompson and Gregory 2017), which is enclosed for your review.

SRI evaluated architectural resources on 162 property parcels (see tables below). Building types represented included residential, commercial, agricultural/industrial, and religious. Buildings constructed prior to 1975 were included in the evaluation. The inventory identified 3 properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) individually and as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 7 properties listed as NRHP eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 1 property recommended NRHP-eligible individually and as a contributor to the Florence Townsite Historic District; 8 properties recommended NRHP-eligible as contributors to the Florence Townsite Historic District; and 143 properties as not eligible for NRHP listing. NRHP eligibility recommendations for individual properties are provided in Tables 1 and 2, which list the properties within the 400-foot alignments and within the 0.25-mile buffer, respectively.

**Table 1. NRHP Eligibility Recommendations for Properties within the 400-ft Alternative Alignments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Year Constructed</th>
<th>Eligibility Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>200-31-019E</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200-31-054A</td>
<td>1575 W. Hunt Highway</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200-40-0070</td>
<td>802 Southwind Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-40-010A0</td>
<td>1140 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-45-008B</td>
<td>120 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>202-11-0180</td>
<td>2150 W. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>202-18-0030</td>
<td>12710 E. Adamsville Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>202-25-0010</td>
<td>4151 W. Canal Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>202-33-0020</td>
<td>4205 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>202-33-0050</td>
<td>3665 E. Coolidge Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>202-34-001C</td>
<td>1914 S. Clemans Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>210-04-1200</td>
<td>34631 N. Mountain View Way</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>400-36-002A</td>
<td>4755 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>400-36-0010</td>
<td>4809 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>401-54-0030</td>
<td>12105 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>401-62-0310</td>
<td>4826 E. Stallion Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>401-71-0040</td>
<td>11125 S. Highway 87</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>401-86-003B</td>
<td>7101 E. Steele Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>411-13-003C</td>
<td>3110 E. Milligan Road</td>
<td>commercial, agricultural/industrial, residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>411-15-0070</td>
<td>3002 E. Phillips Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>411-16-002A</td>
<td>4741 E. Highway 84</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>411-22-035C</td>
<td>6395 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1960; 1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>411-22-0360</td>
<td>18350 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>411-22-048B</td>
<td>6270 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>411-25-006H</td>
<td>6471 E. Regal Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>411-25-019E</td>
<td>6815 E. Spur Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Year Constructed</td>
<td>Eligibility Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>102-19-001B</td>
<td>2175 W. Southern Avenue</td>
<td>multifamily</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102-19-008A</td>
<td>3587 S. Meridian Drive</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104-22-006T</td>
<td>37642 N. Sierra Vista Drive</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962 (three houses on parcel)</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-34-0030</td>
<td>119 W. Poston Butte Loop</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>200-43-0070</td>
<td>366 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>200-43-0080</td>
<td>382 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>200-43-0090</td>
<td>400 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200-43-0100</td>
<td>414 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>200-43-0110</td>
<td>432 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200-43-0120</td>
<td>450 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>200-43-0130</td>
<td>452 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200-43-0140</td>
<td>80 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>200-43-0150</td>
<td>60 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>200-43-0160</td>
<td>40 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>200-43-0170</td>
<td>20 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>200-43-0180</td>
<td>21 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>200-43-0190</td>
<td>41 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>200-43-0200</td>
<td>61 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>200-43-0210</td>
<td>81 N. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>200-43-0220</td>
<td>401 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>200-43-0230</td>
<td>385 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>200-43-0240</td>
<td>369 W. Butte Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>200-43-0250</td>
<td>40 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>200-43-0260</td>
<td>20 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>200-43-0270</td>
<td>370 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>200-43-0280</td>
<td>390 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>200-43-0290</td>
<td>410 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>200-43-0300</td>
<td>430 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>200-43-0310</td>
<td>224 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>200-43-0320</td>
<td>210 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>200-43-0330</td>
<td>190 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>200-43-034A</td>
<td>174 N. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>200-43-0360</td>
<td>435 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>200-43-0370</td>
<td>415 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>200-43-0380</td>
<td>395 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>200-43-0390</td>
<td>375 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>200-43-0400</td>
<td>372 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>200-43-0410</td>
<td>392 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>200-43-0420</td>
<td>412 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>200-43-0430</td>
<td>432 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>200-43-0440</td>
<td>433 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>200-43-046A</td>
<td>393 W. Poston Circle</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>200-43-0470</td>
<td>220 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>200-44-0470</td>
<td>171 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>225 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>274 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>234 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>201 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>181 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>325 W. 9th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>110 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>90 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>70 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>55 and 75 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919, 1960</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>95 N. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>345 W. 11th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>110 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>multifamily, residential</td>
<td>1890–1891, 1900</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>90 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>70 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>71 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1888, ca. 1962</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, c), noncontributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>149 and 149½ N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1938, 1963–1992</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>44 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>30 N. Willow Street</td>
<td>religious</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>35 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>30 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>10 N. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>310 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>140 N. Centennial Park Place</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>44 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>221 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>contributor (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>88 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>267 W. Butte Avenue, 60 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930, 1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>323 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>345 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>120 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>190 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>177 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>145 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>102 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>contributor (Criteria a, b, and c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>144 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>188 S. Willow Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>individually eligible (Criterion c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>240 W. 16th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>220 W. 16th Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>101 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical 868</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>202-07-0920</td>
<td>245 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential, commercial</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>202-07-0940</td>
<td>212 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>202-07-0950</td>
<td>230 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>202-07-0960</td>
<td>300 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>202-07-0980</td>
<td>313 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>202-07-0990</td>
<td>233 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>202-07-100B</td>
<td>211 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>202-07-101C</td>
<td>390 S. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential, commercial</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>202-08-002A</td>
<td>188 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>202-08-002B</td>
<td>407 W. Butte Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>202-08-0030</td>
<td>200 S. Bush Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>202-11-0110</td>
<td>2302 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>202-11-0120</td>
<td>2336 W. Loma Linda Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>202-19-013D</td>
<td>2501 S. Hiscox Lane</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>202-25-005A</td>
<td>12473 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>agricultural/industrial</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>202-25-007B</td>
<td>10698 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>202-26-0080</td>
<td>12068 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>202-27-0070</td>
<td>9997 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>202-28-003F</td>
<td>10805 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>202-28-0200</td>
<td>3846 E. Central Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>202-29-0040</td>
<td>10946 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>202-29-0050</td>
<td>10998 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>202-29-0590</td>
<td>11974 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>202-29-0600</td>
<td>12022 N. Moore Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>202-29-0610</td>
<td>10863 E. Vah Ki Inn Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>202-32-004C</td>
<td>9983 N. Valley Farms Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1950; 1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>202-35-0010</td>
<td>8118 N. Clemans Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>400-36-004D</td>
<td>4633 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>400-36-0080</td>
<td>4513 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>400-37-0110</td>
<td>3543 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>400-37-0130</td>
<td>3467 N. Wheeler Road</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>411-21-028A</td>
<td>18145 S. Halsey Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>411-22-0270</td>
<td>6085 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>ca. 1940s</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>411-22-0288</td>
<td>6145 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>411-22-0310</td>
<td>6215 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>411-22-0320</td>
<td>6235 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>411-22-0330</td>
<td>6275 E. Monitor Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>411-23-0150</td>
<td>6842 E. Picacho Boulevard</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>411-23-0180</td>
<td>18065 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>411-23-021A</td>
<td>18050 Oak Avenue</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>411-25-0070</td>
<td>18525 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>411-25-009A</td>
<td>18595 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>411-25-0110</td>
<td>18705 S. Picacho Highway</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1940; 1952</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>411-25-021B</td>
<td>6710 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>411-25-023F</td>
<td>6496 E. Shasta Street</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. Please review the enclosed report and information in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and the NRHP eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, the study in general, or would like to request hard copies of the inventory forms, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature]
Signature for Town of Queen Creek Concurrence STP-999-A(365)X

