APPENDIX 2-1

SECTION 106 CONSULTATION

Appendix 2-1, Section 106 Consultation, contains a record of communications pertaining to the Section 106 Consultation process pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act. Correspondence is generally organized in chronological order by original inquiries with the exception of responses to original inquiries. Responses to original inquiries, regardless of the date, immediately follow the original inquiries. The reader is referred to the Cultural Resources section of Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation and Chapter 2, Gila River Indian Community Coordination.

APPENDIX 2-1

Mr. Steve Ross, Archaeologist
Arizona State Land Department
1010 W. Adams
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Ross:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to the I-10 south of Phoenix. As this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because alternatives have not yet been decided, land ownership of the project area is not yet known. Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Cities of Phoenix, Avondale, Tolleson and Chandler, the Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Ak Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC), the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe and the Yavapai Apache Nation.

The scope of this project would involve the construction of a freeway to connect I-10 south of Phoenix to I-10 west of Phoenix. The project team is in the process of identifying potential project alternatives, but the area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been defined.

The GRIC Cultural Resources Management Program performed a Class I overview of the freeway corridor to identify previously recorded cultural resources. The results of the Class I overview are presented in a draft report entitled “A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Burden 2002) and is enclosed for your review:

A total of 301 cultural resources were identified as being within the proposed project corridor. Two of these cultural resources, sites AZ T12:S9(ASM), the Villa Buena site, and site AZ T11:S9(ASM), the Cashion site, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). An additional 27 sites were
The previous letter was also sent to:
Mr. Garry Cantley, Archaeologist, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Ms. Connie Stone, Archaeologist, Bureau of Land Management
Ms. Carol Heathington, Bureau of Reclamation
Mr. Todd Hileman, City Manager, City of Avondale
Mr. Pat McDermott, City Manager, City of Chandler
Mr. Todd Bostwick, Archaeologist, City of Phoenix
Ms. Barbara Stocklin, Historical Preservation Office, City of Phoenix
Mr. Ralph Valez, City Manager, City of Tolleson
Mr. Rick Anduze, Archaeologist, Salt River Project
Mr. David Jacobs, Ph.D., Compliance Specialist, State Historic Preservation Office
Mr. Terry Enos, Chairman, Ak Chin Indian Community
Mr. Richard Narcia, Gila River Indian Community
Mr. Leigh Kuwanwiswma, Cultural Preservation Office, Hopi Tribe
Ms. Joni Ramos, President, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Mr. Pete Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Tohono O'odham Nation
Mr. Joe Joaquin, Cultural Affairs Office, Tohono O'odham Nation
Mr. Vincent Randall, Chairman, Yavapai-Apache Nation
Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr., President, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
September 8, 2003

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator
U.S. Department of Transportation
FHWA – Arizona Division
400 E. Van Buren Street
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Re: HA-AZ, NR-202(ADY), 202L MA 654 H5764 01L, Loop 202, South Mountain, Initial Section 106 Consultation

Dear Mr. Hollis:

Your office recently forwarded a “Class I” report to my office regarding the proposed Loop 202 freeway corridor. The purpose of the report as explained in your letter is to identify “previously recorded cultural resources” to help with the process of identifying feasible project alternatives for the proposed freeway.

I have a number of concerns regarding this report. They are as follows:

+ It does not appear that this initial study attempted to identify non-archaeological historic properties that have been previously identified through historic surveys or determined National Register eligible by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). I am aware of at least several known National Register eligible historic properties located within the corridor area, including the Webster Farmstead at 75th Avenue and Baseline Road (previously determined National Register eligible by the SHPO), South Mountain Park (may or may not be partially in the boundary of the corridor study), and potentially historic canals and canal laterals (need to confer with Bureau of Reclamation and Salt River Project).

+ A search of the National Register and Section 106 files of the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office and the survey files of the City Historic Preservation Office is needed to locate any historic non-archaeological properties in the project corridor and “to identify previously recorded cultural resources” as stated in your letter. We highly recommend that the cultural resources “Class I Overview” by amended at this time to incorporate a records search of surveyed and designated historic buildings, structures, districts and objects.

+ My office also recommends that all further cultural resources identification efforts for this project include a qualified architectural historian on the identification team. This is needed given the high potential to locate other historic non-archaeological properties within the project’s area of potential efforts.

If I can provide additional information, please feel free to contact me at (602) 262-7468.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Barbara Stocklin, City Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Kae Neustadt, Arizona Department of Transportation
Jim Garrison, State Historic Preservation Office

...
Hi Kim.

My office received a Class I overview report of the proposed Loop 202 freeway corridor to identify previously identified cultural resources.

I have a number of concerns regarding this report:

+ There does not appear to be any efforts undertaken to identify non-archeological historic properties that have been previously identified or designated. I am aware of at least several known National Register eligible historic properties located within the corridor area, including the Webster Farmstead at 75th Avenue and Baseline Road (previously determined National Register eligible by the SHPO), South Mountain Park (may or may not be partially in the boundaries of the corridor study), and historic canals and canal laterals (need to confer with Bureau of Reclamation and Salt River Project).

+ A search of the National Register files of the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office and the City Historic Preservation Office for historic non-archeological properties does not appear to have occurred, and is needed 'to identify previously recorded cultural resources' as stated in the cover letter.

+ In recent months, I have received various cultural resource reports from your office to review, and am concerned in general regarding the consistent lack of information on historic non-archaeological resources - including buildings, structures, objects and districts in particular - in the front end of the planning process.

In summary, prior to completing a 'Class I overview of the freeway to identify previously recorded cultural resources', I am recommending that additional work be done to identify previously identified historic non-archaeological resources.
September 10, 2003

To: Robert E. Hollis  
Division Administrator  
USDOT, FHWA, Arizona Division  
One Arizona Center, Suite 41D  
400 E. Van Buren St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

From: Mr. Robert E. Hollis  
Division Administrator  
USDOT, FHWA, Arizona Division  
One Arizona Center, Suite 41D  
400 E. Van Buren St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

RE: HA-AZ, NH-202-D (ADY), 202L MA054 H5764 01L  
Loop 202, South Mountain

Mr. Robert E. Hollis  
Division Administrator  
USDOT, FHWA, Arizona Division  
One Arizona Center, Suite 41D  
400 E. Van Buren St.  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

RE: HA-AZ, NH-202-D (ADY), 202L MA054 H5764 01L  
Loop 202, South Mountain

Dear Mr. Hollis:

We have reviewed your letter dated August 20, 2003 regarding the above named project. Since this project lies in the South Mountain area we will defer to the tribes nearer to that area. If you have any questions regarding this matter please contact our Tribal Culture Research Director, Nancy Lee Hayden at (928) 445-8790 ext. 135.

Sincerely,

Ernest Jones, Sr.  
President

EJS:lj-2003

530 E. MERRITT PRESCOTT, AZ 86301-2038 Phone 928-445-8790 FAX 928-778-9445
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
ARIZONA DIVISION
One Arizona Center, Suite 410
400 E. Van Buren St.
Phoenix, AZ 85004
August 20, 2003

Ms. Carol Heathington
Bureau of Reclamation
P.O. Box 81169
2222 W. Dunlap, Suite 330
Phoenix, Arizona 85069-1169

Dear Ms. Heathington:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to the I-10 south of Phoenix. As this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because alternatives have not yet been decided, land ownership of the project area is not yet known. Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Cities of Phoenix, Avondale, Tolleson and Chandler, the Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District, the Gila River Indian Community (GRTC), the Ak Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP/MIC), the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe and the Yavapai Apache Nation.

The scope of this project would involve the construction of a freeway to connect I-10 south of Phoenix to I-10 west of Phoenix. The project team is in the process of identifying potential project alternatives, but the area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been defined.

The GRIC Cultural Resources Management Program performed a Class I overview of the freeway corridor to identify previously recorded cultural resources. The results of the Class I overview are presented in a draft report entitled “A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Burden 2002) and is enclosed for your review.

A total of 301 cultural resources were identified as being within the proposed project corridor. Two of these cultural resources, sites AZ T:12:9(ASM), the Villa Buena site, and site AZ T:11:39(ASM), the

Dear Ms. Heathington:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to the I-10 south of Phoenix. As this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because alternatives have not yet been decided, land ownership of the project area is not yet known. Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Cities of Phoenix, Avondale, Tolleson and Chandler, the Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District, the Gila River Indian Community (GRTC), the Ak Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP/MIC), the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe and the Yavapai Apache Nation.

The scope of this project would involve the construction of a freeway to connect I-10 south of Phoenix to I-10 west of Phoenix. The project team is in the process of identifying potential project alternatives, but the area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been defined.

The GRIC Cultural Resources Management Program performed a Class I overview of the freeway corridor to identify previously recorded cultural resources. The results of the Class I overview are presented in a draft report entitled “A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Burden 2002) and is enclosed for your review.

A total of 301 cultural resources were identified as being within the proposed project corridor. Two of these cultural resources, sites AZ T:12:9(ASM), the Villa Buena site, and site AZ T:11:39(ASM), the

Cashion site, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). An additional 27 sites were previously recommended as eligible for the NRHP. Fifteen (15) sites were identified as being previously recommended as ineligible to the NRHP. One hundred thirty-six (136) sites either were not evaluated for the NRHP eligibility or would require additional information in order to determine their NRHP eligibility. The Class I overview acknowledges the presence of prior survey data for the South Mountain corridor area and the need for further investigations into the eligibility of the historic properties identified within the corridor. FHWA recommends that future cultural resource survey and eligibility determinations be made once potential project alternatives are identified.

As a cultural resources survey has not yet occurred for this project, FHWA is not currently making any recommendations of project effect. As additional information regarding the project alternatives, project scope, and historic properties becomes available, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. However, because the likelihood is high that historic properties would be affected, FHWA proposes that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known.

Please review the enclosed report and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with FHWA’s recommendation that this report serve as consultation initiation and that consultation regarding eligibility, area of potential effect, and project scope as well as effect, be continued once surveys of the preferred alternatives are completed and that a PA be developed to address potential impacts to historic properties, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Kae Neustadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist at 602-712-8148 or email kneustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for Record Concurrency

Date

Enclosure

Appendix 2-1 - A255
Dear Mr. Bostwick:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to the I-10 south of Phoenix. As this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 consultation. Because alternatives have not yet been decided, land ownership of the project area is not yet known. Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Cities of Phoenix, Avondale, Tolleson and Chandler, the Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Ak Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC), the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe and the Yavapai Apache Nation.

The scope of this project would involve the construction of a freeway to connect I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 south of Phoenix. The project team is in the process of identifying potential project alternatives, but the area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been defined.

As a cultural resources survey has not yet occurred for this project, FHWA is not currently making any recommendations of project effect. As additional information regarding the project alternatives, project scope, and historic properties becomes available, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. However, because the likelihood is high that historic properties would be affected, FHWA proposes that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known.

Please review the enclosed report and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with FHWA’s recommendation that this report serve as consultation initiation and that consultation regarding eligibility, area of potential effect, and project scope as well as effect, be continued once surveys of the preferred alternatives are completed and that a PA be developed to address potential impacts to historic properties, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Kae Neustadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist at 602-712-8148 or email kneustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

(Enclosure)
Appendix 2-1

City of Phoenix

Report Review Form

Project No.: ADOT
Report Title: A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona.

Report Review Form

Date Report Submitted: 9-5-03

More Information Requested

Comments:
On the abstract page under agency, it should read Phoenix Parks and Recreation Department. Library is now its own separate Department. On page 2-14, third paragraph, please add river after lower salt and before valley. On page 2-15, first paragraph, the second sentence should read like this. For example, habitation sites composed of a courtyard group focusing on a mutual extramural work area become a common settlement organizational pattern. In figure 5.3 does the legend explain what the colors of the sites stand for or for the colors of their boundaries? Please add something in the legend to explain this. Figure 5.4 and 5.5 need the same clarification that figure 5.3 does. On page 5-14, last paragraph, please add river between Salt and Valley. Also on the same page please replace is with are after examples. Please add Bostwick (2002) and Stubing et al. (2000) to your references cited section. Also add these references and projects to the table you have on previous research in section 3.1.

Recommendations:
Please revise report accordingly and send the City Archaeologist one final bound copy.

Reviewed By: Robert A. Serocki Jr. and Todd W. Bostwick, Ph.D.
Date: 9-17-03

References to be added:

Stubing, Michael, Chris T. Wenker, John M. Lindly, Ph.D., and Douglas Mitchell

Bostwick, Ph.D., Todd and Peter Krocek
The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), the Arizona Division, Maricopa County, presented a corridor to identify previously recorded cultural resources. The results of the Class I overview are incorporated in this letter.

The scope of this project would involve the construction of a freeway to connect I-10 south of Phoenix to I-10 west of Phoenix. The project team is in the process of identifying potential project alternatives, but the area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been defined. The Arizona Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Cities of Phoenix, Avondale, Tolleson and Chandler, the Salt River Project (SRP), the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe and the Yavapai Apache Nation.

The scope of this project would involve the construction of a freeway to connect I-10 south of Phoenix to I-10 west of Phoenix. The project team is in the process of identifying potential project alternatives, but the area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been defined.

The GRIC Cultural Resources Management Program performed a Class I overview of the freeway corridor to identify previously recorded cultural resources. The results of the Class I overview are presented in a draft report entitled "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Budin 2003) and is enclosed for your review.

As a cultural resources survey has not yet occurred for this project, FHWA is not currently making any recommendations of project effect. As additional information regarding the project alternatives, project scope, and historic properties becomes available, it will be provided to your agency through continued consultation. However, because the likelihood is high that historic properties would be affected, FHWA proposes that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known.

The Class I overview acknowledges the presence of prior survey data for the South Mountain corridor area and the need for further investigations into the eligibility of the historic properties identified within the corridor. FHWA recommends that future cultural resource survey and eligibility determinations be made once potential project alternatives are identified.

As a cultural resources survey has not yet occurred for this project, FHWA is not currently making any recommendations of project effect. As additional information regarding the project alternatives, project scope, and historic properties becomes available, it will be provided to your agency through continued consultation. However, because the likelihood is high that historic properties would be affected, FHWA proposes that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known.

A total of 301 cultural resources were identified as being within the proposed project corridor. Two of these cultural resources, sites AZ-T:129(ASM), the Villa Buena site, and site AZ-T:1139(ASM), the Cashin site, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). An additional 27 sites were previously recommended as eligible for the NRHP. Fifteen (15) sites were identified as being previously recommended as ineligible to the NRHP. One hundred thirty-six (136) sites either were not evaluated for the NRHP eligibility or would require additional information in order to determine their NRHP eligibility.

The Class I overview acknowledges the presence of prior survey data for the South Mountain corridor area and the need for further investigations into the eligibility of the historic properties identified within the corridor. FHWA recommends that future cultural resource survey and eligibility determinations be made once potential project alternatives are identified.

As a cultural resources survey has not yet occurred for this project, FHWA is not currently making any recommendations of project effect. As additional information regarding the project alternatives, project scope, and historic properties becomes available, it will be provided to your agency through continued consultation. However, because the likelihood is high that historic properties would be affected, FHWA proposes that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known.

Please review the enclosed report and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with FHWA’s recommendation that this report serve as consultation initiation and that consultation regarding eligibility, area of potential effect, and project scope as well as effect, be continued once surveys of the preferred alternatives are completed and that a PA be developed to address potential impacts to historic properties, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Kae Neustadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist at 602-712-8148 or email kneustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

[Signature]

[Date]

[Enclosures]

[Current submittal failed to mention some significant historic properties within corridor area.]

Cc: Kae Neustadt, ADOT
Dear Ms. Stone:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to the I-10 south of Phoenix. As this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Cities of Phoenix, Avondale, Tolleson and Chandler, the Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Ak Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPIMC), the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe and the Yavapai Apache Nation.

The scope of this project would involve the construction of a freeway to connect I-10 south of Phoenix to I-10 west of Phoenix. The project team is in the process of identifying potential project alternatives, but the area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been defined.

The GRIC Cultural Resources Management Program performed a Class I overview of the freeway corridor to identify previously recorded cultural resources. The results of the Class I overview are presented in a draft report entitled "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002) and is enclosed for your review.

A total of 301 cultural resources were identified as being within the proposed project corridor. Two of these cultural resources, sites AZ T:12:S(ASM), the Villa Buena site, and site AZ T:11:39(ASM), the Cashion site, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). An additional 27 sites were previously recommended as eligible for the NRHP. Fifteen (15) sites were identified as being previously recommended as ineligible to the NRHP. One hundred thirty-six (136) sites either were not evaluated for the NRHP eligibility or would require additional information in order to determine their NRHP eligibility. The Class I overview acknowledges the presence of prior survey data for the South Mountain corridor area and the need for further investigations into the eligibility of the historic properties identified within the corridor. FHWA recommends that future cultural resource survey and eligibility determinations be made once potential project alternatives are identified.

As a cultural resources survey has not yet occurred for this project, FHWA is not currently making any recommendations of project effect. As additional information regarding the project alternatives, project scope, and historic properties becomes available, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. However, because the likelihood is high that historic properties would be affected, FHWA proposes that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known.

Please review the enclosed report and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with FHWA's recommendation that this report serve as consultation initiation and that consultation regarding eligibility, area of potential effect, and project scope as well as effect, be continued once surveys of the preferred alternatives are completed and that a PA be developed to address potential impacts to historic properties, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Kae Neustadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist at 602-712-8148 or email kae.neustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

[Signature]

Date: Sept 22, 2003

Concurrency Enclosure
The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to the I-10 south of Phoenix. As this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because alternatives have not yet been decided, land ownership of the project area is not yet known. Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Cities of Phoenix, Avondale, Tolleson and Chandler, the Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Ak Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP-MIC), the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai- Prescott Tribe and the Yavapai Apache Nation.

The scope of this project would involve the construction of a freeway to connect I-10 south of Phoenix to I-10 west of Phoenix. The project team is in the process of identifying potential project alternatives, but the area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been defined.

The GRIC Cultural Resources Management Program performed a Class I overview of the freeway corridor to identify previously recorded cultural resources. The results of the Class I overview are presented in a draft report entitled “A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Budden 2002) and is enclosed for your review.

A total of 301 cultural resources were identified as being within the proposed project corridor. Two of these cultural resources, sites AZ T:12:9(ASM), the Villa Buena site, and site AZ T:11:39(ASM), the Cashin site, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). An additional 27 sites were previously recommended as eligible for the NRHP. One hundred thirty-six (136) sites either were not evaluated for the NRHP eligibility or would require additional information in order to determine their NRHP eligibility. The Class I overview acknowledges the presence of prior survey data for the South Mountain corridor area and the need for further investigations into the eligibility of the historic properties identified within the corridor. FHWA recommends that future cultural resource survey and eligibility determinations be made once potential project alternatives are identified.

As a cultural resources survey has not yet occurred for this project, FHWA is not currently making any recommendations of project effect. As additional information regarding the project alternatives, project scope, and historic properties becomes available, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. However, because the likelihood is high that historic properties would be affected, FHWA proposes that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known.

Please review the enclosed report and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with FHWA's recommendations that this report serve as consultation initiation and that consultation regarding eligibility, area of potential effect, and project scope as well as effect, be continued once surveys of the preferred alternatives are completed and that a PA be developed to address potential impacts to historic properties, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Kase Neustadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist at 602-712-8148 or email kineustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for BIA Concurrence

Dated: OCT 27, 2003

Enclosure
A total of 301 cultural resources were identified as being within the proposed project corridor. Two of these cultural resources, sites AZ T:12:9(ASM), the Villa Buena site, and site AZ T:11:39(ASM), the Cashion site, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). An additional 27 sites were previously recommended as eligible for the NRHP. Fifteen (15) sites were identified as being previously recommended as ineligible to the NRHP. One hundred thirty-six (136) sites either were not evaluated for the NRHP eligibility or would require additional information in order to determine their NRHP eligibility. The Class I overview acknowledges the presence of prior survey data for the South Mountain corridor area and the need for further investigations into the eligibility of the historic properties identified within the corridor. FHWA recommends that future cultural resource survey and eligibility determinations be made once potential project alternatives are identified.

As a cultural resources survey has not yet occurred for this project, FHWA is not currently making any recommendations of project effect. As additional information regarding the project alternatives, project scope, and historic properties becomes available, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. However, because the likelihood is high that historic properties would be affected, FHWA proposes that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known.

Please review the enclosed report and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with FHWA’s recommendation that this report serve as consultation initiation and that consultation regarding eligibility, area of potential effect, and project scope as well as effect, be continued once surveys of the preferred alternatives are completed and that a PA be developed to address potential impacts to historic properties, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Kate Nuestadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist at 602-713-8148 or email knuestadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

[Signature]

11/10/03

Enclosure
The previous letter was also sent to:

Ms. Connie Stone, Archaeologist, Bureau of Land Management
Mr. John Czaplick, Bureau of Reclamation
Dr. Todd Bostwick, Archaeologist, City of Phoenix
Ms. Barbara Stocklin, Historic Preservation Office, City of Phoenix
Mr. Rick Anduze, Archaeologist, Salt River Project
Dr. David Jacobs, Ph.D., Compliance Specialist, State Historic Preservation Office
Mr. Richard Narcia, Governor, Gila River Indian Community
Mr. Leigh Kuwanwistiwma, Cultural Preservation Office, Hopi Tribe
December 11, 2003

Kae Neustadt
Historic Preservation Specialist
Arizona Department of Transportation, Environmental & Enhancement Group
206 South 17th Avenue, Room 213E, Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Re: Draft Programmatic Agreement

Dear Ms. Neustadt,

This letter is in response to your correspondence with an enclosed draft Programmatic Agreement dated December 9, 2003, regarding the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to I-10 south of Phoenix. As you know, the Hopi Tribe appreciates FHWA and ADOT's continuing solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

In a letter dated September 10, 2003, in response to a correspondence from the Federal Highway Administration dated August 20, 2003, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office reviewed the cultural resources overview report for this project by the Gila River Indian Community that identifies 301 cultural resources within the proposed project corridor. We stated we support continuing solicitation of our input and ADOT's continued solicitation of our input and your efforts to address our concerns.

We note that the Gila River Indian Community is a party in the enclosed draft Programmatic Agreement, and therefore is a party to the Gila River Indian Community in a party to the Programmatic Agreement. However, we request to be provided copies of the cultural resources surveys, archaeological treatment plans, and archeological reports for review and comment. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Terry Morgart at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. Thank you again for consulting with the Hopi Tribe.

Sincerely,

Kae Neustadt
Historic Preservation Specialist
Arizona Department of Transportation, Environmental & Enhancement Group
206 South 17th Avenue, Room 213E, Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Bill Bostwick
Archaeologist
City of Phoenix
Pueblo Grande Museum
4619 E. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85034

Dear Mr. Bostwick:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to I-10 south of Phoenix. Previous consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) recommended a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known. SHPO concurred with this recommendation (Jacobs [SHPO] to Hollis [FHWA] September 19, 2003).

At this time, ADOT, on behalf of FHWA, is submitting a draft PA for your review and comment. Please review the enclosed draft PA. If you find the PA adequate, please sign below to indicate your concurrence. If you have any comments or changes to request, please respond in writing. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (602) 712-8148 or via email at kneustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Todd Bostwick
Archaeologist
City of Phoenix
Pueblo Grande Museum
4619 E. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85034

Enclosure

Kae Neustadt
Historic Preservation Specialist
Arizona Department of Transportation, Environmental & Enhancement Group
206 South 17th Avenue, Room 213E, Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Signature for COP Concurrence

Date

c: SHPO

A263
Ms. Kae Neustadt
Historic Preservation Specialist
Arizona Department of Transportation
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue, Room 213E/MD 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Subject: Draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) Loop 2002, South Mountain – Project No. NH-202-D(ADY); TRACS No. 202L MA 054 13564 01L

Dear Ms. Neustadt:

We have reviewed the subject PA and have several comments. On page 2, the seventh WHEREAS dealing with treatment of human remains under NAGPRA applies only to remains found on federally-owned lands. The last WHEREAS should refer to State and private lands only; a permit issued by the Arizona State Museum is not valid on federally-owned land. Another WHEREAS should be added that addresses permitting on Federal lands under the Archaeological Resource and Protection Act (ARPA). In this particular case, an ARPA permit from Reclamation is required for any archaeological activity on lands under Reclamation’s jurisdiction.

On page 5 under Item “9. Curation,” all records and materials from archaeological investigations conducted on lands under Reclamation’s jurisdiction shall be curated at the Huhugam Heritage Center (HHC), Gila River Indian Reservation. In January 2004, Reclamation’s temporary curatorial facility in Tucson (the Central Arizona Project Repository) will close, and the collections will be moved to the new permanent repository at the HHC. The HHC will serve as Reclamation’s new curation facility for all future Reclamation cultural resource activities.

Item “12. Discoveries” on page 12 must be changed to reflect that in the case of discovery situations on lands under the jurisdiction of Reclamation, the Phoenix Area Office archaeological staff shall be notified immediately. This is especially true in cases involving potential or known human remains, in which case Reclamation is responsible for consultation under NAGPRA.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft PA. We would appreciate the chance to review the revised PA prior to signing the final version. If you have questions, please contact staff Archaeologist Jon S. Czaplicki at 602-216-3862.

Sincerely,

Bruce D. Ellis
Chief, Environmental Resource Management Division
Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janet Napolitano
Governor

December 9, 2003

Bill Higgins
Acting State Engineer

Connie Stone, Archaeologist
Bureau of Land Management
21605 N 7th Ave
Phoenix, AZ 85027

RE: Project No. NH-202-D(ADY)
TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 O1L
Loop 202, South Mountain
Continuing Section 106 Consultation

Dear Ms. Stone:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to the I-10 south of Phoenix. Previous consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) recommended a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known. SHPO concurred with this recommendation (Jacobs to Hollis [FHWA] September 19, 2003).

At this time, ADOT, on behalf of FHWA, is submitting a draft PA for your review and comment. Please review the enclosed draft PA. If you find the PA adequate, please sign below to indicate your concurrence. If you have any comments or changes to request, please respond in writing. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (602) 712-8148 or via email at kneustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kae Neustadt
Historic Preservation Specialist
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 S 17th Avenue, Room 213E / MD 619E
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Signature for BLM Concurrence
Archaeologist

Dec. 30, 2003

Enclosure
c: SThomas
W Vachon

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janet Napolitano
Governor

December 9, 2003

Bill Higgins
Acting State Engineer

David Jacobs, Ph.D.
Compliance Specialist
State Historic Preservation Office
Arizona State Parks
1300 W Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

RE: Project No. NH-202-D(ADY)
TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 O1L
Loop 202, South Mountain
Continuing Section 106 Consultation

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to the I-10 south of Phoenix. Previous consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) recommended a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known. SHPO concurred with this recommendation (Jacobs to Hollis [FHWA] September 19, 2003).

At this time, ADOT, on behalf of FHWA, is submitting a draft PA for your review and comment. Please review the enclosed draft PA. If you find the PA adequate, please sign below to indicate your concurrence. If you have any comments or changes to request, please respond in writing. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (602) 712-8148 or via email at kneustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kae Neustadt
Historic Preservation Specialist
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 S 17th Avenue, Room 213E / MD 619E
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Signature for SHPO Concurrence

Enclosure
c: SThomas
W Vachon
Ms. Jane Crisler
Historic Preservation Specialist
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
12136 W. Bayaud Avenue
Suite 330
Lakewood, Colorado 80228

Dear Ms. Crisler:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix with I-10 south of Phoenix. As this project is qualified for federal-aid funding, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because alternatives have not yet been determined, land ownership for the project is not yet known. Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, SHPO, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Cities of Phoenix, Avondale, Tolleson and Chandler, the Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Ak Chin Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC), the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe and the Yavapai Apache Nation.

The scope of this project would involve the construction of a freeway to connect I-10 south of Phoenix to I-10 west of Phoenix. The project team is in the process of identifying potential project alternatives, and the area of potential effect (APE) has not yet been defined.

Because of the scope of the project, it is unlikely that the project would avoid all historic properties. Consultation with the SHPO recommended the development of a Programmatic Agreement (PA) to address the effects of the project on any historic properties as they become known. SHPO concurred with this recommendation (Jacobs [SHPO] to Hollis [FHWA] September 19, 2003, enclosed).

The purpose of this letter is to notify the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and to determine Council participation pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.6(1). Attached to this letter is documentation specified in § 800.116(e). Please review this information and if the Council plans to participate in consultation, inform us within 15 days of receipt of this notice. If there is any additional information you require for this project or if you have any questions or comments, please contact Kae Neustadt at (602) 712-8148 or via email at kneustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Division Administrator

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Enclosure
cc: SThomas
WVachon
KNeustadt (619E)
SDT:cdm
March 30, 2004

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Arizona Division
One Arizona Center, Suite 410
400 E. Van Buren St.
Phoenix, AZ 85004

RE: Proposed Programmatic Agreement Regarding Construction of a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix and I-10 south of Phoenix.

Dear Mr. Hollis:

On March 12, 2004, we received your notification and supporting documentation regarding the FHWA's intent to develop a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and other parties regarding the construction of a loop highway between I-10 west of Phoenix and I-10 south of Phoenix. We appreciate your notifying the ACHP early in planning, but at present there is not enough information available about the historic properties that may be affected to determine if the ACHP's participation is warranted. We encourage you to proceed to develop the PA in consultation with the SHPO and other parties without our participation. As consultation proceeds, please notify us if any of the criteria for ACHP involvement appear to be met.

The criteria for ACHP involvement are included in Appendix A of our regulations (36 CFR Part 800). According to these criteria, the ACHP is likely to participate in consultation when the undertaking:

1. Has substantial impacts on important historic properties;
2. Presents important questions of policy or interpretation;
3. Has the potential for presenting procedural problems; or
4. Presents issues of concern to Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations.

If none of these criteria apply, you will need to file the final PA, developed in consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), and other parties, at the conclusion of the consultation process pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6(b)(1)(iv). Please also provide us at that time with a description of the undertaking, including maps and illustrations as needed, the views of consulting parties and the public, and any additional information you feel appropriate. The filing of this PA with the ACHP is required in order for the FHWA to complete its compliance responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Sincerely,

Carol Legard
FHWA Liaison
Office of Federal Agency Programs

Thank you for providing us with your notification. If you have any questions, please contact Carol Legard at (303) 969-5110 or via E-mail at clegard@achp.gov.
ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION  
206 SOUTH SEVENTEENTH AVENUE  PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007-3213

RE: Project No: NH-202-D(ADY)  
TRACS No: 202L MA 054 H5764 01L  
Continuing Section 106 Consultation  

Dear Mr. Anduze:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to the I-10 south of Phoenix. Previous consultation with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) recommended a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address the effects of the project as they become known. SHPO concurred with this recommendation (Jacobs [SHPO] to Hollis [FHWA] September 19, 2003).

At this time, ADOT, on behalf of FHWA, is submitting a draft PA for your review and comment. Please review the enclosed draft PA. If you find the PA adequate, please sign below to indicate your concurrence. If you have any comments or changes to request, please respond in writing. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (602) 712-8148 or via email at kneustadt@dot.state.az.us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ray Neustadt  
Historic Preservation Specialist  
Environmental & Enhancement Group  
205 S 17th Avenue, Room 113E / MD 619E  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Signature for SHPO Concurrence

Date

Enclosure

c: NT/Thomas  
W/Vachon

December 9, 2003

BILL HIGGINS  
Acting State Engineer

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION  
206 SOUTH SEVENTEENTH AVENUE  PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007-3213

RE: Project No: NH-202-D(ADY)  
TRACS No: 202L MA 054 H5764 01L  
South Mountain Transportation Corridor  
Continuing Section 106 Consultation  
Class III Survey Report  
Second Draft Programmatic Agreement

Dear Mr. Ross:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.32 acres).

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Havasupai Tribe, the HoPI Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan...
Southern Paiute, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of five alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (T01, T02, T03, T04, and T06) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000 ft (304.8 m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes four technical studies:

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: “A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); Hopi Tribe (Kuwamatisawa, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Aubry, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: “A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Darling 2005), which is enclosed for consultation and discussed below.

- Addendum Class I overview and Addendum Class III survey to address the expansion (late 2004 and early 2005) of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 L freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments. These two additional reports will be forthcoming as part of the Section 106 consultations. The results of these two studies will be provided in the near future.

The initial alternative alignments, defined in March 2003, were surveyed by the Gila River Indian Community’s Cultural Resource Management Program (GRIC-CRMP). The results are reported in a report titled A Class II Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2005), which is enclosed for your review and comment. Twenty-one archaeological sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments (see attached table). Twenty sites are recommended as eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D.

- AZ T:12:197 (ASM) is a prehistoric quarry (age and cultural affiliation unknown, but likely Native American in origin). The site is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on prehistoric settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including lithic resource procurement and ground stone technology.

- AZ T:12:200 (ASM) are historic O’odham artifact scatters. AZ T:12:199 (ASM) is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on historical period O’odham settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including the use of upland areas for subsistence and religious practices.

- AZ T:12:201 (ASM) is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on prehistoric settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including lithic resource procurement and ground stone technology.

- AZ T:12:199 (ASM) and AZ T:12:200 (ASM) are historic O’odham artifact scatters. AZ T:12:199 (ASM) is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on historical period O’odham settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including the use of upland areas for subsistence and religious practices. AZ T:12:200 (ASM) is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on prehistoric settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including lithic resource procurement and ground stone technology.

- AZ T:12:198 (ASM) and AZ T:12:208 (ASM) are prehistoric petroglyph sites with historic components. The sites are considered eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam and historic O’odham settlement and land use at the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including the use of upland areas for religious practices.

- AZ T:10:83 (ASM) (Roosevelt Canal) and AZ T:12:154 (ASM) (Western Canal) are historic American irrigation canals. Both sites have previously been determined eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for their important associations with the development of Arizona’s agricultural industry and irrigation networks.

All sites are located on private land, except for AZ T:10:83 (ASM) – Roosevelt Irrigation District; AZ T:12:154 (ASM) – Bureau of Reclamation / Salt River Project; AZ T:12:207 (ASM) – City of Phoenix, Park and Recreation; and AZ T:12:211 (ASM) – Arizona State Land Department. FHWA/ADOT is concurrently consulting with these agencies regarding the eligibility of these sites located on their land.
In addition, FHWA/ADOT is recirculating a second draft Programmatic Agreement (PA, enclosed) because few tribes opted to participate in the PA when it was originally circulated in August 2003. This recirculation will allow the tribes another opportunity to participate in the PA. This second draft PA has been edited to address any comments from the first draft as well as to also addresses TCP properties more specifically.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed survey report, PA, and information provided in this letter. If you find the survey report adequate, agree with the eligibility recommendation for site AZ T12R211 (ASM), and find the second draft PA acceptable, please sign below to indicate your concurrence and return to ADOT within 30 days. If you have any comments or changes to request for the PA, please respond in writing. We look forward to continuing consultation with your office as we develop the final PA to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-8636 or e-mail slaine@adot.gov.

Sincerely,

Juell E. Laine

Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue Rm. 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Enclosures

Signature for ASLD Concurrence

_____/Date

cc: SThomas (FHWA); WVaccon (FHWA)

This letter was also sent to:
Mr. Garry Cantley, Western Regional Archaeologist, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Dr. Connie Stone, Archaeologist, Bureau of Land Management
Mr. Richard Boston, Archaeologist, Bureau of Reclamation
Mr. Todd Bostwick, Archaeologist, City of Phoenix
Mr. Rick Anduze, Archaeologist, Salt River Project
Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist, State Historic Preservation Office

ARIZONA DIVISION
400 East Van Buren Street
One Arizona Center Suite 418
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2264

July 7, 2005

In Reply Refer To: HA-AZ
NH-202-(DADDY)
TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 01L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Section 106 Consultation
Traditional Cultural Places
Draft Programmatic Agreement

Mr. Terry Enos, Chair
Al-Chin Indian Community
4207 W. Peters & Null Rd.
Maricopa, Arizona 85239

Dear Chairman Enos:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIR & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 reviews.

Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,140.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.32 acres).

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Al-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Pine Nut Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of five alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (T01, T02, T03, T04, and T06) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000’-8’ (304.8 m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

Buckle Up
America
The Gila River Indian Community’s Cultural Resource Management Program (GRIC-CRMP) conducted a Class III cultural resources survey of the proposed alternative alignments. The results of the GRIC-CRMP survey are presented in a report titled ‘A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona’ (Darling 2003), which is enclosed for your review. Twenty-one archaeological sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments (see attached table). Twenty sites are recommended as eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D. One site is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP.

Because of the presence of the South Mountain Range and because areas of traditional cultural significance are not always identified through archaeological surveys, FHWA would like to request your participation in discussions regarding the potential effects to such resources that could result from the South Mountain Freeway project.

At this time, FHWA is inquiring whether you have any concerns regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance to your community within the project area. If you have such concerns, any information you might provide within 30 days of receipt of this letter would be considered in the project planning. If your office opts to participate in cultural resource consultation at a later date, FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns.

Additionally, FHWA is in the process of finalizing the South Mountain Corridor Programmatic Agreement (PA) to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues. The original draft PA was circulated in August 2003. At that time few tribes opted to participate. FHWA is re-circulating the draft PA (enclosed) and would like to offer another opportunity for your tribe/community to participate in the PA. Please sign below if you would like to be included as a Concurring Party to the PA and return to FHWA within 30 days.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your tribe/community through continued Section 106 consultation. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Serelle E. Laine at 602-712-8636 or e-mail slaine@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

The previous letter was also sent to:
Mr. Edward Smith, Chairman, Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
Ms. Sherry Cordova, Chairwoman, Cocopah Indian Tribe
Mr. Daniel Eddy, Jr., Chairman, Colorado River Indian Tribe
Mr. Ralph Bear, President, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Ms. Nora McDowell, Chairwoman, Fort Mojave Tribe
Mr. Mike Jackson, Sr., President, Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe
Mr. Richard Narcia, Governor, Gila River Indian Community
Mr. Don Watahionigie, Chairman, Havasupai Tribe
Mr. Leigh Kuwanisiwma, Cultural Preservation Office, Hopi Tribe
Ms. Loretta Jackson, Tribal Historic Preservation Office, Hualapai Tribe
Ms. Carmen Bradley, Chair, Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians
Mr. Alan Downer, Ph.D., Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department
Ms. Herminia Frias, Chairwoman, Pascua Yaqui Tribe
Mr. Arden Quewakia, Governor, Pueblo of Zuni
Ms. Joni Ramos, President, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Ms. Kathleen Wesley-Kitcheyan, Chairwoman, San Carlos Apache Nation
Mr. John Lehi, Sr., President, San Juan Southern Paiute
Mr. Peter Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Tohono O’odham Nation
Mr. Joe Joaquin, Cultural Resource Specialist, Tohono O’odham Nation
Mr. Ivan Smith, Chairman, Tonto Apache Tribe
Mr. Dallas Massey, Sr., Chairman, White Mountain Apache Tribe
Ms. Jamie Fullmer, Chairman, Yavapai-Apache Nation
Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr., President, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
Regarding eligibility recommendations, besides the above comments about IOs, two of the identified historic properties are historic period canals. Both AZ T:\10:83 (ASM), the Roosevelt Canal, and AZ T:\12:154 (ASM), the Western Canal, are recommended as eligible under Criterion "d", however, our records suggest Criterion "a" should also be considered.
Arizona Division
400 East Van Buren Street
One Arizona Center, Suite 410
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2264

July 7, 2005

In Reply Ref.: HA-AZ

TRACS No. H202, MA 054 B2764 01L

South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Section 106 Consultation
Traditional Cultural Places
Draft Programmatic Agreement

Mr. Azriel Quewakia, Governor
Pueblo of Zuni
P. O. Box 339
Zuni, New Mexico 87327

Dear Governor Quewakia:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report Project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.2 acres).

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District (RED), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colenso River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pima-Papago Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Teko' On'ehn Nation, the Tonopah Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of five alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (T01, T02, T03, T04, and T06) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The Gila River Indian Community’s Cultural Resource Management Program (GRIC-CRMP) conducted a Class III cultural resources survey of the proposed alternative alignments. The results of the GRIC-CRMP survey are presented in a report titled A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2005), which is enclosed for your review. Twenty-one archaeological sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments (see attached table). Twenty sites are recommended as eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D. One site is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP.

Because of the presence of the South Mountain Range and because areas of traditional cultural significance are not always identified through archaeological surveys, FHWA would like to request your participation in discussions regarding the potential effects to such resources that could result from the South Mountain Freeway project.

At this time, FHWA is inquiring whether you have any concerns regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance to your community within the project area. If you have such concerns, any information you might provide within 30 days of receipt of this letter would be considered in the project planning. If your office opts to participate in cultural resources consultation at a later date, FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns.

Additionally, FHWA is in the process of finalizing the South Mountain Corridor Programmatic Agreement (PA) to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues. The original draft PA was circulated in August 2003. At that time few tribes opted to participate. FHWA is re-circulating the draft PA (enclosed) and would like to offer another opportunity for your tribe/community to participate in the PA. Please sign below if you would like to be included as a Concurring Party to the PA and return to FHWA within 30 days.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your tribe/community through continued Section 106 consultation. We also look forward to continued consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Serelle E. Latos at 602-712-8656 or e-mail: slatos@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for Pueblo of Zuni
Concurrence

Date

Enclosures under separate cover: (Governor: map and Programmatic Agreement)

cc: Jonathan Dump, Archaeologist, Pueblo of Zuni, Cultural Resources Enterprise, P.O. Box 1149, Zuni, NM, 87328 (Enclosures under separate cover: map, site table, Programmatic Agreement, and cultural resources survey report)
APPENDIX 2-1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
PHOENIX AREA OFFICE
P.O. BOX 8119
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85069

TO: MS. SERRELLE E. LAINE
COORDINATOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION TEAM
ENVIRONMENTAL & ENHANCEMENT GROUP
202 SOUTH 17TH AVENUE
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85020

FROM: BRUCE D. ELLIS
CHIEF, ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION
ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
206 SOUTH SEVENTEENTH AVENUE
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007-3213

DATE: JULY 12, 2005

SUBJECT: PROJECT NO: NH-202-D(ADY), TRACS NO. 202L MA 054 H5764 01L, SOUTH MOUNTAIN TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR

Dear Ms. Laine:

We have reviewed the report titled, “A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2005),” and find it complete and adequate with one minor revision. The summary of Site Eligibility on page 5-21, paragraph 5, should indicate that the Western Canal AZ T:12:154 (ASM) has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

We have also reviewed the second draft Programmatic Agreement for the project and look forward to signing as a co-concurring party. If you any questions, please do not hesitate to call Mr. Richard Boston at 602-216-3941.

Sincerely,

BRUCE D. ELLIS
CHIEF, ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

JANET NAPOLITANO
Governor
VICTOR M. MENDOZA
Director

July 1, 2005

Mr. Todd Bostwick, Archaeologist
City of Phoenix
Pueblo Grande Museum
4619 E. Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

RE: Project No: NH-202-D(ADY)
TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 01L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report
Second Draft Programmatic Agreement

Dear Mr. Bostwick:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.32 acres).

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Coopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Huautapai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Pineutes Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Paqua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan County Archaeological Survey and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPH), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Coopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Huautapai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Pineutes Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Paqua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan
Southern Paiute, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of five alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (T01, T02, T03, T04, and T06) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes four technical studies:

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: “A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 19, 2003), HLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kwaukuingwaia, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Huntington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: “A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Darling 2003), which is enclosed for consultation and discussed below.

- Addendum Class I overview and Addendum Class III survey to address the expansion (late 2004 and early 2005) of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101L freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments. These two additional reports will be forthcoming as part of the Section 106 consultations. The results of these two studies will be provided in the near future.

The initial alternative alignments, defined in March 2003, were surveyed by the Gila River Indian Community’s Cultural Resource Management Program (GRIC-CRMP). The results are reported in a report titled A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2003), which is enclosed for your review and comment. Twenty-six archaeological sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments (see attached table). Twenty sites are recommended as eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D. One site is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP.

- AZ T:12:9 (ASM) (Villa Buena) and AZ T:12:52 (ASM) are prehistoric Hohokam villages with existing and/or historically documented public architecture. The sites are recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam social organization, settlement, and land use in the lower Salt River Valley, including the village structure and the development of irrigation communities south of the Salt River.

- AZ T:12:197 (ASM), AZ T:12:201 (ASM), and AZ T:12:211 (ASM) are trail sites with associated features (age and cultural affiliation unknown, but likely Native American in origin). The site is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information about prehistoric Hohokam social organization, settlement, and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including cultural mobility and transportation networks.

- AZ T:12:199 (ASM) is a prehistoric trail site with an associated Hohokam artifact scatter (age and cultural affiliation unknown, but likely Native American in origin). The site is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information about prehistoric Hohokam social organization, settlement, and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including cultural mobility and transportation networks.

- AZ T:12:200 (ASM) is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information about prehistoric Hohokam social organization, settlement, and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including the use of upland areas for subsistence and religious practices.

- AZ T:12:200 (ASM) is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of integrity and information potential.

- AZ T:12:198 (ASM) and AZ T:12:208 (ASM) are prehistoric petroglyph sites with historic components. The sites are considered eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam and historic O’odham artifact scatters. AZ T:12:199 (ASM) is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on historical-period O’odham settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including the use of upland areas for subsistence and religious practices.

- AZ T:12:198 (ASM) and AZ T:12:208 (ASM) are prehistoric artifact sites with historic components. The sites are considered eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam and historic O’odham settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including the use of upland areas for subsistence and religious practices.

- AZ T:12:54 (ASM) (Western Canal) and AZ T:12:54 (ASM) (Western Canal) are historic American irrigation canals. Both sites have previously been determined eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam and historic O’odham artifact scatters. AZ T:12:199 (ASM) is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on historical-period O’odham settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including the use of upland areas for subsistence and religious practices.
In addition, FHWA/ADOT is recirculating a second draft Programmatic Agreement (PA, enclosed) because few tribes opted to participate in the PA when it was originally circulated in August 2003. This recirculation will allow the tribes another opportunity to participate in the PA. This second draft PA has been edited to address any comments from the first draft as well as to also address TCP properties more specifically.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed survey report, PA, and information provided in this letter. If you have any comments or changes to request for the PA, please respond in writing. We look forward to continuing consultation with your office as we develop the final PA to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-8636 or e-mail slaine@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Serelle E. Laine, Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue Rm. 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Enclosures

cc: SThomas (FHWA); WVachon (FHWA)
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An important reference not cited in this report is:
Bostwick, Todd

Recommendations:
Please revise the report accordingly and send one final bound copy of this report to the City of Phoenix Archaeology Office.

Reviewed By: Robert A. Serocki Jr. and Todd W. Bostwick, Ph.D.

Collection to be submitted: No
Remarks: No collections were made.
survey are presented in a report titled A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2005), which is enclosed for your review. Twenty-one archaeological sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments (see attached table). Twenty sites are recommended as eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D. One site is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP.

Because of the presence of the South Mountain Range and because areas of traditional cultural significance are not always identified through archaeological surveys, FHWA would like to request your participation in discussions regarding the potential effects to such resources that could result from the South Mountain Freeway project.

At this time, FHWA is inquiring whether you have any concerns regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance to your community within the project area. If you have such concerns, any information you might provide within 30 days of receipt of this letter would be considered in the project planning. If your office opts to participate in cultural resource consultation at a later date, FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns.

Additionally, FHWA is in the process of finalizing the South Mountain Corridor Programmatic Agreement (PA) to address project efforts as the environmental documentation continues. The original draft PA was circulated in August 2005. At that time few tribes opted to participate. FHWA is re-circulating the draft PA (enclosed) and would like to offer another opportunity for your tribe/community to participate in the PA. Please sign below if you would like to be included as a Concurring Party to the PA and return to FHWA within 30 days.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your tribe/community through continued Section 106 consultation. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Sherelle E. Laine at 602-712-4604 or e-mail slaine{a).azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Division Administrator

The Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe does not wish to be a party to the Programmatic agreement for this project as it occurs entirely outside aboriginal Yavapai Territory. We defer to the southern tribes.

Concurrence

Sue Kwiatkowski, Tribal Anthropologist

Enclosures under separate cover: map, site table, Programmatic Agreement, and cultural resources survey report

SThomas, WVichon, SLaine (619E), REHils (619E)
SDThomascds.

---

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
205 South Seventeenth Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Jul 1, 2005

Dr. Connie Stone, Archaeologist
Bureau of Land Management
Phoenix Field Office
21602 N. 7th Ave.
Phoenix, Arizona 85027-2099

RE: Project No: NH-202-DADY
TRACS No: 200L MA 054 H5764 01L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Class III Survey Report
Second Draft Programmatic Agreement

Dear Dr. Stone:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the northeast side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (331 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.32 acres).

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHIPD), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the City of Avendale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Hopi Indian Community, the Ocotillo-Salome Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hohokam Tribe, the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan
Southern Paiute, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes four technical studies:

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: “A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Burden, 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrence/responses from SHPO (September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stockton, September 9, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kuwawsimwa, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: “A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Darling, 2005), which is enclosed for consultation and discussed below.

- Addendum Class I overview and Addendum Class III survey to address the expansion (late 2004 and early 2005) of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101L freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments. These two additional reports will be forthcoming as part of the Section 106 consultations. The results of these two studies will be provided in the near future.

The initial alternative alignments, defined in March 2003, were surveyed by the Gila River Indian Community’s Cultural Resource Management Program (GRIC-CRMP). The results are reported in a report titled A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling, 2005), which is enclosed for your review and comment. Twenty-one archeological sites were identified in the proposed alignment (see attached table). Twenty sites are recommended as eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D. One site is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP.

- AZ T:12:9 (ASM) (Villa Buena) and AZ T:12:32 (ASM) are prehistoric Hohokam villages with existing and/or historically documented public architecture. The sites are recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam social organization, settlement, and land use in the lower Salt River Valley, including the village structure and the development of irrigation communities south of the Salt River.
In addition, FHWA/ADOT is recirculating a second draft Programmatic Agreement (PA, enclosed) because few tribes opted to participate in the PA when it was originally circulated in August 2003. This recirculation will allow the tribes another opportunity to participate in the PA. This second draft PA has been edited to address any comments from the first draft as well as to also addresses TCP properties more specifically.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed survey report, PA, and information provided in this letter. If you find the survey report adequate and the second draft PA acceptable, please sign below to indicate your concurrence and return to ADOT within 30 days. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-8636 or e-mail slaine@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Serelle E. Laine, Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue Rm. 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Enclosures

Cc: SThomas (FHWA); VWachon (FHWA)
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ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Intermodal Transportation Division
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

John A. Bogert
Chief of Staff

Mr. Ralph Velez, City Manager
City of Tolleson
9555 West Van Buren Street
Tolleson, Arizona 85353

RE: Project No: NH-202-D( )
TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 01L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Section 106 Consultation
Draft Cultural Resources "Programmatic Agreement"

August 3, 2005

Dear Mr. Velez:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of five alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (T01, T02, T03, T04, and T06) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length. Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.32 acres).

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes four technical studies:

- A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Burden 2002).
- A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2005).
- An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck and Touchin 2003).
- An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck 2005).

Twenty-two archaeological sites and twenty-one historic sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments. In addition, the South Mountain Range is identified as place of traditional cultural importance to Native American tribes.

FHWA/ADOT is circulating the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) that addresses cultural resources for the project for your review. If you find the PA adequate and wish to participate in the final PA, please indicate your concurrence by signing below and return within 20 days. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-8636 or e-mail slaine@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Sue E. Laine, Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
206 South 17th Avenue, Room 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Enclosures

Signature for City of Tolleson Concurrence

Date

cc: STomas (FHWA); WVachon (FHWA)
The previous letter was also sent to:
Mr. Charlie McClendon, City Manager, City of Avondale
Mr. Mike Normand, Transportation Services and Planning Manager, City of Chandler
Mr. Ed Beasley, City Manager, City of Glendale

Mr. Raphael Bear, President
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
P.O. Box 17779
Fountain Hills, Arizona 85269

Dear President Bear:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 2021, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.32 acres).

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), Salt River Project (SRP), Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribes, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Faqua Yagil Tribe, the Peeble of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of five alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (T01, T02, T03, T04, and T06) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.5 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The Gila River Indian Community’s Cultural Resource Management Program (GRIC-CRMP) conducted a Class III cultural resources survey of the proposed alternative alignments. The results of the GRIC-CRMP survey are presented in a report titled, A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Area.
Enclosures under separate cover: map, site table, Programmatic Agreement, and cultural resources survey report

Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2005), which is enclosed for your review. Twenty-one archaeological sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments (see attached table). Twenty sites are recommended as eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D. One site is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP.

Because of the presence of the South Mountain Range and because areas of traditional cultural significance are not always identified through archaeological surveys, FHWA would like to request your participation in discussions regarding the potential effects to such resources that could result from the South Mountain Freeway project.

At this time, FHWA is inquiring whether you have any concerns regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance to your community within the project area. If you have such concerns, any information you might provide within 30 days of receipt of this letter would be considered in the project planning. If your office opts to participate in cultural resource consultation at a later date, FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns.

Additionally, FHWA is in the process of finalizing the South Mountain Corridor Programmatic Agreement (PA) to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues. The original draft PA was circulated in August 2003. At that time few tribes opted to participate. FHWA is re-circulating the draft PA (enclosed) and would like to offer another opportunity for your tribe/community to participate in the PA. Please sign below if you would like to be included as a Concouring Party to the PA and return to FHWA within 30 days.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your tribe/community through continued Section 106 consultation. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact our office at 602-712-8636 or e-mail slaine@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Concurrence

[Signature]

Date: 8-5-05

Mr. Rick Anduze, Archaeologist
Salt River Project
P.P. Box 35205, Mailstop PAB 352
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3525

RE: Project No: NH-202-D(ADY)

Dear Mr. Anduze:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.32 acres).

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Salt River Project, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Havasupai Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Paite tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pass-a-Que-Que Nation, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan A283
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Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D.

Free,way Corridor Community's Cultural Resource Management Program (GRIC-CRMP). The results are reported in a report titled "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrence/responses from SHPO, Jacobo, September 19, 2003; BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kuanwisiwma, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003), and BIA (October 27, 2003).

A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: “A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Darling 2005), which is enclosed for consultation and discussed below.

Addendum Class I overview and Addendum Class III survey to address the expansion (late 2004 and early 2005) of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101L freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments. These two additional reports will be forthcoming as part of the Section 106 consultations. The results of these two studies will be provided in the near future.

The initial alternative alignments, defined in March 2003, were surveyed by the Gila River Indian Community's Cultural Resource Management Program (GRIC-CRMP). The results are reported in a report titled "A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005), which is enclosed for your review and comment. Twenty-one archaeological sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments (see attached table). Twenty sites are recommended as eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D. One site is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP.

- AZ T:12:9 (ASM) Villa Buena and AZ T:12:52 (ASM) are prehistoric Hohokam villages with existing and/or historically documented public architecture. The sites are recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam social organization, settlement, and land use in the lower Salt River Valley, including the village structure and the development of irrigation communities south of the Salt River.

Southern Pintail, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tentoe Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Paiute Nation, and the Yavapai-Apache Indian Tribe.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of five alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (T01, T02, T03, T04, and T05) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes four technical studies:

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrence/responses from SHPO, Jacobo, September 19, 2003; BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kuanwisiwma, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003), and BIA (October 27, 2003).

AZ T:12:1164 (ASM), AZ T:12:91 (ASM), AZ T:12:127 (ASM) (Baseline Ruin), AZ T:12:202 (ASM), AZ T:12:203 (ASM), AZ T:12:204 (ASM), AZ T:12:205 (ASM), and AZ T:12:206 (ASM) are prehistoric Hohokam artifact scatters. The sites are recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam social organization, settlement, and land use in the lower Salt River Valley, including the development and structure of irrigation communities.

- AZ T:12:197 (ASM), AZ T:12:201 (ASM), and AZ T:12:211 (ASM) are trail sites with associated features (age and cultural affiliation unknown, but likely Native American in origin). AZ T:12:207 (ASM) is a prehistoric trail site with an associated Hohokam artifact scatter. The sites are recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including social mobility and transportation networks.

- AZ T:12:210 (ASM) is a prehistoric quarry (age and cultural affiliation unknown, but likely Native American in origin). The site is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on prehistoric settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including lithic resource procurement and ground stone technology.

- AZ T:12:199 (ASM) and AZ T:12:200 (ASM) are historic O'odham artifact scatters. AZ T:12:199 (ASM) is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on historical-period O'odham settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including the use of upland areas for subsistence and religious practices. AZ T:12:200 (ASM) is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of integrity and information potential.

- AZ T:12:198 (ASM) and AZ T:12:208 (ASM) are prehistoric petroglyph sites with historic components. The sites are considered eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam and historic O'odham settlement and land use at the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including the use of upland areas for religious practices.

- AZ T:10:83 (ASM) (Roosevelt Canal) and AZ T:12:154 (ASM) (Western Canal) are historic American irrigation canals. Both sites have previously been determined eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for their important associations with the development of Arizona's agricultural industry and irrigation networks.

All sites are located on private land, except for AZ T:10:83 (ASM) – Roosevelt Irrigation District; AZ T:12:154 (ASM) – Bureau of Reclamation/Salt River Project; AZ T:12:207 (ASM) – City of Phoenix, Park and Recreation; and AZ T:12:211 (ASM) – Arizona State Land Department. FHWA/ADOT is concurrently consulting with these agencies regarding the eligibility of these sites located on their land.
Anduze
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In addition, FHWA/ADOT is recirculating a second draft Programmatic Agreement (PA, enclosed) because few tribes opted to participate in the PA when it was originally circulated in August 2003. This recirculation will allow the tribes another opportunity to participate in the PA. This second draft PA has been edited to address any comments from the first draft as well as to also addresses TCP properties more specifically.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed survey report, PA, and information provided in this letter. If you find the survey report adequate, please sign below to indicate your concurrence and return to ADOT within 30 days. If you have any comments or changes to request for the PA, please respond in writing. We look forward to continuing consultation with your office as we develop the final PA to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-8636 or e-mail slaine@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Serelle E. Laine, Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue Rm. 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Enclosures

cc: SThomas (FHWA); WVachon (FHWA)
The previous letter was also sent to:
Mr. Edward Smith, Chairman, Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
Ms. Sherry Cordova, Chairwoman, Cocopah Indian Tribe
Mr. Daniel Eddy, Jr., Chairman, Colorado River Indian Tribes
Mr. Ralph Bear, President, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Ms. Nora McDowell, Chairwoman, Fort Mojave Tribe
Mr. Mike Jackson, Sr., President, Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe
Mr. Richard Narcia, Governor, Gila River Indian Community
Mr. Don Watahonie, Chairman, Havasupai Tribe
Mr. Leigh Kuwaniswina, Cultural Preservation Officer, Hopi Tribe
Ms. Loretta Jackson, Tribal Historic Preservation Office, Hualapai Tribe
Mr. Carmen Bradley, Chair, Kaibab-Band of Paiutes Indians
Mr. Alan Downer, Ph.D., Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Navaajo Nation Historic Preservation Department
Ms. Herminia Frias, Chairwoman, Pascua Yaqui Tribe
Ms. Joni Ramos, President, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Ms. Kathleen Wesley-Kitcheyan, Chairwoman, San Carlos Apache Nation
Mr. John Lehi, Sr., President, San Juan Southern Paiute
Mr. Peter Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Tohono O'odham Nation
Mr. Joe Joaquin, Cultural Resource Specialist, Tohono O'odham Nation
Mr. Ivan Smith, Chairman, Tonto Apache Tribe
Mr. Mark Altaha, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, White Mountain Apache Tribe
Ms. Jamie Fullmer, Chairwoman, Yavapai-Apache Nation
Stewart
August 31, 2005
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Twenty-two archeological sites and 71 historic sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments. In addition, the South Mountain Range is identified as place of traditional cultural importance to Native American tribes.

All sites are located on private land, except for the Sacha-Webster Farmhouse (7515W West Baseline Road) – Flood Control District Maricopa County; SRP 99th Avenue Lateral – Bureau of Reclamation/Salt River Project; US 80/ AZ FF-9:17 (ASM) – City of Phoenix, and the 6100 Block West Dobbin Road Streetcape – City of Phoenix. FHWA/ADOT is concurrently consulting with these agencies regarding the eligibility of these sites located on their land.

The SRP 99th Avenue Lateral, located on the east side of South 99th Avenue and north of Lower Buckeye Road, is recommended as eligible to the NHRP under Criterion A as a rare irrigation feature that was once common in the agricultural landscape of the Salt River Valley. The lateral is being converted to an underground pipe in response to the Pecos Promenade and City of Phoenix development projects. SRP and Reclamation are currently in the process of preparing a report for the canal that documents its history and engineering, as a form of mitigation. Upon completion of these projects, the 99th Avenue Lateral will no longer be considered a contributing component of the overall SRP irrigation network.

FHWA/ADOT is circulating the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) that addresses cultural resources for the project for your review. Please review the enclosed draft PA. If you find the PA adequate and wish to participate in the final PA, please indicate your concurrence by signing below and return within 20 days. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail RGreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Position]

[Agency]

[Address]

[City, State ZIP]

[Telephone Number]

[Email Address]

[Attachment]

[Page Number]

This letter was also sent to:
Brian Kenny, Environmental Programs Manager, Maricopa County Dept. of Transportation
Stanley Ashby, Superintendent, Roosevelt Irrigation District

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
206 South Seventeenth Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Janet Napolitano
Governor

August 31, 2005

Vicente M. Mandez
Director

Mr. Steven Ross, Cultural Resources Manager
Arizona State Land Department
1616 W. Adams
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

RE: Project No. N40-202-DADVY
TRACS No. 200L, MA H7764 01E
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Addendum Class I and Class III Survey Reports

Dear Mr. Ross:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 2021, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.32 acres).

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RUD), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Coconino Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonopah Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.
The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of ten alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (E1, W55, W71, W101WPR, W101WFR, W101W99, W101CPR, W101CFF, W101ERF, and W101ER) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes four technical studies:

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrence/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 15, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kwawisamnwa, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is ongoing. To date, concurrence/responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005), Bureau of Reclamation (Ellis, July 12, 2005), Bureau of Land Management (Stone, July 36, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Quewakas, July 12, 2005), Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe (Kwawisamnwa, July 22, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101I freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report is titled An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2002, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona. The Class III report is titled An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2002, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona. Both reports are enclosed for consultation and discussed below.

Addendum Class I Overview Results

The addendum Class I overview, titled An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2002, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck and Touchin 2005), identified 27 previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, five historical-period linear sites, and 129 historic building properties (see a Table A). In addition, historical maps indicate that several prehistoric canal alignments pass through the study area. For the archaeological sites, five are considered eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D, five are not eligible, nine sites have not been evaluated for eligibility, and the eligibility status of eight sites is unknown due to a lack of available information. Historically-
Commercial Properties

- The SRP 99th Avenue Lateral, located on the east side of South 99th Avenue and north of Lower Buckeye Road, is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A as a rare irrigation feature that was once common in the agricultural landscape of the Salt River Valley. The lateral is being converted to an underground pipe in response to the Pecan Promenade and City of Phoenix development projects. SRP and Reclamation are currently in the process of preparing a report for the canal that documents its history and engineering, as a form of mitigation. Upon completion of these projects, the 99th Avenue Lateral will no longer be considered a contributing component of the overall SRP irrigation network.

Farmsteads

- The Hudson Farm located at 5900 South 59th Avenue is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A as an exceptional example of a historic farmstead in Laveen. It retains a complete suite of agricultural buildings and structures from the period of significance that are in good condition and well preserved. In addition, the farmstead does not have any intrusive modern buildings or structures that would detract from its historic setting and feel (other than a large satellite dish which could be easily removed). The farmstead’s combination and overall layout of older buildings and structures, along with other contributing elements such as the mature landscaping, palm tree-lined driveways and entrance gates, provides a cohesive picture of what a working farmstead was like in the agricultural era of significance. The property retains integrity of location, workmanship, materials, design, and association. Furthermore, the surrounding agricultural field provides the contextual framework within which the property conveys its historic character as a farmstead. Thus, the agricultural field is an important contributing component that defines and preserves the farmstead’s integrity of setting and feeling. It is recommended that the entire 38-acre parcel is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A as an exceptional example of a historic-period Laveen farmstead. Additionally, the pair of stave silos are recognized as individually eligible to the NRHP due to their historical period character.

- The Anderson Farm Tenant Residences at 9901 and 9903 West Van Buren Road are recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance.

- The Parker Farmstead at 5720 West Dobson Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical significance, architectural merit, and integrity. Individually, the farmhouse and barn have been modified and lack architectural distinction. Overall, the property fails to convey its original historic character as a working farmstead.

- The Carter Farmstead at 7201 and 7215 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP because it has lost too many of its period elements to convey its historic character. The farmhouse is the only primary element remaining from the historic period; however, it lacks integrity and architectural distinction.

- The Williams Farm located at 6102 West Dobson Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical significance, architectural merit, and integrity. Individually, the farmhouse and barn have been modified and lack architectural distinction. Overall, the property fails to convey its original historic character as a working farmstead.

- The Maddux House at 9115 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance and diminished integrity of workmanship, design, and materials. The farmhouse is heavily modified through additions and is in a general state of disrepair.

- The Colvin Farmstead located at 9115 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP because it has lost too many of its period elements to convey its historic character. The farmhouse is the only primary element remaining from the historic period; however, it lacks integrity and architectural distinction.

- The Carter Farmstead at 5720 West Dobson Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical significance and diminished integrity of workmanship, design, and materials. The farmhouse is heavily modified through additions and is in a general state of disrepair.

- The Dean Farmstead at 9445 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance and diminished integrity of workmanship, design, and materials. The farmhouse is heavily modified through additions and is in a general state of disrepair.

- The Carter Farmstead at 5720 West Dobson Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance.

- The Parker Farmstead at 3606 South 83rd Avenue is recommended as not eligible due to a lack of historical and architectural significance. None of the farmstead’s historic period buildings and structures remain, except for the farmhouse built in 1950, which is heavily modified with additions and generally lacks integrity of design, workmanship, and materials.

- The Dad Farmstead at 10500 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance, in its current condition, it no longer conveys an accurate representation of its historical period character.
Furthermore, its integrity of setting and feeling are lost with most of the surrounding landscape development of the poorly preserved and generally lack integrity. The highway has been widened and modernized and no longer retains integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. It is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B. The unincorporated townsite is a living example of an historic, rural Hispanic agricultural community in the Salt River Valley. Communities such as Santa Maria had an important role in the development and operation of the Valley’s agricultural industry throughout the 20th century. In addition, the townsite has an association with Khatat Joseph Nackard, an Arizona businessman who had an influential role developing and shaping the State’s economic and commercial future. As such, it is recommended that the Santa Maria Townsite is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B.

**Historic Townsites**

- The historic Santa Maria Townsite, located at the southwest corner of Lower Buckeye Road and 83rd Avenue, is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and B. The unincorporated townsite is a living example of a historic, rural Hispanic agricultural community in the Salt River Valley. Communities such as Santa Maria had an important role in the development and operation of the Valley’s agricultural industry throughout the 20th century. In addition, the townsite has an association with Khatat Joseph Nackard, an Arizona businessman who had an influential role developing and shaping the State’s economic and commercial future. As such, it is recommended that the Santa Maria Townsite is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B.

**Railroads**

- The Southern Pacific Railroad Wellton-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line (AZ T:10:84 (ASM)) is recommended as eligible to the NRHP for its association with the development of Arizona’s railroad network. The railroad has been maintained and upgraded over the years and remains an important component of Arizona’s transportation network.

**Streetscapes**

- The 6100 Block West Dobbins Road Streetscape is eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and D as an example of a historic, rural streetscape. It is an important example of the development and operation of the Valley’s agricultural industry throughout the 20th century. In addition, the townsite has an association with Khatat Joseph Nackard, an Arizona businessman who had an influential role developing and shaping the State’s economic and commercial future. As such, it is recommended that the Santa Maria Townsite is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B.