Date 10/17/17

Enclosure

cc:
Chris Dovel, Town Engineer, 22350 South Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, Arizona, 85142 (with enclosure)
Brett Burningham, Planning Administrator, 22350 South Ellsworth Road, Queen Creek, Arizona, 85142 (with enclosure)

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Barnaby Lewis, GRIC
   Mr. Shane Anton, SRPMIC
   Mr. Peter Steere, TON
   Ms. Bernadette Carra, ACIC

FROM: Jill Heilman, ADOT

CC: Rebecca Yedlin, FHWA

DATE: October 24, 2017

RE: TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
    North-South Corridor Study

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) initiated consultation for a proposed new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona in 2011, entitled the North-South Corridor Study (NSCS). Since that time, FHWA and ADOT have converted the project from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT have met with the Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group (FSTCRWG) a number of times to present project updates and listen to comments and concerns from the Tribes (November 2011, June 2012, April 2016, June 2016, August 2016, March 2017, May 17, 2017, and May 31, 2017). Additionally, FHWA and ADOT have made presentations to Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) Districts 1, 2, and 3, and to the Tohono O’odham Gu Achi District.

At the May 17, 2017 meeting with the FSTCRWG, a question was raised regarding the possible re-evaluation of site AZ U:14:73(ASM) (Site 73) as an eligible traditional cultural property (TCP) following recent archaeological work at the site by the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). In response, ADOT contacted Reclamation for information and also conducted a field visit to the site on August 18, 2017. This memorandum summarizes the results found by FHWA and ADOT.

HISTORY OF SITE 73

Site 73 was first recorded by Arizona State University (ASU) in 1969 during the initial planning surveys for the proposed Salt-Gila Aqueduct (SGA) portion of the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal (Dittert et al. 1969). The site also was revisited by the Arizona State Museum (ASM) (Grady 1973) and the Museum of Northern Arizona (Stein 1979) during subsequent surveys of the CAP right-of-way (ROW). These surveys defined two loci with concentrations of surface features and artifacts (loci A and B) surrounded by an extensive low-density artifact scatter that appeared to be redistributed sheet trash. ASU first interpreted locus B as a possible compound (Dittert et al. 1969). The ASM survey of the CAP alignment identified as possibly an unfinished ball court (Stein 1979). ASM subsequently surface collected and tested the site as mitigation in advance of the CAP construction (Teague and Crown 1983). The site was identified as a small farmstead with a reservoir in locus B. ASM concluded that over the course of its use-history, the feature may have been used first as a well, then as a large reservoir, and finally as a smaller water catchment feature (Dart 1983). Locus A was located within and east of the CAP ROW. Locus B was located east of the CAP ROW, outside the Reclamation easement. The area west of the CAP ROW was a low density surface artifact scatter, presumably representing displaced sheet wash. In 2008, Desert Archaeology excavated four 1x1 m test units in the site west of the CAP for utility pole installation for the Dinosaur to Hunt 12kV/69kV Electric Line Project; no subsurface deposits were observed (Bagwell and others 2008).
For the NSCS, research to identify TCPs was carried out by J. Andrew Darling of Southwest Heritage Research LLC (SWHR) in late 2013. SWHR led a field visit for GRIC Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) personnel to the west side of the Site 73 on April 15, 2014. During the site visit SWHR and GRIC THPO personnel observed a low-density scatter and what they believed were the remains of the reservoir (vachki) (Darling 2016:69). SWHR’s research and on-site discussion with the GRIC THPO led to a finding that the site was significant to the Four Southern Tribes (FSTs) as a TCP, but not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) because its integrity was so degraded as detailed in Traditional Cultural Property Overview for the Proposed North-South (NSC) and SR 24 (Pinal County) Freeway Corridors, Maricopa and Pinal Counties, Arizona (Darling 2016). The GRIC-THPO, lead for the FST for the NSCS, concurred with this determination of eligibility (Lewis [GRIC-THPO] to Petty [FHWA] December 14, 2015). Building on the TCP overview, SWHR conducted a formal NRHP eligibility evaluation of the TCPs identified in the project area alignments, which included Site 73. The results were reported in Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) Evaluation of Proposed Alternative Alignments for the North-South Corridor (NSC) Project, Pinal County, Arizona (Darling 2017). Again, GRIC-THPO concurred with the NRHP eligibility determinations for the site (Lewis [GRIC-THPO] to Petty [FHWA] April 4, 2017).

FHWA AND ADOT RESPONSE TO COMMENT

In response to the May 17, 2017 question as to whether on-going work by Reclamation would lead to new information regarding Site 73 and its NRHP-eligibility as a TCP, FHWA and ADOT contacted Reclamation. In general, Reclamation is conducting surveys and completing site condition updates within CAP canal ROW as part of their compliance management responsibilities. The Reclamation work is addressing over 100 cultural resources, but only those portions of sites on Reclamation land. Within the last year, Reclamation recorded the portion of the Site 73 within with the CAP ROW and documented a low-density scatter of prehistoric artifact, but the site recording did not extend outside the CAP ROW. Additionally, the work does not include coordination or discussion with Tribes. The resultant survey report will only yield updated site boundaries and management recommendations based on surface observations. In summary, the work carried out on behalf of Reclamation has not provided any new information on the reservoir feature and will not lead to a reevaluation of Site 73 as a TCP.

FHWA and ADOT have noted that the field visit to Site 73 carried out for the NSCS in April 2014 was limited to the west side of the CAP canal where a currently proposed western corridor alternative for the NSCS is located. As part of FHWA and ADOT’s response to the question raised regarding Site 73, ADOT’s cultural consultant, HDR Engineering, and an archaeologist from Reclamation conducted a field visit to the portion of the site on the eastern side of the CAP canal on August 18, 2017 and found the reservoir feature in relatively good condition, despite the prior archaeological testing. HDR also noted that the site likely has more integrity on the eastern side of the CAP canal than on the western side. One of the currently proposed corridor alternatives is located on the western side of the CAP canal.

Although previous Section 106 concurrences were received from the FSTs regarding the ineligibility of Site 73 for inclusion to the NRHP, with the new information regarding Site 73, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site could be eligible and may be a TCP. FHWA and ADOT determined that sufficient information has been obtained on Site 73 for the Tier 1 EIS level process. If the proposed corridor that partially encompasses a portion of Site 73 is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD), FHWA and ADOT would re-evaluate Site 73 eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS.