All sites are located on private land, except for the Sachs-Webster Farmhouse (7515 West Baseline Road) – Flood Control District Maricopa County, ERP 99th Avenue Lateral – Bureau of Reclamation/Salt River Project, US 80 AZ FF:9:17 (ASM) – City of Phoenix, and the 6100 Block West Dobbins Road Streetscape – City of Phoenix. FHWA/ADOT is concurrently consulting with these agencies regarding the eligibility of these sites located on their land.
### Table A. Addendum Class I Overview Report Eligibility and Management Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignments</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility (Criterion)</th>
<th>Management Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W55/W71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:11:26 (ASM)</td>
<td>Hohokam Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S4</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:12:4 (MNA)</td>
<td>Hohokam Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S6</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:12:5 (MNA)</td>
<td>Hohokam Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>T1N, R3E, S3</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:12:19 (ASM)</td>
<td>Les Colinas</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>T1N, R3E, S5, T1N, R2E, R3:2, 11</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:12:38 (ASM)</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>T1N, R3E, S3</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:12:13 (ASM)</td>
<td>Los Aumentos</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S2</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:17:38 (ASM)</td>
<td>Grand Canal</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>T1N, R3E, S2</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:11:28 (ASM)</td>
<td>Roosevelt Canal</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>T1N, R3E, S3, 4</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (A, C)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:11:28 (ASM)</td>
<td>Roosevelt Canal</td>
<td>T2N, R1E, S9, 16</td>
<td>Reclamation</td>
<td>Eligible (A, C)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W101 Alignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:11:28 (ASM)</td>
<td>Roosevelt Canal</td>
<td>T2N, R3E, S3</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:12:4 (MNA)</td>
<td>Hohokam Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>T1N, R3E, S6</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ T:12:17 (ASM)</td>
<td>Los Aumentos</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S2</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes alignments W101 WPR, W110 WPR, W110 WFR, W110 WDR, W110 WCR, W110 WFR, W110 WDR.
Table B. Addendum Class III Survey Report Eligibility and Management Summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Newly (N)/Previously (P) Recorded</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>USGS 7.5' Map</th>
<th>Township, Range, Section</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZT:12:221</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Scatter</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W55</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S3</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 Block W Dobbs Road</td>
<td>6100 Block W Dobbs Rd.</td>
<td>Rural Streetscape</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W55</td>
<td>Laveen</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S6</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Eligible (A,D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Farm Tenant Residences</td>
<td>9901 and 9903 W Van Buren Rd.</td>
<td>Tenant Streetscape</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W101 (all)</td>
<td>Tolleson</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S8</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. O. Piret &amp; Sons Feedlot</td>
<td>6100 Block W Elliott Rd.</td>
<td>Feedlot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W71, W101 (all)</td>
<td>Laveen</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S14</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Farmstead</td>
<td>7211 W Broadway Rd.</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W7</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S23</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil and Mary Colvin Farmstead</td>
<td>5139 W Basella Rd.</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Laveen</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S20</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colvin-Tyson Farmstead/Butternut Dairy</td>
<td>6159 W Dobbins Rd.</td>
<td>Farmstead/Dairy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W55</td>
<td>Laveen</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S7</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Farmstead: Not Eligible; Dairy Barn: Eligible (C); contributing elements to 6100 Block Streetscape impacts to 6100 Block Streetscape boundaries, or else mitigate</td>
<td>Avoid dairy barn, or else mitigate; avoid position within 6100 Block Streetscape boundaries, or else mitigate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name | Address | Type | Newly (N)/Previously (P) Recorded | Alignment | USGS 7.5' Map | Township, Range, Section | Ownership | NRHP Eligibility Recommendation | Management Recommendation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAD Farmstead</td>
<td>6102 W Dobbs Rd.</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W55</td>
<td>Laveen</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S6</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Farmstead: Not Eligible; Dairy Barn: Eligible (C)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Farmstead</td>
<td>9445 W Broadway Rd.</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W101 (a)</td>
<td>Tolleson</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S28</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkin Farmstead/Dairy</td>
<td>10048 E 39th Ave.</td>
<td>Farmstead/Dairy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Laveen</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S7</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Farmstead: Not Eligible; Dairy Barn: Eligible (C)</td>
<td>Avoid dairy barn, or else mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Farm</td>
<td>9300 S 39th Ave.</td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W55</td>
<td>Laveen</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S7</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Farm: Eligible (A); Silos: Eligible (C)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis Marine Repair Shop</td>
<td>3800 W Buckeye Rd.</td>
<td>Commercial Building</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W55</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S8</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddox House</td>
<td>9115 W Broadway Rd.</td>
<td>Farmhouse</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W101 (a)</td>
<td>Tolleson</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S28</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Restaurant</td>
<td>7550 W Buckeye Rd.</td>
<td>Commercial Building</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W55</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S0</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Farmstead</td>
<td>3605 S 83rd Ave.</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W101EPR, W101EPR</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S22</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piret Farmstead</td>
<td>5901 W Elliot Rd.</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>T1N, R2E, S10</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Historic Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Newly (Y) Previously (P) Recorded</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>USGS 7.5' Map</th>
<th>Township, Range, Section</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quinones House</td>
<td>9131 W. Broadway Rd.</td>
<td>Farmhouse</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>W101 (all)</td>
<td>Tellison</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S28</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salsa-Welsho Farmhouse</td>
<td>7515 W. Baseline Rd.</td>
<td>Farmhouse</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W101 (all)</td>
<td>Tellison</td>
<td>T1S, R1E, S8</td>
<td>FCDMC</td>
<td>Eligible (C)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Townsite</td>
<td>Lower Buckeye Rd. and S. 13th Ave.</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>W71</td>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S24</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Eligible (A,B)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRR Wells-Farm-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line</td>
<td>UPRR R/W</td>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Tellison</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S8,12,17; T1N, R2E, S8</td>
<td>UPRR</td>
<td>Eligible (A)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR 99th Avenue Lateral</td>
<td>99th Ave. and Lower Buckeye Rd.</td>
<td>Irrigation Canal</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>W101W99</td>
<td>Tellison</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S16</td>
<td>SFRP Reclamation</td>
<td>Eligible (A)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 80 (AZ-PF-817 ASM)</td>
<td>West Buckeye Road</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Tellison</td>
<td>T1N, R1E, S8,12,13,16,17; T1N, R2E, S8, 17</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Eligible (A)</td>
<td>Non-contributing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Notes:**
1. All alignments cross the property parcel but do not intersect the farmstead.
2. W55 crosses the property parcel but misses the farmstead and dairy barn.
3. All alternate alignment pass within about 100 m of the farmstead but do not directly impact it.
Dear Ms. Laine:

I have reviewed the documents and agree to their adequacy with the following recommended changes. The discussions of the historic features are presented in great detail supporting their eligibility recommendations.

Class I report, page 60, discussion of the Grand Canal-

The canal is eligible under Criterion A, but I believe only certain features of the canal would be eligible under Criterion C, and I know of no individual features that have been determined eligible.

The Grand Canal presently heads at the SRP Crosscut facility on Washington Street. Water from a forebay at the southern end of the Arizona Crosscut Canal flows through two penstocks to the Crosscut Hydro Plant. After passing through the hydro plant, no longer operative, the water enters the Grand Canal.

The HAER document for the canal was not completed as part of the recent PA. It was the result of a 1989 MOA between the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the AZ SHPO, with concurrence from SRP and ADOT, which stated HAER documentation would be adequate mitigation for present and future modifications to the canal system.

Also-

Various places in the report site AZ T:12:10 (ASM) is referred to as "Los Colinas", it is "Las Colinas".

Richard A. Anduze
Environmental Scientist/Archaeologist
Siting and Studies
Environmental Services

File: ORG 2-2
The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of ten alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (E1, W55, W71, W101WPR, W101WFR, W101W99, W101CPR, W101CPR, W101EPR, and W101EPR) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000-8 (304.8-km) wide and range from 31.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes four technical studies:

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrence/responses from SHPO (Jacob, September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kwawwiwiwa, September 19, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Herrington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Andrus, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is ongoing. To date, concurrence responses have been received from SHPO (Jacob, July 11, 2005), Bureau of Reclamation (Ellis, July 12, 2005), Bureau of Land Management (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Qrurakia, July 12, 2005), Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe (Kiwiwakawi, July 22, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report is titled An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona. The Class III report is titled An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona. Both reports are enclosed for consultation and discussed below.

Addendum Class I Overview Results

The addendum overview, titled An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Borchard and Toshin 2005), identified 27 previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, five historical-period linear sites, and 129 historic building properties (see attached Table A). In addition, historical maps indicate that several prehistoric canals alignments pass through the study area. For the archaeological sites, five are considered eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D, five sites are not eligible, nine sites have not been evaluated for eligibility, and the eligibility status of eight sites is unknown due to a lack of available information. Historically
The Class I study revealed five historical-period linear sites in the study area. The linear sites are considered eligible overall under Criterion A with contributing and non-contributing segments.

Of the 129 historic building properties, 25 have been previously recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and/or C, 37 have been recommended as not eligible, and 67 have not been evaluated. Seventy-one historic building properties are in the Capital Redevelopment Area in Phoenix, an unincorporated residential area with an abundance of historic building properties. Eighteen of the historic building properties are in the Villa Verde Historic District, which is listed on the Phoenix Register of Historic Places. Although the Villa Verde properties were previously recommended as not eligible to the NRHP, they should be re-evaluated within the context of an early Phoenix suburban neighborhood.

The vast majority of cultural resources identified in the addendum Class I study area will not be affected by any of the proposed alternative alignments. Cultural resources in the W55 and W71 alignments include AZ T:11:26 (ASM), AZ T:12:4 (MNA), AZ T:12:5 (MNA), AZ T:12:10 (ASM) (Los Colinas), AZ T:12:38 (ASM), and AZ T:12:178 (ASM) (Los Aumentos). Cultural resources in the W101 alignments include AZ T:7:167 (ASM) (Grand Canal), AZ T:10:83 (ASM) (Roosevelt Canal), AZ T:11:26 (ASM), AZ T:12:4 (MNA), and AZ T:12:178 (Los Aumentos).

**Addendum Class III Survey Results**

An addendum survey of shifted alternative alignments, defined in December 2004, and agricultural fields that had been plowed in early 2005 since the time of the initial Class III survey conducted by the GRC (Darling 2004), was conducted by HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR). In addition, the addendum Class III survey included documentation of 21 historic sites not included in the initial Class III survey (Darling 2004). The results are reported in a report titled *An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2001 Award Recipient: Mountain Freeway & EDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brookeback 2005)*, which is enclosed for your review and comment. One archaeological site and 21 historic sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments (see attached Table B). The archaeological site is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D. Two historic sites are recommended as eligible under Criteria A and B. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A and C. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A, B, and C. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A, B, and D. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A, B, and C, but non-contributing within the proposed alternative alignments. Twelve historic sites are recommended as not eligible.

**Archaeological Sites**

- AZ T:12:221 (ASM) is a prehistoric Hohokam artifact scatter. The site is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on prehistoric settlement and land use in the lower Salt River Valley near the confluence of Gila and Salt rivers.
Farmsteads

- The Anderson Farm Tenant Residences at 9901 and 9903 West Van Buren Road are recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance.

- The Carter Farmstead at 7201 and 7215 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP. The farmstead has lost too many of its primary elements to convey a good sense of its historic character. While it provides a picturesque rural setting, it does not provide an accurate portrayal of its historic composition.

- The Cecil and Mary Colvin Farmstead located at 5139 West Estrella Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP because it has lost too many of its period elements to convey its historic character. The farmhouse is the only primary element remaining from the historic period; however, it lacks integrity and architectural distinction.

- The Dad Farmstead at 6102 West Dobbins Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical significance, architectural merit, and integrity. Individually, the farmhouse and barn have been modified and lack architectural distinction. Overall, the property fails to convey its original historic character as a working farmstead.

- The Dean Farmstead at 9445 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance and diminished integrity of workmanship, design, and materials. The farmhouse is heavily modified through additions and is in a general state of disrepair.

- The Maddux House at 9115 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance.

- The Parker Farmstead at 3606 South 83rd Avenue is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of integrity and architectural distinction. The structures and buildings are poorly preserved and generally lack integrity.

- The Pitrat Farmstead at 5901 West Elliot Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of architectural integrity and historical significance. The historical layout of the farmstead has been lost as a result of property subdivisions and new construction. The house is heavily modified from its original form through multiple additions. Although the property is consistent with a rural agricultural landscape, in its current condition, it no longer conveys an accurate representation of its historical period character.

- The Quinonez House at 9131 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance and diminished integrity of workmanship, design, and materials.

- The Ranch House at 9119 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance and workmanship, design, and materials.

- The Sachs-Webster Farmhouse at 7515 West Baseline Road was previously recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C as an outstanding example of the Pyramid Cottage or Neo-Classical bowed style house. Not only is the house a rare example of a once common Territorial-period architectural style, it is also exceptional in that few homes built in Phoenix in the Pyramid Cottage style possess as many of the hallmark attributes as does the Sachs-Webster House.

Farmsteads with Dairy Components

- The Colvin-Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy located at 6159 West Dobbins Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP as a whole because of a lack of integrity and historical significance. However, the dairy “head-to-toe” barn is recommended as individually eligible under Criterion C as a rare example of a once common architectural form that was a characteristic feature in Laveen’s historic landscape and an integral component of its local economy. It is one of the few standing family-operated dairy barns in Laveen. It is also recognized as important within the broader context of the Salt River Valley’s dairy industry as a surviving example of a dairy head-to-toe barn used during the height of its agricultural era.

- The Hacken Farmstead/Dairy at 10048 South 55th Avenue is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP because of a lack of integrity and historical significance. However, the dairy “flat” barn is recommended as individually eligible under Criterion C as a rare example of a once common form that was a characteristic feature in Laveen’s historic landscape and an integral component of its local economy. It is one of the few remaining family-operated dairy barns in Laveen. It is also important within the broader context of the Salt River Valley’s dairy industry as a surviving example of a dairy flat barn used during the height of its agricultural era.

Feedlots

- The C.O. Pitrat & Sons Feedlot in the 6100 Block of West Elliot Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP because of a lack of historical and architecture significance. The feedlot is 50 years old; however, most of its operation occurred in modern times. The structures and buildings are poorly preserved and generally lack integrity.

Highways

- US 80 (AZ FF:9:17 [ASM]) is considered eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A at the national level as one of the first designated transcontinental routes and for its association with the development of the U.S. interstate transportation network. The segment within the study area has been widened and modernized and no longer retains integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. Furthermore, its integrity of setting and feeling are lost with most of the surrounding landscape transformed from rural agricultural to urban commercial/industrial. It is recommended that the segment in the study area is not eligible to the NRHP as a non-contributing component of US 80.
Historic Townsites

- The historic Santa Marie Townsite, located at the southwest corner of Lower Buckeye Road and 83rd Avenue, is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and B. The unincorporated townsite is a living example of an historic, rural Hispanic agricultural community in the Salt River Valley. Communities such as Santa Maria had an important role in the development and operation of the Valley's agricultural industry throughout the 20th century. In addition, the townsite has an association with Khatarr Joseph Nackard, an Arizona businessman who had an influential role developing and shaping the State's economic and commercial future. As such, it is recommended that the Santa Marie Townsite is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B.

Railroads

- The Southern Pacific Railroad Wellton-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line (AZ T:10:84 [ASM]) is recommended as eligible to the NRHP for its association with the development of Arizona's railroad network. The railroad has been maintained and upgraded over the years and remains an important component of Arizona's transportation network.

Streetscapes

- The 6100 Block West Dobbins Road Streetscape is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and D as an example and reflection of the lower Salt River Valley's agricultural past. In contrast to a more common, barren rural streetscape defined by a two-lane road passing between broad, open agricultural fields, the 6100 Block contains a suite of rural agricultural elements that convey a strong sense of what rural life was like in Arizona in the early to mid-1900s (i.e., it captures more of the human element). Rural streetscapes are becoming increasingly rare in the lower Salt River Valley, as agricultural communities are replaced by urban development. It is recommended that the 6100 Block West Dobbins Road Streetscape is eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and D, not only for its association with Arizona's early agricultural development, but more so for its information potential to provide future Arizonans with an idea of what rural agricultural life was like in the lower Salt River Valley during the early years of statehood.

All sites are located on private land, except for the Sachs-Webster Farmhouse (7515 West Baseline Road) – Flood Control District Maricopa County, SRP 99th Avenue Lateral – Bureau of Reclamation/Salt River Project; US 80/ AZ 97:17 (ASM) – City of Phoenix; and the 6100 Block West Dobbins Road Streetscape – City of Phoenix. FHWA/ADOT is concurrently consulting with these agencies regarding the eligibility of these sites located on their land.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed Class I overview and Class III survey report and information provided in this letter. If you find any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail RGreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Serele E. Laine, Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue Rm. 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Signature for Reclamation Concurrence

cc: SThomas (FHWA); WVachon (FHWA)
"Managing and conserving natural, cultural, and recreational resources"

September 19, 2005

Dr. Ruth Greenspan
Historic Preservation Specialist
Environmental & Enhancement Group
Arizona Department of Transportation
205 South 17th Avenue, Room 213E
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3212

RE: Project No. NH-202-D(ADY)
TRACS No. 202L, MA H5764 01E
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
SHPO-2003-1890 (25323)

Dear Dr. Greenspan:

Thank you for consulting with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act regarding plans for the South Mountain Freeway connecting Interstate 10 in west Chandler to I-10 in west Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona, and submitting cultural resources reports and recommendations for review and comment. Dr. Bill Collins, Deputy SHPO/Historian, and I have reviewed the submitted materials and offer the following comments.

The submitted cultural resources reports [An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona and An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona] are adequate. Before responding to the eligibility recommendations, some clarification is needed:

1) Page two of the cover letter states that the Class I identified 27 previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites; the breakdown of the eligibility status of these sites (i.e., 5 eligible, 7 not eligible, 7 not evaluated and 8 unknown) in the report differs from the characterization in the cover letter (i.e., 5 eligible, 5 not eligible, 9 not evaluated, and 8 unknown).

2) The text of the cover letter neglects to mention that the eligible Barnes Dairy Barn and the ineligible Dad Farmstead are part of the eligible 6100 West Dobbins Road Streetscape (although this is part of the listing in Table B to the cover letter). Dr. Collins also commented that the reasoning behind the suggested D eligibility of the 6100 West Dobbins Road Streetscape is actually more appropriate to A eligibility, so he disagrees with the recommendation that it is "more" eligible for D than A (see page 7 of cover letter). He agrees that it is A eligible, and did not see D eligibility properly evaluated at all.

We appreciate your cooperation with this office in considering the potential impacts of development on cultural resources situated in Arizona. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (602) 542-7140 or electronically at djacobs@azstate.gov.

Sincerely,

David Jacobs
Compliance Specialist/Archaeologist
State Historic Preservation Office
Dear Mr. Kenny:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of five alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (T01, T02, T03, T04, and T06) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000-ft (304.8 m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length. Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation (62.32 acres).

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes four technical studies:

- A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Burden 2002).
- A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2005).
- An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck and Touchin 2005).
- An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck 2005).

Twenty-two archaeological sites and 21 historic sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments. In addition, the South Mountain Range is identified as place of traditional cultural importance to Native American tribes. Please let me know if you would like to review any of the above reports and they will be sent to you.

FHWA/ADOT is circulating the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) that addresses cultural resources for the project for your review. Please review the enclosed draft PA. If you find the PA adequate and wish to participate in the final PA, please indicate your concurrence by signing below and return within 20 days. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail RGreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Serelle E. Laine, Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
206 South Seventeenth Avenue, Rm. 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213
September 27, 2005

In Reply Refer To: HA-AZ
NH-202-D(ADT)
TRACS No. 202L MA-054 IH764 01L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Section 106 Consultation
Draft Programmatic Agreement

Ms. Carol Legard
Historic Preservation Specialist
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
12136 W. Baywood Avenue, Suite 330
Lakewood, Colorado 80228

Dear Ms. Legard:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map). As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

FHWA originally consulted with your office regarding the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) in August 2003. At that time, the Council declined to participate. Recently, FHWA has re-circulated a second draft Programmatic Agreement to all consulting parties. It was decided to do this because when it was originally circulated, few tribes opted to participate at that time. FHWA felt this re-circulation of the PA would allow the tribes another opportunity to participate in the PA. This second draft PA has been edited to address any comments from the first draft as well as to also address TCP properties more specifically.

The purpose of this letter is to notify the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and to determine Council participation pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.6(1). Please review this information and if the Council plans to participate in consultation, inform us within 15 days of receipt of this notice. If there is any additional information you require for this project or if you have any questions or comments, please contact Ruth Greenspan at (602) 712-6266 or via email at rgreenspan@azdot.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Enclosure (Map and draft Programmatic Agreement)

Signature for Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Concurrence

date

cc:

SThomash
RGreenspan (619E)
REllis (619E)
SDThomas (602E)
Dear Governor Narcia:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. As part of this effort, FHWA has previously invited you to review and comment on several cultural resource reports and a draft Programmatic Agreement (PA), and has requested your participation in discussions regarding the potential effects of the proposed undertaking on areas of traditional cultural significance, including the South Mountain Range.

Although no written response to previous consultations has been received, on September 28, 2005, a meeting was held at the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) to discuss Traditional Cultural Places (TCPs) and any other concerns your community has regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance that have the potential to be affected by this project. In attendance at the meeting were Barnaby Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, GRIC; Andrew Darling, Assistant Coordinator, Cultural Resource Management Program, GRIC; Katherine Neustadt and Ruth Greenspan, Historic Preservation Team, ADOT; and Mark Brobeck, Coordinator, Cultural Resources Section, HFA, Inc. The following items were discussed at the meeting:

1. The GRIC's Cultural Resource Specialist confirmed that all of South Mountain is viewed by the Akimel O'odham and Pueblo as an important and sacred place, and that cutting a road, or tunneling under, any part of it would be viewed as a desecration. In the opinions of Mr. Lewis and Dr. Darling the only way to mitigate impacts to South Mountain would be to avoid it completely.

2. It was acknowledged by all in attendance that the only ways to completely avoid South Mountain are:
   a) the no-build alternative, and
   b) constructing a segment of the freeway on the GRIC reservation.

   It was the opinion of Mr. Lewis that a freeway on the northern edge of the reservation would create an "unnatural" barrier that would serve to hinder access to South Mountain for Community members. In addition, Community members have voiced general objections to having a freeway on the reservation.

3. There are other TCPs and highly sensitive historic properties, such as the Villa Buena site, within some of the proposed alignments and in the general project area that have potential to be adversely affected by the proposed freeway.

4. Mr. Lewis said he was not aware of any TCPs north of the Salt River within the study area, but added that other Native American tribes should be consulted to confirm that there are no TCP concerns in that area.

5. Mr. Lewis and Dr. Darling agreed that GRIC will provide FHWA and ADOT with a formal response to the consultation letter of July 7, 2005 regarding TCPs, and agreed that the response would include a map of the project area with areas that GRIC would like to see avoided in the event that an alternative other than the no-build alternative is selected. This response will be made by October 3, 2005.

6. Mr. Lewis and Dr. Darling confirmed that GRIC is interested in participating in continuing consultation on this project, and agreed that GRIC will review and provide comments on the draft Programmatic Agreement by October 3, 2005.

At this time, no decisions have been made regarding the various alternatives being studied for this project. If GRIC provides FHWA with a map and written information regarding locations and possible mitigation measures for those areas your community would like to see avoided by the proposed freeway, FHWA will be in a position to ensure that GRIC's concerns are given full consideration in the decision-making process. Any information provided would be kept strictly confidential.

Additionally, if GRIC chooses to participate in future consultation as a Concurring Party to the Programmatic Agreement, any comments on the draft PA provided by October 3, 2005 will be considered in preparation of the final document. If GRIC opts to participate in cultural resource consultation at a later date, FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns of the Community.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your tribe/community through continued Section 106 consultation. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth L. Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS

Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc:
Barnaby Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, Cultural Resource Management Program, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton, AZ 85247
J. Andrew Darling, Assistant Coordinator, Cultural Resource Management Program, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, 192 S. Skill Center Road, Room 200, Sacaton, AZ 85247
Sandra Shade, Department of Transportation, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton, AZ 85247
S Thomas
RGreenspan(619E)
REllis (619E)
SDThomassdm
Robert E. Hollis, Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration  
Arizona Division  
400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 410  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  

RE: South Mountain Transportation Corridor, Section 106 Consultation, Traditional Cultural Places; HA-AZ NH-202-D (ADV); TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 01L

Dear Mr. Hollis,

This letter is in response to your letter dated July 7, 2005 regarding the “South Mountain Transportation Corridor, Section 106 Consultation, Traditional Cultural Places; HA-AZ NH-202-D (ADV); TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 01L.” The Environmental Impact Statement addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway. This project, which extends around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix, would be located in close proximity to the Gila River Indian Community and would negatively impact cultural resources, especially traditional cultural properties.

The Gila River Indian Community has concerns regarding 21 archaeological sites identified in the report “A Class III Cultural Resources Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County (Darling 2005)” as well as concerns for the protection of the traditional cultural properties in the South Mountain Range.

The cultural significance of South Mountain figures prominently in oral traditions 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) as well as the Pee Posh, formally known as the Maricopa Tribe of the Gila River Indian Community and of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community.

The Gila River Indian Community identifies the South Mountain as a Traditional Cultural Property. Traditional cultural properties are defined as historic sites that are important because of “their association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in the community’s history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community” (National Register Bulletin 38). Historic sites must exhibit four attributes: an age greater than 50 years; existence as a tangible property; integrity in relationship to the transmission and retention of cultural beliefs or the performance of ceremonial practices; and integrity of condition wherein their traditional cultural significance has not been reduced through alteration of location, setting, design or materials.

The Gila River Indian Community was established by an act of Congress in 1859 that comprises 372,000 acres that protected some of our ancestral lands and provided a land base for the Akimel O’odham and Pee Posh. However Muhadagi Doag (Greasy Mountain) was not included as part of the present day community. This mistake restricted and prevented access by community members to this sacred mountain. South Mountain stands prominently within the landscape and is central to our traditional and spiritual understanding of respect for the natural resources and the ecosystem. We believe this unique relationship enabled our ancestors to live harmoniously within this desert environment from time immemorial and this relationship is essential to the continued survival of our culture. Our elders reaffirm valuable cultural information regarding our people’s use of the mountain area through oral tradition, which continuously reiterates and renews our ties with the land through stories and songs of the people of this community.

Muhadagi Doag (South Mountain’s traditional name from the story of creation) has been well documented by several researchers in published literature as a traditional cultural property of central importance to the Akimel O’odham of the Gila River Indian Community (Bahr 2001:13, 32; Boatwick 2002b:1; Densmore 1929-41; Lloyd 1911:77, 125; Saxton and Saxton 1973:328; Rea 1996:18; Russell 1908:216, 224, 278; Spier 1933:253). The South Mountain has also been documented as a traditional cultural property known as Avikw’ox’os, which is documented in published literature as well (Harrington 1908:33; Rea 1996; Spier 1933:252-253). Muhadagi Doag is one of the mountain homes of Se’due also known as Miti, an ancient deity of the O’odham. Due to the sacred nature of the area, private traditional religious activities are still conducted in various forms by individual community members today.

Although some modern impacts have occurred since the establishment of the City of Phoenix, the South Mountain range continues to hold its religious and cultural significance. The proposed transportation corridor will be intrusive to the spiritual connections associated with the people of the Gila River Indian Community and it will forever alter the landscape and view-shed of South Mountain as they are experienced by the people of this Community. Trails and shrines located within the proposed corridor will be destroyed and contribute to diminishing our traditional way of life. Numerous petroglyphs have been recorded within and around South Mountain that demonstrate its traditional religious uses since the prehistoric days of our Holokan ancestors.

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended provides a compliance process for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and those impacts to these sites must be considered in order to provide an opportunity to protect traditional
The Gila River Indian Community identifies archaeological sites, Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 ASM) and Pueblo del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 ASM), as traditional cultural properties. Although modern development has impacted the Villa Buena site, in particular, and limited archaeological investigations have been conducted, this site still holds its physical and cultural integrity and its religious and cultural significance has not diminished.

FHWA must take appropriate mitigation measures in adversely affecting the physical integrity of these traditional cultural properties which are sacred sites. In our view cutting out part of the mountain or tunneling for the proposed road project will adversely impact South Mountain. Your full consideration of our compelling cultural connection to South Mountain must be acknowledged.

The Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) appreciates the efforts of the Federal Highway Administration in addressing our concerns and anticipates meaningful consultations in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act on this undertaking. Please call GRIC Cultural Resource Specialist, Barnaby V. Lewis at 1-520-562-3570 should you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

Mary Thomas
Gila River Indian Community

cc: John C. Ravesloot GRIC-CRMP Coordinator
Larry Stephenson, GRIC Land Use Planning & Zoning
Sandra Shade, GRIC Department of Transportation
Kae Neustadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist
Ruth Greenspan, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist
Mark Brodbeck, HDR Engineering, Inc.
Four Southern Tribes of Arizona

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

August 17, 2005

Dear President Ramos:

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is following up on our recent request for input on the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) for the South Mountain Corridor freeway project (letter from Hollis, FHWA, July 7, 2005). ADOT/FHWA are in the process of finalizing the South Mountain Corridor PA to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues for the project. A draft PA was circulated in July 2005 along with an invitation to participate in discussions regarding the potential effects of the project on areas of traditional cultural significance, however, at this time, few tribes have opted to participate.

ADOT on behalf of FHWA would like to offer another opportunity for your tribe/community to participate in the PA and in discussions regarding potential effects to areas of traditional cultural significance. Please sign below if you would like to be included as a Concurring Party to the final PA and return to ADOT by September 2, 2005. If your office opts to participate in cultural resource consultation at a later date, ADOT/FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-8636 or e-mail slaine<adot.gov.

Sincerely,

Jenelle E. Laine, Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue Rm. 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3313

Signature for Salt River Pima-Maricopa Concurrence 10-2-05

cc: Deborah Hasabih, Acting Cultural Programs Supervisor, Cultural and Environmental Services
Kelly Washington, Acting Cultural Resources Department Director
Kim Rieko, Community Development Director
SThomas (FHWA)
Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. As part of this effort, our office submitted two cultural resources reports on August 26, 2005. The reports were entitled An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. In your response letter dated September 19, 2005, you found the report adequate and provided several comments requesting clarification on the following eligibility recommendations:

- The first comment noted inconsistencies between the eligibility summary in the consultation letter and the Class I report. We have confirmed that a total of 27 previously recorded historic and prehistoric archaeological sites were identified in the Class I report. Five of the sites were previously determined eligible, 7 were considered not eligible, 7 had not been previously evaluated, and the eligibility status of 8 sites is unknown.

- The second comment noted that the consultation letter neglected to mention that the Barnes Dairy and the Dad Farmstead are part of the 6100 West Dobbins Road Streetscape. We would like to confirm that the Barnes Dairy is recommended as eligible both individually and as a contributing component of the Dobbins Streetscape. In contrast, while the Dad Farmstead is recommended as not eligible as an individual property, it is recommended eligible as a contributing component of the Dobbins Streetscape.

- Third, Dr. Collins commented that the 6100 West Dobbins Road Streetscape is more appropriately eligible under Criterion A than Criterion D. We concur that the Dobbins Streetscape is eligible under A, rather than D.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. If you find the reports adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-6266 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Ruth L. Greenspan
Historic Preservation Specialist
Environmental & Enhancement Group
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Rm. 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Signature for SEPO Concurrence

Date

cc:
SThomas (FHWA)
WVachon (FHWA)
The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of ten alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (E1, W55, W71, W101WPR, W101WBR, W101WBR, W101CRF, W101CRF, W101BFR, and W101EFR) that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1000 to 3046 m wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes four technical studies:

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: “A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 17, 2003), BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanswimanka, September 10, 2003); Yanapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003), SRP (Audius, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: “A Class III Cultural Resources Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona.” (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is on-going. To date, concurrence responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005), Bureau of Reclamation (Ellis, July 12, 2005), Bureau of Land Management (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Quewakia, July 12, 2005), Yanapai Prescott Indian Tribe (Kwiatkowski, July 22, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report is titled An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2001, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona. The Class III report is titled An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2001, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona. Both reports are enclosed for consultation and discussed below.

Addendum Class I Overview Results

The addendum Class I overview, titled An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2001, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck and Touchin 2005), identified 27 previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites, five historical-period linear sites, and 129 historic building properties (see attached Table A). In addition, historical maps indicate that several prehistoric canal alignments pass through the study area. For the archaeological sites, five are considered eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D, five sites are not eligible, nine sites have not been evaluated for eligibility, and the eligibility status of eight sites is unknown due to a lack of available information. Historically
documented prehistoric canals in the area are viewed as potentially eligible resources that should be investigated if encountered.

The Class I study revealed five historical-period linear sites in the study area. The linear sites are considered eligible overall under Criterion A with contributing and non-contributing segments.

Of the 129 historic building properties, 25 have been previously recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and/or C, 37 have been recommended as not eligible, and 67 have not been evaluated. Seventy-one historic building properties are in the Capital Redevelopment Area in Phoenix, an unannounced residential area with an abundance of historic building properties. Eighty-eight of the historic building properties are in the Villa Verde Historic District, which is listed on the Phoenix Register of Historic Places. Although the Villa Verde properties were previously recommended as not eligible to the NRHP, they should be re-evaluated within the context of an early Phoenix suburban neighborhood.

The vast majority of cultural resources identified in the addendum Class I study area will not be affected by any of the proposed alternative alignments. Cultural resources in the W55 and W71 alignments include AZ T:12:26 (ASM), AZ T:12:4 (MNA), AZ T:12:5 (MNA), AZ T:12:10 (ASM) (Los Cofman), AZ T:12:38 (ASM), and AZ T:12:178 (ASM) (Los Aumentos). Cultural resources in the W101 alignments include AZ T:7:167 (ASM) (Grand Canal), AZ T:10:83 (ASM) (Roosevelt Canal), AZ T:11:26 (ASM), and AZ T:12:178 (Los Aumentos).

Addendum Class III Survey Results

An addendum survey of shifted alternative alignments, defined in December 2004, and agricultural fields that had been plowed in early 2005 since the time of the initial Class III survey conducted by the GRC (Darling 2004), was conducted by HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR). In addition, the addendum Class III survey included documentation of 22 historic sites not included in the initial Class I survey (Darling 2004). The results are reported in a report titled "Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2005, South Mountain Freeway EIS & L/DCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2005), which is enclosed for your review and comment. One archaeological site and 21 historic sites were identified in the proposed alternative alignments (see attached Table B). The archaeological site is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A. Two historic sites are recommended as eligible under Criterion C. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A and B. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A and C. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A and D. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criterion D. Two historic sites are recommended as eligible under Criterion C. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A and B. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A and C. One historic site is recommended as eligible under Criteria A and D. Twelve historic sites are recommended as not eligible.

Archaeological Sites

- AZ T:12:221 (ASM) is a prehistoric Hohokam artifact scatter. The site is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criterion B for its potential to provide important information on prehistoric settlement and land use in the lower Salt River Valley near the confluence of Gila and Salt rivers.

129th Avenue

The SRP 99th Avenue Lateral, located on the east side of South 99th Avenue and north of Lower Buckeye Road, is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A as a rare irrigation feature that was once common in the agricultural landscape of the Salt River Valley. The lateral is being converted to an underground pipe in response to the Pecan Promenade and City of Phoenix development projects. SRP and Reclamation are currently in the process of preparing a report for the canal that documents its history and engineering, as a form of mitigation. Upon completion of these projects, the 99th Avenue Lateral will no longer be considered a contributing component of the overall SRP irrigation network.

Commercial Properties

- Mother’s Restaurant at 5760 West Buckeye Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack historical significance and integrity. The original gas station was heavily modified as a result of its conversion to a restaurant in the 1970s. The gas station has lost its integrity of setting and feeling, as it is in a modern industrial zone with old US 80 (West Buckeye Road) widened to a five-lane urban thoroughfare.

- The Jarvis Marine Repair Shop at 3800 West Buckeye Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to its age and lack of architectural significance.

Farms

- The Hudson Farm located at 9300 South 99th Avenue is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A as an exceptional example of a historic farmedstead in Laveen. It retains a complete suite of agricultural buildings and structures from the period of significance that are in good condition and well preserved. In addition, the farmstead does not have any intrusive modern buildings or structures that would detract from its historic setting and feeling (other than a large satellite dish which could be easily removed). The farmstead’s combination and overall layout of older buildings and structures, along with other contributing elements such as the mature landscaping, palm tree-lined driveways and entrance gates, provides an inclusive picture of what a working farmedstead was like in Laveen during the agricultural era period of significance. The property retains integrity of location, workmanship, materials, design, and association. Furthermore, the surrounding agricultural field provides the contextual framework within which the property conveys its historic character as a farmedstead. Thus, the agricultural field is an important contributing component that defines and preserves the farmstead’s integrity of setting and feeling. It is recommended that the entire 38-acre parcel is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A as an exceptional example of a historic-period Laveen farmstead. Additionally, the pair of stone silos are recognized as individually eligible to the NRHP under Criterion C, as rare examples of a once common architectural form that was a fundamental component of Laveen’s historic agricultural landscape.
Farmsteads

- The Anderson Farm Tenant Residences at 9901 and 9903 West Van Buren Road are recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance.

- The Carter Farmstead at 7201 and 7215 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP. The farmstead has lost too many of its primary elements to convey a good sense of its historic character. While it provides a picturesque rural setting, it does not provide an accurate portrayal of its historic composition.

- The Cecil and Mary Colvin Farmstead located at 5139 West Estrella Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP because it has lost too many of its period elements to convey its historic character. The farmhouse is the only primary element remaining from the historic period; however, it lacks integrity and architectural distinction.

- The Dad Farmstead at 6102 West Dobbs Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical significance, architectural merit, and integrity. Individually, the farmhouse and barn have been modified and lack architectural distinction. Overall, the property fails to convey its original historic character as a working farmstead.

- The Dean Farmstead at 9445 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance and diminished integrity of workmanship, design, and materials. The farmhouse is heavily modified through additions and is in a general state of disrepair.

- The Maddux House at 9115 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance.

- The Parker Farmstead at 3606 South 83rd Avenue is recommended as not eligible due to a lack of historical significance, architectural merit, and integrity. Individually, the farmhouse and barn have been modified and lack architectural distinction. Overall, the property fails to convey its original historic character as a working farmstead.

- The Pitrat Farmstead at 5901 West Elliot Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP due to a lack of architectural integrity and historical significance. The historical layout of the farmstead has been lost as a result of property subdivisions and new construction. The house is heavily modified from its original form through multiple additions. Although the property is consistent with a rural agricultural landscape, in its current condition, it no longer conveys an accurate representation of its historical period character.

- The Quinonez House at 9131 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance and diminished integrity of workmanship, design, and materials.

- The Dad Farmstead at 6102 West Dobbs Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP as a non-contributing component of a larger NRHP-listed property.

- The Carter Farmstead at 7201 and 7215 West Broadway Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP due to a lack of historical and architectural significance. None of the farmstead's historic period buildings and structures remain, except for the farmhouse built in 1950, which is heavily modified with additions.

- The Colvin-Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy located at 6159 West Dobbins Road is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP because of a lack of integrity and historical significance. However, the dairy 'head-to-toe' barn is recommended as individually eligible under Criterion C as a rare example of an intact dairy barn used during the height of its agricultural era.

- The Hackin Farmstead/Dairy located at 10048 South 59th Avenue is recommended as not eligible to the NRHP because of a lack of integrity and historical significance. However, the dairy "flat" barn is recommended as individually eligible under Criterion C as a rare example of a once common form that was a characteristic feature in Laveen's historic landscape and an integral component of its local economy. It is one of the few remaining family-operated dairy barns in Laveen. It is also recognized as an important within the broader context of the Salt River Valley's dairy industry as a surviving example of a dairy "head-to-toe" barn used during the height of its agricultural era.

Feedlots

- The C.O. Pitrat & Sons Feedlot in the 6100 Block of West Elliot Road is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP because of a lack of historical and architectural significance. The feedlot is 50 years old; however, most of its operation occurred in modern times. The structures and buildings are poorly preserved and generally lack integrity.

Highways

- US 80 (AZ FF:9:17 [ASM]) is considered eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A at the national level as one of the first designated transcontinental routes and for its association with the development of the U.S. interstate transportation network. The segment within the study area has been widened and modernized and no longer retains integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. Furthermore, its integrity of setting and feeling are lost with most of the surrounding landscape transformed from rural agricultural to urban commercial/industrial. It is recommended that the segment in the study area is not eligible to the NRHP as a non-contributing component of US 80.
Historic Townsites:

- The historic Santa Marie Townsite, located at the southwest corner of Lower Buckeye Road and 83rd Avenue, is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and B. The unincorporated townsite is a living example of an historic, rural Hispanic agricultural community in the Salt River Valley. Communities such as Santa Maria had an important role in the development and operation of the Valley’s agricultural industry throughout the 20th century. In addition, the townsite has an association with Khattar Joseph Nackard, an Arizona businessman who had an influential role developing and shaping the State’s economic and commercial future. As such, it is recommended that the Santa Marie Townsite is eligible for the NRHP under Criteria A and B.

Railroads:

- The Southern Pacific Railroad Wellton-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line (AZ T:10:84 [ASM]) is recommended as eligible to the NRHP for its association with the development of Arizona’s railroad network. The railroad has been maintained and upgraded over the years and remains an important component of Arizona’s transportation network.

Streetscapes:

- The 6100 Block West Dobbins Road Streetscape is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and D as an example and reflection of the lower Salt River Valley’s agricultural past. In contrast to a more common, barren rural streetscape defined by a two-lane road passing between broad, open agricultural fields, the 6100 Block contains a suite of rural agricultural elements that conveys a strong sense of what rural life was like in Arizona in the early to mid 1900s (i.e., it captures more of the human element). Rural streetscapes are becoming increasingly rare in the lower Salt River Valley, as agricultural communities are replaced by urban development. It is recommended that the 6100 Block West Dobbins Road Streetscape is eligible to the NRHP under Criteria A and D, not only for its association with Arizona’s early agricultural development, but more so for its information potential to provide future Arizonans with an idea of what rural agricultural life was like in the lower Salt River Valley during the early years of statehood.

All sites are located on private land, except for the Sachs-Webster Farmhouse (7515 West Baseline Road – Flood Control District Maricopa County; SRP 99th Avenue Lateral – Bureau of Reclamation/Salt River Project; US 60 AZ FF:9:17 [ASM] – City of Phoenix, and the 6100 Block West Dobbins Road Streetscape – City of Phoenix. FHWA/ADOT is concurrently consulting with these agencies regarding the eligibility of these sites located on their land.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed Class I overview and Class III survey report and information provided in this letter. If you find the reports adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. The final Programmatic Agreement is being completed and will be submitted for signature in September 2005. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail RGreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Serele E. Laine, Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue Rm. 213 E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Enclosures

CC: SThomas (FHWA); WVachon (FHWA)

Date 11-1-05
Table A. Addendum Class I Overview Report Eligibility and Management Summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignments</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility (Criterion)</th>
<th>Management Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W15/W1</td>
<td>AZ: T:1:24 (ASM)</td>
<td>Hohokam Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>TIN, RIE, S4</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AZ: T:1:24 (MNA)</td>
<td>Hohokam Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>TIN, RIE, S6</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AZ: T:1:24 (MNA)</td>
<td>Hohokam Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>TIN, RIE, S5</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AZ: T:1:24 (ASM)</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>TIN, RIE, S1, 2, 4</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AZ: T:1:24 (ASM)</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>TIN, RIE, S5</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AZ: T:1:24 (ASM)</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>TIN, RIE, S2</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AZ: T:1:24 (ASM)</td>
<td>Hohokam Village</td>
<td>TIN, RIE, S1</td>
<td>ADOT, Private</td>
<td>Eligible (D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B. Addendum Class III Survey Report Eligibility and Management Summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>(Ny)Previously Recorded</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Township, Range, Section</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ: T:1:221 (ASM)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W10</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Eligible (E)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 Block W. Dobbins Road Streetscape</td>
<td>6100 Block W. Dobbins Rd.</td>
<td>Rural Streetscape</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W55</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Eligible (A,D)</td>
<td>Avoid, or else mitigate adverse effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Farm Tenant Residences</td>
<td>9901 and 9903 W. Van Buren Rd.</td>
<td>Tenant Residences</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W101 (all)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. O. Pires &amp; Sons Feedlot</td>
<td>6100 Block W. Elliot Rd.</td>
<td>Feedlot</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W71, W101 (all)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Farmstead</td>
<td>7201 and 7215 W. Broadway Rd.</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil and Mary Carter Farmstead</td>
<td>5139 W. Van Buren Rd.</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colvin-Tyson Farmstead/Dairy</td>
<td>6159 W. Dobbins Rd.</td>
<td>Farmstead/Dairy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W55</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Dairy Farm; Not Eligible; Dairy Farm: Eligible (C); Contributing elements to 6100 Block Streetscape</td>
<td>Avoid dairy farm, or else mitigate; avoid portion within 6100 Block Streetscape boundaries, or else mitigate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Notes:
1) all the alignments cross the property parcel but do not intersect the farmstead.
2) W55 crosses the property parcel but misses the farmstead and dairy barn.
3) All the alternative alignments pass within about 100 m of the farmstead but do not directly impact it.
• Under Agency on the Abstract page (iii): ASLD, BLM and the COP Parks and Recreation Department should also be in this section because they are listed as having jurisdiction for the alternative alignments on the first page of the cover letter of this report from Serelle E. Laine for ADOT. Please revise this.

• Under Location on the Abstract page (iii), partial paragraph at the bottom of the page, last line and partial paragraph at the top of page iv, first line: According to Figures 2-7, Sections 3 to 5, 8, 9, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 29, and 31 to 36 should read Sections 3 to 5, 8 to 10, 15 to 17, 20 to 22, 27 to 29, and 31 to 36. Also, Sections 31 to 36 of Township 2 North, Range 1 West and Sections 1 to 12 of Township 1 North, Range 1 West should be added to this section. Please fix this here and under the Introduction, page 1, first paragraph.

• Under List of Sites on the W55 and W71 Alignments on the Abstract page (iv), final line: AZ T:5- (ASM) should read AZ T:5-X (ASM) here and everywhere it occurs in the report.

• Under Management Recommendations on the Abstract page (v), final paragraph and under Summary and Management Recommendations, page 63, partial paragraph at the bottom of the page, and partial paragraph at the top of page 64: Add the following sentence at the end of each paragraph: if the resources are identified within the City of Phoenix, the City of Phoenix Archaeology Office should be contacted and allowed time to properly assess the materials.

• On the Table of Contents page (vi), List of Figures: vi should read viii.

• On the Table of Contents page (vi), List of Tables: vi should read ix.

• Under List of Figures, page viii: Figure 4 should read Figure 3. As a result, all of the remaining figure numbers are off by one both here and in the text of the report. Please revise this here and wherever it occurs in the report.

• Under the Introduction, page 1, initial paragraph, line 3: Omit it is a between This and federally-funded.

• Under Chapter 2: Environmental Context, page 4, initial paragraph, line 4: Avra Fria should read Agua Fria.

In Table 1, page 6: Please state whose cultural chronology you are basing the table on (Dean [1991])?

In Table 1, page 6: You place the Vyahi phase before the Pioneer period, yet under Early Formative and Pioneer Periods, page 8, partial paragraph at the bottom of the page, initial sentence, you state that the Vyahi phase is a part of the Pioneer period. Please revise this.

Under Paleo-Indian Period, page 7, line 4: hills sites should read hill sites.

Under Paleo-Indian Period, page 7, line 10: You state that a single specimen was recovered from the northern edge of the basin. Please clarify which basin you are referring to. Also, for more information on Paleoindian finds in the area, please see:


Under Archaeic Period, page 7, initial paragraph, line 9: Please move the dash from after assemblages to after sedentism.

Under Archaeic Period, page 8, partial paragraph at the top of the page, first and second lines: Please add the following report to your list of work done on Archaeic sites in the Phoenix Basin:


Under Colonial Period, page 10, partial paragraph at the top of the page, line 6: Insert the word a after become.

Under Colonial Period, page 10, final paragraph, lines 4-5: Doyel (1978), Elsom et al. (1995), Faries (1952) and Mitchell (1986) are not in the References Cited section. Please revise this.

Under Classic Period, page 12, partial paragraph at the top of the page, line 3: Howard (1987) is not in the References Cited section. Please revise this.

Under Classic Period, page 12, partial paragraph at the top of the page, second complete sentence: For information on the platform mound at Pueblo Grande, please see:


Under Historic Period, page 13, line 2: if divided should read is divided.

Under The Hispanic Era (A.D. 1694-1853), page 14, partial paragraph at the bottom of the page, initial sentence: It is not clear what group of people are you referring to.
when you mention the word Western. Do you mean the Western Apache? Please revise this.
- Under Chapter 4: Regulatory Context, page 17, paragraph 2, line 5: Please omit the comma after NHPA and add a period.
- Under Chapter 4: Regulatory Context, page 17, partial paragraph at the bottom of the page, initial line: State Historic Preservation of 1982 seems incomplete. Do you mean State Historic Preservation Act of 1982?
- Under Chapter 5: Results, page 19, paragraph 2, line 2: You state that 76 projects were surveys, yet more than 80 surveys are listed in Table 2. Please revise this.
- Under Chapter 5: Results, page 19, paragraph 4, line 2 and under Chapter 6: Summary and Management Recommendations, page 65, paragraphs 2 and 4: You state that there were 129 historic buildings, yet 130 are listed in Table 7.
- Under Chapter 5: Results, page 19, paragraph 4, sentence 3: You state that five archaeological sites are not eligible, yet seven sites are listed as not evaluated in Table 5. Please revise this.
- In Table 2, page 21: The Schroeder (1995) survey is not shown in Figure 5. Please revise this. Also,Stubbing and Mitchell should read Stubbing and Mitchell.
- In Table 2, page 22: The Hart (1999) survey is not shown in Figure 3. Please revise this.
- In Table 2, page 23: Please indicate which Touchin and Brodbeck (2003) you mean (a or b).
- In Table 3, page 24: The projects listed for the Excavations at Las Colinas, the Clark and Henderson (2001) project and the Boston and Ryan (2002) project are not shown in Figure 5. Also, the Shepher (1998) project is not shown in Figure 3. Please revise this.
- In Table 4, page 25: The Marshall (1996) project is not shown in Figure 5. Please revise this.
- In Table 4, page 25: The location of the Hart (2001a) project should read T2N, R2E, S32.
- On Figure 2, page 26: Four UTM's must be displayed. Please revise this both here and throughout the report.
- On Figure 4, page 28: Hart 2001c should read Hart 2001b.
- On Figure 5, page 29: Hart 2001d should read Hart 2001c.
- In the caption of Table 5, page 32: Previous should read Previously.
- In Table 5, page 32: You mention the site labeled "ASU" and cite our base map as a reference, but this site is not labeled "ASU" on any of our maps. On whose records is this site labeled ASU?
- In Table 5, page 32: According to our records, Midvale-6 and AZ T:12:28m(ASU) are two separate sites. Please revise this.
- In Table 5, page 32: Site AZ T:12:184(ASM) should be placed in the Site Number column for the Fangmeier (2002) project.
- In Table 5, page 33: Marshall (1997c) is not in the References Cited section. Please revise this.
- In Table 5, page 34: Site AZ T:12:13(PG) is located far from this project area. It is located in T1S R1E S3. There was originally some confusion on the PGM site cards (which has been resolved) as to whether this site is located in T1N or T1S, which may have caused it to be erroneously placed in T1N on SHPO inventory J120.
- In Table 5, page 35, References for AZ T:12:38(ASM): Please include the other report references that were listed in the site file you obtained when you conducted your search at PGM, especially Laye (1988), Excavations at AZ T:12:38 (ASM). In The 1982-1984 Excavations at Las Colinas: The Site and Its Features.
- In Table 6, page 36: Please indicate which Touchin and Brodbeck (2003) you are referring to (a or b).
- On Figure 9, page 47: Many sites are labeled but not displayed. Please revise this both here and in other figures where this occurs.
- On Figure 9, page 47: The site boundary of Los Aumentos does not match that in our database. Please explain any discrepancies in the way that this site is plotted.
- Under Archaeological Sites (NRIIP-Ineligible), page 58, paragraph 2, initial sentence: You state that sites AZ T:12:4(MNA) and AZ T:12:5(MNA) have not been formally evaluated for eligibility and are located within the proposed alignments. Since there is federal involvement, these sites will need to be formally evaluated for eligibility if they will be impacted by the project.
- Under References Cited: Please insert spaces between the following reports: ASM (1998) and Bassan (1933); McDermott (2003) and McDonald (1974); Rosenberg (1983a) and Rosenberg (1983b);
- Under References Cited, page 69: The Burden (2002) report that was mentioned in the cover letter from ADOT is not in the References Cited Section (A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona).

Recommendations:
Please revise the report accordingly and send one final bound copy of this report to the City of Phoenix Archaeology Office. Please send the appropriate number of final bound copies of this report to the lead federal agency. They will then forward copies to all consulting parties.

Reviewed By: Robert A. Serocki Jr. and Todd W. Boswick, Ph.D. Date: 11/3/05

Collection to be submitted: N/A

Remarks:
Appendix 2-1

Report Review Form

Project No.: ADOT Date Report Submitted: 9/26/05

Report Title: An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2021, South Mountain
Foreway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona

Draft: X Final: 

Author: Brodbeck Firm: HDR

Action: Revise & Resubmit

Comments:
• Under Land Jurisdiction on the Abstract page (ii): FCDMC should also be in this section because it is listed as a land owner in the second table in the Abstract on page iv. Please revise this.
• Under Eligibility and Management Recommendations on the Abstract page (v), paragraph 2, initial line: You mention an archaeological site. Please clarify if this site is historic or prehistoric.
• Under Eligibility and Management Recommendations on the Abstract page (v), final paragraph and under Management Summary, page 130, final paragraph: Add the following sentence at the end of each paragraph: If the resources are identified within the City of Phoenix, the City of Phoenix Archaeology Office should also be contacted and allowed time to properly assess the materials.
• Under Table Data on the Abstract page (vii), line 2 and under Feedlots, page 156, line 2: architecture should read architectural.
• Under Historic Townsites on the Abstract page (vi) and under Historic Townsites, page 157: If you will use both Santa Maria and Santa Marie to describe the same township, please explain the difference as you do on page 110.
• Under Project Background, page 1, line 14: The publication date for MAG (2003) is shown as 2002 in the Reference Cited section. Please revise this.
• In Table 1.1, page 4: Survey Area 5 looks much larger than 10 acres in Figure 1.5. Please revise this.
• On Figure 1.4, page 6: Please include the line that identifies quad map boundaries in the legend both here and in any figures where it occurs.
• Under Chapter 3: Cultural Context, page 16, lines 4-5: Please enclose the time period of the Formative Period in parentheses, as with the other major stages.

• Under Paleo-Indian Period, page 16, second-to-last line: For more information on Paleo-Indian finds in the area, please see:
  North, Chris, Michael S. Foster, John M. Lindly and Douglas R. Mitchell
  2005 A Newly Discovered Clovis Point from the Phoenix Basin and an Update on Arizona Clovis Point Attributes. Xena 70(3): 293-307.
• Under Archaic Period, page 16, initial paragraph, line 9: Please move the dash from after assemblages to after sedentism.
• Under Archaic Period, page 17, initial paragraph, lines 3-4: Please add the following report to your list of work done on Archaic sites in the Phoenix Basin:
  Hackbarth, Mark R.
• Under Colonial Period, page 19, partial paragraph at the top of the page, line 8: Insert the word a after become.
• Under Colonial Period, page 19, final paragraph, line 5: Mitchell (1986) is not in the References Cited section. Please revise this.
• Under Classic Period, page 21, partial paragraph at the top of the page, third complete sentence: For information on the platform mound at Pueblo Grande, please see:
  Downum, Christian and Todd Bostwick
• Under Classic Period, page 21, final paragraph, line 12: Sires (1983) is not in the References Cited section. Please revise this.
• Under The Hispanic Era (A.D. 1694-1833), page 23, partial paragraph at the bottom of the page, initial sentence: It is not clear what group of people are you referring to when you mention the word Western. Do you mean the Western Apache? Please revise this.
• Under The Hispanic Era (A.D. 1694-1833), page 24, final paragraph, final sentence: Mention the Mexican-American War and the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (1848) as well.
• Under Chapter 4: Regulatory Context, page 26, paragraph 2, line 5: Omit the comma after NHPA and add a period.
• Under Chapter 4: Regulatory Context, page 26, partial paragraph at the bottom of the page, initial line: State Historic Preservation of 1962 seems incomplete. Do you mean State Historic Preservation Act of 1987?
• Under Chapter 5: Methodology, page 28, initial paragraph, line 3: In addition to referring readers to the Burden (2002) report, refer readers to the Addendum Class I report that was recently compiled as well (Brodbeck and Touchin 2005).
• Under NRHP Eligibility and Management Recommendations for site AZ T:12:221(ASM), page 33, initial sentence: Please insert the word 'potentially' before 'eligible'. Also, this site needs to be formally evaluated for eligibility.
• On Figure 6.4, page 34: The legend gives an aerial photo date of Summer, 2003, yet there is no aerial photo in this figure. Please revise this.
• Under References Cited, page 159: The Burden (2002) report was mentioned in the cover letter of this report from Serelle E. Laine for ADOT is not in the References Cited Section (A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona).

Recommendations:
The City of Phoenix Archaeology Office concurs with the recommendation that archaeological and historic sites determined eligible for the NRHP should be avoided if possible. If avoidance is not possible, then any adverse effects should be mitigated. Please revise the report accordingly and send one final bound copy of this report to the City of Phoenix Archaeology Office. Please send the appropriate number of final bound copies of this report to the lead federal agency. They will then forward copies to all consulting parties.

Reviewed By: Robert A. Serocki Jr. and Todd W. Bestwick, Ph.D. Date: 11/1/05

Collection to be submitted: No
Remarks: No collections were made.

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
206 South Seventeenth Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Jaime Namie
Governor

Victor M. Mendez
Director

Peter Stowe, Program Manager
Joe Joggin, Cultural Resource Specialist
Tohono O'odham Nation
Cultural Affairs Office
P.O. Box 837
Sells, Arizona 85634

RE: Project No: NH-202-DADY
TRACS No. 2003 MA 054 H5764 01L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Continuing Section 116 Consultation
Second Draft Programmatic Agreement follow-up

Dear Sirs:
The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is following up on our recent request for input on the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) for the South Mountain Corridor freeway project (letter from Hollis, FHWA, July 7, 2005). ADOT/FHWA are in the process of finalizing the South Mountain Corridor PA to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues for the project. A draft PA was circulated in July 2005 along with an invitation to participate in discussions regarding the potential effects of the project on areas of traditional cultural significance, however, at this time, few tribes have opted to participate.

ADOT on behalf of FHWA would like to offer another opportunity for your tribe/community to participate in the PA and in discussions regarding potential effects to areas of traditional cultural significance. Please sign below if you would like to be included as a Concurring Party to the final PA and return to ADOT by September 2, 2005. If your office opts to participate in cultural resource consultation at a later date, ADOT/FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-8636 or e-mail slaine@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Serelle E. Laine, Coordinator
Historic Preservation Team
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue, 213E Mail Drop 615E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

Date: 11-8-05

cc: SThermas (FHWA)
Dear Governor Narcia:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) appreciate your letter dated September 30, 2005 responding to our consultation regarding traditional cultural places. This consultation is part of the process of preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the South Mountain Freeway project. Your letter expressed concern for the protection of 21 archaeological sites and three areas of traditional cultural importance—South Mountain itself, the Villa Buena site, and the Pueblo del Alamo site. The letter also requested that FHWA take appropriate mitigation measures to address adverse effects to the physical integrity of these traditional cultural places, which are considered sacred sites. The purpose of this letter is to request more specific information regarding the boundaries and cultural importance of these properties so that mitigation strategies can be developed within the context of Section 106 consultations of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR Part 800).

Under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP's) are defined as historic sites eligible for inclusion in the National Register because of their association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that are rooted in the community's history, and (B) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community (National Register Bulletin Number 38). Historic sites must exhibit four attributes: an age greater than 50 years; existence as a tangible property; integrity in relationship to the transmission and retention of cultural beliefs or the performance of ceremonial practices; and integrity of condition wherein their traditional cultural significance has not been reduced through alteration of location, setting, design or materials. A TCP may be eligible for the National Register under one or more of the following Criteria: (A) association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history; (B) association with the lives of persons significant in the past; (C) the embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; and (D) history of yielding, potential to yield, information important in prehistory or history (National Register Bulletin Number 38). Your letter dated September 30, 2005 identifies South Mountain as a TCP and explains how it is rooted in the community's history and is important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the Akimel O'odham and Pee Posh ceremonial and religious activity that is rooted in their history and integral to continuation of their cultural identity. To finalize this recommendation and fulfill FHWA's Section 106 obligations, we need to be able define the South Mountain TCP as 'a tangible property,' as defined by the NHPA. Therefore, FHWA requests that the Gila River Indian Community provide a map marked with the physical boundaries of the South Mountain TCP, to assist with our environmental issues assessment.

Your letter also identifies two archaeological sites as TCP's, Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 ASM) and Pueblo del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 ASM); however, no information is provided about the association of these sites with cultural practices or beliefs of the community that are rooted in the community's history and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community. FHWA recommends the two archaeological sites as eligible for the NHRP under Criterion D. Additional research would be required to evaluate their status as TCP's. FHWA recommends that a TCP evaluation be prepared to address the sites' TCP eligibility, so FHWA can proceed appropriately. Any information provided in a TCP study would be kept strictly confidential and not included in any documents released to the public.

FHWA and ADOT appreciate the efforts of the Gila River Indian Community in addressing these complex issues and are committed to continuing consultation with the Community on these and other issues relating to this project. We are grateful for your efforts in providing a tangible boundary for the South Mountain TCP so that we can move forward with our legal obligations.

Please review the information provided in this letter. If you agree that a TCP evaluation would be appropriate to evaluate the eligibility of Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 ASM) and Pueblo del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 ASM) for the National Register as TCP's, please indicate your concurrence by signing below.

We look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to call Steve Thomas at 602-379-3645 ext. 117 or email stephen.thomas@fhwa.dot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Division Administrator

Signature for Gila River Indian Community Concurrence

Date

cc:
Barabah Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box E, Sacaton, AZ 85247
John C. Ravello, Coordinator, Cultural Resource Management Program, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, AZ 85247
Sandra Shade, Director, Department of Transportation, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton, AZ 85247
SThomas, BVacho, KDavis, REllis (6198), RGreenespan (6198)
SDThomas.com

Arizona Division
400 East Van Buren Street
One Arizona Center Suite 410
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2364

November 22, 2005

In Reply Refer To: HA-AZ

TRAC No. 2225: MA 049 15704-01-L

South Mountain Transportation Corridor

Section 106 Consultation

Traditional Cultural Places

Mr. Richard P. Narcia, Governor
Gila River Indian Community
P.O. Box 97
Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Mr. Barnaby Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box E, Sacaton, AZ 85247

Buckle Up America
Dear Governor Narcia:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are in the process of finalizing the South Mountain Corridor Programmatic Agreement (PA) to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues for the project. A draft PA was circulated in July 2005. At this time, FHWA is following up on our previous request for participation in the PA for the South Mountain Corridor freeway project (letter from Hollis, FHWA, July 7, 2005). FHWA would like to offer another opportunity for your tribe/community to participate in the PA. Please sign below if you would like to be included as a Concurring Party to the PA and return to FHWA by December 23, 2005. If your office opts to participate in cultural resource consultation at a later date, FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns you may have. We look forward to continuing consultation with your office.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Steve Thomas at 602-379-3645 x 117 or email: Steve.Thomas@fhwa.dot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for GRIC Concurrence

Date

cc:

Sandra Shade,
Director, Department of Transportation, GRIC, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton, AZ 85247

STThomas, RGreenspan (619E), REllis (619E)

December 27, 2005

Mr. Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
400 East Van Buren Street
One Arizona Center Suite 410
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2264

REF: Proposed South Mountain Transportation Corridor Project
Maricopa County, Arizona

Dear Mr. Hollis:

The ACHP received your notification and supporting documentation regarding the adverse effects of the referenced project on properties listed on and eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Based upon the information you provided, we do not believe that our participation in consultation to resolve adverse effects is needed. However, should circumstances change and you determine that our participation is required, please notify us.

Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6(b)(4), you will need to file the final Memorandum of Agreement and related documentation at the conclusion of the consultation process. The filing of the Agreement with us is required in order to complete the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Thank you for providing us with your notification of adverse effect. If you have any questions or require further assistance, please contact Carol Legard, FHWA Liaison, at 202-406-8533.

Sincerely,

Raymond V. Wallace
Historic Preservation Technician
Office of Federal Agency Programs
Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. As part of this effort, we submitted a Class III cultural resources survey report on July 1, 2005 prepared by the Gila River Indian Community’s (GRIC) Cultural Resource Management Program (CRMP). The report was titled A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2005). In your letter dated July 11, 2005, you provided several comments regarding the treatment of isolated occurrences (IOs) and on the Programmatic Agreement being prepared for the project. The purpose of this letter is to address the IO comments and request concurrence on the eligibility recommendations for the archaeological sites that were provided in the report (Darling 2005).

Isolated Occurrences

In your letter you noted that the report grouped IOs into 12 clusters in “areas where numerous artifacts co-occur but in concentrations less than would merit an archaeological site designation (Darling 2005:4-13).” None of the areas with IOs has high enough artifact densities to meet standard site definition criteria. In fact, the term “cluster” is somewhat misapplied in the report. For example, IO Cluster 4 consists of six artifacts in a roughly 20-acre area; IO 6 has 17 artifacts in a 40-acre area; and, IO Cluster 7 consists of six artifacts in an approximately 15-acre area. The other IO “clusters” have similarly low artifact densities.

In your letter you also pointed out that the report notes that some of the IO Clusters are associated with prehistoric trails and trail sites near South Mountain with the additional note that some of the trails continue to be used by GRIC today. It should be pointed out that not all IOs in the study area are associated with trails, and in fact, at this point the relationships of the IOs with the trails and other cultural uses of South Mountain have not been investigated beyond collecting basic inventory and location information. ADOT and FHWA recognize that while the IOs are not individually considered eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), they are an important component to understanding the region’s overall cultural pattern of prehistoric and historic use. ADOT and FHWA agree that proper mitigation of impacts to the cultural resources in the South Mountain Freeway corridor should include considerations of “non-site” areas. With this in mind, the IOs that are in proximity to other IOs, or in proximity to defined sites or trails, were called out in the report so that further investigation of them could be considered in any treatment plans that might be developed in the future.

However, based on survey data alone, these IOs do not meet the ASM criteria for sites, or the NRHP criteria for historic properties, and we recommend that the site boundaries in the GRIC CRMP report not be revised to include outlying IOs.

Eligibility Recommendations

Nineteen archaeological sites and two historic canals were identified in GRIC CRMP’s Class III report (Darling 2005). The eligibility of the historic canals—AZ T:12:93 (ASM) (Roosevelt Canal) and AZ T:12:154 (ASM) (Western Canal)—are currently being reassessed and will be addressed in an eligibility assessment report being prepared by HDR Engineering’s Cultural Resources Section which will be submitted to your office at a later date. Of the archaeological sites, 18 are recommended as eligible to the NRHP and one is recommended as not eligible:

- AZ T:12:9 (ASM) (Villa Bona) and AZ T:12:52 (ASM) are prehistoric Hohokam villages with existing and/or historically documented public architecture. The sites are recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam social organization, settlement, and land use in the lower Salt River Valley, including the village structure and the development of irrigation communities south of the Salt River.
- AZ T:11:154 (ASM), AZ T:12:91 (ASM), AZ T:12:127 (ASM) (Baseline Ruin), AZ T:12:202 (ASM), AZ T:12:203 (ASM), AZ T:12:204 (ASM), AZ T:12:205 (ASM), and AZ T:12:206 (ASM) are prehistoric Hohokam artifact clusters. The sites are recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric Hohokam social organization, settlement, and land use in the lower Salt River Valley, including the development and structure of irrigation communities.
- AZ T:12:197 (ASM), AZ T:12:201 (ASM), and AZ T:12:211 (ASM) are trail sites with associated features (age and cultural affiliation unknown, but likely Native American in origin). AZ T:12:207 (ASM) is a prehistoric trail site with an associated Hohokam artifact scatter. The sites are recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for their potential to provide important information on prehistoric settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including social mobility and transportation networks.
- AZ T:12:210 (ASM) is a prehistoric quarry (age and cultural affiliation unknown, but likely Native American in origin). The site is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion D for its potential to provide important information on prehistoric settlement and land use near the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers, including lithic resource procurement and ground stone technology.
Dear Dr. Greenspan:

Thank you for consulting with this office regarding the cultural resources survey report and the eligibility recommendations associated with the South Mountain Transportation Corridor pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as implemented by 36 CFR Part 800. We have reviewed the submitted letter and eligibility recommendations, and offer the following comments.

The earlier submitted cultural resource report [A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona] by J. Andrew Darling identified 21 sites and 19 Isolated Occurrences (lOs). The current submitted letter [dated January 12, 2006] notes that the eligibility of the two historic canals [AZ T:10:83 (ASM), the Roosevelt Canal, and AZ T:12:154 (ASM), the Western Canal] are being reassessed, and will be addressed later. Of the remaining 19 sites, one [i.e., AZ T:12:200 (ASM)] is recommended as ineligible, and the 18 others [AZ T:11:164 (ASM) and AZ T:12:9, 52, 91, 127, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 210, and 211 (ASM)] are eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D. We agree with these eligibility recommendations from a site-by-site consideration, however, consideration needs to be given to a broader context to properly understand the significance of the project area and the surrounding setting.

Our office noted in an earlier letter [dated July 11, 2005] that many of the lOs should be reconsidered as parts of larger entities, such as known prehistoric habitation sites, canals, and avenues of travel. Your letter acknowledges that "ADOT and FHWA recognize that while the lOs are not individually considered eligible to the NRHP, they are an important component to understanding the region's overall cultural pattern of prehistoric and historic use and that further investigation of them could be considered in any treatment plans that might develop in the future." Our office agrees conceptually with this, but we are uncomfortable with your usage of the term "non-site" areas.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. If you agree that (1) the lOs do not qualify as sites and that the boundaries of the existing sites, as defined by the GRIC CRMP (Darling 2005), should not be revised to include outlying lOs, (2) that the proper treatment of affected cultural resources in the APE should include considerations of non-site cultural resources, and (3) if you agree with the National Register eligibility recommendations for the 19 archaeological sites, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-6266 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

Ruth L. Greenspan
Historic Preservation Specialist
Environmental & Enhancement Group
205 South 17th Avenue Rm. 213E Mail Drop 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

cc: SThomason (FHWA); WVishon (FHWA)
January 23, 2006
Page 2, Greenspan

Regarding the term "non-site" areas, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) distinguishes five different property types [i.e., building, structure, site, district, and object] in contrast to the systematics to be found with the assignment of numbers by the Arizona State Museum (ASM). In order for this project to meet federal standards, the National Register classification system should be used. In some cases, IOs may be considered to be contributing elements to structures (trails would be structures), districts, and landscapes. IOs may also be considered as objects, defined as constructions that are primarily artistic in nature or are relatively small in scale and simply constructed; although it may be, by nature or design, movable, an object is associated with a specific setting or environment. Examples of objects would include a boundary marker or milepost marker.

Regarding the project area, it is clear that a broader context [beyond the individual "site" and beyond the physical footprint of the project] needs to be considered to determine the significance of the many identified IOs, perhaps individually undistinguished, and even the purported ineligible and individually considered AZ T:12:200 (ASM), a historic O'odham artifact scatter. The property type of "district" and/or the notion of a cultural landscape should be seriously considered when addressing the significance of the "non-site" cultural resources within the South Mountain Transportation Corridor project area and the development of a treatment plan. Tribal input is crucial; the oral traditions of the O'odham identify the South Mountain area [Greasy Mountain?] as a place associated with Elder Brother [I'itoi].

We do appreciate your cooperation with this office in considering the impacts of federal undertakings on cultural resources situated in Arizona, and we look forward to reviewing the revised data recovery report. If you have any questions, please contact me at (602) 542-7140 or electronically via djacobs@pr.state.az.us.

Sincerely,

David Jacobs
Compliance Specialist/Archaeologist
State Historic Preservation Office

CC: Barnaby Lewis, Gila River Indian Community

Mr. Steve Dibble
Archaeologist
United States Army Corp of Engineers
P.O. Box 532711
Los Angeles, California 90053-2325

Dear Mr. Dibble:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix (see attached map).