1 Comments on the report led to revisions, hence, the final report cited herein is dated after the GRIC-THPO concurrence. There were no comments with respect to site eligibility.
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Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Arizona Division
4000 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation

Dear Karla S. Petty,

The Ak-Chin Indian Community received your letter dated October 24, 2017 regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 near Apache Junction with Interstate 10 between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona. The letter is in response to a question regarding the status of site AZ U:14:73(ASM) (Site 73) which was raised in the May 17, 2017 meeting among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) HDR Engineering, Inc., and the Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group. The question as to whether ongoing work by the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) would lead to new information regarding Site 73 and its National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility as a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP). The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) have investigated the issue and respond as follows:

- The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) contacted the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and was informed that the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) is conducting surveys and completing site condition updates within the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal Right-of-Way (ROW) as part of their compliance management responsibilities. The reclamation work is addressing over 100 cultural resources, but only those portions of sites on Reclamation land.
- Within the last year, reclamation recorded the portion of the Site 73 within with the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal Right-of-Way (ROW) and documented a low-density scatter of prehistoric artifact, but the site recording did not extend outside the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal Right-of-Way (ROW) and the work does not
include coordination or discussion with tribes. In summary, the work carried out on behalf of the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) has not provided any new information on the reservoir feature and will not lead to a reevaluation of Site 73 as a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP).

- As part of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) response to the question raised regarding Site 73, Arizona Department of Transportation's (ADOT's) cultural consultant, HDR Engineering, Inc., and an archaeologist from the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) conducted a field visit to the portion of the site on the eastern side of the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal on August 18, 2017 and found the reservoir feature in relatively good condition, despite the prior archaeological testing. HDR also noted that the site likely has more integrity on the eastern side of the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal than on the western side. One of the currently proposed corridor alternatives is located on the western side of the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal.

- Although previous Section 106 concurrences were received by the Four Southern Tribes regarding the ineligibility of Site 73 for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), with the new information regarding Site 73, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) acknowledge that the site could be eligible and may be a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP).

At this time, the Ak-Chin Indian Community will await the selection of the final corridor selection. We understand that if the proposed corridor that partially encompasses a portion of Site 73 is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) would re-evaluate Site 73 eligibility in the Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). We look forward to continually working with you through the Section 106 Consultation Process on the North/South Corridor Project as well as any and all projects that affect the Four Southern Tribes Land Management areas pertaining to cultural resources and properties. If you should have any questions, please contact Ms. Bernadette Carra, CRS-Land Management at (520) 568-1337 or (520) 568-1365, thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert Miguel, Chairman
Ak-Chin Indian Community
corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD).

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;
2. Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for SCIP Concurrency
STP-999-A(365)X

eecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman

11/9/2018 Date
November 2, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Evaluation

Mr. Bryant Powell, City Manager
City of Apache Junction
300 East Superstition Boulevard
Apache Junction, Arizona 85119

Dear Mr. Powell:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.
Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRPMIC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRPMIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a Tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPs, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73(ASM) would provide new information or a re-evaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT’s efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation’s work would not lead to a re-evaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site
may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to re-evaluate the site’s eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD).

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)¹</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td></td>
<td>village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village²</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gu Achi District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;
² - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Signature for City of Apache Junction Concurrence  
STP-999-A(365)x  
Date  
11-7-17

cc:  
Mr. Emile Schmid, City Engineer, Public Works, 575 East Baseline Avenue, Apache Junction, AZ 85119  
Mr. Larry Kirch, Director, Development Services, City of Apache Junction, 300 East Superstition Boulevard, Apache Junction, Arizona 85119

ecc:  
RYedlin  
JHeilman
November 2, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Evaluation

Mr. Jayme Lopez, Tucson Field Office Field Manager
Bureau of Land Management, Tucson Field Office
3201 East Universal Way
Tucson, Arizona 85756

Dear Mr. Lopez:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRPMC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Upton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRP-MIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPs, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73 (ASM) would provide new information or a re-evaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT's efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation's work would not lead to a re-evaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to re-evaluate the site's eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed
corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (RCD),

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)(^1)</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village(^2)</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;  
2 - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Signature for BLM Field Manager Concurrence  
STP-999-A(365x)

Date: 11/20/2017

cc:  
Ms. Amy Sobiech, BLM Tucson Field Office Archaeologist (same as addressee)  
Leslie A. Uhr, BLM Tucson Field Office Lands and Realty Specialist (same as addressee)

cc:  
RYedlin  
JHeilman

NOV 27 2017
November 2, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Evaluation

Ms. Jennifer Evans, CLG Contact-Grants Coordinator
Town of Florence
P.O. Box 2670
Florence, Arizona 85132

Dear Ms. Evans:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRPMIC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRP-MIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPs, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73(ASM) would provide new information or a re-evaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT’s efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation’s work would not lead to a re-evaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to re-evaluate the site’s eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed
corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD),

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)†</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village²</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation, Gu Achi</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;
2 - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for Town of Florence Concurrence

Date

Signatures:

R.Yedlin
J.Heilman

ecc:
December 6, 2017

Karla S. Petty, Division Administrator
U. S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
4000 North Central Avenue, Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

RE: STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L, North-South Corridor Study
(NSCS), Continuing Section 106 Consultation, TCP Evaluation

Dear Ms. Petty,

The Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office (GRIC-THPO) has received your consultation letter dated November 2, 2017. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to develop and construct a new north-to-south transportation corridor linking United States Highway 60 (US 60) in Apache Junction, Maricopa County, Arizona, to Interstate 10 (I-10) between Picacho and Eloy, Pinal County, Arizona. The North-South corridor will also link to State Route 24 (SR24) connecting southeast metropolitan Phoenix to the proposed freeway.

The FHWA has submitted a letter providing a summary of the Section 106 consultation process regarding the NSCS. The NSCS undertaking was converted from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS project, due to budget constraints. Discussions between the FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes have addressed the issues of adverse effects to identified and recognized Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) within the NSCS project area. The TCP Evaluation Report (Darling 2017) identified the potential of adverse effects to site AZ U:15:1(ASM) identified as Adamsville Ruin, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, Tohono O’odham Nation [TON]) and the Florence Village cemeteries. Additional information was also requested for site AZ U:14:73(ASM), identified as Smiley’s Well. The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) is conducting archaeological surveys to update archaeological site records for sites within the BOR right-of-way (ROW) of the Central Arizona Project (CAP). The report will present information for updated site boundaries and revised management recommendations based upon field inspections. Site AZ U:14:73(ASM) will be included in the BOR report. There is a prehistoric reservoir located on the east part of site AZ U:14:73(ASM) which the BOR has described as being in good condition. Based upon this updated information the FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that AZ U:14:73(ASM) could be considered a Register eligible property and a Register eligible Traditional Cultural Property. The site is located within a proposed alignment of the NSCS. If that corridor is chosen as the preferred alignment for this undertaking, the FHWA and ADOT will formally re-evaluate the Register eligibility status of site AZ U:14:73(ASM).

The FHWA considers AZ U:15:1(ASM) to be a Register eligible TCP under Criteria A, B, D, and D. AZ U:15:1(ASM) is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as an archaeological site
(Criterion D). Florence Village is also considered to be a Register eligible TCP under Criteria A, B, C, and D. The FHWA and ADOT are seeking concurrence with the adequacy of the letter report. The FHWA is not making a finding of effect at this time.

The GRIC-THPO considers the letter report to be an adequate reporting document. We also agree with the determinations of Register Eligibility for AZ U:15:1(ASM)/Adamsville Ruin and for Florence Village. The proposed project area is within the ancestral lands of the Four Southern Tribes (Gila River Indian Community; Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community; Ak-Chin Indian Community and the Tohono O'Odham Nation).

Thank you for consulting with GRIC-THPO regarding this undertaking. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me or Archaeological Compliance Specialist Larry Benallie, Jr. at 520-562-7162.

Respectfully,

Barnaby V. Lewis
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Gila River Indian Community
November 2, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 1745401L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Evaluation

Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma, Director
Cultural Preservation Office
Hopi Tribe
P.O. Box 123
Kykotsmovi, AZ 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwisiwma:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.
Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRPMIC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRP-MIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPs, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73(ASM) would provide new information or a re-evaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT’s efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation’s work would not lead to a re-evaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site
may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to re-evaluate the site’s eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD).

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NCS study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village 2</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;
2 - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature for Hopi Tribe Concurrence]

STP-999-A(365)X

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman

11-7-17

Date
corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD).

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)¹</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village²</td>
<td>Tohono O'odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O'odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site; 2 - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature] 11/7/2017

Signature for Pinal County Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X
ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
Mr. Sean Heath, Chief
Environmental Resource Management Division
Bureau of Reclamation - Phoenix Area Office
6150 West Thunderbird Road
Glendale, Arizona 85306

Dear Mr. Heath:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.
Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRPMIC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with the adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRP-MIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a Tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPs, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73 (ASM) would provide new information or a re-evaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT's efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation's work would not lead to a re-evaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site
may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to re-evaluate the site’s eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD).

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (R) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1 (ASM)/Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)†</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;
2 - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature]

11/7/2017

Signature for Reclamation Concurrency
STP-999-A(365)X

cc:
Dave Gifford, Archaeologist, Reclamation Phoenix Area Office, 6150 W. Thunderbird Road
Glendale, Arizona 85306-4001

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
Mr. Terry Rambler, Chairman
San Carlos Apache Tribe
P.O. Box 0
San Carlos, AZ 85550

Dear Chairman Rambler:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRPMIC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrency were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Utton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovich [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRPMIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPS, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73(ASM) would provide new information or a re-evaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT's efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation's work would not lead to a re-evaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to re-evaluate the site's eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD),
In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/ Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Becca Yedlin

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for San Carlos Apache Tribe Concurrence
STP-999-A(365)X

Date: 11/27/17

cc: Ms. Vernelda Grant, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (same as addressee)

cce: RYedlin
JHeilman

Note: We continue to support the Four Southern Tribes for this project.

Vernelda Grant, THPO
11/21/17
November 2, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRAC No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Evaluation

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist/Archaeologist
State Historic Preservation Office
Arizona State Parks
1100 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

SHPO-2010-1454

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.
Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRPMIC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRPMIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPs, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73(ASM) would provide new information or a re-evaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT’s efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation’s work would not lead to a re-evaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site
may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to re-evaluate the site's eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD).

In recognition of the GRIC's concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village²</td>
<td>Tohono O'odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O'odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;
2 - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature for SHPO Concurrence]
STP-999-A(365)X

ccc:
RYedlin
JHeilman

cc: Jill Heilman, ADOT

7 NOV 97
Date
November 2, 2017

In Reply Refer To:
STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L.
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Evaluation

Ms. Cheryl Eamick, Senior Environmental and Land Use Planner
Tucson Electric Power Company
88 East Broadway Boulevard., Mail Stop HQW603
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Ms. Eamick:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.
In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRPMCIC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urton [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Disbent [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRP-MIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPs, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73 (ASM) would provide new information or a reevaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT's efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation's work would not lead to a reevaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to reevaluate the site's eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed
corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD),

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;
2 - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Pety
Division Administrator

[Signature for TEPC Concurrence]

STP-999-A(365)X

date

tcc:
Rythealin
JHeilman
November 2, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Evaluation

Mr. Matthew Behrend
Cultural Resources Section Manager
Arizona State Land Department
1616 West Adams Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Behrend:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier I EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.
Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRP-MIC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Krauss [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urtom [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovic [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRP-MIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPs, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73(ASM) would provide new information or a re-evaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT’s efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation’s work would not lead to a re-evaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site
may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to re-evaluate the site’s eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD),

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village²</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;  
2 - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karl S. Petty  
Division Administrator

Signature for ASLD Concurrence  
STP-999-A(365)X

ccc:  
April Sewequaptewa-Tutt, ASLD asewequaptewa-tutt@azland.gov  
Crystal Carrancho, ASLD ccarrancho@azland.gov  
R Yedin  
JHeilman

11/6/2017

Date
November 2, 2017

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
TCP Evaluation

Mr. Andy Laurenzi, Southwest Field Representative
Archaeology Southwest
300 North Ash Alley
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Dear Mr. Laurenzi:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility linking U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) near Apache Junction to Interstate 10 (I-10) between the towns of Picacho and Eloy in Pinal County, Arizona, entitled the North-South Corridor (NSC). The project also includes State Route 24 (SR 24), a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202 eastward to the NSC alignment. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The following provides a summary of previous consultation regarding traditional cultural properties (TCPs) identified in the NSC study area followed by a presentation of results of a TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to a Tier 1 EIS. The TCP Evaluation was submitted to the Four Southern Tribes through Section 106 consultation. Due to the culturally sensitive nature of TCP Evaluation content, the results are provided in an abbreviated form in this letter, in lieu of a technical summary.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard (AANG), Arizona Public Service (APS), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Arizona State Museum (ASM), the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office (BLM-TFO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Central Arizona Project (CAP), the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service (NPS), the Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP), the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District (SCIDD), the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, the Tucson Electric Power Company (TEPC), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Ak-Chin Indian Community (ACIC), the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe (PYT), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation (TON), the Tonto Apache Tribe (TAT), the Yavapai-Apache Nation (YAN), and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. GRIC is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.
Previous consultation in 2014 defined the study area and consulting parties, recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement, provided the results of the Class I inventory, proposed an approach for addressing TCPs, and defined the area of potential effects (APE) for the NSC study area.

In continuing consultation on April 18, 2016, a TCP overview report and a TCP technical summary were provided to the Four Southern Tribes (FST): ACIC, GRIC, SRPMC, and TON; and the TCP technical summary was provided to the remaining consulting parties. Concurrences were received from SHPO (Petty [FHWA] to Jacobs [SHPO], May 2, 2016); ASLD (Petty [FHWA] to Behrend [ASLD], April 26, 2016); the City of Apache Junction (Petty [FHWA] to Powell [Apache Junction], April 26, 2016); the City of Eloy (Petty [FHWA] to Kraus [Eloy], May 25, 2016); Pinal County (Petty [FHWA] to Bender [Pinal County], July 28, 2016); Reclamation (Petty [FHWA] to Heath [Reclamation], May 6, 2016); SCIDD (Petty [FHWA] to Urtom [SCIDD], April 20, 2016); SCIP (Petty [FHWA] to Rago [SCIP], June 2, 2016); the Town of Queen Creek (Petty [FHWA] to Kross [Queen Creek], May 5, 2016); TEPC (Petty [FHWA] to Hutchens [TEPC], May 17, 2016); UPRR (Petty [FHWA] to Popovici [UPRR], May 3, 2016). The Corps responded via email stating the Corps does not need to participate in Section 106 consultation (Petty [FHWA] to Diebolt [Corps] April 18, 2016; Corps email April 25, 2016). GRIC also concurred with adequacy of the TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports but requested a revision to both reports (Lewis [GRIC THPO] to Petty [FHWA], April 29, 2016). On June 22, 2016, the revised TCP overview and TCP technical summary reports were provided to GRIC, Ak-Chin, SRP-MIC, and TON, and the revised TCP technical summary was provided to the other consulting parties.