As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Furthermore, because the South Mountain Freeway would cross jurisdictional waters of the US, there will be United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) involvement. Section 106 consultations were initially initiated for the project in August 2003. At that time, the Corps was inadvertently excluded from the list of participating agencies. It is therefore the purpose of this letter is to provide a summary of the consultations to date along with accompanying reports; to provide the Corps an opportunity to review and comment on the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) developed for the project; and to inquire as to whether the Corps would prefer to participate in the PA as a Signatory or as a Concurring Party.

Land jurisdiction for the alternative alignments includes private land (5,160.7 acres) and lands administered by the Arizona State Land Department (101.4 acres), the Bureau of Land Management (35.1 acres), and the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation Department (62.32 acres).

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the
The second phase of the project entailed pedestrian surveys of the proposed alternative alignments that extend from I-10 west of Phoenix to I-10 in west Chandler, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are generally 1000 ft (304.8 m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

To date, there have been four cultural resources technical reports prepared for the EIS, which include two Class I overviews and two Class III survey reports:

In 2001, the first phase of the technical studies began with the Gila River Indian Community’s Cultural Resource Management Program (GRC-CRMP) preparing the initial Class I overview of the overall study area. The report is titled “A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 19, 2003; BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix, Historic Preservation Office (Stocklin, September 8, 2003); City of Phoenix, Pueblo Grande Museum (Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanyiwiwa, September 10, 2003); and Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

The second phase of the project entailed pedestrian surveys of the proposed alternative alignments. The GRC-CRMP conducted the Class III survey between November 2003 and March 2004. The results of the survey are presented in a report titled “A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Darling 2005). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in responses from SHPO (Jacobs, January 23, 2006); BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005); BIA (Canley, August 11, 2005); Reclamation (Czaplicki, July 12, 2005); City of Phoenix, Pueblo Grande Museum (Bostwick, July 18, 2005); and SRP (Anduze, August 8, 2005).

In late 2004 and early 2005, the third phase of the cultural studies included an addendum Class I overview that covered expanded portions of the study area along I-10 and the State Route 101L freeway corridors on the west side of Phoenix. HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR) prepared the addendum Class I overview. The results were provided in a technical report titled “An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2021, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Brodbeck and Touchin 2005). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in responses from SHPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Czaplicki, September 19, 2005); SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005); City of Phoenix, Pueblo Grande Museum (Bostwick, November 1, 2005).

Finally, the fourth phase of the cultural resource studies entailed an addendum Class III survey. HDR conducted the survey in early 2005. The survey covered shifted proposed alignments, freshly plowed agricultural fields, and areas with historical resources that had been overlooked during the initial Class III survey (Darling 2005). The results are presented in a report titled “An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2021, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Brodbeck 2005). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in responses from SHPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Czaplicki, September 19, 2005); SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005); and City of Phoenix, Pueblo Grande Museum (Bostwick, November 1, 2005).

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resources technical reports and the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA). If you concur with the adequacy of the reports and their eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below as indicated. If you agree with the adequacy of the draft PA, please indicate your concurrence by signing below as indicated. In addition, please indicate below whether the Corps would like to participate as a Signatory or Concurring Party to the PA. We look forward to continuing consultation with your office to address project effects as the environmental documentation continues.

If you have any questions concerning this submission, please call Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6269 or e-mail RGreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Division Administrator

Signature for Corps concurrence with adequacy of the reports and eligibility recommendations

Date

Signature for Corps Concurrence with adequacy of the draft PA

Date
The Corps prefers to participate in the PA as a Signatory or Consulting Party. (please circle)

Enclosures (draft PA and four technical reports)
cc: SThomass 
Wyshon, 
REllis (ADOT 619E) 
RGreenspan (ADOT 619E) 
Cindy Lester - AZ Area Office, 3636 N Central Ave, Suite 900, Phoenix AZ 85012 (with enclosures) 
SDThomas:cdn

Mr. Steve Ross, Archaeologist 
Arizona State Land Department 
1616 West Adams Street 
Phoenix, Arizona, 85007 

Dear Mr. Ross:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 west of Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC), the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Navajo Nation, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of ten alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (E1, E3, W71, W101WPR, W101WFR, W101W99, W101CPFR, W101EPR, W101E2PFR) that extend from I-10 in west Chandler to I-10 west of Phoenix, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1,000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.
The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

Previous Consultation:

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stoddell, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kwiatkowski, September 10, 2003); Yavapai-Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 19, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class III Cultural Resources Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is ongoing. To date, concurrences/responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, July 12, 2005), BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Quetzali, July 12, 2005), Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe (Kuwankawisiwma, July 22, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2021 South Mountain Freeway EIS & I/DCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck and Tocuhin 2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2021 South Mountain Freeway EIS & I/DCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2005). To date, concurrences/responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, September 19, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005).

Current Consultation:

A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarify the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W55 and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Dobbinas Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South Mountain Park/Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T:10:83 (ASM)) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 (ASM)) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2021 South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & I/DCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2006), assesses the NRHP eligibility of South Mountain Park/Preserve and the Roosevelt Canal.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing
The previous letter was also sent to:
Mr. Garry Cantley, Western Regional Archaeologist, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Ms. Cheryl Blanchard, Archaeologist, Bureau of Land Management
Mr. Bryan Lausten, Archaeologist, Bureau of Reclamation
Mr. Charlie McClendon, City Manager, City of Avondale
Mr. Mike Normand, Transportation Services & Planning Manager, City of Chandler
Mr. Ron Short, Deputy Director for Long Range Planning, City of Glendale
Dr. Todd Bostwick, Archaeologist, City of Phoenix
Ms. Barbara Stocklin, Historic Preservation Officer, City of Phoenix
Mr. Ralph Valez, City Manager, City of Tolleson
Mr. Larry Henderson, Flood Control District of Maricopa County
Mr. Brian Kenny, Environment Programs Manager, Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Mr. Stanley Ashby, Superintendent, Roosevelt Irrigation District
Mr. Rick Anduze, Archaeologist, Salt River Project
Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist, State Historic Preservation Office
Mr. Steve Dibble, Archaeologist, United States Army Corps of Engineers
Ms. Delia M. Carlyle, Chairwoman, Ak-Chin Indian Community
Mr. Charles Wood, Chairman, Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
Ms. Sherry Cordova, Chairwoman, Cocopah Indian Tribe
Mr. Daniel Eddy, Jr., Chairman, Colorado River Indian Tribes
Mr. Ralph Bear, President, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
Ms. Nora McDowell, Chairman, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe
Mr. Mike Jackson, Sr., President, Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe
Mr. William Rhodes, Governor, Gila River Indian Community
Mr. Thomas Siyuja, Chairman, Havasupai Tribe
Mr. Leigh Kuwaniswma, Hopi Tribe
Mr. Gary Tom, Chairman, Kaibab-Band of Paiute Indian Tribes
Dr. Allen Downer, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department
Ms. Herminia Frias, Chairwoman, Pascua Yaqui Tribe
Mr. Arden Quewakia, Governor, Pueblo of Zuni
Ms. Joni Ramos, President, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Ms. Kathleen Wesley-Kitcheyan, Chairwoman, San Carlos Apache Nation
Ms. Evelyn James, President, San Juan Southern Paiute
Mr. Peter Steere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Tohono O’odham Nation
Mr. Joe Joaquin, Cultural Resource Specialist, Tohono O’odham Nation
Mr. Ivan Smith, Chairman, Tonto Apache Tribe
Mr. Dallas Massey, Sr., Chairman, White Mountain Apache Tribe
Mr. Jamie Fullmer, Chairman, Yavapai-Apache Nation
Mr. Ernest Jones, Sr., President, Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
In response, FWHI and ADOT requested additional information regarding any concerns regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance to the community, in a letter dated July 7, 2005. FWHI and ADOT appreciate the letter sent in response by former Governor Richard P. N. Garcia, dated September 30, 2005, which reconfirmed the cultural importance of three of the properties: South Mountain, Villa Buena, and Pueblo del Alamo.

In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800-4), which requires federal agencies to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties that could be affected by a project, FWHI and ADOT have prepared the enclosed traditional cultural property assessment report, which evaluates the eligibility of the above mentioned properties for the National Register of Historic Places. The report is titled, An Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Properties for the 2021-2024 South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LCPR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodeck 2006).

Please review the enclosed traditional cultural property evaluation report, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and eligibility recommendations, please sign below to indicate your concurrence. We look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any question or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Ruth Greenman at 602-712-5286 or email RGreenman@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for Tribal Concurrence

Date

Enclosure

cc:
SThomas
RGreenman (619E)
J. Andrew Darling, Coordinator, Cultural Resource Management Program, GRIC, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, AZ 85247 (with enclosure)
Barmby V. Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, GRIC, P.O. Box E, Sacaton, AZ 85247 (with enclosure)
SDThomas/dmv

This letter was also sent to Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist, State Historic Preservation Office.
As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from the I-10/I-202L traffic interchange to I-10 in west Phoenix. This project is a federal action that requires compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The area of potential effect (APE) is comprised of the alternative alignment corridors.

The proposed alternative alignments being studied for the EIS have potential to affect archaeological sites and natural features on the landscape that may be deemed sacred by Native American tribes that may qualify for the National Register of Historic Places as traditional cultural properties. The Gila River Indian Community’s Cultural Resource Management Program (CIRMP) conducted the initial survey of the alternative alignments. The results were presented in a report titled A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona (Darling 2005). In the report, the CIRMP identified ten properties as places of cultural importance that could potentially be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places as traditional cultural properties: the South Mountain Range (commonly referred to as “South Mountain”); two prehistoric villages, AZ T:12:9 (ASM) (Villa Buena) and AZ T:12:32 (ASM) (Pueblo of the Alamo); two rock art sites, AZ T:12:198 (ASM) and AZ T:12:208 (ASM); four trail sites, AZ T:12:197 (ASM), AZ T:12:201 (ASM), AZ T:12:207 (ASM), and AZ T:12:211 (ASM); and one shrine site, AZ T:12:112 (ASM) (Darling 2005). While the CIRMP did not formally evaluate these sites as traditional cultural properties in their study, they recommended continued consultations to address the issue and the concerns of the community.

In response, FHWA and ADOT requested additional information regarding any concerns regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance to the community, in a letter dated July 7, 2005. FHWA and ADOT appreciate the letter sent in response by former Governor Richard P. Neece, dated September 30, 2005, which reconfirmed the cultural importance of three of the properties: South Mountain, Villa Buena, and Pueblo del Alamo.

In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800-4), which requires federal agencies to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties that could be affected by a project, FHWA and ADOT have prepared the enclosed traditional cultural property assessment report which evaluates the eligibility of the above mentioned properties for the National Register of Historic Places. The report is titled An Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Properties for the 202L South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LUDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brockback, 2006).

Please review the enclosed traditional cultural property evaluation report, and the information provided in this letter. If you agree with the adequacy of the report and eligibility recommendations, please sign below to indicate your concurrence. If you have any question or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or email RGreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for Tribal Concurrence

Date

Enclosure
c/o:
J. Andrew Darling, Coordinator, Cultural Resource Management Program, GRIC, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, AZ 85247
Barashy V. Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, GRIC, P.O. Box E, Sacaton, AZ 85247
SThomas
RGreenspan (619E)
SIThomasaccolin
Mr. Mike Normand  
Transportation Services & Planning Manager  
City of Chandler  
P.O. Box 4018, Mailstop 412  
Chandler, Arizona, 85244-4018  

Dear Mr. Normand:  

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to 1-10 west of Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Arizona Division (AZT:10:83), the Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), the Mount Pleasant Irrigation District (MPID), and the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR).

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of the existing alignment of I-10 Freeway: the Arizona Division (AZT:10:83); the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID); the Arizona Division (AZT:10:83); the Salt River Project (SRP); the Bureau of Reclamation (USBR); the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE); the Mount Pleasant Irrigation District (MPID); and the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR).

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

**Previous Consultation:**

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: “An Addendum Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrence responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kuwatskiewicz, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Rosslington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: “An Addendum Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is ongoing. To date, concurrence responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005); Reclamation (Ellin, July 12, 2005); BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005); City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005); Pueblo of Zuni (Quetawki, July 12, 2005); Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe (Kuwatskiewicz, July 22, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled “An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Brodeck and Touchin 2005). The Class III report was titled “An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Brodeck and Touchin 2005). To date, concurrence responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005); Reclamation (Ellin, September 19, 2005); City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005).

**Current Consultation:**

A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarifies the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W55 and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Debbie Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South Mountain Park Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZT:12:154 [ASM]) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZT:12:154 [ASM]) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, “A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Darling 2005), is currently under review.
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The report is enclosed for your review and comment.

South Mountain Park/Preserve is a municipal park owned by the City of Phoenix and managed by their Parks and Recreation Department. Approximately 3 acres of the 12,000-acre park is in the proposed E1 Alternative. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the South Mountain Park/Preserve is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the National Park Service, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), and the Roosevelt Canal. The Western Canal is owned and managed by Reclamation and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), and the Roosevelt Canal was NRHP eligible (Burden 2002; Darling 2005).

The report is enclosed for your review and comment.

In 2006, a cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or email ruth.greenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Administrator

Enclosure
The Federal Highway Administration (FHW A) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 west of Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Arizona State Water Rights Board (WWRB), the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT/FCDMC), the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Indian Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Huapai-Paite Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pasqua Yaki Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonopah Apache Tribe, the Tubac Guild of 锡 Flow, the West Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Paiute Indian Community, and the Yavapai-Hopi Tribe.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of ten alternative (overlying) freeway corridors, including I-10, South Mountain Freeway, and I-10, respectively. The APE extends from I-10 in west Chandler to I-10 west of Phoenix, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1,000 feet (304.8 m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

**Previous Consultation:**
- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SHPO (Jones, September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 23, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kwiatkowski, September 8, 2003; Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heatington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).
- A Class II survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is on-going. To date, concurrence/responses have been received from SHPO (Jones, July 11, 2005); Reclamation (Bills, July 11, 2005); BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005); City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005); Pueblo of Zuni (Quetawki), July 12, 2005; Yavapai/Prescott Indian Tribe (Kwiatkowski), July 22, 2005.
- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck and Tochon 2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2005). To date, concurrence/responses have been received from SHPO (Jones, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Bills, September 19, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, November 19, 2005).

**Current Consultation:**
A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarifies the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W55 and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6004 West Dobson Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South Mountain Park/Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T:12:154 [ASM]) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 [ASM]) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report Project" (Brodbeck and Tochon 2005), has been released to all affected parties.
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Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & L/DCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck 2006), assesses the NRHP eligibility of South Mountain Park/Preserve and the Roosevelt Canal (Brodbeck 2006). As subconsultants to HDR, architectural historians with EcoPlan Associates (EcoPlan) assessed the two residential properties (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). The report is enclosed for your review and comment.

South Mountain Park/Preserve is a municipal park owned by the City of Phoenix and managed by their Parks and Recreation Department. Approximately 32 acres of the 16,000+ acre-park is in the proposed E1 Alignment. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the South Mountain Park/Preserve is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the National Park Service (NPS) and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) New Deal programs in Phoenix during the Depression era. The park is also recommended as eligible under Criterion C for its overall sensitive design that set historical precedent in planning natural parks and implementing NPS design standards for improvements in wilderness area parks. While the current study focused on the 32 acres within the footprint of the E1 Alternative, further evaluation of the park’s entire 16,000+ acres has the potential to establish eligibility under Criterion A as contributing components; under Criterion D for its collection of prehistoric archaeological sites and historical mining-related sites (components of the park’s mining sites may also be eligible under Criterion A pending further study).

In its entirety, the Roosevelt Canal—AZ T:10:83 (ASM)—is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the historical development of irrigation districts in lower Salt River Valley. While previous studies for the South Mountain EIS Study acknowledged that the Roosevelt Canal was NRHP eligible (Burden 2002; Darling 2005), the specific segments within the proposed alternative alignments had not been assessed in terms of whether they are contributing or non-contributing to that eligibility. The Roosevelt Canal intersects the proposed alternative alignment footprints in four locations. The canal segments that cross the W55 and W71 Alternatives south of Van Buren Road retain integrity and are recommended as eligible to the National Register under Criterion A as contributing components. The segments that cross the proposed alternative alignments in the I-10 and the 101 freeway corridors are modern realignments that lack historical integrity, and therefore are recommended to be non-contributing components.

The rural residences at 6304 West Dobbins Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road were added to the project’s APE as a result of alignment shifts referred to above. Both properties are on privately owned land. Architectural historians with EcoPlan evaluated the properties’ eligibility (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). Both properties lack important historical associations and architectural merit, therefore, FHWA and ADOT recommend that neither property is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Finally, the initial Class III survey report for the South Mountain Freeway study (Darling 2005) had identified the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 [ASM]) as an historic property in the APE, in the E1 Alternative at Elliot Road. The Western Canal is owned and managed by Reclamation and SRP. Further study has indicated that this irrigation feature is actually a tail-water drainage ditch and that the Western Canal terminates prior to reaching the APE. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the Western Canal will not be affected by the proposed undertaking.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6566 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Ruth W. Kenny

Signature for MCDOT Concurrence

Date

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6566 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Ruth W. Kenny

Signature for MCDOT Concurrence

Date

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6566 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Ruth W. Kenny

Signature for MCDOT Concurrence

Date

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6566 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Ruth W. Kenny

Signature for MCDOT Concurrence

Date

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6566 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.
The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of ten alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (E1, W55, W71, W101WFR, W101WFR, W101W99, W101CPR, W101CFR, W101EFR, and W101EFR) that extend from I-10 in west Chandler to I-10 west of Phoenix, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1,000 ft (304.8 m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

**Previous Consultation:**

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kwiatkowski, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2003). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is on-going. To date, concurring responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, July 12, 2005), BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Quartezki, July 12, 2005), Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe (Kwiatkowski, July 22, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2022 South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Broebbeck 2005). To date, concurring responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, September 19, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005).

**Current Consultation:**

A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarifies the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W55 and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Dobbs Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South Mountain Park/Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T10S R33E) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T12S 1:254 ASM) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2022, South
Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2006), assesses the NRHP eligibility of South Mountain Park/Preserve and the Roosevelt Canal (Brodbeck 2006). As subconsultants to HDR, architectural historians with EcoPlan Associates (EcoPlan) assessed the two residential properties (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). The report is enclosed for your review and comment.

South Mountain Park/Preserve is a municipal park owned by the City of Phoenix and managed by their Parks and Recreation Department. Approximately 32 acres of the 16,000+ acre-park is in the proposed E1 Alignment. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the South Mountain Park/Preserve is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the National Park Service (NPS) and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) New Deal programs in Phoenix during the Depression era. The park is also recommended as eligible under Criterion C for its overall sensitive design that set historical precedent in planning natural parks and implementing NPS design standards for improvements in wilderness area parks. While the current study focused on the 32 acres within the footprint of the E1 Alternative, further evaluation of the park’s entire 16,000+ acres has the potential to establish eligibility under Criterion B for associations with influential NPS architects; under Criterion C for the architectural merit of its buildings and structures, both individually and collectively as a district; and under Criterion D for its collection of prehistoric archaeological sites and historical mining-related sites (components of the park’s mining sites may also be eligible under Criterion A pending further study).

In its entirety, the Roosevelt Canal—AZ T:10:83 (ASM)—is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the historical development of irrigation districts in lower Salt River Valley. While previous studies for the South Mountain EIS Study acknowledged that the Roosevelt Canal was NRHP eligible (Burden 2002; Darling 2005), the specific segments within the proposed alternative alignments had not been assessed in terms of whether they are contributing or non-contributing to that eligibility. The Roosevelt Canal intersects the proposed alternative alignment footprints in four locations. The canal segments that cross the W55 and W71 Alternatives south of Van Buren Road retain integrity and are recommended as eligible to the National Register under Criterion A as contributing components. The segments that cross the proposed alternative alignments in the I-10 and the 101L freeway corridors are modern realignments that lack historical integrity, and therefore are recommended to be non-contributing components.

The rural residences at 6304 West Dobbins Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road were added to the project’s APE as a result of alignment shifts referred to above. Both properties are on privately-owned land. Architectural historians with EcoPlan evaluated the properties’ eligibility (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). Both properties lack important historical associations and architectural merit, therefore, FHWA and ADOT recommend that neither property is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Finally, the initial Class III survey report for the South Mountain Freeway study (Darling 2005) had identified the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 [ASM]) as an historic property in the APE, in the E1 Alternative at Elliot Road. The Western Canal is owned and managed by Reclamation and SRP. Further study has indicated that this irrigation feature is actually a tail-water drainage ditch and that the Western Canal terminates prior to reaching the APE. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the Western Canal will not be affected by the proposed undertaking.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail russgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Division Administrator

Date

Endorse
I just got a phone call from Michael Tsosie, who is the director of the Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum, in response to the consultation letter sent for the 2nd Addendum report. He informed me that CRIT would be unable to concur with the consultation, because South Mountain is a TCP for them, and plays an important role in their creation myth. I asked him to please make a written response to the consultation letter outlining their concerns, and assured him that the written response would trigger another round of consultation.

Ruth
To: Ruth L. Greenspan, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist.

Date: July 07, 2006.

Project: South Mountain Transportation Corridor – HA-AZ NH-202-D(ADY)

The White Mountain Apache Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) appreciates receiving information on the proposed project, dated June 26, 06. In regards to this, please attend to the checked items below.

☐ There is no need to send additional information – unless project planning or implementation results in the discovery of sites or items having known or suspected Apache cultural affiliations.

☐ The proposed project is located within an area of probable cultural or historical importance to the White Mountain Apache Tribe (WMAT). As part of the effort to identify historical properties that may be affected by the project, we recommend an ethnographical study and interviews with Apache elders. Ramon Riley, the Cultural Resource Director is the contact person at (928) 338-4625.

☐ The proposed project is located within or adjacent to a known historic property of cultural or historical importance to the WMAT and will most likely result in adverse affects to said property. Please refrain from further steps in project planning or implementation.

NOTES: We have finally received and reviewed the information in regards to the conducted technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 west of Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC), the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Paulete Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Yavapai Apache Nation, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Paiute Indians, and the Yavapai-Papago Indians.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 west of Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC), the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Paulete Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Yavapai Apache Nation, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Paiute Indians, and the Yavapai-Papago Indians.

We look forward to continued collaboration in the protection and preservation of places of cultural and historical significance.

Sincerely,

Mark T. Altura
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
White Mountain Apache Tribe
The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

### Previous Consultation:

- **A Class I overview of the overall study area:** "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2006). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 19, 2005); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2005); City of Phoenix (Suddlin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kwiatkowski, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heathington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- **A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments:** "A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is ongoing. To date, concurring responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, July 12, 2005), BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Qumawki, July 12, 2005), Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe (Kwiatkowski, July 22, 2005).

- **An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005).** The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brobeck and Touchin 2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brobeck 2005). To date, concurring responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, September 19, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005).

### Current Consultation:

A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarifies the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W55 and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Dobbs Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South Mountain Park/Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T:10:83 (ASM) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 (ASM) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L, South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brobeck 2006), assesses the NRHP eligibility of South Mountain Park/Preserve and the Roosevelt Canal.
Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma
Hopi Tribe
P.O. Box 123
Kykotsmovi, Arizona, 86039

Dear Mr. Kuwanwisiwma:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 west of Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC), the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOt), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yaqui Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, and the Yavapai-Apache Nation.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of ten alternative overlapping freeway corridors (E1, W55, W71, W101WPR, W101WFR, W101W99, W101CPR, W101CPR, W101EPR, and W101EPR) that extend from I-10 in west Chandler to I-10 west of Phoenix, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1,000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for SRP
Enclosure
The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

**Previous Consultation:**

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kuwaiowisinga, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 19, 2003); and Reclamation (Hastings, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is on-going. To date, concurrences/responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, July 12, 2005), BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Quatsuki), July 12, 2005), Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe (Kuwaiowisinga, July 22, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101L freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2001, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LD/CR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck and Touchin 2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2001, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LD/CR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2005). To date, concurrences/responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, September 19, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005).

**Current Consultation:**

A second addendum cultural resource assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarifies the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W55 and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Dobbin's Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South Mountain Park/Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T:10:83 (ASM)) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 (ASM)) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2001, South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LD/CR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2006), assesses the NRHP eligibility of South Mountain Park/Preserve and the Roosevelt Canal (Brodbeck 2006). As subconsultants to HDR, architectural historians with EcoPlan Associates (EcoPlan) assessed the two residential properties (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). The report is enclosed for your review and comment.

South Mountain Park/Preserve is a municipal park owned by the City of Phoenix and managed by its Parks and Recreation Department. Approximately 32 acres of the 16,000+ acre-park is in the proposed E1 Alignment. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the South Mountain Park/Preserve is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the National Park Service (NPS) and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). New Deal programs in Phoenix during the Depression era. The park is also recommended as eligible under Criterion C for its overall sensitive design that set historical precedent in planning natural parks and implementing NPS design, standards for improvements in wilderness area parks. While the current study focused on the 32 acres within the footprint of the E1 Alternative, further evaluation of the park's entire 16,000+ acres has the potential to establish eligibility under Criterion B for associations with influential NPS architects; under Criterion C for the architectural merit of its buildings and structures, both individually and collectively as a district; and under Criterion D for its collection of prehistoric archaeological sites and historic mining-related sites (components of the park's mining sites may also be eligible under Criterion A pending further study).

In its entirety, the Roosevelt Canal—AZ T:10-83 (ASM)—is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the historical development of irrigation districts in lower Salt River Valley. While previous studies for the South Mountain EIS Study acknowledged that the Roosevelt Canal was NRHP eligible (Bueno 2002; Darling 2005), the specific segments within the proposed alternative alignments had not been assessed in terms of whether they are contributing or non-contributing to that eligibility. The Roosevelt Canal intersects the proposed alternative alignment footprints in four locations. The canal segments that cross the W55 and W71 Alternatives South of Van Buren Road retain integrity and are recommended as eligible to the National Register under Criterion A as contributing components. The segments that cross the proposed alternative alignments in the I-10 and the I-11 freeway corridors are modern realignments that lack historical integrity, and therefore are recommended to be non-contributing components.

The rural residences at 6304 West Dobbin's Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road were added to the project's APE as a result of alignment shifts referred to above. Both properties are on privately-owned land. Architectural historians with EcoPlan evaluated the properties' eligibility (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). Both properties lack important historical associations and architectural merit, therefore, FHWA and ADOT recommend that neither property is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Finally, the initial Class III survey report for the South Mountain Freeway project (Darling 2005) had identified the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 (ASM)) as an historic property in the APE, in the E1 Alternative at Elliot Road. The Western Canal is owned and managed by Reclamation and SRP. Further study has indicated that this irrigation feature is actually a tail-water drainage ditch and that the Western Canal terminates prior to reaching the APE. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the Western Canal will not be affected by the proposed undertaking.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing
At this time, FHWA is once again inquiring whether you have any concerns regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance to your community within the project area. If you have such concerns, any information you might provide within 30 days of receipt of this letter would be considered in the project planning. If your office opts to participate in cultural resource consultation at a later date, FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns. However, such consultation would not necessitate a reconsideration of this determination of project effect. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for Hopi Concurrence

4/5/06

Enclosure
The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

**Previous Consultation:**

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 19, 2003); USLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Bucklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Guanwixivma, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Heshlington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anzu, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2002).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is on-going. To date, concurring responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, July 12, 2005), BLIM (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Quetawki), July 12, 2005), Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe (Kwiatkowski, July 22, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101L freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck and Tocchini 2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2005). To date, concurring responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, September 19, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Anzu, September 19, 2005).

**Current Consultation:**

A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarifies the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W55 and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Dobbin Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South Mountain Park/Preserve with the specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T:10:83 (ASM)) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 (ASM)) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2006), assesses the NRHP eligibility of South Mountain Park/Preserve and the Roosevelt Canal.
If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail rgreen@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

June 26, 2006

Ms. Kathleen Wesley-Kitcheyan, Chair
San Carlos Apache Tribe
P.O. Box 0
San Carlos, Arizona, 85550

Dear Chairperson Wesley-Kitcheyan:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 1-10 in west Chandler and to I-10 west of Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC), the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chehoolah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yaqui Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Patuq Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-McCionga Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odh
The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

**Previous Consultation:**
- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previously consulted regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrence/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, October 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Blocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bozwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kuwanwisiwma, September 16, 2003); Yavapai-Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Blocklin, September 11, 2003); SRP (Andune, November 10, 2003); and BTA (October 27, 2003).
- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class III Cultural Resources Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report was ongoing. To date, concurrence responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005), Reclamation (Elli, July 12, 2005), BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bozwick, July 19, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Quatleak), July 12, 2005), Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe (Kwistok), July 22, 2005).
- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101L freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck and Tschan, 2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resource Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Bozwick 2005). To date, concurrence responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Elli, September 19, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bozwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Andune, September 19, 2005).

**Current Consultation:**
A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarify the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the WSS and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Dobbins Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE acquired additional evaluation: South Mountain Park/Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T:10831 [ASM]) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T:12154 [ASM]), relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2006), assesses the NRHP eligibility of South Mountain Park/Preserve and the Roosevelt Canal (Brodbeck 2006). As subconsultants to HDR, architectural historians with EcoPlan Associates (EcoPlan) assessed the two residential properties (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). The report is enclosed for your review and comment.

South Mountain Park/Preserve is a municipal park owned by the City of Phoenix and managed by their Parks and Recreation Department. Approximately 32 acres of the 16,000-acre property is in the proposed E1 Alternative. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the South Mountain Park/Preserve is eligible for inclusion in the NHRP under Criterion A for its associations with the National Park Service (NPS) and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) New Deal programs in Phoenix during the Depression era. The park is also recommended as eligible under Criterion C for its overall aesthetic design that set historical precedent in planning parks and implementing NPS design standards for improvements in wilderness area parks. While the current study focused on the 32 acres within the footprint of the 202L Alternative, further evaluation of the park's entire 16,000+ acre has the potential to establish eligibility under Criterion B for associations with influential NPS architecture under Criterion C for the architectural merit of its buildings and structures, both individually and collectively as a district; and under Criterion D for its collection of historic archaeological sites and historical migration-related sites (components of the park's mining sites may also be eligible under Criterion A pending further study).

In its entirety, the Roosevelt Canal—AZ T:10831 (ASM)—is considered eligible for the NHRP under Criterion A. By its associations with the historical development of irrigation districts in lower Salt River Valley. While previous studies for the South Mountain EIS Study acknowledged that the Roosevelt Canal was NRHP eligible (Burden 2002, Darling 2005), the specific segments within the projected alternative alignments had not been assessed in terms of whether they are contributing or non-contributing to that eligibility. The Roosevelt Canal intersects the proposed alternative alignment footprints in four locations. The canal segments that cross the WSS and W71 Alternative south of Van Buren Road retain integrity and are recommended as eligible to the National Register under Criterion A as contributing components. The segments that cross the proposed alternative alignments in the I-10 and the 101L freeway corridors are modern realignments that lack historical integrity, and therefore are recommended to be non-contributing components.

The rural residences at 6304 West Dobbins Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road were added to the project's APE at a result of alignment shifts referred to above. Both properties are on privately-owned land. Architectural historians with EcoPlan evaluated the properties' eligibility (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). Both properties lack important historical associations and architectural merit; therefore, FHWA and ADOT recommended that neither property is eligible for inclusion in the NHRP.

Finally, the initial Class III survey report for the South Mountain Freeway project (Darling 2005) had identified the Western Canal (AZ T:12154 [ASM]) as an historic property in the APE, in the E1 Alternative at Elliot Road. The Western Canal is owned and managed by Reclamation and SRP. Further study has indicated that this irrigation feature is actually a tail-water drainage ditch and that the Western Canal terminates prior to reaching the APE. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the Western Canal will not be affected by the proposed undertaking.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing
below. At this time, FHWA is once again inquiring whether you have any concerns regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance to your community within the project area. If you have such concerns, any information you might provide within the next 30 days of receipt of this letter would be considered in the project planning. If your office elects to participate in cultural resource consultation at a later date, FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns. However, such consultation would not necessitate a reconsideration of this determination of project effect. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6386 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

July 19, 2006

Robert E. Hollis, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
U.S. Department of Transportation
One Arizona Center, Suite 410
400 E. Van Buren Street
Phoenix, AZ 85004-0674

Attention: Stephen Thomas

RE: HA-AZ-NU-002-ADDY;

TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 01L;
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
SHPO-2005-1890 (59665)

Dear Mr. Hollis:

Thank you for consulting with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding the alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway and submitting materials for review and comment pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as implemented by 36 CFR Part 800. Dr. Bill Collins, Deputy SHPO/Historian, and I have reviewed the submitted materials and have the following comments.

The submitted report [A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & L/DCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona] addresses the eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) of four properties in the area of potential effect (APE), and also discusses the location of the Western Canal, previously believed to fall within the APE. We concur with the FHWA/ADOT recommendations regarding the two rural residential properties [6304 West Dobbs Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road], the Roosevelt Canal [AZ T:10H3 (ASM)], and the Western Canal [AZ T:12J:154 (ASIM)].

We also agree with the recommendation that the South Mountain Park/Preserve is eligible for inclusion to the NRHP under Criterion A, but suggest restating the eligibility in association with the development of parks and recreation in Phoenix [also in the West generally for the unique emphasis on mountain preserves] and not with the CCC. The CCC constitutes just a small portion of the park. Additionally, we agree with the FHWA/ADOT recommendations regarding eligibility of the South Mountain Park/Preserve for inclusion to the NRHP under Criteria B, C, and D.

Thank you for your effort on behalf of the community.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Napolitano
Governor

State Parks Board Members
Chair William C. Porter
Kingman
William Cordascolo
Flagstaff
Janice Chilton Payson
William C. Scalzo Phoenix
Reese Woodling Tucson
Elizabeth Stewart Tempe
Mark Winkelman State Land Commissioner
Kenneth E. Travus Executive Director
Arizona State Parks
1530 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Tel & TTY: 602.542.4174
www.azstateparks.com
800.285.3703 from (520 & 928) area codes
General Fax: 602.542.4180
Director's Office Fax: 602.542.4185
Appendix 2-1

July 19, 2006
Page 2, Hollis

If you have any questions, please contact me at (602) 542-7140 or electronically at djacobs@pr.state.az.us.

Sincerely,

David Jacobs
Compliance Specialist/Archaeologist
State Historic Preservation Office

CC: Ruth Greenspan, ADOT

Mr. Charlie McClendon
City Manager
Avondale City Hall
11465 West Civic Center Drive, Suite 200
Avondale, Arizona, 85323

Dear Mr. McClendon:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 west of Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC), the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of ten alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (E1, W55, W71, W101WPR, W101WPR, W101W99, W101CFR, W101CFR, W101EPR, and W101EPR) that extend from I-10 in west Chandler to I-10 west of Phoenix, south of the greater...
Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1,000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

**Previous Consultation:**

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SRP (Jaco, July 11, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, July 10, 2005), HLM (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005).

- A Class II survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class II Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Reclamation (Ellis, July 10, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 1101 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2022 South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brockdoek and Thompson 2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2022 South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brockdoek 2005). To date, concurrences/responses have been received from SRP (Jacobs, September 12, 2005), Reclamation (Ellis, September 19, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005).

**Current Consultation:**

A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarifies the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W5S and W7T were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Dobbs Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluations: South Mountain Park/Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T:10:83 [ASM]) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 [ASM]) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2022, South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brockdoek 2006), assesses the NRHP eligibility of South Mountain Park/Preserve and the Roosevelt Canal (Brockdoek 2006). As subconsultants to HDR, architectural historians with EcoPlan Associates (EcoPlan) assessed the two residential properties (Brockdoek 2006, Appendix A). The report is enclosed for your review and comment.