After consultation on the TCP overview report and TCP technical summary, the Four Southern Tribes requested a meeting with FHWA and ADOT to discuss sensitive sites that would potentially be impacted by the proposed NSC project. On August 9, 2016, a meeting was held in Casa Grande with representatives from FHWA, ADOT, and the Four Southern Tribes in attendance. The meeting resulted in FHWA and ADOT agreeing to identify avoidance alternatives.

On October 3, 2016, FHWA announced in the Federal Register that the NSC Study was converted from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. This change was made by the lead agencies, ADOT and FHWA, as a result of fiscal constraint issues and the interest in developing a preferred corridor for use in future Tier 2 EIS NEPA planning studies. As part of continuing consultation on March 23, 2017, the TCP evaluation (Darling 2017) was completed for the project level, 400-ft alternative alignments limited to specific sections of the alternatives developed previously within the NSC Study area that preceded the project conversion to a tiered EIS approach.

Based on the TCP Evaluation, FHWA found that the 400-ft alternative alignments would adversely affect one TCP, Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), through direct impacts, and would adversely affect one TCP, Florence Village (Gu Achi District, TON) and its cemeteries, through indirect effects. Both Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]) and Florence Village and its cemeteries (Gu Achi District, TON) were documented in the aforementioned TCP Overview Report and TCP technical summary in 2016. On March 28, 2017, FHWA and ADOT met with the Four Southern Tribes in Casa Grande, Arizona to discuss these results, other studies, the tiered approach for the development of the EIS, and avoidance alternatives. Through Section 106 consultation, the GRIC concurred with the adequacy of the TCP Evaluation with regard to TCPs, but did not concur with sending the report to the remaining consulting parties (identified above) due to the culturally sensitive nature of the information (Petty [FHWA] to Lewis [GRIC] March 23, 2017; GRIC response April 4, 2017).

FHWA and ADOT had a follow-up meeting with the Four Southern Tribes on May 17, 2017 in Casa Grande, Arizona. A question was raised in the meeting regarding whether ongoing work by Reclamation at site AZ U:14:73(ASM) would provide new information or a re-evaluation of that site as an eligible TCP. A memo dated October 24, 2017 to the Four Southern Tribes outlined FHWA and ADOT’s efforts to obtain information regarding the site and determined that Reclamation’s work would not lead to a re-evaluation of the site as an eligible TCP. In the memo, FHWA and ADOT acknowledge that the site
may be eligible as a TCP, have determined that sufficient information has been obtained for the Tier 1 EIS level process, and proposed to re-evaluate the site’s eligibility in the Tier 2 EIS if the proposed corridor that partially encompasses the site is chosen as the preferred corridor in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD).

In recognition of the GRIC’s concerns as the lead for the Four Southern Tribes, this letter presents the results of the TCP Evaluation below. Again, these are the results of the TCP Evaluation of proposed 400-foot (ft) alignment alternatives that was prepared prior to the conversion of the NSC study from a project-level EIS to a Tier 1 EIS. FHWA and ADOT identified alternatives that avoid documented TCPs for the Tier 1 EIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>TCP Eligibility Status (Criterion/Criteria)</th>
<th>Recommended Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AZ U:15:1(ASM)/Adamsville Ruin</td>
<td>ASLD, private</td>
<td>Prehistoric village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, C, D)¹</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florence Village²</td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation, Gu Achi District</td>
<td>O’odham village</td>
<td>Eligible (A, B, D)</td>
<td>Avoid; minimize potential for indirect effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ - Listed on the National Register under Criterion D as an archaeological site;
² - Located outside alignment but potential for indirect effects

FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. However, avoidance is recommended for Adamsville Ruin (AZ U:15:1 [ASM]), which is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a TCP (Criteria A, B, C, D), and for Florence Village and its cemeteries which is recommended eligible for NRHP listing as a TCP (Criteria A, B, D). If you agree with the adequacy of this letter for reporting the results of the TCP Evaluation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. Furthermore, if you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the proposed freeway corridors alignments, or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karl S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Signature for Archaeology Southwest Concurrence]

STP-999-A(365)X

Date: 11/9/17

cc: RY edlin
    JHeilman
February 26, 2018

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation

Mr. Jon Shumaker, MA, RPA
Cultural Resource Compliance Manager
Arizona Game and Fish Department
5000 West Carefree Highway
Phoenix, AZ 85086

Dear Mr. Shumaker,

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility that connects the growing communities in central Pinal County with U.S. Route 60 and Interstate 10. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the north-to-south transportation facility. The project consists of multiple proposed action corridor alternatives that include segment options throughout, including the No-Action Alternative, which will be evaluated in the draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Each action corridor alternative is approximately 1,500 feet wide. The action corridor alternatives are divided into four segments that allow shifts from the east to the west, or from the west to the east, with the addition of two transition areas. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the Unites States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. The Gila River Indian Community is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Because Casa Grande National Monument requested to participate and because Arizona Game and Fish Department manages land within the study area, FHWA is inviting both agencies to participate in the Section 106 process for this undertaking.
In 2016, ADOT and FHWA decided to convert the project-level National Environmental Policy Act EIS process to a Tier 1-level EIS, in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality regulations codified at 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.02. On October 3, 2016, a revised Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register. Cultural resources studies for the project-level EIS included a Class I overview (Graves et al. 2011), a targeted Class III survey (Hall et al. 2017), a built environment evaluation (Thompson and Gregory 2017), a traditional cultural property overview (Darling 2016), and a traditional cultural property evaluation (Darling 2017). Since the completion of these studies, the decision was made to convert the project-level EIS to a Tier 1-level EIS, and the alternatives were modified. A map showing the Tier 1-level EIS action alternative corridors is enclosed. If you choose to become a consulting party, past reports and SHPO consultation would be provided for your records.

Because the alternatives had shifted, the project-level inventories of archaeological and built environment resources (historic buildings and structures) within the proposed action corridor alternatives required updating in support of the Tier 1-level EIS alternative analysis. These reports will be forthcoming through Section 106 consultations. The prior traditional cultural property studies, which covered the entire North-South Corridor study area, encompassed the Tier 1 action corridor alternatives and, therefore, did not require an update. Furthermore, no new Class III survey is required for the Tier 1 EIS.

Because the Arizona Game and Fish Department manages land within the study area, FHWA and ADOT are inquiring whether your agency would like to be added as a consulting party for the Tier 1-level EIS. If your agency would like to be added as a consulting party, please indicate on the signature line below and would send an invitation to download previous documents. FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the recommended action corridor alternatives or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Yes, the Arizona Game and Fish Department would like to be added as a consulting party:

________________________________________
Signature for AGFD
STP-999-A(365)X

Date

Enclosure

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
North South Corridor Study Project-level EIS Cultural Reports

- A Class I Cultural Resources Inventory of the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Graves 2011)

- Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Hall et al. 2017)

- Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona (Thompson and Gregory 2017).

- Traditional Cultural Property Overview for the Proposed North-South (NSC) and SR 24 (Pinal County) Freeway Corridors, Pinal County, Arizona (Darling 2016a) - confidential not for distribution

- Technical Summary: Traditional Cultural Property Overview for the Proposed North-South (NSC) and SR 24 (Pinal County) Freeway Corridors, Maricopa and Pinal Counties, Arizona (Darling 2016b).

- Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) Evaluation of Proposed Alternative Alignments for the North-South Corridor (NSC) Project, Pinal County, Arizona (Darling 2017) confidential not for distribution\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) *In lieu* of a technical summary for this confidential report, the report was summarized in a Section 106 consultation letter, a copy of which will be forwarded with these reports.
February 26, 2018

In Reply Refer To:

STP-999-A(365)X
TRACS No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L
North-South Corridor Study
Continuing Section 106 Consultation

Mr. Karl M. Pierce, Superintendent
Casa Grande National Monument
1100 West Ruins Drive
Coolidge, Arizona 85128

Dear Mr. Pierce,

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are proposing to construct a new north-to-south transportation facility that connects the growing communities in central Pinal County with U.S. Route 60 and Interstate 10. The project also includes a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a proposed controlled-access highway that would connect the southeastern suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the north-to-south transportation facility. The project consists of multiple proposed action corridor alternatives that include segment options throughout, including the No-Action Alternative, which will be evaluated in the draft Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Each action corridor alternative is approximately 1,500 feet wide. The action corridor alternatives are divided into four segments that allow shifts from the east to the west, or from the west to the east, with the addition of two transition areas. The project qualifies for federal funds and, as such, constitutes a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Archaeology Southwest, the Arizona Army National Guard, Arizona Public Service, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the Bureau of Land Management Tucson Field Office, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Central Arizona Project, the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the National Park Service, Pinal County, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Town of Florence, the Town of Queen Creek, Tucson Electric Power Company, Union Pacific Railroad, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Western Area Power Administration, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. The Gila River Indian Community is the lead for the Four Southern Tribes.

Because Casa Grande National Monument requested to participate and because Arizona Game and Fish Department manages land within the study area, FHWA is inviting both agencies to participate in the Section 106 process for this undertaking.

In 2016, ADOT and FHWA decided to convert the project-level National Environmental Policy Act EIS process to a Tier 1-level EIS, in accordance with Council on Environmental Quality regulations codified at 40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.02. On October 3, 2016, a revised Notice of Intent was
published in the Federal Register. Cultural resources studies for the project-level EIS included a Class I overview (Graves et al. 2011), a targeted Class III survey (Hall et al. 2017), a built environment evaluation (Thompson and Gregory 2017), a traditional cultural property overview (Darling 2016), a traditional cultural property technical summary (Darling 2016b), and a traditional cultural property evaluation (Darling 2017). Since the completion of these studies, the decision was made to convert the project-level EIS to a Tier 1-level EIS, and the alternatives were modified. A map showing the Tier1-level EIS action alternative corridors is enclosed.

Because the alternatives had shifted, the project-level inventories of archaeological and built environment resources (historic buildings and structures) within the proposed action corridor alternatives required updating in support of the Tier 1-level EIS alternative analysis. These reports will be forthcoming through Section 106 consultations. The prior traditional cultural property studies, which covered the entire North-South Corridor study Area, encompassed the Tier 1 action corridor alternatives and, therefore, did not require an update. Furthermore, no new Class III survey is required for the Tier 1 EIS.

Because Casa Grande National Monument manages land within the study area, FHWA and ADOT are inquiring whether your agency would like to be added as a consulting party for the Tier 1-level EIS. If your agency would like to be added as a consulting party, please indicate on the signature line below. ADOT can provide all of the past reports and SHPO consultation via ADOT Sharefile and would send an invitation to download documents. FHWA is not making a finding of project effect at this time. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the locations of the recommended action corridor alternatives or the project in general, please feel free to contact Jill Heilman at (602) 712-6371 or email JHeilman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Kara S. Petty
Division Administrator

Yes, Casa Grande National Monument would like to be added as a consulting party:

__________________________
Signature for Casa Grande National Monument
STP-999-A(365)X

__________________________
Date

Enclosure

cc:
Ms. Alycia Hayes, Archaeologist (same as addressee)
Ms. Sue Masica, Regional Director, National Park Service, 12795 Alameda Parkway, Denver, Colorado 80225

ecc:
RYedlin
JHeilman
North South Corridor Study Project-level EIS Cultural Reports

- A Class I Cultural Resources Inventory of the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Graves 2011)

- Results of a Class III Cultural Resources Survey and Historical-Period Linear Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona (Hall et al. 2017)

- Results of an Inventory of Architectural Resources for the North-South Corridor Study Area, Pinal County, Arizona (Thompson and Gregory 2017).

- Traditional Cultural Property Overview for the Proposed North-South (NSC) and SR 24 (Pinal County) Freeway Corridors, Pinal County, Arizona (Darling 2016a) - **confidential not for distribution**

- Technical Summary: Traditional Cultural Property Overview for the Proposed North-South (NSC) and SR 24 (Pinal County) Freeway Corridors, Maricopa and Pinal Counties, Arizona (Darling 2016b).

- Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) Evaluation of Proposed Alternative Alignments for the North-South Corridor (NSC) Project, Pinal County, Arizona (Darling 2017) – **confidential not for distribution**

---

1 *In lieu* of a technical summary for this confidential report, the report was summarized in a Section 106 consultation letter, a copy of which will be forwarded with these reports.
Programmatic Agreement for NSCS Tier 1 EIS, Interstate 10 to US 60, Arizona

PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,

PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

WHEREAS, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) is preparing a Tier 1 environmental impact statement (EIS) to evaluate Build Corridor Alternatives for the proposed development of the North South Corridor (NSC) Freeway connecting the growing communities in central Pinal County with U.S. Highway 60 (US 60) and Interstate 10 (I-10) (see Attachment 1, NSC Study [NSCS] Build Corridor Alternatives), a federally-funded project in Pinal and Maricopa Counties, Arizona, with a planning and implementation horizon that extends to the year 2040 (hereafter referred to as the Project); and

WHEREAS, the Project would include a portion of State Route (SR) 24, a controlled-access highway, that this Project would use to connect the southeast suburban areas of greater metropolitan Phoenix from SR 202L eastward to the north-south transportation facility; and

WHEREAS, at the completion of the Tier 1 EIS, ADOT will select a Corridor Alignment, approximately 2,000 feet wide, for designation and development of the NSC Freeway between I-10 at Picacho and US 60 in Apache Junction, Arizona; or select the No Build Alternative; and

WHEREAS, if a Build Corridor Alternative is selected, Tier 2 undertakings would be studied and constructed in multiple, separate undertakings over the 40-year planning horizon; and

WHEREAS, an area of potential effects (APE), and land jurisdiction within each APE, would be defined for each subsequent Tier 2 undertaking pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(a)(1); and

WHEREAS, ADOT has developed this programmatic agreement (Agreement) to fulfill Section 106 responsibilities of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for the Tier 1 EIS, to define and outline how individual Tier 2 projects would be carried out, and to establish Section 106 consultation protocols for individual Tier 2 projects; and

WHEREAS, ADOT will assume Tier 1 responsibilities as the lead federal agency for compliance under Section 106 of the NHPA, and will consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) pursuant to Sections 101 and 106 of the NHPA and 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 800.2 (c)(1)(i) and 800.6(b)(1) pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated April 16, 2019 and executed by the Federal Highway Administration; and