South Mountain Park/Preserve is a municipal park owned by the City of Phoenix and managed by their Parks and Recreation Department. Approximately 33 acres of the 16,000-acre park is in the proposed E1 Alignment. FHWA and ADOT concurred that the South Mountain Park/Preserve is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A as for its associations with the National Park Service (NPS) and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) New Deal programs in Phoenix during the Depression era. The park is also recommended as eligible under Criterion C for its overall sensitive design, and is eligible under Criterion B for its associations with NPS architectural resources; under Criterion C for the architectural merit of its buildings and structures, and is eligible under Criterion D for its collection of prehistoric archaeological sites and historical mining-related sites (components of the park’s mining sites may also be eligible under Criterion A pending further study).

In its entirety, the Roosevelt Canal—AZ T:10:83 (ASM)—is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the historical development of irrigation districts in lower Salt River Valley. While previous studies for the South Mountain EIS Study acknowledged that the Roosevelt Canal was NRHP eligible (Burden 2002, Darling 2005), the specific segments within the proposed alternative alignments had not been assessed in terms of whether they are contributing or non-contributing to that eligibility. The Roosevelt Canal introduces the proposed alternative alignment footprints in four locations. The canal segments that cross the W5S and W7T. Alternatives south of Van Buren Road retain integrity and are recommended as eligible to the National Register under Criterion C as contributing components. The segments that cross the proposed alternative alignments in the I-10 and the I-101 freeway corridors are modern realignments that lack historical integrity, and therefore are recommended to be non-contributing components.

The rural residences at 6304 West Dobbs Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road were added to the project’s APE as a result of alignment shifts referred to above. Both properties are on privately-owned land. Architectural historians with EcoPlan evaluated the properties’ eligibility (Brockdoek 2006, Appendix A). Both properties lack important historical associations and architectural merit, therefore, FHWA and ADOT recommend that neither property is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Finally, the initial Class III survey report for the South Mountain Freeway study (Darling 2005) had identified the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 [ASM]) as an historic property in the APE, in the E1 Alternative at Elliot Road. The Western Canal is owned and managed by Reclamation and SRP. Further study has indicated that this irrigation feature is actually a tail-water drainage ditch and that the Western Canal terminates prior to reaching the APE. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the Western Canal will not be affected by the proposed undertaking.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed...
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cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail greenspan(a).azdot.gov.

Enclosure

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Date 7-25-04

Signature for Avondale Concurrency

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Arizona Division
460 East Van Buren Street
One Arizona Center Suite 410
Phoenix, Arizona 85044-0674
June 26, 2006

In Reply Refer To: HA-AZ
NH-202-D(ADY)
TRACS No. 202L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Second Addendum Class III Survey Report

Mr. Bryan Lausten, Archaeologist
Bureau of Reclamation
Phoenix Area Office
6150 West Thunderbird Road
Glendale, Arizona, 85306

Dear Mr. Lausten:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses ten variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 west of Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

Potential consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Roosevelt Irrigation District (RID), the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC), the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai- Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.
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APE is addressed. The report, alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal
north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two
A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to

Previous Consultation:

• A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain
Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Burden 2002). Previous consultation
regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrences/responses from SRPO (Jacobs,
September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin,
September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kwasmasawuma,
September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation
(Heftington, September 11, 2003); SRP (Andrews, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27,
2003).

• A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class III Cultural Resource
Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area,
Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is
ongoing. To date, concurrences/responses have been received from SRPO (Jacobs, July 11,
2005); Reclamation (Ellis, July 12, 2005); BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005); City of Phoenix
(Bostwick, July 18, 2005); Pueblo of Zuni (Quetawki), July 13, 2005); Yavapai-Prescott Indian
Tribe (Kwiajikowki), July 22, 2005.

• An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the
overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 freeway corridors and
shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report
was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202L, South
Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck and Touchin
2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L,
South Mountain Freeway EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2005).
To date, concurrences/responses have been received from SRPO (Jacobs, October 3, 2005),
Reclamation (Ellis, September 19, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and

Current Consultation:

A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to
address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarify the
location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W55 and W71 were shifted
north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two
historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Dobson Road and 7316 West Lower
Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South
Mountain Park/Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T:10:83 (ASM)) in the
alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 (ASM)) relative to the
APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L South
Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck
2006), assesses the NRHP eligibility of South Mountain Park/Preserve and the Roosevelt Canal
(Brodbeck 2006). As subsuppliers to HDR, architectural historians with EcoPlan Associates
(EcoPlan) assessed the two residential properties (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). The report is enclosed
for your review and comment.

South Mountain Park/Preserve is a municipal park owned by the City of Phoenix and managed by their
Parks and Recreation Department. Approximately 32 acres of the 15,000+ acre-park is in the proposed
alignment. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the South Mountain Park/Preserve is eligible for
inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the National Park Service (NPS) and
Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) New Deal programs in Phoenix during the Depression era. The
park is also recommended as eligible under Criterion C for its overall scenic design that set
historical precedent in planning natural parks and implementing NPS design standards for
improvements in wilderness area parks. While the current study focuses on the 32 acres within the
footprint of the E1 Alternative, further evaluation of the park's entire 15,000+ acres has the potential
to establish eligibility under Criterion B for associations with influential NPS architects; under Criterion
C for the architectural merit of its buildings and structures, both individually and collectively as
a district; and under Criterion D for its collection of prehistoric archaeological sites and historical
mining-related sites (components of the park's mining sites may also be eligible under Criterion A
pending further study).

In its entirety, the Roosevelt Canal—AZ T:10:83 (ASM)—is considered eligible for the NRHP under
Criterion A for its associations with the historical development of irrigation districts in lower Salt
River Valley. While previous studies for the South Mountain EIS Study acknowledged that the
Roosevelt Canal was NRHP eligible (Husman 2002; Darling 2005), the specific segments within the
proposed alternative alignments had not been assessed in terms of whether they are
contributing or non-contributing to that eligibility. The Roosevelt Canal intersects the proposed alternative
alignment footprints in four locations. The canal segments that cross the W55 and W71 Alternatives south of
Valley might receive eligibility review. Architectural historians with EcoPlan evaluated the properties’
eligibility (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). Both properties lack important historical associations and architectural merit,
therefore, FHWA and ADOT recommend that neither property is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Finally, the initial Class III survey report for the South Mountain Freeway study (Darling 2005) had
identified the Western Canal (AZ T:12:154 (ASM)) as an historic property in the APE, in the E1
Alternative at Elliot Road. The Western Canal is owned and managed by Reclamation and SRP.
Further study has indicated that this irrigation feature is actually a tail-water drainage ditch that the
Western Canal terminates prior to reaching the APE. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the Western
Canal will not be affected by the proposed undertaking.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be
provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed

Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1,000 ft (304.8 m) wide and range from 21.5
miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L South
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To the Pascua Yaqui Tribe,

The cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Date

Signature for Reclamation Concurrence

Ruth Greenspan

From: Amalia Reyes [Amalia.Reyes@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 2:15 PM
To: Ruth Greenspan
Subject: South Mountain Freeway

Ms. Greenspan,

The Pascua Yaqui Tribe has received the documents for:
HA-AZ 11-3-9 (ADY)
TRACS No: 2022 R 024 H761401L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor

The tribe has no concerns with the freeway corridor project. If you have any questions, please contact me at the address below.

Thank you.

Amalia A.M. Reyes
Resource Coordinator
Education Administration Division
amalia.reyes@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov
(520) 879-9711
Fax: (520) 883-1549
August 1, 2006

Robert E. Hollis, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
U.S. Department of Transportation
One Arizona Center, Suite 410
400 E. Van Buren Street
Phoenix, AZ 85004-0674

Attention: Kenneth E. Travous

RE: HA-AZ; NH-202-D(ADY);
   TRACS No. 202L MA 004 HS764 01L;
   South Mountain Transportation Corridor
   Continuing Section 106 Consultation
   Traditional Cultural Places; Eligibility Evaluation Report
   SHPO-2003-1890 (29666)

Dear Mr. Travous:

Thank you for consulting with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding the alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway and submitting materials for review and comment pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as implemented by 36 CFR Part 800. We have reviewed the submitted materials and have the following comments:

The submitted report [An Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Properties for the 20L South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LIDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona] addresses the eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) of ten properties in the area of potential effect (APE).

Two obvious comments regarding eligibility are as follows:

First, the historic wagon road associated with AZ T:12:112 (ASM) in the report's text and figures should be assigned an ASM linear site number [although it actually is a structure in National Register terminology]. Figure 8 on page 52 labels it as the road to Phoenix, however, since additional petroglyphs are located along this transportation corridor about 100 meters to the northeast, it seems reasonable that it also served as a prehistoric route to what is now Phoenix. It is noted on page 53 that the petroglyphs at the location of AZ: T:12:112 (ASM) is problematic in terms of association, and states it is possible the petroglyph is a minor for a prehistoric trail, a precursor of the historic wagon road. As hinted at in the report, the petroglyph at AZ T:12:112 (ASM) appears to be associated with the travel route and the shrine [both strategically placed on the landscape].

Secondly, there are some process issues with eligibility and integrity. There appears to be a conflation of the determination of eligibility and effect determination; Section 106 is a linear process with assessing eligibility occurring before assessing impacts. The determination of being eligible for inclusion in the NRHP includes the entire site; if there is agreement that any portion of the site is eligible, then the site as a whole is eligible. The discussions regarding, for instance AZ T:12:9 (ASM) aka Villa Buena, should be revisited. Regarding that site, issues of integrity should consider the perspective of the associated native peoples; the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) letter to FHWA dated September 30, 2005, clearly states that [they believe] the site retains integrity [cf. page 46 of report].

Our office is very interested in the tribal response to the traditional cultural property assessment report that evaluates the eligibility for the NRHP, and look forward to receiving copies of their response. We also look forward to reviewing an amended traditional cultural property assessment report.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (602) 542-7140 or electronically at djacobs@az.state.az.us.

Sincerely,

David Jacobs
Compliance Specialist/Archaeologist
State Historic Preservation Office

CC: Ruth Greenspan, ADOT
The Area of San Pueblo Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO), Potential federal undertaking subject to consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrent responses from SHPO (Jacoby, September 19, 2003); BLM (Stone, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 8, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kwiatkowski, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); Reclamation (Huston, September 11, 2003); SRP (Anduze, November 10, 2003); and BIA (October 27, 2003).

A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "An Overview of the Overall Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Diefing 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is ongoing. To date, concurrent responses have been received from SHPO (Jacoby, July 11, 2005), Reclamation (Hills, July 12, 2005), BLM (Stone, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Quetawki, July 12, 2005), Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe (Kwiatkowski, July 22, 2005).

An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 611 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 202 South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brockeur and Touchin 2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202 South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brockeur 2005). To date, concurrent responses have been received from SHPO (Jacoby, October 3, 2005), Reclamation (Hills, September 19, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Anduze, September 19, 2005).

Current Consultation:
A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarify the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W55 and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 0304 West Dobbin Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South Mountain Park Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T:10S E311534 [ASLM]) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T:11S N311534 [ASLM]) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202 South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brockeur and Touchin 2005).
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provided to your agency through continued consultation. At this time, FHWA is once again inquiring whether you have any concerns regarding historic properties of religious or cultural importance to your community within the project area. If you have such concerns, any information you might provide within 30 days of receipt of this letter would be considered in the project planning. If your office opts to participate in cultural resource coordination at a later date, FHWA would make a good faith effort to address any concerns. However, such consultation would not necessitate a reconsideration of this determination of project effect. We also look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail: rgreenspan@az.dot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc: Greg Glassco, Director, Cultural Resource Program, 530 East Merritt, Prescott, Arizona 86301-2038 (enclosure)

Stephen D. Thomas (MD 619E)
Division Administrator

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you find the report inadequate, disagree with the eligibility recommendations, or have any concerns, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail: rgreenspan@az.dot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Division Administrator

Enclosure
June 26, 2006

Dear Ms. Stocklin:

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) is comprised of ten alternative (overlapping) freeway corridors (E1, W5S, W71, W101WPR, W101WPR, W101W99, W101CPR, W101CPR, W101CF9, and W101EFR) that extend from I-10 in west Chandler to I-10 west of Phoenix, south of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area. Alternative corridors are 1,000-ft (304.8-m) wide and range from 21.5 miles (34.6 km) to 23.6 miles (38.0 km) in length.

The cultural resources component of the EIS includes five technical studies:

**Previous Consultation:**

- A Class I overview of the overall study area: "A Class I Overview of the South Mountain Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Bartun 2002). Previous consultation regarding adequacy of the report resulted in concurrence/responses from SHPO (Jacobs, September 15, 2003); BLM (Stokes, September 22, 2003); City of Phoenix (Stocklin, September 5, 2003 and Bostwick, September 17, 2003); the Hopi Tribe (Kawanwishi, September 10, 2003); Yavapai Prescott (Jones, September 10, 2003); and BIA (October 7, 2003).

- A Class III survey of the proposed alternative alignments: "A Class III Cultural Resource Survey of Five Alternative Alignments in the South Mountain Freeway Corridor Study Area, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Darling 2005). Consultation regarding adequacy of the report is on-going. To date, commenting responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, July 11, 2005), BLM (Stokes, July 26, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, July 18, 2005), Pueblo of Zuni (Quatsawi), July 12, 2005), and Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe (Kwintowski, July 22, 2005).

- An addendum Class I overview and addendum Class III survey to address the expansion of the overall study area to include portions of the I-10 and State Route 101 freeway corridors and shifts in the alternative alignments (late 2004 and early 2005). The addendum Class I report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Class I Overview Report for the 2022, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brookbank and Teichman 2005). The Class III report was titled "An Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2003, South Mountain Freeway EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona." (Brookbank 2005). To date, commenting responses have been received from SHPO (Jacobs, October 5, 2005), BLM (October 27, 2005), City of Phoenix (Bostwick, November 1, 2005), and SRP (Anduna, November 19, 2005).

**Current Consultation:**

A second addendum cultural resources assessment report has been prepared by HDR, Inc. in order to address the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of four properties and clarifies the location of a fifth property relative to the APE. In September 2005, the W5S and W71 were shifted north of the Salt River to avoid potential impact to historic properties. As a result of this shift, two historic residential properties were added to the APE: 6304 West Debbie Road and 7315 West Lower Buckeye Road. Furthermore, two properties in the existing APE required additional evaluation: South Mountain Park Preserve and specific segments of the Roosevelt Canal (AZ T: 10.83 (ASM) in the alternative alignments. Finally, the location of the Western Canal (AZ T: 12.154 (ASM) relative to the APE is addressed. The report, "A Second Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2021, South
South Mountain Preserve is a municipal park owned by the City of Phoenix and managed by their Parks and Recreation Department. Approximately 32 acres of the 16,000+ acre-park is in the proposed I-10 Alignment. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the South Mountain Park/Preserve is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the National Park Service (NPS) and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) New Deal programs in Phoenix during the Depression era. The park is also recommended as eligible under Criterion C for its overall sensitive design that set historical precedent in planning natural parks and implementing NPS design standards for improvements in wilderness area parks. While the current study focused on the 32 acres within the footprint of the I-10 Alternative, further evaluation of the park’s entire 16,000+ acres has the potential to establish eligibility under Criterion B for associations with influential NPS architects; under Criterion C for the architectural merit of its buildings and structures, both individually and collectively as a district; and under Criterion D for its collection of prehistoric archaeological sites and historical mining-related sites (components of the park’s mining sites may also be eligible under Criterion A pending further study).

In its entirety, the Roosevelt Canal—AZ T: 10:83 (ASM)—is considered eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for its associations with the historical development of irrigation districts in lower Salt River Valley. While previous studies for the South Mountain EIS Study acknowledged that the Roosevelt Canal was NRHP eligible (Burden 2002; Darling 2005), the specific segments within the proposed alternative alignments had not been assessed in terms of whether they are contributing or non-contributing to that eligibility. The Roosevelt Canal intersects the proposed alternative alignment footprints in four locations. The canal segments that cross the W55 and W71 Alternatives south of Van Buren Road retain integrity and are recommended as eligible to the National Register under Criterion A as contributing components. The segments that cross the proposed alternative alignments in the I-10 and the I-11 Freeway corridors are modern realignments that lack historical integrity, and therefore are recommended to be non-contributing components.

The rural residences at 6304 West Dobbins Road and 7316 West Lower Buckeye Road were added to the project’s APE as a result of alignment shifts referred to above. Both properties are on privately-owned land. Architectural historians with EcoPlan evaluated the properties’ eligibility (Brodbeck 2006, Appendix A). Both properties lack important historical associations and architectural merit, therefore, FHWA and ADOT recommend that neither property is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Finally, the initial Class III survey report for the South Mountain Freeway study (Darling 2005) had identified the Western Canal (AZ T:12:1154 [ASM]) as an historic property in the APE, in the I-10 Alternative at Elliot Road. The Western Canal is owned and managed by Reclamation and SRP. Further study has indicated that this irrigation feature is actually a tail-water drainage ditch and that the Western Canal terminates prior to reaching the APE. FHWA and ADOT recommend that the Western Canal will not be affected by the proposed undertaking.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the enclosed cultural resource assessment report and information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with the eligibility recommendations, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or e-mail rgreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for Historic Preservation Office Concurrence

Date

Enclosure
September 25, 2006

Robert E. Holli, Division Administrator
U. S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Arizona Division
400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 410
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

RE: South Mountain Transportation Corridor, Section 106 Consultation, Traditional Cultural Places, HA-AZ NH-202-D (ADV), TRACS No. 2021, MA 054 H5764 011

Dear Mr. Holli,

The Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) has received HDR Engineering, Inc. Cultural Resource Report 05-01, titled "An Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Properties for the 2021, South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LDCP Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodeck, 2006). The GRIC Cultural Resource Management Program is presently reviewing this report and wishes to present an evaluation of the document to the GRIC Cultural Resource Standing Committee prior to submission to the Federal Highway Administration.

We understand that in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800-4), which requires federal agencies to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties that could be affected by a proposed project, the aforementioned report was prepared for the Arizona Department of Transportation and evaluates the eligibility of historic properties identified in our letter of July 7, 2005.

The Gila River Indian Community wishes to maintain participation in discussions regarding the potential effects to such resources that could result from the South Mountain Freeway project. We anticipate forwarding a formal response to the submitted report in mid October 2006.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William R. Rhodes
Governor
Gila River Indian Community

cc: Andrew Darling GRIC-CRMP Assistant Coordinator
Doug Blackwater, GRIC Land Use Planning & Zoning
Steve Thomas, Environmental Program Manager, FHW Arizona Division
Kae Neustadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist
Mark Brodeck, HDR Engineering, Inc.
Ms. Charyl Blanchard, Archaeologist
Bureau of Land Management
Phoenix Field Office
21605 North 7th Ave.
Phoenix, Arizona 85027-2099

Dear Ms. Blanchard:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway (State Route 202L) between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to I-10 south of Phoenix. As this project is qualified for federal-aid funding, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because an alternative has not been chosen for the highway, land jurisdiction is unknown at this time. Consulting parties for this project have included FHWA, ADOT, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), Arizona State Land Department, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Salt River Project, Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Roosevelt Irrigation District, the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Southern Paiute Tribe, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni (Zuni), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Yavapai- Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation, and the Yavapai-Paiute Tribe (Y-PIT).

Previous consultation with SHPO recommended a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address potential effects of the project on historic properties. SHPO concurred with this recommendation (Jacobs [SHPO] to Hollis [FHWA] September 9, 2003). Drafts of the PA were submitted to consulting parties in December, 2003, June, 2005, and in July and August, 2005.

In 2004 the ACHP encouraged FHWA to develop a PA in consultation with SHPO and other consulting parties without ACHP participation, but requested to be informed if any criteria for ACHP involvement were met in the future. In September 2005 a revised draft PA was sent to ACHP, and they again responded that they did not feel their participation was necessary (Wallace [ACHP] to Hollis [FHWA]).
The previous letter was also sent to:
Mr. Steve Ross, Archaeologist, Arizona State Land Department
Mr. Bruce Ellis, Chief, Environmental Resource Management Division, Bureau of Reclamation
Mr. Robert B. Stevens, Environmental Programs Manager, Flood Control District of Maricopa County
Mr. Charlie McClendon, City Manager, City of Avondale
Mr. Mike Normand, Transportation Services and Planning Manager, City of Chandler
Mr. Ron Short, Deputy Director for Long Range Planning, City of Glendale
Mr. Todd Bostwick, Archaeologist, City of Phoenix
Ms. Barbara Stocklin, Historic Preservation Officer, City of Phoenix
Mr. Ralph Veliz, City Manager, City of Tolleson
Mr. Brian Kenny, Environmental Programs Manager, Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Mr. Stanley Ashby, Superintendent, Roosevelt Irrigation District
Mr. Rick Anduze, Archaeologist, Salt River Project
Ms. Lydia Lopez-Cruz, Archaeologist, United States Army Corps of Engineers
Ms. Delia M. Carlyle, Chairwoman, Ak-Chin Indian Community
Mr. Charles Wood, Chairman, Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
Ms. Sherry Cordova, Chairwoman, Cocopah Tribe
Mr. Daniel Eddy, Jr., Chairman, Colorado River Indian Tribes
Mr. Raphael Bear, President, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation

Ms. Nora McDowell, Chairwoman, Fort Mojave Indian Tribe
Mr. Mike Jackson, Sr., President, Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe
Mr. William Rhodes, Governor, Gila River Indian Community
Mr. Thomas Siyuja, Chairman, Havasupai Tribe
Mr. Leigh Kuwanwisiwma, Cultural Preservation Officer, Hopi Tribe
Ms. Loretta Jackson, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Hualapai Tribe
Mr. Gary Tom, Chairwoman, Kaibab-Paite Tribe
Dr. Alan Downer, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department
Ms. Herminia Frias, Chairwoman, Pascua Yaqui Tribe
Mr. Arlen Quetawki, Governor, Pueblo of Zuni
Ms. Joni Ramos, President, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Ms. Kathleen Wesley-Kitcheyan, Chairwoman, San Carlos Apache Nation
Ms. Evelyn James, President, San Juan Southern Paiute
Mr. Peter Stere, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Tohono O'odham Nation
Mr. Joe Josquin, Cultural Resource Specialist, Tohono O'odham Nation
Mr. Ivan Smith, Chairwoman, Tonto Apache Tribe
Mr. Ronnie Lupe, Chairwoman, White Mountain Apache Tribe
Mr. Jamie Fullmer, Chairwoman, Yavapai-Apache Nation
The Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) maintains that the cultural significance of South Mountain figures prominently in oral traditions 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) as well as the Pee Posh, formally known as the Maricopa Tribe of the GRIC and of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community. Traditional religion has always been central to the O'odham that defines their relationship to the natural world and the landscape they live in. Akimel O'odham and Pee Posh religion, oral histories, creation stories, ritual activities, ceremonial practices, and concepts of power and sacred places on the land are all connected to every part of the natural environment and must be treated with reverence and respect. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended provides a compliance process for identifying and evaluating potentially significant traditional cultural properties (TCPs) per NRHP criteria. Construction of the proposed alternative alignments being studied for the EIS for the proposed Loop 202 (202L), South Mountain Freeway will adversely affect these properties. Each property is described below with the eligibility recommendation provided by HDR Engineering, Inc.

South Mountain Range
TCP Recommendation: Eligible

NOTE: GRIC does not concur with the designation of a “core homeland” by Brodbeck (2006:62-63, Figure 16) as partial justification for TCP status.

NOTE: GRIC does not concur with the boundary of the South Mountain Range TCP as designated by Brodbeck (2006: Figure 14).

We concur with the recommendation that the South Mountain Range is eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A and B as a traditional cultural property for its association with the broad patterns of traditional cultural practices and beliefs for the Akimel O’odham, Pee Posh, and other tribes and for its association with O’odham creator deity Se’ehe (Elder Brother).

However, an Akimel O’odham “core homeland” depicted in the TCP evaluation report is inaccurate and downplays the significance of Mohadjad Doag (South Mountain) to all O’odham, Pee Posh, and Colorado River Tribes, and possibly others who maintain an association with the South Mountain Range (Brodbeck 2006:62-63, Figure 16). Brodbeck identifies the traditional homeland of the Akimel O’odham as a core area comprised of the Middle Gila River valley, generally from the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument near the City of Coolidge and the Town of Florence to the confluence of the Gila and Salt Rivers. The south-end of the traditional core is framed by the San Tan Mountains and Sacaton Mountains and the north-west end by the Estrella Mountains and South mountain ranges. This designation is at variance with the present day boundaries of the Gila River Indian Community. This representation is not accurate and the GRIC is highly disturbed by this designation, even though Brodbeck does concede that “While the social, economic, political and religious spheres of the Akimel O’odham ranged far beyond this land, across southern Arizona...
and as far as northern Mexico and southern California...the land of their ancestors (the Hohokam), the place of their origin, and the nexus of their spiritual landscapes" (2006:69).

We firmly recommend that reference to a “core homeland” and Figure 16 be stricken from the report. If reference to traditional aboriginal lands is necessary to the discussion, we suggest this designation be represented by the 1970 Indian Claims Commission (ICC) Aboriginal Lands title that identifies lands that had been continuously and exclusively used by the Akimel O’Odham (Pima) and the Pee Posh (Maricopa). The ICC ruling placed under aboriginal title an area in excess of over three million acres, far exceeding the "reservation lands currently occupied by the peoples of the GRIC today. As a territory, these lands describe the tangible world of the Akimel O’Odham (Pima) and Pee Posh (Maricopa) cultures living in the GRIC, in which religious beliefs, ideology, and life-ways make sense, have place and shape a vibrant heritage and worldview. It should be kept in mind, however, that the aboriginal lands identified by the ICC for Gila River do not include the interests of other Tribes (such as the Colorado River Tribes or the remaining members of the Four Southern Tribes of Arizona) who may be concerned about the status of South Mountain.

South Mountain Range TCP boundary

We do not concur with the TCP boundary based on the geology of the mountain. We also do not agree that the boundary as recommended for the purposes of the TCP study is sensitive to its cultural importance and is inclusive of its traditional uses.

GRIC representatives at an on-site consultation on February 9, 2006 related that creating a boundary around Muhadagi Doag is inconsistent with O’Odham worldviews and Muhadagi Doag is a continuum of life and not an "object". The GRIC believes that creating a boundary around Muhadagi Doag is inconsistent with the spiritual realm of the site because the site penetrates the entire earth in its spiritual realm. We understand that modern development has impaired the portion of the site located outside the reservation, this site still holds its physical and cultural integrity and modern impact outside the GRIC does not diminish the site’s religious and cultural significance.

Pueblo Del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 ASM) TCP Recommendation: Not Eligible

We do not concur with the recommendation for the Villa Buena archaeological site. The GRIC identifies the Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 ASM) archaeological site, which has shrines, ballcourts, and platform mounds, as a traditional cultural property and feels that it is a TCP under NRHP criteria. We believe that the report should specify this and that the portion of the site evaluated for the proposed South Mountain alignment is not representative of the total site’s eligibility. Although modern development has impacted the portion of the Villa Buena site outside the reservation, this site still holds its physical and cultural integrity and modern impact outside the GRIC does not diminish the site’s religious and cultural significance.

NOTE: GRIC does not concur and recommends that the Villa Buena site is a TCP under NRHP criteria. The portion of the site located within the proposed South Mountain corridor may be considered non-contributing to the status of the site as a TCP overall (under criterion A). However, this portion in the corridor is eligible under criterion D for its information potential.

We do not concur with the recommendation for the Villa Buena archaeological site. The GRIC identifies the Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 ASM) archaeological site, which has shrines, ballcourts, and platform mounds, as a traditional cultural property and feels that it is a TCP under NRHP criteria. The assessment clearly was applied only to the portion of the site in the current proposed South Mountain Corridor located outside the reservation boundary. We believe that the report should specify this and that the portion of the site evaluated for the proposed South Mountain alignment is not representative of the total site’s eligibility. Although modern development has impacted the portion of the Villa Buena site outside the reservation, this site still holds its physical and cultural integrity and modern impact outside the GRIC does not diminish the site’s religious and cultural significance.

Pueblo Del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 ASM) TCP Recommendation: Not Eligible

We do not concur with the recommendation for the Villa Buena archaeological site. The GRIC identifies the Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 ASM) archaeological site, which has shrines, ballcourts, and platform mounds, as a traditional cultural property and feels that it is a TCP under NRHP criteria. We believe that the report should specify this and that the portion of the site evaluated for the proposed South Mountain alignment is not representative of the total site’s eligibility. Although modern development has impacted the portion of the Villa Buena site outside the reservation, this site still holds its physical and cultural integrity and modern impact outside the GRIC does not diminish the site’s religious and cultural significance.

Pueblo Del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 ASM) TCP Recommendation: Not Eligible

We do not concur with the recommendation for the Villa Buena archaeological site. The GRIC identifies the Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 ASM) archaeological site, which has shrines, ballcourts, and platform mounds, as a traditional cultural property and feels that it is a TCP under NRHP criteria. We believe that the report should specify this and that the portion of the site evaluated for the proposed South Mountain alignment is not representative of the total site’s eligibility. Although modern development has impacted the portion of the Villa Buena site outside the reservation, this site still holds its physical and cultural integrity and modern impact outside the GRIC does not diminish the site’s religious and cultural significance.

NOTE: GRIC does not concur and recommends that the Villa Buena site is a TCP under NRHP criteria. The portion of the site located within the proposed South Mountain corridor may be considered non-contributing to the status of the site as a TCP overall (under criterion A). However, this portion in the corridor is eligible under criterion D for its information potential.

We do not concur with the recommendation for the Villa Buena archaeological site. The GRIC identifies the Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 ASM) archaeological site, which has shrines, ballcourts, and platform mounds, as a traditional cultural property and feels that it is a TCP under NRHP criteria. The assessment clearly was applied only to the portion of the site in the current proposed South Mountain Corridor located outside the reservation boundary. We believe that the report should specify this and that the portion of the site evaluated for the proposed South Mountain alignment is not representative of the total site’s eligibility. Although modern development has impacted the portion of the Villa Buena site outside the reservation, this site still holds its physical and cultural integrity and modern impact outside the GRIC does not diminish the site’s religious and cultural significance.

Pueblo Del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 ASM) TCP Recommendation: Not Eligible

We do not concur with the recommendation for the Villa Buena archaeological site. The GRIC identifies the Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 ASM) archaeological site, which has shrines, ballcourts, and platform mounds, as a traditional cultural property and feels that it is a TCP under NRHP criteria. We believe that the report should specify this and that the portion of the site evaluated for the proposed South Mountain alignment is not representative of the total site’s eligibility. Although modern development has impacted the portion of the Villa Buena site outside the reservation, this site still holds its physical and cultural integrity and modern impact outside the GRIC does not diminish the site’s religious and cultural significance.
AZ T:12:197 (ASM) - Trail  TCP Recommendation: Eligible  GRIC: Concur

We concur that this site is eligible under Criterion A as a contributing component of the South Mountain TCP overall and that it is also considered individually eligible to the NRHP under Criterion D as an archaeological site with important information potential.

AZ T:12:208 (ASM) - Petroglyph Site  TCP Recommendation: Not Eligible  GRIC: Concur (in general)

We concur that the site is no longer an eligible TCP under NRHP criteria due to vandalism and looting. However, it continues to be a contributing feature to the overall TCP status of South Mountain and it should be recognized that this site retains cultural significance for Indian communities, despite the highly diminished integrity of the petroglyphs. Furthermore, the site remains eligible under Criterion D for its association with prehistoric lithic procurement and quarrying.

AZ T:12:201 (ASM), AZ T:12:207 (ASM), and AZ T:12:211 (ASM) - Trail Sites  TCP Recommendation: Not Eligible  GRIC: Concur (in general)

We concur that these three trail sites are eligible under criterion D and may not be TCPs. It should be recognized that some trails may be eligible TCPs under Criterion A and B but this should be determined on a case by case basis.

Active Shrine AZ T:12:112 (ASM)  TCP Recommendation: Eligible  GRIC: Concur

We concur that the shrine is eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A as a TCP and under Criterion D as an archaeological site.

Management Recommendation:

The GRIC notes that this report only provides eligibility recommendations for TCP status for the sites considered. However, this is only a first step towards effective management. It is clear, but never acknowledged, that construction of the proposed South Mountain Freeway alignment will adversely impact TCPs. No substantive management recommendations, such as avoidance, for example, or other strategies for mitigation, are provided in the TCP evaluation by Brodbeck/HDR Engineering, Inc. It is our understanding that management recommendations for TCPs are required in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which apparently exists in draft but has not been received for review by the GRIC. However, such issues need to be considered in close consultation with the GRIC and other concerned Native American communities.

Conclusion

We reiterate that the landscape view of Muhadagi Doag (South Mountain) will be forever altered by a transportation corridor that will be intrusive to the spiritual connections associated with the people of the Gila River Indian Community. We are highly concerned that the proposed transportation project will cause the destruction of sacred places and spaces, archaeological sites, trails, and shrines located within the proposed corridor. The presence of Muhadagi Doag, the home of ancient deity Se’he, evokes solemn reverence among the people of the GRIC and any alteration of the Muhadagi Doag will contribute to diminishing our traditional way of life.

The GRIC appreciates the efforts of the Federal Highway Administration in addressing our concerns that must be resolved through the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) 106 Consultation process. We anticipate continued and meaningful consultations on this federal undertaking. Please call GRIC Cultural Resource Specialist, Barnaby V. Lewis at 1-520-562-3570 should you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

William R. Rhodes, Governor
Gila River Indian Community

cc: J. Andrew Darling, GRIC-CRMP Coordinator
Errol Blackwater, GRIC Land Use Planning & Zoning
Doug Torres, GRIC Department of Transportation
Kae Neustadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist
Ruth Greenspan, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist
Mark Brodbeck, HDR Engineering, Inc.
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Mr. John Madison
Curator of Archaeology, Repatriation Coordinator
Arizona State Museum
P. O. Box 24006
Tucson, Arizona 85721-0006

Dear Mr. Madison:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning to construct a loop highway (State Route 202) between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to I-10 south of Phoenix. As this project is qualified for federal-aid funding, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because an alternative has not been chosen for the highway, land jurisdiction is unknown at this time. Consulting parties for this project have included SHPO, ADOT, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), Arizona State Land Department, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Salt River Project, Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Roosevelt Irrigation District, the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ah-Chin Iosca Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Apache Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe (Hopi), the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pima Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblos of Zuni (Zunil), the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, the Tonto O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Yavapai-Paiute Nation, and the Yavapai-Peoria Indian Tribe (Y-11).

Previous consultation with SHPO recommended a Programmatic Agreement (PA) be developed to address potential effects of the project on historic properties. SHPO concurred with this recommendation (SHPO to Hollis [FHWA] September 9, 2003). Drafts of the PA were submitted to consulting parties in December, 2003, June, 2004, and in July and August, 2005.

In 2004 the ACHP encouraged FHWA to develop a PA in consultation with SHPO and other consulting parties with or without ACHP participation, but requested to be informed if any criteria for ACHP involvement were met in the future. In September 2005 a revised draft PA was sent to ACHP, and they again responded that they did not feel this participation was necessary (Waltz et al [ACHP] to Hollis [FHWA]).

The previous letter was also sent to:
Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist, State Historic Preservation Office
Mr. Bruce Ellis, Chief, Environmental Resource Management Division, Bureau of Reclamation
December 28, 2006

Robert E. Hollis, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
One Arizona Center, Suite 410
Phoenix, AZ 85004-0674

Attention: Stephen Thomas

Janet Napolitano
Governor

State Parks
Board Members
Chair
William C. Porter
Kingman
William Cordasco
Flagstaff
Janice Chilton
Payson
William C. Scalzo
Phoenix
Reese Woodling
Tucson
Janice Chilton
Payson
William C. Porter
Kingman
William Cordasco
Flagstaff

Dear Mr. Hollis:

Enclosed is the Programmatic Agreement (PA) for the Federal Highway Administration project to construct a loop highway (State Route 202L) between Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix to I-10 south of Phoenix in Maricopa County. It was signed by James Garrison, the Arizona State Preservation Officer, on December 28, 2006. The document should be filed with the Advisory Council according to 36 CFR § 800.6(b)(1)(iv). We would appreciate receiving a copy of the complete signature page for our files.

We look forward to reviewing and commenting on the project’s treatment plans according to stipulations of the PA. We appreciate your continuing cooperation with our office in complying with the requirements of historic preservation.

Please contact me at (602) 542-7140 or electronically at djacobs@Dr.state.az.us if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

David Jacobs
Compliance Specialist/Archaeologist
State Historic Preservation Office

Cc: Ruth Greenspan, ADOT

January 8, 2007

U.S. Department of Transportation — Federal Highway Administration
Arizona Division
400 E. Van Buren Street
One Arizona Center, Suite 410
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-0674

Re: HOP-AZ, NH-202(ADY), TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 01L
SR 202L – South Mountain Final Programmatic Agreement

Dear Mr. Robert Hollis:

I have signed the enclosed Programmatic Agreement on behalf of the City of Phoenix as a concurring party.

If you need additional information, please contact me by telephone at (602) 281-8699 or by fax at (602) 534-4671.

Sincerely,

Barbara Stocklin
Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Todd Bostwick, City Archaeology Office

Enclosure
Robert E. Hollis  
Division Administrator, Arizona Division  
USDOT Federal Highway Administration  
400 East Van Buren Street  
One Arizona Center Suite 410  
Phoenix, AZ 85004 -0674  

RE: HOP-AZ; NH-202-D(ADY); TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 011; SR 202L; South Mountain Final Programmatic Agreement

Dear Mr. Hollis:

The Salt River Project (SRP) does want to be included as a Concurring Party to the South Mountain Final Programmatic Agreement. I have enclosed the document provided to SRP and signed by Ray Hedrick, Manager, Siting and Studies, Environmental Services.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Anduze  
Environmental Scientist/Archaeologist

File: LEG 1-1-2

Arizona Division
400 East Van Buren Street  
One Arizona Center Suite 410  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004 -0674

January 18, 2007

In Reply Refer To: HOP-AZ  
NH-202-D(ADY) TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 011, South Mountain Transportation Corridor Section 106 Consultation  
Traditional Cultural Places Eligibility Evaluation Report

Mr. William Rhodes, Governor  
Gila River Indian Community  
P.O. Box 97  
Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Rhodes:

We are in receipt of your letter of December 19, 2006 in response to the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA’s) consultation regarding the report, “An Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Properties for the 202L, South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LDECR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona” (Brodbeck 2006). The report is being revised in response to your comments, and the revised document will be sent to you for review and further comment.

In the interim, we want to ensure that the interests of the Community continue to be taken into account as design alternatives are developed and considered for this proposed project. As part of this process, we would like for the design consultants to be able to consider all options for minimizing impacts to those properties that are of cultural significance to your Community. In order for the design team to take into consideration alternatives that would avoid the active shrine site, AZ T:12:112(ASM), it would be necessary for them to be aware of the area to be avoided.

We are therefore requesting your permission to disclose the general location of the shrine to the project manager, the prime design consultant, and a small number of support personnel in order to request that they develop design alternatives that would avoid the shrine, allow continued access, and minimize indirect impacts to it. If permission to identify areas of avoidance were given, we would divulge only the general location of the property, and not provide any specific information regarding the nature of the property or its significance.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you agree to allow disclosure of the general location of the active shrine, AZ T:12:112 (ASM), to a limited number of people involved in the design process, please sign below to indicate your concurrence. We look forward to continuing
consultation with your office. If you have any question or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or email R.Greenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for Tribal Concurrence

Date

cc:
S Thomas
RGreenspan (M D619E)

S Ted W. Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, GRIC, P.O. Box E, Sacaton, AZ 85247
SDThomas@cinc

January 16, 2007

Federal Highway Administration
Attn: Steve Thomas
Arizona Division
400 E. Van Buren Street
One Arizona Center Suite 410
Phoenix Arizona

RE: Programmatic Agreement – Loop 202 S. Mountain Ext.

Dear Steve Thomas:

President Bear has signed the attached Agreement on behalf of the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation ("Nation"). Ruth Greenspan advised me to forward this to you.

Sincerely:

[Signature]

Thomas J. Mostary
Office of the General Counsel
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation
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February 22, 2007

Mr. Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Division
400 E. Van Buren Street, One Arizona Center #419
Phoenix AZ 85004-0674

Re: SR202 South Mountain Final Programmatic Agreement
TRACS # 202L MA 054 H5764 OIL

Dear Mr. Hollis:

The City of Chandler is in receipt of your letter dated December 11, 2006 regarding the Final Programmatic Agreement for the referenced project. Since no construction is anticipated to occur within the City’s jurisdiction as part of this project, the City does not wish to sign the Agreement. However, the City would like to be consulted throughout the environmental planning, design and construction process.

Thank you for your cooperation. Should you have any questions, please contact me at (480) 782-3431, or email me at Samuel.Hanna@chandleraz.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Samuel Hanna, Ph.D., P.E.
Senior Transportation Engineer

cc: Daniel W. Cook, Acting Public Works Director
    Mike Normand, Acting Assistant Public Works Director/Transportation & Operations
    Ruth Greenspan, ADOT Environmental Planning Group
    205 S. 17th Ave., Room #213, MD 619E, Phoenix AZ 85007

---

Arizona Department of Transportation
Intermodal Transportation Division
200 South Seventeenth Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3213

May 15, 2007

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist
State Historic Preservation Office
Arizona State Parks
1300 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

RE: Project No NH-202-D(ADY)
TRACS No. 202L MA 054 H5764 OIL
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Continuing Section 106 Consultation
Jackson Farmstead Eligibility

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses variations on three alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler to I-10 in west Phoenix. One of the alignments, the W55 alignment, was recently shifted to avoid an industrial facility at the southwest corner of 51st Avenue and Van Buren Street. As a result of this shift, an historic farmstead located at 5727 West Van Buren Street, referred to herein as the Jackson farmstead, is now in the project's area of potential effects (APE) and requires evaluation.

As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review. The Jackson farmstead is on private property in the City of Phoenix. Consulting parties for this assessment include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the City of Phoenix Historic Preservation Office. Due to the scope and nature of this component of the project, no tribal consultations will occur.

EcoPlan & Associates, Inc., as subconsultant to HDR Engineering, Inc., evaluated the eligibility of the Jackson farmstead for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The results of the assessment are reported in a technical memorandum, dated December 4, 2006 (Dorigo 2006), which is enclosed for your review.

Based on Dorigo’s evaluation, FHWA/ADOT recommend the Jackson farmstead is not eligible for inclusion on the NRHP due to a general lack of historical and architectural significance. Its
This letter was also sent to:
Ms. Liz Wilson, Historic Preservation Officer, City of Phoenix

Jacobs
TRACS No. 202 I. MA 054 H5764 01L
Project No NH-202-D(ADY)
May 15, 2007
Page 2 of 2

setting has lost its rural character and the current property is only a fraction of the original farmstead. The property fails to convey the character of a historical farmstead in the context of the agricultural development of the Salt River Valley. Furthermore, because of their lack of historical and architectural significance, the two remaining houses on the property, individually, are also recommended not eligible for the NRHP.

Please review the enclosed report and the information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with FHWA/ADOT’s eligibility recommendation, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 602-712-6626 or e-mail rgreenpan@jxdo.t.gov.

Sincerely,

Ruth L. Greenspan
Historic Preservation Specialist
Environmental Planning Group
201 S. 17th Avenue, Room 213E / MD 619E
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Signature for SHPO Concurrence  Date

Enclosure

cc: STThomas (FHWA)

Ms. Carol Legend
Historic Preservation Specialist
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 809
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Ms. Legend:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concpt Report project. The EIS addresses nine variations of five alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

FHWA originally consulted with your office regarding the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) in August 2003, and again in September, 2005. In response to both consultations, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) declined to participate in the PA. Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.650(r), at the time FHWA is submitting the final PA to the Council to complete the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. If there is any additional information that you request, or if you have any questions or comments, please Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6626 or electronically at rgreenpan@jxdo.t.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Enclosure (Programmatic Agreement)

cc: STThomas, RGreenspan (FHWA), MHollowell (ADOT)

MOVING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY
Dear Governor Rhodes:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Location/Design Concept Report for the proposed Loop 202 (SR 202L), South Mountain Freeway. The DEIS addresses variations of alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from the Interstate 10 (I-10) and SR 202L traffic interchange to I-10 in western Phoenix. This project is a federal action that requires compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The area of potential effects (APE) consists of the alternative alignment corridors.

The proposed alternative alignments being studied for the DEIS have the potential to affect archaeological sites and natural features on the landscape that are deemed sacred by Native American tribes and that may qualify for the National Register of Historic Places. The resulting evaluations of alternative alignments for Loop 202/South Mountain Transportation Corridor (SR 202L MA 054 H1764) were reported in an Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Places for the Loop 202/South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LOICP Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck 2006). FHWA and ADOT appreciate the Gila River Indian Community's comments on the report, sent on December 19, 2006, and we are in the process of revising the TCP evaluation report accordingly. The purpose of this letter is to seek additional input on the boundary for the South Mountain TCP.

FHWA and ADOT recognize that creating any type of boundary around Muhadagi Doag (South Mountain) is inconsistent with O'odham and Pee Posh worldviews and that Muhadagi Doag is part of a continuum of life interwoven with far-reaching social, cultural, spiritual, and physical landscapes. Furthermore, we appreciate the Community’s understanding that potential traditional cultural properties must be evaluated with reference to the National Register of Historic Places Criteria for Evaluation (36 C.F.R. Part 60) to determine if Muhadagi Doag is eligible for the National Register, and that this requires delineating a boundary to define it as a tangible property.

In the draft TCP eligibility report (Brodbeck 2006), the boundary for the Muhadagi Doag TCP was initially based on geologic features, and defined the mountain range through a series of disjointed bedrock protrusions (see enclosed map). Per your response, we understand that this boundary was not fully sensitive to its cultural importance as viewed by the Community and not adequate for Section 106 purposes because it was not inclusive of all of its traditional uses. We appreciate your suggestion to use a one mile radius from the base of the geologic bedrock formations to provide a boundary that is culturally sensitive to and inclusive of traditional uses. As shown in the enclosed figures, when this boundary is mapped out it includes a combination of natural desert, agricultural fields, and built-out urban areas, such as residential subdivisions and the I-10/US 60 traffic interchange.

To assess the National Register eligibility of the Muhadagi Doag TCP, FHWA and ADOT propose using a boundary that is inclusive of its traditional uses and balanced with the surrounding built urban environment. The revised proposed boundary minimizes the inclusion of surrounding urban areas, such as housing subdivisions and freeway corridors, where no traditional uses of the South Mountain TCP are known to exist. In keeping with the Community’s suggestions, this proposed boundary includes surrounding natural and less-developed areas where traditional activities and access to the mountain are maintained.

In the Southern Foothills area, there are areas where modern urban development falls within the proposed TCP boundary. These instances are ones where the built environment is fully surrounded by natural, undeveloped areas. The boundary was drawn to include those areas in order to capture the fullest possible extent of culturally sensitive traditional use areas directly associated with the TCP.

Please review the information provided in this letter and the enclosed map showing our proposed revised boundary for the Muhadagi Doag TCP. If you agree with the use of this proposed boundary for the National Register eligibility assessment, please sign below to indicate your concurrence.

At this time we would also like to reiterate our request of January 18, 2007 regarding AZ T:12:112(ASM), the active shrine site. FHWA and ADOT are committed to investigating strategies to minimize potential impacts to historic properties and TCPs. In a letter dated January 18, 2007 we requested permission to disclose the general location of AZ T:12:112(ASM) to the project manager, the prime design consultant, and a small number of support personnel so that they might investigate design alternatives that would avoid the shrine, allow continued access,
and minimize indirect impacts to it. To date, we have not received a response. The draft
Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will be made public soon, and as you pointed out in
your December 19, 2006 letter, that document will include management recommendations to
mitigate any potential adverse effects to TCPs, including the active shrine. We are requesting
your input in investigating potential measures to minimize harm to the shrine, and requesting
permission to involve the engineering design team in this effort.

Your December 19, 2006 letter also pointed out the need for mitigation strategies to be
considered in close consultation with the Community and other concerned Native American
communities. We, too, recognize the need for close consultation regarding potential mitigation
strategies and other issues of mutual concern relating to the proposed South Mountain Freeway.
As there are a number of issues that have thus far not been effectively resolved through our
written consultations, we propose some meetings between the Community, FHWA, and ADOT.
We recognize that formal decisions are unlikely to be made in such a forum, but feel that face-to
face meetings would allow for an exchange of ideas and concerns and identify issues that could
be brought back to our respective Community/Agencies for discussion and consideration.

We look forward to continued consultation with you. If you have any question or concerns,
please do not hesitate to call Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or email RGreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS
Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

Signature for GRIC Concurrence Date

Enclosure
cc: Jennifer Allison-Ray, Lieutenant Governor, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton, Arizona 85247
David White, Community Manager, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton, Arizona 85247
Barb Sleva, Cultural Resource Specialist, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85247
J. Andrew Ewing, CRMP Coordinator, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85247
SJohnson
W.Vachon
K.Bowen
M.Hollowell (EM02)
E.Greenhouse (EM02)
M.Draker (EM45)
S.D.Thomas and others

GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY
Executive Office of the Governor & Lieutenant Governor

July 2, 2007

Robert E. Hollis, Division Administrator
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Arizona Division
400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 410
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

RE: South Mountain Transportation Corridor, Section 106 Consultation, Traditional Cultural Places, Eligibility Report; HOP-AZ NH-202-D (ADV); Project No. 202-L
MA 054 H5764 01L

Dear Mr. Hollis,

The Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) in response to your letter dated June 13, 2007 in which you requested additional input on the boundary for the Muhadagi Doag (South Mountain) TCP. We appreciate that you recognize the need for close consultation regarding potential mitigation strategies in close consultation with the GRIC and other concerned Native American communities.

We appreciate that the FHWA acknowledges that the draft TCP Eligibility report (Broda et al. 2006), defined the boundary for the Muhadagi Doag TCP based on geological features is not fully sensitive to the cultural importance as viewed by the GRIC and is not adequate for Section 106 purposes because it was not inclusive of all of its traditional uses. In review of the information provided in your letter and the enclosed proposed boundary map for the Muhadagi Doag TCP. The GRIC wishes further consultation before its submission for the purposes of National Register eligibility assessment.

We understand that the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will be made public soon, and pleased that DEIS will include management recommendations to mitigate any potential adverse effects to TCPs, including the active shrine.

We agree that some meetings between the GRIC, FHWA, and ADOT must be scheduled at the earliest possible time to discuss your request for permission to disclose the general location of AZ T:12:112 (ASM), active shrine area in order to investigate design alternatives that would avoid the shrine, allowed continued access, and minimize indirect
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impacts to the shrine. We request consideration in inviting the State Historic Preservation Office to the proposed meeting as we discuss issues that have not been resolved through written communications.

The GRIC appreciates the efforts of the Federal Highway Administration in addressing our grave concerns that must be resolved through the National Historic Preservation Act 106 Consultation process. We anticipate continued and meaningful consultations on this federal undertaking. Please call GRIC-Cultural Resource Specialist, Barnaby V. Lewis at 1-520-562-6713 should you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

William R. Rhodes, Governor
Gila River Indian Community

cc J. Andrew Darling GRIC-CRMP Coordinator
Enrol Blackwater, GRIC Land Use Planning & Zoning
Doug Torres, GRIC Department of Transportation
Kae Neustadt, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist
Ruth Greenspan, ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist
Mark Brodbeck, HDR Engineering, Inc.

ARIZONA DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT GROUP
JUL 27 2007

ARIZONA DIVISION
Federal Highway Administration
Suite 410
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-0074
602-379-2646

In Reply Refer To:
HOP-AZ

NI-203-D(ADY)
Project No. 2031 MA 034 05764 01L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor
Section 106 Consultation
Traditional Cultural Places
Mitigation Measures

Mr. William Rhodes, Governor
Gila River Indian Community
P.O. Box 97
Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Rhodes:

In previous consultation regarding the potential effects of the proposed SR 202L (South Mountain Freeway) on historic properties and other places of concern to the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), it was suggested that some informal meetings between representatives of GRIC, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) should take place in order to address possible mitigation strategies relating to a proposed freeway option. Following receipt of your letter of July 2, 2007, several informal meetings and conversations have been held between various representatives of the GRIC Cultural Resource Specialist's Office (CRSO), GRIC Cultural Resource Management Program (CRMP), the FHWA, the ADOT Historic Preservation Team (HPT), the SHPO, and the City of Phoenix Archaeology Section (COP-AS). As a result of these various meetings, FHWA and ADOT have been pursuing two possible strategies to help mitigate potential adverse effects of the proposed freeway on the Muhadagi Doag (South Mountain) Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) and other places of traditional significance to your community.

Previous consultation regarding the Muhadagi Doag TCP addressed attempts to define a boundary that could be used to satisfy FHWA's Section 106 (of the National Historic Preservation Act) responsibilities and afford protection to Muhadagi Doag. As a result of this consultation, FHWA recognizes that the traditional use areas of Muhadagi Doag extend on the south and southeast beyond the northern boundary of the Community, and that any of the build alternatives of the proposed freeway would have an adverse effect on the Muhadagi Doag TCP. During consultation
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it was also recognized that although some areas of Muhadagi Doag, such as the southwest ridges, clearly active traditional use areas, fully defining a meaningful boundary for the TCP as a whole will require a more detailed study of traditional uses and cultural significance of Muhadagi Doag. Rather than define an arbitrary boundary until such time as a more meaningful boundary can be identified, FHWA proposes to formally acknowledge that any of the build alternatives of the proposed freeway would impact the southern and southwestern portion of Muhadagi Doag, and would have an adverse effect on the TCP. At this time, FHWA would like to proceed with consultation addressing specific mitigation measures to address the adverse effect.

One such mitigation measure discussed at some of the above-referenced meetings is for FHWA and ADOT to provide funds for GRIC CRMP to conduct a detailed study of traditional uses and cultural significance of Muhadagi Doag. The City of Phoenix is currently working on a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility study of the archaeological and historical sites within South Mountain Park Preserve. The City of Phoenix Archaeologist, the GRIC CRMP Coordinator, and the GRIC CRSO have expressed interest in working together and expanding the ongoing study to include an evaluation of the Muhadagi Doag TCP. FHWA and ADOT are willing to consider funding GRIC’s participation in this proposed study. If this potential mitigation measure is something that you are interested in pursuing, we request that you provide a brief scope of work and budget for the proposed study, to ensure a common understanding about exactly what proposal is being considered.

Additionally, FHWA and ADOT are currently investigating design options to minimize impacts to the active shrine site, AZ T:12:112(ASM) and a rock art site, AZ T:12:198(ASM). We would like to meet with members of your Community to present and discuss some of these possible options.

If you are interested in pursuing these potential mitigation measures, we look forward to receiving a proposal for a study of the Muhadagi Doag TCP, and to meeting with you to discuss possible avoidance measures. We look forward to continuing consultation with you. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or email RGreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOMAS

Robert E. Hollis
Division Administrator

cc: Jennifer Allison-Ray, Lieutenant Governor, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton, Arizona 85247
David White, Community Manager, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton, Arizona 85247
Barnaby Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85247
J. Andrew Darling, CRMP Coordinator, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Signature for ORIC Concurrence

Date

SDThomas cim
WHEREAS, the Gila River Indian Community Council ("the Community Council") is the governing body of the Gila River Indian Community ("the Community"); and

WHEREAS, the Community Council on January 6, 1982, did adopt Ordinance No. GR-01-82 under Title XV of the Gila River Indian Community Law and Order Code in which 

WHEREAS, the Community Council through Resolution GR-15-89 did approve the Policy Statement of the Four Southern Tribes (Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Ak Chin Indian Community, Tohono O'odham Nation, and the Gila River Indian Community) which outlines the Four Tribes intent to protect, promote, and preserve cultural affinity to the HuHuiKam; and

WHEREAS, the Community Council has always held the preservation of historical, archaeological, cultural, religious sites as a high priority and recognizes the need to protect the cultural heritages of the Akimel O'odham (Pima) and the Pee Posh (Maricopa); and

WHEREAS, the identification and authentication of sacred places / traditional cultural properties is the sole responsibility of the federally recognized tribe according to its unique culture; and

WHEREAS, the Community does recognize certain locations to be sacred places / traditional cultural properties based on the unique cultural and spiritual beliefs of the Akimel O'odham (Pima) and the Pee Posh (Maricopa); and
Dear Mr. Hollis:

In reply to your previous request of April 22, 2008, please find attached a draft summary scope of work for proposed efforts offered as partial mitigation in connection with adverse effects to the Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) known as Muhadagi Doag (South Mountain), which will result with the proposed development of SR 2062L (South Mountain Freeway) as currently designed.

This summary scope recommends a Phased Treatment Plan be developed, which is appropriate when eligible properties are adversely affected by a federal undertaking and evidence is not possible, as follows:

Phase I  Treatment Plan Development
Phase II  Implementation of the Study
Phase III  Reporting and National Register nomination of the South Mountain TCP.

Understanding that previous cultural resource assessments, consultation with ADOT-FHWA, and GRUC Council resolution (with support from other Tribes) all agree that South Mountain is a TCP, this proposal serves to address the need to provide a strategy for mitigation in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the South Mountain Freeway Project.

We look forward to further comment and discussion of this proposal. Upon receipt of your concurrence or following revision of the proposal, the final version may be cited in the EIS in connection with the Muhadagi Doag TCP. Please note, that all other impacts to cultural properties located within the proposed alignment, or that will be directly or indirectly impacted by proposed construction, will need to be addressed in accordance with federal regulations provided under NEPA and the NHPA.

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact me at (520) 562-7151 or jdarlin@gilariver.com.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Andrew Darling
Coordinator
the proposed project were to be cancelled or put on hold prior to the implementation of the proposed
TCP study, financial support of the study would also be cancelled or put on hold until such time as
the ISs were to move forward again.

Additionally, FHWA and ADOT have responded to the request made at our meeting on November 18,
2008 to investigate an elevated split design to minimize impacts to the active shrine site, AZ
T:12:112(ASM). A design has been developed and efforts are underway to coordinate a
presentation of that design to your Community.

We look forward to your response to our comments regarding the proposed study of the
Muhadagi Doag
TCP, and in discussing the proposed avoidance measures. If you have any questions or concerns,
please do not hesitate to call Ruth Greenspan at 602-712-6266 or email RGreenspan@azdot.gov.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN D. THOM S
Division Administrator

(signature for GRIC Concurrence)

cc :

Jennifer Allison-Ray, Lieutenant Governor, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton,
Arizona 85247
David White, Community Manager, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 97, Sacaton, Arizona
85247
Barnaby Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton,
Arizona 85247
J. Andrew Darling, CRMP Coordinator, Gila River Indian Community, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, Arizona
85247
SThomas
Allison
AVille
KDavis
MKhollowell (EM02)
RGreenspan (EM02)
MBurder (EM01)
MBurdick (111A)
SDThomas.com

Mr. William Rhodes, Governor
Gila River Indian Community
P.O. Box 97
Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Rhodes:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation
(ADOT) initiated consultation regarding a proposed study of the Muhadagi Doag TCP (Hollis
FHWA to Rhodes [Gila River Indian Community] January 13, 2009). FHWA found the
proposal acceptable, pending clarification and elaboration of a few points before formal
approval. The consultation letter also addressed the request made at the November 18, 2008
meeting to investigate an elevated split design to minimize impacts to the active shrine site, AZ
T:12:112(ASM). A design has been developed and efforts are underway to coordinate a
presentation of that design to your Community. A copy of the consultation is enclosed to assist
you in your review.

FHWA would like to offer another opportunity for the Gila River Indian Community to respond
to comments regarding the proposed study of the Muhadagi Doag TCP, and to discuss the
proposed avoidance measures. We look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If

U.S. Department
of Transportation
Federal Highway
Administration

ARIZONA DIVISION
April 28, 2010

Mr. William Rhodes, Governor
Gila River Indian Community
P.O. Box 97
Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Rhodes:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation
(ADOT) initiated consultation regarding a proposed study of the Muhadagi Doag TCP (Hollis
FHWA to Rhodes [Gila River Indian Community] January 13, 2009). FHWA found the
proposal acceptable, pending clarification and elaboration of a few points before formal
approval. The consultation letter also addressed the request made at the November 18, 2008
meeting to investigate an elevated split design to minimize impacts to the active shrine site, AZ
T:12:112(ASM). A design has been developed and efforts are underway to coordinate a
presentation of that design to your Community. A copy of the consultation is enclosed to assist
you in your review.

FHWA would like to offer another opportunity for the Gila River Indian Community to respond
to comments regarding the proposed study of the Muhadagi Doag TCP, and to discuss the
proposed avoidance measures. We look forward to continuing consultation with your office. If
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you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at 602-712-8636 or email Ldavis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN E. THOMAS
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc: J. Andrew Darling, Coordinator, Cultural Resource Management Program, GRIC, P.O. Box 2140, Sacaton, AZ 85247 (with enclosures)
Barnaby V. Lewis, Cultural Resource Specialist, GRIC, P.O. Box E, Sacaton, AZ 85247 (with enclosures)
S Thomas
TDelitering
A Hansen
MPrye
KDavis
LDavis (EM02)
SDThomas: cdm

GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY

JUL 1 2010

Executive Office of the Governor & Lieutenant Governor

William R. Binda
Governor
Joseph Manuel
Executive Governor

June 23, 2010

Robert Hollis, Administrator, Arizona Division
U.S. Department of Transportation (FHWA)
4000 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500

Re: HOP-AZ, NH-200 (DIADY)
Project No. 2020 MA 094 J5764-01L
South Mountain Transportation Corridor, Section 106 Consultation, Traditional Cultural Places, Mitigation Measures.

Dear Mr. Hollis:

In reply to your letter dated April 28, 2010 regarding potential effects of the proposed SR 202L (South Mountain Freeway), the Gila River Indian Community Cultural Resource Management Program (GRIC CRMPI) has prepared the attached proposal for the Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Property and Adverse Effects of Transportation Corridor Development posed by the proposed construction of the current Pecos Alignment of the South Mountain Freeway. This proposal has been reviewed and approved by the GRIC Community Council and the GRIC Transportation Technical Team. A digital (soft copy) was submitted to Matthew Baustick (Arizona Department of Transportation - ADOT) via electronic mail on January 19, 2010.

Please be advised that the current proposal only addresses partial measures for the mitigation of adverse effects posed by the Pecos alignment to Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) including individual sites and the mountain (Muhuagli Doag - South Mountain) and may be used in the preparation and finalization of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). All other requirements under such federal acts as the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for the protection and preservation of cultural properties including data recovery of archaeological sites within the proposed corridor still pertain to the project and are not addressed by the attached document. The Community is aware that as the project developments, design changes and consideration of alternate corridors may require further adjustment or revision to the plan as presented.

The attached proposal also acknowledges the engineering solutions provided by ADOT in the form of overpasses for the avoidance and protection of sensitive cultural sites as acceptable concepts and that implementation of their design and construction will require further
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consultation in the event these go forward. This includes especially the implementation of proposed massive cuts through the western ridges of Muhadagi/Doag and earthworks required for construction of the Pecos alignment, which will significantly impact the mountain and the surrounding cultural landscape.

Finally this proposal identifies the important and significant overlap of wildlife and culture corridors and the significance of all plants and animals in the traditional culture of the Akimel O’odham and Pee Posh of this Community. In this respect, we value the strong connection between the environment, the land, traditional places, and all living things, not just people. To this end, the attached proposal recognizes the intimate connection of TCPs to the environment in general, which certainly will be affected permanently through the construction of this major transportation facility.

The Gila River Indian Community looks forward to continuing consultation through its newly established Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Barnaby V. Lewis (THPO), especially on the draft EIS once it is assembled. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to call Dr. J. Andrew Darling, Coordinator, Cultural Resource Management Program at (520) 562-7151 or Barnaby V. Lewis (THPO) at (520) 562-7152.

Sincerely,

Lt. Governor Joseph Manuel, Chair Transportation Technical Team

Attachment: South Mountain Freeway Survey Proposal

cc: Governor William R. Rhodes
Chief of Staff Greg Mendoza
Community Managers (5)
Transportation Technical Team

Dear Mr. Holt:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 2022, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concepts Report project. The EIS addresses alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix. The project would be built entirely on new right-of-way (ROW). As this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because alternatives are still under development, land ownership of the project area is not yet known.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, Arizona State Land Department, Arizona State Museum, Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Western Area Power Administration (Western), Salt River Project, Maricopa County Department of Transportation, Flood Control District of Maricopa County, Roosevelt Irrigation District, City of Avondale, City of Chandler, City of Glendale, City of Phoenix, City of Tolleson, Ak-Chin Indian Community, Chemehuevi Tribe, Cocopah Tribe, Colorado River Indian Tribe, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, Fort Mojave Tribe, Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, Gila River Indian Community, Havasupai Tribe, Hopi Tribe, Hualapai Tribe, Kaibab-Pauma Tribe, Navajo Nation, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Paipielo of Zuni,

In 2007, a Programmatic Agreement (PA) was executed for the project; however, Western had not been included. Western has transmission lines that intersect the proposed freeway alignments and asked FHWA to be included in the PA. Therefore, per Stipulation 14 of the PA, FHWA has revised the PA to include Western as a concurring party. Additionally, FHWA and ADOT are taking this opportunity to invite the Gila River Indian Community to participate as a concurring party at this time.

A copy of the revised PA is enclosed for your review and comment. If Western would like to participate, please sign the enclosed PA and return it to ADOT within 30 days. Upon receipt of Western’s signature on the PA and the Gila River Indian Community’s signature, if they choose to participate at this time, FHWA will forward the updated PA through continued Section 106 consultations.

As more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the information provided in this letter. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at (602) 712-8636 or by e-mail at LDavis2@azdot.gov

Sincerely yours,

Linda Davis
Division Administrator

Enclosure
Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway (SMF), EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler to I-10 in west Phoenix. The project would be built entirely on new right-of-way (ROW). As this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

This project has been the subject of extensive prior consultation (SHPO-2003-1890). This letter requests concurrence only on the approach of mitigating impacts to historic properties in the area of the proposed SMF’s interaction with Dobbin Road (see attached map). Land ownership in this portion of the project area is mostly private. Alternative alignments of the proposed SMF are being considered. The 1985 Phoenix General Plan Map had a proposed transportation corridor near 59th Avenue. ADOT’s 1988 SMF Design Concept Report and Environmental Assessment presented a preferred alignment corridor along 61st Avenue. That same year, the Phoenix Planning Commission recommended and City Council approved, an alignment shift in the General Plan to a 61st Avenue alignment. It remained on this alignment until comprehensive cultural resources investigations revealed several properties were eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). As a result of these investigations, in 2005 an alternative alignment on 63rd Avenue was developed to avoid these resources.

In 2010, the City of Phoenix (COP) provided information to the SMF project team that the 63rd Avenue alignment conflicted with proposed land uses in the area. These rezoning cases and one special permit were approved by the COP assuming the 61st Avenue alignment. One of these cases, approved in 2009, was for the location of a hospital and healthcare campus. This facility would be directly in the path of the 63rd Avenue alignment. As a result of these conflicts, the COP has asked FHWA to consider a proposed alignment of the SMF on 61st Avenue.

NRHP-eligible properties would be impacted by the alignment of the South Mountain Freeway along 61st Avenue. These include:

1. The Colvin-Tyson Farmstead/James Dairy located at 6159 West Dobbin Road was determined not eligible to the NRHP as a whole because of a lack of integrity and historical significance. However, the dairy “hand-to-toe” barn is recommended as eligible to the NRHP under Criterion C because it is one of the few standing family-operated dairy barns in Laveen.

2. The Hudson Farm located at 9300 South 59th Avenue was determined eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A as an exceptional example of a historic farmstead in Laveen, with the surrounding agricultural field an important contributing component that defines and preserves the farmstead’s integrity of setting and feeling.

3. The 6100 Block West Dobbin Road Streetscape was determined eligible to the NRHP under Criterion A and D as an example and reflection of the lower Salt River Valley’s agricultural past.

Potential impacts to NRHP-eligible properties by the alignment of the SMF along 61st Avenue include:

- The James dairy barn would be destroyed by the proposed project.
- A sixteen-acre strip of the western side of the Hudson Farm would be taken by the proposed SMF. A portion of the agricultural field would be used to construct the proposed freeway.
- The 6100 Block West Dobbin Road Streetscape would be destroyed by the proposed project.

It is important to note that the City of Phoenix has designated this area as the core area of “downtown” Laveen. Landowners in the area have expressed a desire to develop their properties for commercial and/or residential uses. Therefore, it is highly likely that development actions by private land owners would also lead to the destruction of these resources. Although the property owners would have to comply with City of Phoenix historic preservation ordinances, it is still likely that destruction with limited documentation of these properties would occur.

To mitigate the potential impacts from the SMF and to offer a greater level of protection to these resources than would otherwise be provided, ADOT, FHWA, and the COP’s Historic Preservation Office are considering the following approach. The final details of mitigation are...
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February 7, 2011

Mr. William Rhodes, Governor
Gila River Indian Community
P.O. Box 97
Sacaton, Arizona 85247

Dear Governor Rhodes:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, I-10 Location/Denomination Corridor project. The EIS addresses alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in western Phoenix. The project would be built entirely on new right-of-way (ROW). At this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because alternatives are still under development, land ownership of the project area is not yet known.


In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800.4), which requires federal agencies to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties that could be affected by a project, FHWA and ADOT prepared a traditional cultural property assessment titled An Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Properties for the 202L South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (November 2006), which was sent to your office for review June 2006.

Sincerely yours,

Mary E. Ege
Division Administrator

Signature for SHPO concurrence

Date

Enclosure
FHW A .t'hat.their Cultural Resource Management Since Hollis (FHWA) to Rhodes [GRIC] June 28, 2006. GRIC responded in September 2006 notifying FHWA that their Cultural Resource Management Program (CRMP) was reviewing the traditional cultural properties (TCP) evaluation report and that a formal response would be forthcoming (Rhodes [GRIC] to Hollis [FHWA] September 25, 2006). In December 2006, GRIC provided their formal response which included National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility concurrences and comments on the proposed boundary for the South Mountain TCP (Rhodes [GRIC] to Hollis [FHWA] December 19, 2006). While the GRIC generally concurred with the NRHP eligibility recommendations provided in the TCP report, there were three points where they did not concur: (1) the designation of a O'odham core homeland, (2) the proposed boundary for the South Mountains TCP, and (3) the NRHP eligibility recommendations for Villa Buena site (AZ T:12S:9 [ASM]).