WHEREAS, the lead agency for compliance under Section 106 of the NHPA will be determined for each individual Tier 2 project during the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, and will consult with the SHPO pursuant to Sections 101 and 106 of the NHPA and 36 CFR § 800.2 (c)(1)(i) and 800.6(b)(1); and

WHEREAS, SHPO is authorized to advise and assist federal and state agencies in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities and cooperate with those agencies in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS) § 41-511.04(D)(4); and

WHEREAS, SHPO is authorized to enter into this Agreement in order to fulfill its role of advising and assisting federal agencies in carrying out their responsibilities pursuant to Sections 101 and 106 of the NHPA and 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(1)(i) and 800.6(b)(1)(i), and SHPO is a signatory to this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Project may have an adverse effect on historic properties, pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.5(a)(2)(i); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(b)(2) and 800.5(a)(3), a phased approach for identifying historic properties, including archaeological resources, historic built environment resources (districts, buildings, and structures), and
WHEREAS, in accordance with the phased approach, a Class I overview (Supplemental Class I Cultural Resources Inventory for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona [Stewart and Brodbeck 2018] and built environment report (Supplemental Inventory of Historic Buildings, Structures, and Districts for the North-South Corridor Study, Pinal County, Arizona [Brodbeck 2018]) (SHPO concurrence April 2, 2018) were undertaken during preparation of the Tier 1 EIS that identified historic properties listed in the NRHP, or are eligible for listing, and could be affected by the Project; and

WHEREAS, all historic properties, including traditional cultural properties, that may be affected by this Project have not yet been identified; and

WHEREAS, efforts to identify and evaluate additional historic properties that would be affected by the Project will be conducted during subsequent Tier 2 projects; and

WHEREAS, the Tier 2 projects would be planned and constructed in multiple, separate phases, the environmental effects of each individual project would be evaluated within each subsequent Tier 2 NEPA process. These evaluations may result in individual EISs, Environmental Assessments (EAs), or Categorical Exclusions (CEs). The lead agency for each of these individual Tier 2 projects would be defined as part of this process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(2); and

WHEREAS, ADOT has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) about the potential for effects resulting from the Undertaking, pursuant to 36 CFR Part § 800(b)(1), and invited the ACHP to participate in this Agreement, and ACHP has accepted the invitation; and

WHEREAS, ADOT has consulted with the following federal agencies: the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, Casa Grande National Monument, the National Park Service, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)4 and these parties have been invited to be concurring parties to this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, ADOT is the project sponsor and must comply with the State Historic Preservation Act, and ADOT’s participation in this agreement as a signatory satisfies compliance with ARS §41-861 through 41- 864; and

WHEREAS, ADOT has consulted with and invited the following Indian Tribes that may attach religious or cultural importance to affected properties [pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2 (c)(2)(i)(A-F)] to be concurring parties to this Agreement: the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe; and

WHEREAS, Tribal participation in the Agreement does not constitute approval of the outcome of the Tier 1 EIS; and

WHEREAS, ADOT will continue to consult with interested Tribes that do not participate in this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, ADOT has consulted, pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(3), with the following state agencies: the Arizona Army National Guard, the Arizona State Land Department, and the Arizona State Museum (ASM), inviting them to be concurring parties to this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, ADOT has consulted, pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(3), with the following municipalities: the City of Apache Junction, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, the City of Mesa, the Town of Florence, and the Town of Queen Creek, inviting them to be concurring parties to this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, ADOT has consulted, pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(3), with the following Pinal County, inviting them to be concurring parties to this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, ADOT has consulted pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)5 with Archaeology Southwest, Arizona Public Service Company, the Central Arizona Project, the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, the Tucson Electric Power Company, and Union Pacific Railroad, inviting them to be concurring parties to this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the ASM has been invited to participate pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.6(c)(2)(iii), because it has mandated authority and responsibilities under the Arizona Antiquities Act (AAA), A.R.S. § 41-841 et seq., that apply to the
portion of the Project on state lands in Arizona (state, county, municipality, or other subdivision of the state), and
mandated authority and responsibilities under ARS § 41-865 that apply to the portion of the Project on private
lands, and is a concurring party to this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, ADOT will seek, discuss, and consider the views of the consulting parties, and where feasible, will seek
agreement with them (pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.16[f]) when making decisions under the stipulations of this
Agreement; and

WHEREAS, ADOT has used and coordinated the NEPA public participation requirements to assist in satisfying the
public involvement requirements under Section 106 of the NHPA pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(d)(3); and

NOW, THEREFORE, ADOT, SHPO, and ACHP agree that development of the Project would be implemented in
accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account any effects of the Undertaking on historic
properties, and these stipulations will govern the Undertaking and all of its parts until the Agreement expires or is
terminated.

STIPULATIONS

ADOT will ensure that the following are carried out:

I. Individual Tier 2 Projects

The lead agency will be determined for each individual Tier 2 project during the NEPA process. The lead agency will
ensure that the following are carried out during Tier 2:

A. The lead agency will comply with all applicable Federal laws and regulations, including but not limited to
   Section 106 of the NHPA (54 United States Code [USC] 306108), Section 106 regulations (36 CFR 800),
   Section 304 of NHPA (54 USC 307103), and Section 9 of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16
   USC 470hh).
B. ADOT will comply with all applicable State laws and regulations, including but not limited to ARS §41–861
   through -864, and ARS § 39-125.
C. The lead agency will provide cultural resource survey reports, plans, and related documents, including
   determinations of National Register eligibility and findings of project effect, pertaining to this Project to the
   consulting parties for a 30-calendar-day review and comment period.
D. The lead agency will afford consulting parties the opportunity to provide input concerning design and
   construction of Tier 2 projects.
E. The lead agency will take into account direct, indirect, and cumulative effects on historic properties and
   will consider measures to improve existing conditions affecting historic properties.
F. The lead agency will identify which consulting parties want to participate in review of each individual Tier 2
   project, and whether there are additional federal and state agencies, local governments, Tribes, and other
   interested parties that are entitled to be consulted for each specific Tier 2 project.
G. The Section 106 process for individual Tier 2 projects will follow 36 CFR 800 or a Section 106 agreement
   document.
H. Any identified adverse effects of Tier 2 projects on historic properties will be resolved through
   separate/individual/or one overarching Section 106 agreement documents.
I. The lead agency will adhere to the commitment to assess and evaluate site AZ U:14:73(ASM) as a potential
   traditional cultural property if a western build option is selected.

II. Professional Qualifications Standards

The lead agency will ensure that activities carried out under the terms of this Agreement shall be done by or under
the supervision of persons meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (48 Federal
Register 44738-44739) and terms of permits issued for archaeological investigations.

III. Permitting and Curation

Any Tier 2 archaeological investigations on federal land, or on non-federal land under federal jurisdiction, will be
conducted in accordance with a permit issued by the administering federal agency, and archaeological
investigations on state, county, or municipal lands will be conducted in accordance with an Arizona Antiquity Act permit issued by ASM, pursuant to A.R.S. §41-842.

All materials and records resulting from Tier 2 projects shall be curated in accordance with 36 CFR 79, any applicable Federal land managing agency direction or policy, and guidelines generated by ASM.

**IV. Confidentiality**

Federal agencies managing federal lands or SHPO may withhold information about the location, character, or ownership of a history property provided the requirements of Section 304 of the NHPA and of 36 CFR 800.11(c) are met.

Federal agencies managing federal lands or SHPO may withhold information about the nature and location of archaeological resources pursuant to Section 9 of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC 470hh) and its implementing regulations (43 CFR § 7.18).

State agencies managing lands owned or controlled by the State of Arizona may withhold information related to the location of archaeological discoveries pursuant to ARS §§ 41-841 and 39-125, or places or objects included in, or that may qualify for, inclusion in the Arizona Register of Historic Places pursuant to ARS § 41-511.04, subsection A, paragraph 9.

Pursuant to this stipulation, the signatories and concurring parties agree to appropriately safeguard and control the distribution of any confidential information they may receive as a result of their participation in this Agreement. Such safeguarded information is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552).

**V. Additional Signatories**

The lead agency will consider requests from other agencies and Tribes to become a party to this Agreement if they should have historic preservation responsibilities related to any future Tier 2 project. Upon approval of such a request, the lead agency will sign a signature page and send it to the party to sign and then they will return it to the lead agency. A formal amendment to the Agreement will not be necessary to add parties to this Agreement, but the lead agency will document the addition of each added signatory with a codicil to this Agreement and provide a copy to all participating parties.

**VI. Amendments**

In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.6(c)(7), if any signatory or invited signatory determines that an amendment to its terms is needed, that party shall immediately notify ADOT and request an amendment. A draft of the proposed amendment shall be submitted with the request. The signatories and invited signatories to this Agreement will consult to review and consider such an amendment. The amendment will be effective on the date a copy is signed by all signatories and invited signatories. ADOT shall file any amendments with the ACHP and provide copies of the amendments to the concurring parties.

**VII. Dispute Resolution**

Should any party to this Agreement object, within 30 days, to any action, plan or report provided for review, ADOT shall consult with the objecting party to resolve the objection. The objection and reasons for the objection must be specifically documented in writing. If the objection cannot be resolved, ADOT shall notify ACHP and the SHPO of the objection and shall:

A. Forward all documentation relevant to the dispute to the ACHP in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(b)(2). Any comment provided by the ACHP, and all comments from the consulting parties to this Agreement, will be taken into account by ADOT in reaching a final decision regarding the dispute.

B. If the ACHP does not provide any comments regarding the dispute within 30 days after receipt of adequate documentation, ADOT may render a decision regarding the dispute. In reaching its decision, ADOT will take into account all written comments regarding the dispute from the consulting parties to the Agreement.

C. ADOT will notify all consulting parties of its decision in writing before implementing that portion of the Undertaking subject to dispute under this stipulation. ADOT’s decision will be a final agency decision.
D. It is the responsibility of ADOT to carry out all other actions subject to the terms of this Agreement that are not the subject of the dispute.

VIII. Termination

A. Any Signatory may terminate the Agreement by providing a 30-day written notification to the other signatories. During this 30-day period, the signatories may consult to seek agreement on amendments or other actions that would avoid termination pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.6(b). If the parties cannot agree on actions to resolve disagreements, ADOT will comply with 36 CFR § 800.7(a).

IX. Agreement Review

Any signatory or invited signatory to this Agreement may request a meeting of consulting parties to review the effectiveness and application of this Agreement.

X. Counterpart Signatures

This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original and all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument. This Agreement shall be null and void if its terms are not carried out by December 31, 2040, unless the signatories agree in writing to an extension for carrying out its terms.

Execution of this Agreement by ACHP, SHPO, and ADOT and its subsequent filing with the ACHP is evidence that ADOT has afforded the ACHP an opportunity to comment on the Undertaking and its effects on historic properties, and that ADOT has taken into account the effects of the Undertaking on historic properties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATORIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: ______________________ Date: ______________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name: ____________________ Title: ______________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: ______________________ Date: ______________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name: ____________________ Title: ______________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: ______________________ Date: ______________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name: ____________________ Title: ______________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCURRING PARTY

Ak-Chin Indian Community

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ________________________________

Printed Name: ________________________________ Title: ________________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Archaeology Southwest

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ________________________________

Printed Name: ________________________________ Title: ________________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Arizona Army National Guard

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Printed Name: ____________________________ Title: ____________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Arizona Public Service

Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Printed Name: __________________________ Title: __________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Arizona State Land Department

Signature: __________________________ Date: _________________________

Printed Name: __________________________ Title: _________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Arizona State Museum

Signature: ______________________________ Date: ____________________________

Printed Name: ______________________________ Title: ____________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Bureau of Land Management, Tucson Field Office

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Printed Name: ____________________________ Title: ____________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

1  Bureau of Reclamation

2

3  Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

4

5  Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

6

7

8
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

1 CONCURRING PARTY
2
3 Central Arizona Project
4
5 Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
6
7 Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Casa Grande National Monument

Signature: _______________________________ Date: _______________________________

Printed Name: _______________________________ Title: _______________________________
CONCURRING PARTY

City of Apache Junction

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

1  CONCURRING PARTY
2
3  City of Coolidge
4
5  Signature: _______________________________  Date: __________________________
6
7  Printed Name: _______________________________  Title: __________________________
8
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H74S4 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

City of Eloy

Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Printed Name: __________________________ Title: __________________________
CONCURRING PARTY

City of Mesa

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Gila River Indian Community

Signature: _______________________________ Date: _______________________________

Printed Name: _______________________________ Title: _______________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Hopi Tribe

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________
Printed Name: ____________________________ Title: ____________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

1 CONCURRING PARTY
2
3 Pascua Yaqui Tribe
4
5 Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
6
7 Printed Name: ______________________ Title: __________________________
8
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

1 CONCURRING PARTY

2

3 Pinal County

4

5 Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

6

7 Printed Name: ____________________________ Title: ____________________________

8
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

San Carlos Apache Tribe

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
 REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY
San Carlos Irrigation Project

Signature: _____________________________ Date: ________________________

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY
Tohono O’odham Nation
Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
CONCURRING PARTY

Tonto Apache Tribe

Signature: ________________________________ Date: ________________________________

Printed Name: ________________________________ Title: ________________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Town of Florence

Signature: _______________________________ Date: _______________________________

Printed Name: _______________________________ Title: _______________________________
CONCURRING PARTY

Town of Queen Creek

Signature: ___________________________ Date: __________________________

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: __________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

1 CONCURRING PARTY

2 Tucson Electric Power Company

3

4 Signature: _______________________________ Date: _______________________________

5 Printed Name: _______________________________ Title: _______________________________

6

7

8
CONCURRING PARTY

Union Pacific Railroad

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Printed Name: ____________________________ Title: ____________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

REGARDING

NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Western Area Power Administration

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Yavapai-Apache Nation

Signature: _______________________________ Date: _______________________________

Printed Name: _______________________________ Title: _______________________________
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
REGARDING
NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY TIER 1 EIS, INTERSTATE 10 TO U.S. ROUTE 60, ARIZONA,
PROJECT NO. STP-999-A(365)X, TRACS NO. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L,
PINAL AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZONA

CONCURRING PARTY

Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe

Signature: _____________________________ Date: _____________________________
Printed Name: ___________________________ Title: ____________________________
Attachment 1: NSCS Tier 1 Build Alternatives