Since then, FHWA and ADOT have continued an open dialog with GRIC's cultural resources staff regarding the identification and evaluation of traditional cultural properties as they pertain to the South Mountain Freeway project. During this time, the TCP report has been reviewed per GRIC comments: (1) the report no longer uses the concept of a core O'odham homeland; (2) FHWA, ADOT, and GRIC have agreed to defer delineation of TCP boundary for the South Mountains until a more detailed and comprehensive study of its traditional uses and cultural significance can be conducted, therefore the boundary proposed in the earlier version of the report has been removed; and, (3) the NRHP eligibility recommendation for the Villa Buena site (AZ T:12S:9 [ASM]) is now recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A as a traditional cultural property. A copy of the revised report is enclosed for your review and comment.

The revised report includes National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility concurrences and comments on the proposed boundary for the South Mountain Freeway project. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning geotechnical borings at the W 59th Alternative crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) for the proposed South Mountain Freeway in west Phoenix, Maricopa County. As this project is qualified for federal funding, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Geotechnical investigations will occur on private land. Consulting parties for this undertaking include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and UPRR. Due to the limited scope and nature of work, tribal consultation is not warranted.

The scope of this project would involve excavating ten 8-inch diameter borings approximately 100 feet deep near the intersection of 59th Avenue and the UPRR tracks, which run east-west about halfway between Van Buren Street and Buckeye Road. Access to the boring locations would be from 59th Avenue along the UPRR access roads and adjacent parking lots. No new right-of-way (ROW) or temporary construction easements are anticipated for this project. The area of potential effects (APE) is defined as 50 feet around the borings and access routes. A copy of the geotechnical boring plan is enclosed to assist you in your review.

The UPRR right-of-way portion of the APE has been previously surveyed by SWCA, Environmental Consultants, Inc. (SWCA) in conjunction with a separate undertaking. The results are reported in "Archaeological Survey for a Proposed Fiber Optic Cable Line from Yuma to Phoenix" (Doak 1999). The historic Willson-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line of the South Pacific Railroad (AZ T:10S:4 [ASM]) was identified in the project area. The railroad's eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) was evaluated as part of the South Mountain Freeway project by HDR Engineering, Inc (HDR). The results are reported in "At
Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway EIS & L/DCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck and Pratt 2005). FHWA recommended that the railroad was eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion A. SHPO previously concurred with the adequacy of the report and eligibility determination (Jacobs [SHPO] to Greenspan [ADOT] SHPO concurrence October 3, 2005).

The remainder of the APE has recently been surveyed by HDR. The survey results are reported in "A Class III Cultural Resources Survey for Geotechnical Investigations for the South Mountain Freeway W59 Alternative UPRR OP, City of Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck 2011)", and are enclosed here for your review and comment. No new sites were identified in the project area.

AZ T:10:84 [ASM], the historic Wellton-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line, is located within the APE but will not be affected by the project. Therefore, FHWA has determined that a finding of "no adverse effect" is appropriate for this undertaking.

Please review the enclosed report, geotechnical plans, and the information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with FHWA’s determination of project effect, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at 602-712-8636 or email LDavis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Signature for SHPO Concurrence

Date

Enclosures
Dear Dr. Jacobs:

I refer to your letter of August 8, 2011. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning geotechnical borings at the W59 Alternative crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) for the proposed South Mountain Freeway in west Phoenix, Maricopa County. As this project is qualified for federal funding, it is subject to Section 106 review. This geotech work occurs on private land. Consulting parties for this undertaking include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and UPRR. Due to the limited scope and nature of work, tribal consultation is not warranted.

The scope of this project would involve excavating ten 8-inch diameter borings approximately 100 feet deep near the intersection of 59th Avenue and the UPRR tracks, which run east-west about halfway between Van Buren Street and Buckeye Road. Access to the boring locations would be from 59th Avenue along the UPRR access roads and adjacent parking lots. No new right-of-way (ROW) or temporary construction easements are anticipated for this project. The area of potential effects (APE) is defined as 50 feet around the borings and access routes. A copy of the geotechnical boring plan is enclosed to assist you in your review.

The UPRR right-of-way portion of the APE has been previously surveyed by SWCA, Environmental Consultants, Inc. (SWCA) in conjunction with a separate undertaking. The results are reported in "Archaeological Survey for a Proposed Fiber Optic Cable Line from Yuma to Phoenix" (Deak, 1999). The historic Wellton-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line of the South Pacific Railroad (AZ T:1084 [ASM]) was identified in the project area. The railroad’s eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) was evaluated as part of the South Mountain Freeway project by HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR). The results are reported in "An

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Division Administrator

Project, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck and Pratt 2005). FHWA recommended that the railroad was eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion A. SHPO previously concurred with the adequacy of the report and eligibility determination (Jacobs [SHPO]) to Greenspan [ADOT] SHPO concurrence October 3, 2005).

The remainder of the APE has recently been surveyed by HDR. The survey results are reported in "A Class III Cultural Resources Survey for Geotechnical Investigations for the South Mountain Freeway-W59 Alternative UPRR OP, City of Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck, 2011), and are enclosed here for your review and comment. No new sites were identified in the project area.

AZ T:1084 (ASM), the historic Wellton-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line, is located within the APE but will not be affected by the project. Therefore, FHWA has determined that a finding of "no adverse effect" is appropriate for this undertaking.

Please review the enclosed report, geotechnical plans, and the information provided in this letter. If you find the report adequate and agree with FHWA’s determination of project effect, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at 602-712-8636 or email L.Davis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Division Administrator

August 8, 2011

In Reply Refer To:  
NH-202-D(ADY)  
HOR-AZ

NH-202-D(ADY)

TRAC No. 2021, MA 041 H764.44C  
South Mountain Freeway UPRR OP - TRCE  
Continuing Section 106 Consultation  
Geotechnical Investigations

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist  
State Historic Preservation Office  
Arizona State Parks  
1300 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are planning geotechnical borings at the W59 Alternative crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) for the proposed South Mountain Freeway in west Phoenix, Maricopa County. Due to the limited scope and nature of work, tribal consultation is not warranted. This geotech work occurs on private land. Consulting parties for this undertaking include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and UPRR. The scope of this project would involve excavating ten 8-inch diameter borings approximately 100 feet deep near the intersection of 59th Avenue and the UPRR tracks, which run east-west about halfway between Van Buren Street and Buckeye Road. Access to the boring locations would be from 59th Avenue along the UPRR access roads and adjacent parking lots. No new right-of-way (ROW) or temporary construction easements are anticipated for this project. The area of potential effects (APE) is defined as 50 feet around the borings and access routes. A copy of the geotechnical boring plan is enclosed to assist you in your review.

The UPRR right-of-way portion of the APE has been previously surveyed by SWCA, Environmental Consultants, Inc. (SWCA) in conjunction with a separate undertaking. The results are reported in "Archaeological Survey for a Proposed Fiber Optic Cable Line from Yuma to Phoenix" (Deak, 1999). The historic Wellton-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line of the South Pacific Railroad (AZ T:1084 [ASM]) was identified in the project area. The railroad’s eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) was evaluated as part of the South Mountain Freeway project by HDR Engineering, Inc. (HDR). The results are reported in "An
Addendum Cultural Resources Report for the 2021, South Mountain Freeway EIS & L/DCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona (Brodbeck and Pratt 2005). FHWA recommended that the railroad was eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion A. SHPO previously concurred with the adequacy of the report and eligibility determination (Jacobs [SHPO] to Greenspan [ADOT] SHPO concurrence October 3, 2005).

The remainder of the APE has recently been surveyed by HDR. The survey results are reported in "A Class III Cultural Resources Survey for Geotechnical Investigations for the South Mountain Freeway W59 Alternative UPRR OP, City of Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona" (Brodbeck 2011), and are enclosed herewith for your review and comment. No new sites were identified in the project area.

AZ T: 10:84 (ASM), the historic Wellton-Phoenix-Eloy Main Line, is located within the APE but will not be affected by the project. Therefore, FHWA has determined that a finding of "no adverse effect" is appropriate for this undertaking.

If you find the report adequate and agree with FHWA's determination of project effect, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at 602-712-8636 or email LDavis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Stamp: AUG 12 2011]

[Signature for SHPO Concurrence]

[Stamp: 8/1/11]

Enclosures

CC: Linda Davis, ADOT
Review and Comments

Page 5, second paragraph, Brodbeck makes reference to "contemporary local lore." The use of term lore is objectionable. O'Odham oral history is not lore, it is a history as valid and precise as mainstream history which is taught in elementary, high school, and college classes. References to O'Odham history as lore should be removed from the text.

Page 38 and 77, third paragraph, Brodbeck states that because the platform mound has been obliterated at Pueblo del Alamo, "the direct link with the ancestral past has been lost." This is an untrue statement. The direct link with the ancestral past, the link between Pueblo del Alamo and the O'Odham people is still intact through oral histories. The link has not been lost because a platform mound on the site has been obliterated by non-O'Odham farmers. The direct link to the O'Odham ancestral past remains and it should be stated as such. The GRIC-THPO concurs with the evaluation with that Pueblo del Alamo is a Register eligible property. The GRIC-THPO disagrees with ADOT and Brodbeck who believe that Pueblo del Alamo is not a Register eligible TCP based upon a perceived lost of an ancestral link to the site. The GRIC-THPO maintains that the "ancestral link" to the site still exists and that Pueblo del Alamo is a Register eligible TCP.

Pages 44-45 and page 77, the GRIC-THPO concurs with the re-evaluation of Villa Buena as being a Register eligible property as a site and as a TCP. However on page 45 Brodbeck still considers portions of Villa Buena, located off GRIC lands, not contributing to the Register eligibility status of the site and TCP. Again the GRIC-THPO would like to indicate that all portions of a site contribute to Register eligibility. If a cultural property is considered a Register eligible property as an archaeological site or as a TCP, then the entire cultural resource is a Register eligible property. ADOT acknowledges correcting this issue but Brodbeck still continues to evaluate Villa Buena in bits and pieces and not as a whole.

Page 75, fifth paragraph, Brodbeck states "that South Mountain is an important element in a far-reaching spiritual landscape of the Akimel O'odham and Pee Posh." We would like to point out that it is our cultural landscape as well and the statement should be modified to state "cultural and spiritual" in the sentence.

The GRIC-THPO looks forward to continuing consultation regarding the proposed 202 Loop. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me or Archaeological Compliance Specialist Larry Bennallie, Jr. at 520-562-7162.

Respectfully,

Barnaby V. Lewis
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Gila River Indian Community

ARIZONA DIVISION

4000 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-3500
(602) 371-3046
Fax: (602) 362-8998
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/az/index.htm

October 31, 2011

In Reply Refer To:

202-C-200

HOP-AZ

Mr. Brian Bowker, Director
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Western Regional Office
2600 North Central Avenue, 4th Floor Mailroom
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-5550

Dear Mr. Bowker:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 202L, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler and to I-10 in west Phoenix. The project would be built entirely on new right-of-way (ROW). As this project employs federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because alternatives are still under development, land ownership of the project area is not yet known.

In 2005, FHWA circulated a revised draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) to agencies and tribes for review (Hollis [FHWA] to Cantley [BIA] July 1, 2005). At that time, the BIA declined participation in the PA (Cantley [BIA] to Laine [ADOT] personal communication via phone call August 3, 2005). Since then, the BIA has asked FHWA to be included in the PA. Therefore, per stipulation 14 of the PA, FHWA has revised the PA to include BIA as a concurrent party.

A revised PA is enclosed for your review and comment. If the BIA would like to participate, please sign the enclosed PA and return it to ADOT within 30 days. Upon receipt of BIA’s signature on the PA, FHWA will forward the updated PA through continued Section 106 consultations.

Furthermore, as more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the information provided in this letter. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at (602) 712-8636 or by e-mail at LDavis2@azdot.gov

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure
Appendix 2-1

In 2005, FHWA circulated a revised draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) to agencies and tribes for review (Heidt [FHWA] to Cantley [BIA] July 1, 2005). At that time, the BIA declined participation in the PA (Cantley [BIA] to Laine [ADOT] personal communication via phone call August 3, 2005). Since then, the BIA has asked FHWA to be included in the PA. Therefore, per Stipulation 14 of the PA, FHWA has revised the PA to include BIA as a concurring party. A revised PA is enclosed for your review and comment. If the BIA would like to participate, please sign the enclosed PA and return it to ADOT within 30 days. Upon receipt of BIA’s signature on the PA FHWA will forward the updated PA through continued Section 106 consultations.

Furthermore, as more information becomes available regarding the South Mountain Freeway project, it will be provided to your agency through continued Section 106 consultation. Please review the information provided in this letter. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at (602) 712-8636 or by e-mail at LDavis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosure

cc: Garry Cantley, Archaeologist, Bureau of Indian Affairs-Western Region Office, 2600 N. Central Avenue, 4th Floor Mailroom, Phoenix, Arizona 85004-3090
The South Mountain range as a whole is considered a TCP. The range is an important element in the spiritual landscape of the Akimel O'odham and Pee Posh, as well as for some of the Colorado River Tribes. For the Akimel O'odham, South Mountains was one of the homes of the deity and creator, Elder Brother (Se'énc) and several shrines in the range associated with his presence continue to be recognized and honored by the GRIC. Further, South Mountain served as a resource procurement area for upland plants and animals and was a focal point of prehistoric and historic rock art production.

FHWA has recommended that the South Mountains is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A and B as a TCP for its significant associations with the broad patterns of traditional cultural practices and beliefs of the Akimel O’odham, Pee Posh, and other tribes, and for the construction of the South Mountain Freeway. These include the South Mountains (Mukhakiri Doag), the prehistoric Hohokam villages of Villa Buena (AZ T:12:95 [ASM]) and Pueblo del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 [ASM]), a shrine site (AZ T:12:112 [ASM]), and a petroglyph site (AZ T:12:198 [ASM]) that is also a contributing resource to the South Mountain TCP. In addition, the GRIC has identified five other archaeological sites that contribute to the South Mountains TCP. As a result of FHWA and ADOT, GRIC CRMP prepared a draft Treatment Plan that presents measures to mitigate potential adverse effects of the South Mountain Freeway project on the South Mountains TCP, which GRIC TIPO previously approved (Manuel [GRIC] to Hollis [FHWA], June 23, 2010).

Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo

Villa Buena (AZ T:12:95 [ASM]) and Pueblo del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 [ASM]) are prehistoric villages for which Tribal consciousness and veneration exist to the present day in the form of active association and identification of these places with religious, historical, and ideological perpetuation of GRIC’s community culture. As TCPs, therefore, it is the position of GRIC that in regard to eligibility, these sites cannot be subdivided or otherwise segregated into areas considered contributing or non-contributing to the overall significance of the historic property under NRHP criteria. Instead, these are historic properties in their entirety that are considered sacred.

Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo are specifically referred to in the Akimel O’odham creation story, which plays an important role in the on-going cultural traditions of the members of the GRIC. While many aspects of the creation story detail elements of traditional history, such histories also identify places and physical landscapes in the association of the GRIC and its sister tribes (the Four Southern Tribes), as well as other Native communities in southern Arizona, Mexico, and California. By virtue of their associations with regular cycles of universal renewal, places such as Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo are critical to O’odham and Pee Posh beliefs about cultural perpetuation and GRIC survival.

In consultation with the GRIC TIPO, FHWA has determined that Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A as TCPs for their significant associations with the reservation and perpetuation of broad patterns of Akimel O’odham and Pee Posh history and culture. FHWA has also determined, through consultation with the GRIC...
THPO, SHPO, and other consulting parties, that Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D as archaeological sites.

Both Pueblo del Alamo and Villa Buena have been subjected to considerable disturbance from agricultural activities, road construction, and modern construction, as well as bioturbation and erosion. In discussions with ADOT and FHWA, GRIC has expressed the belief that regardless of the current condition of the sites, and regardless of whether the portion of the site under the project area of potential effects (APE) retains physical integrity, these places are known to be sacred and still convey their significance under Criterion A through the perpetuation of the traditional O'odham song culture and traditional religious beliefs and practices. Accordingly, the integrity of those elements that contribute to the significance of these sites under Criterion A would remain, despite any potential impacts from project-related construction, and would not be adversely affected by the proposed undertaking.

At the request of FHWA and ADOT, GRIC CRMP has prepared a draft Treatment Plan that presents measures to mitigate potential adverse affects to the Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo TCPs, which is enclosed for your review.

AZ T:12:112 (ASM)

AZ T:12:112 (ASM) includes an active O'odham huwał himdag shrine that is part of an archaeological site with prehistoric and historic features. The site is a traditional O'odham shrine with historic precedence used by contemporary Community members actively exercising their traditional religious and ceremonial practices and beliefs. The site and its use are part of a broad pattern of traditional religious and ceremonial practices and beliefs that define the cultural identity, continuity, and tradition of the Akimel O'odham. The site's placement on the landscape also has the potential to provide information on prehistoric networks and regional connectivity. FHWA has determined AZ T:12:112 (ASM) is eligible for inclusion on the NRHP under Criterion A as a TCP and under Criterion D as an archaeological site. In consultation with the GRIC THPO and CRMP, ADOT and FHWA have developed proposed freeway alternatives that would avoid the site; therefore, it would not be directly impacted by the project. Mitigation measures for any potential indirect impacts would be developed through continuing consultations with GRIC.

AZ T:12:198 (ASM)

AZ T:12:198 (ASM) is a petroglyph site that, in addition to being a contributor to the South Mountain TCP, is individually eligible as a TCP. The site includes seven panels of prehistoric and historic rock art. Rock art sites such as this continue to function for the GRIC as shrines or spiritual places and they are important in the perpetuation of GRIC's identity and culture. In consultation with the GRIC THPO, FHWA has determined AZ T:12:198 (ASM) is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A as a TCP and under Criterion D as an archaeological site. In consultation with the GRIC THPO and CRMP, ADOT and FHWA have developed proposed freeway alternatives that would avoid the site; therefore, it will not be directly impacted by the project. Mitigation measures for any potential indirect impacts would be developed through continuing consultations with GRIC.

Please review the information provided in this letter and enclosed materials. If you agree with FHWA's determination of NRHP eligibility for the TCPs, and the adequacy of the draft mitigation Treatment Plan, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at 602-712-8636 or at ldavis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Division Administrator

Signature for THPO Concurrence

Date

Enclosures
The previous letter was also sent to:
Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Officer, State Historic Preservation Office

Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist
State Historic Preservation Office
Arizona State Parks
1300 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Dr. Jacobs:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are continuing technical studies in support of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the 2021, South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler to I-10 in west Phoenix. The project would be built entirely on new right-of-way (ROW). As this project is scheduled to employ federal funds, it is considered an undertaking subject to Section 106 review. Because alternatives are still under development, land ownership of the project area is varied.

Consulting parties for this project include FHWA, ADOT, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Western Area Power Administration, the Salt River Project, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Roosevelt Irrigation District, the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, the City of Tolleson, the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), the Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Nation, the San Juan Southern Paiute, the
The South Mountains

The South Mountain range as a whole is considered a TCP. The range is an important element in the spiritual landscape of the Akimel O‘odham and Pee Posh, as well as for some of the Colorado River Tribes. For the Akimel O‘odham, South Mountains was one of the homes of the deity and creator, Elizer Brother (Se’bhe) and several shrines in the range associated with his presence continue to be recognized and honored by the GRIC. Further, South Mountain served as a resource procurement area for upland plants and animals and was a focal point of prehistoric and historic rock art production.

FHWA has determined that the South Mountains is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A and B as a TCP for its significant associations with the broad patterns of traditional cultural practices and beliefs of the Akimel O‘odham, Pee Posh, and other tribes, and for the close association the mountain range has with the O‘odham creator deity. The GRIC previously concurred with FHWA’s eligibility determination (Rhodes [GRIC] to HDDI [FHWA], December 19, 2006). Furthermore, FHWA has determined that archaeological sites AZ T:12:197 (ASM), AZ T:12:198 (ASM), AZ T:12:201 (ASM), AZ T:12:207 (ASM), AZ T:12:208 (ASM), and AZ T:12:211 (ASM) are contributing elements to the Mountain TCP under Criterion A. At the request of FHWA and ADOT, GRIC CRM has prepared a draft Treatment Plan that presents measures to mitigate potential adverse effects of the South Mountain Freeway project on the South Mountains TCP, which is enclosed for your review.

Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo

Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9 [ASM]) and Pueblo del Alamo (AZ T:12:52 [ASM]) are prehistoric villages for which Tribal consciousness and veneration exist to the present day in the form of active association and identification of these places with religious, historical, and ideological perpetuation of GRIC’s community culture. As TCPs, therefore, it is the position of GRIC that in regard to eligibility, these sites cannot be subdivided or otherwise segregated into areas considered contributing or non-contributing to the overall significance of the historic property under NRHP criteria. Instead, these are historic properties in their entirety that are considered whole.

Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo are specifically referred to in the Akimel O‘odham creation story, which plays an important role in the on-going cultural traditions of the members of the GRIC. While many aspects of the creation story detail elements of traditional history, such histories also identify places and physical associations in the landscape of the GRIC and its sister tribes (the Four Southern Tribes), as well as other Native communities in southern Arizona, Mexico, and California. By virtue of their associations with regular cycles of universal renewal, places such as Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo are critical to O‘odham and Pee Posh beliefs about cultural perpetuation and GRIC survival.

In consultation with the GRIC TEPO, FHWA has determined that Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A as TCPs for their significant associations with the preservation and perpetuation of broad patterns of Akimel O‘odham and Pee Posh history and culture. FHWA has also determined, through consultation with the GRIC...
THPO, SEPO, and other consulting parties, that Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo are eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion D as archaeological sites.

Both Pueblo del Alamo and Villa Buena have been subjected to considerable disturbance from agricultural activities, road construction, and modern construction, as well as bertiurbation and erosion. In discussions with ADOT and FHWA, GRIC has expressed the belief that regardless of the current condition of the sites, and regardless of whether the portion of the site within the project area of potential effects (APE) retains physical integrity, these places are known to be sacred and still convey their significance under Criterion A through the perpetuation of the traditional O'odham culture and traditional religious belief and practices. Accordingly, the integrity of these elements that contribute to the significance of these sites under Criterion A would remain, despite any potential impacts from project-related construction, and would not be adversely affected by the proposed undertaking.

At the request of FHWA and ADOT, GRIC CRMP has prepared a draft Treatment Plan that presents measures to mitigate potential adverse effects to the Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo TCPs, which is enclosed for your review.

The TCPs that are the topic of this letter are also subject to regulations set forth in Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966, 49 U.S.C. 303, as amended. Section 4(f) stipulates that FHWA and other DOT agencies cannot approve more than a de minimis use of land from publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or public and private historic sites unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of that land, and that the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use.

Section 4(f) generally applies to the use of TCPs that are determined to be eligible for listing in the NRHP with some exceptions. FHWA has determined that Section 4(f) applies to the proposed use of a portion of the South Mountain TCP and will address the requirements of Section 4(f) for the South Mountain TCP in a separate Section 4(f) evaluation to be published as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement under preparation for this project. The SHRINE site (AZ T:12:112) and the petroglyph site (AZ T:12:198) TCPs will not be addressed in the Section 4(f) evaluation because these sites would not be used by any project alternative under consideration.

FHWA believes that Section 4(f) does not apply to the proposed use of portions of the Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo TCPs for the South Mountain Freeway project alternatives because the impacted area is primarily archaeological in nature and preservation in place is not warranted. The exception is detailed in 23 CFR 774.13 as follows: "The Administration has identified various exceptions to the requirement for Section 4(f) approval. These exceptions include, but are not limited to: (b) Archeological sites that are on or eligible for the National Register when: (1) The Administration concludes that the archeological resource is important chiefly because of what can be learned by data recovery and has minimal value for preservation in place. This exception applies both to situations where data recovery is undertaken and where the Administration decides, with agreement of the official(s) with jurisdiction, not to recover the resource; and (2) The official(s) with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) resource have been consulted and have not objected to the Administration finding in paragraph (b)(1) of this section."

A number of meetings have taken place between FHWA, ADOT, GRIC CRMP, and GRIC THPO in which the nature of and the impacts to the Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo TCPs was discussed. Through these discussions the parties have come to the conclusion that modern development has already significantly altered the portions of these sites that would be impacted by the highway project. While the modern surface development does not diminish the association with traditional cultural practices of the GRIC for purposes of the consultation required by NEPA, for purposes of Section 4(f), the FHWA believes that the impacted area is important chiefly for what could be learned by data recovery of any subsurface features that may still be present. In addition, future archaeological investigations could contribute to their TCP status.

If you have no objection to FHWA's determination under Section 4(f) that the portions of the Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo TCPs that would be used by the project alternatives under consideration are chiefly important because of what can be learned by data recovery and have minimal value for preservation in place, then FHWA will apply the Section 4(f) exception described above to the use of these properties. This determination is for purposes of Section 4(f) only and would not have any impact on the Section 106 consultation that is underway and will continue.

AZ T:12:112 (ASM)

AZ T:12:112 (ASM) includes an active O'odham jiwael himdag shrine that is part of an archaeological site with prehistoric and historic features. The site is a traditional O'odham shrine with historic precedence used by contemporary Community members actively exercising their traditional religious and ceremonial practices and beliefs. The site and its use are part of a broad pattern of traditional religious and ceremonial practices and beliefs that define the cultural identity, continuity, and tradition of the Akimel O'odham. The site's placement on the landscape also has the potential to provide information on prehistoric networks and regional connectivity. FHWA has determined AZ T:12:112 (ASM) is eligible for inclusion on the NRHP under Criterion A as a TCP and under Criterion D as an archaeological site. In consultation with the GRIC THPO and CRMP, ADOT and FHWA have developed proposed freeway alternatives that would avoid the site; therefore, it would not be directly impacted by the project. Mitigation measures for any potential indirect impacts would be developed through continuing consultations with GRIC.

AZ T:12:198 (ASM)

AZ T:12:198 (ASM) is a petroglyph site that, in addition to being a contributor to the South Mountain TCP, is individually eligible as a TCP. The site includes seven panels of prehistoric and historic rock art. Rock art sites such as this continue to function for the GRIC as shrines or spiritual places and they are important in the perpetuation of GRIC's identity and culture. In consultation with the GRIC THPO, FHWA has determined AZ T:12:198 (ASM) is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A as a TCP and under Criterion D as an archaeological site. In consultation with the GRIC THPO and CRMP, ADOT and FHWA have developed
proposed freeway alternatives that would avoid the site; therefore, it will not be directly impacted by the project. Mitigation measures for any potential indirect impacts would be developed through continuing consultations with GRIC.

Please review the information provided in this letter and enclosed materials. If you agree with FHWA’s determination of NRHP eligibility for the TCPs, the adequacy of the draft mitigation Treatment Plans, and do not object to the Section 4(f) determinations described above, please indicate your agreement by signing below. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at 602-712-8636 or at ldavis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

July 3, 2012

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: NH-202-D(ADY) TRACS No. 202L, MA 054 H5764 01C 202L, South Mountain Freeway, DCR and EIS Continuing 106 Consultation Traditional Cultural Properties Section 4(f) Determination

Dear Ms. Petty,

The Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office (GRIC-THPO) has received two documents for review from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): 1) An Evaluation of Traditional Cultural Properties for the 202L, South Mountain Transportation Corridor EIS & LDCR Project, Maricopa County, Arizona Submittal Number 6; and 2) Draft South Mountain Freeway (SR 202L) Traditional Uses and Cultural Significance of Traditional Cultural Properties and Mitigation of Transportation Corridor Development Adverse Effects Addendum Planning for TCP Mitigation Villa Buena (AZT:12:9[ASM]), Pueblo Del Alamo (AZ T:12:53[ASM]). The report reevaluates the National Register eligibility status cultural resources recorded within the 202L during numerous and previous archaeological surveys of the 202 Loop Project Corridor. At issue was the unacceptable, piecemeal evaluation procedures HDR Engineering, Inc. used to evaluate Akimel O’odham and Pee Posh Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP). The GRIC-THPO maintained that Akimel O’odham and Pee Posh TCP’s were Register eligible properties under Criterion A and Criterion D (as archaeological sites). It now appears that the GRIC-THPO, the FHWA, and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) have come to a reasonable, sensible agreement concerning the proper Register eligibility evaluations for the cultural resources considered TCP’s in the 202 Loop Project Corridor.

Muhadagi Doog (South Mountain) as a whole is now considered by the FHWA to be a TCP, eligible for inclusion on the National Register under Criteria A and B. The South Mountain has significant associations with broad patterns of traditional cultural practices and beliefs of the Akimel O’odham and Pee Posh.
Villa Buena (AZ T:12:9[ASM]) is a large prehistoric village named and identified in the Akimel O’Odham creation story. The FHWA acknowledges that O’Odham consciousness and veneration exist today for this site in the form of active association and identification of this place as a religious, historical, and ideological perpetuation of the GRIC’s community culture. The FHWA has determined that Villa Buena is a Register eligible TCP under Criterion A and as a Register eligible archaeological site under Criterion D.

Pueblo del Alamo (AZ T:12:198[ASM]) is a large prehistoric village named and identified in the Akimel O’Odham creation story. The FHWA acknowledges that O’Odham consciousness and veneration exist today for this site through the form of active association and identification of this place as a religious, historical, and ideological perpetuation of the GRIC’s community culture. The FHWA has determined that Pueblo del Alamo is a Register eligible TCP under Criterion A and as a Register eligible archaeological site under Criterion D.

Jiavul Himdag (AZ T:12:112[ASM]) is an O’Odham shrine which is also part of an archaeological site with prehistoric and historic components. The shrine has historic precedence and is still visited by Community members participating in the traditional O’Odham religion. Jiavul Himdag is considered a TCP which is Register eligible under Criterion A and a significant archaeological site under Criterion D.

Site AZ T:12:198(ASM) is a petroglyph panel considered to be a contributing TCP element of Muhadagi Doag (South Mountain). In its own right, AZ T:12:198(ASM) represents a petroglyph site which continues to function as a GRIC shrine and spiritual place important to the perpetuation of GRIC’s identity and culture. AZ T:12:198(ASM) is considered a Register eligible TCP under Criterion A and a significant archaeological site under Criterion D.

Review the TCP mitigation plan prepared by the GRIC-Cultural Resource Management Plan indicates the Adverse Effects of the FHWA undertaking would be: 1) The loss of physical and spiritual connections through the alteration of the cultural landscape; 2) Loss of Social Memory expressed by GRIC culture, creation stories traditional religious activities at sites, native language, song traditions and shared traditional knowledge; and 3) Direct physical impacts to TCPs which could affect the GRIC through the loss of knowledge vested in these properties. Mitigative efforts would be: 1) Allow Traditional religious activities at Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo prior to the initiation of construction activities which would address the spiritual needs of the ancestors and living community members preparing them for the impacts to the cultural landscape resulting from the undertaking; 2) Presentations, exhibits and outreach to the GRIC before, during, and after freeway development explaining efforts being made to recognize and alleviate adverse effects to GRIC tradition; 3) Tribal consultation will be on-going and not cease once the environmental and clearance processes are completed. A consultation plan will identify all Tribes with a vested interest in Villa Buena and Pueblo del Alamo and the consultation will be conducted before, during, and after freeway development; and 4) The protection of equivalent site and sacred landscapes will be a priority. The development of Management Plan(s) to protect sites from adverse effects in the future with the mitigative goal being site preservation and cultural perpetuation integrating Tribal/Community involvement. Furthermore the mitigation plan offers Programmatic Solutions which include; 1) Support of sustainable program in Education and Language Preservation including O’Odham and Pee Posh Song Culture; 2) Coordination of sustainable programs through existing GRIC tribal centers of heritage preservation specially the GRIC Hohgum Heritage Center (HHIC); 3) Use of the GRIC repository at the HHIC for housing all collections, data and information recovered from the mitigation efforts associated with the TCPs; and 4) Organization of exhibits and educational initiatives that result from freeway development.

The GRIC-THPO concurs with all the determinations of Register eligibility for the TCP’s and archaeological sites. The GRIC-THPO also accepts the mitigation Treatment Plan and all recommendations put forth in the document. The rewriting of the TCP report has greatly improved the document and we thank you for considering our suggestions for change. The mitigation Treatment Plan has put forth a thoughtful, unique way to mitigate the adverse effects of this undertaking. It too is well written. The GRIC-THPO appreciates the FHWA and ADOT for acknowledging and accepting the GRIC worldview.

The GRIC maintains and reinforces the cultural significance of South Mountain to the Four Southern Tribes (Gila River Indian Community; Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community; Ak-Chin Indian Community and the Tohono O’Odham Nation) together with the Pee Posh (Maricopa). O’Odham oral history and religion defines our life and relationship to the natural world and the cultural landscape. Akimel O’Odham and Pee Posh oral histories, religion, creation stories, ceremonial activities and practices, and the concepts of power and sacred places are inseparably tied to every part of the natural environment. Sacred places and Traditional Cultural Places (TCPs) must be treated with reverence and respect.

The GRIC-THPO looks forward to continuing consultation regarding the proposed 202 Loop. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me or Archaeological Compliance Specialist Larry Bensaf, Jr. at 520-562-7162.

Respectfully,

Barnaby V. Lewis
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Gila River Indian Community
d

The four historic properties near the Dobbs Road/59th Avenue intersection that were reevaluated include:

1) Hudson Farm, 9300 South 59th Avenue
2) Hackin Farmstead/Dairy, 10048 South 59th Avenue
3) Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy, 6159 West Dobbs Road

4) Dobbs Road Streetscape, 6100 block of West Dobbs Road

Hudson Farm

The Hudson Farm, a historic district, was previously determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under criterion A. The boundaries of the district encompassed nearly 40 acres. Reassessment of the farm and historic farming in the Laveen area determined that the boundaries should encompass nearly 80 acres rather than 40. From the earliest times, the family farms in this area included two quarter-quarter sections, both before the Western Canal irrigated Laveen, and after construction of the canal and the establishment of 40-acre farm units. The original 80-acre farm remains intact, minus rights-of-way for roads and irrigation features.

The current state of the farm were previously determined to be individually eligible for listing under criterion C. The reassessment agrees with this earlier determination.

Hackin Farmstead/Dairy

As a district, the Hackin Farmstead/Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy

As a district, the Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

Dobbs Road Streetscape

The Dobbs Road Streetscape District was previously determined eligible for listing on the NRHP under criteria A and D. The reassessment has found that the district is ineligible. There are several characteristics of the Dobbs Road Streetscape that impact the integrity of the resource as a rural agricultural streetscape. Historic rural landscapes often include miles of roadway and surrounding agricultural properties. The 325 feet of roadway along Dobbs Road is of inadequate length to truly convey the rural agricultural character that once dominated this area. In addition, there are modern intrusions easily visible from the streetscape. At the west end there is a prominent 1977 house on the north side of the road and a mobile home on the south side of the road that was moved onto the site about 1970. A recently constructed subdivision of two-story homes is located just over a quarter-mile east of the streetscape, and is clearly visible from within the streetscape boundaries. Additionally, many components of the historic streetscape have lost their historic character, as detailed in the enclosed report. Therefore, FHWA recommends that this district is ineligible for listing on the NRHP.

Following is a summary of the reassessment:
This letter was also sent to:

Mr. Steve Ross, Archaeologist, Arizona State Land Department
Mr. Dave Gifford, Archaeologist, Bureau of Reclamation
Ms. Cheryl Blanchard, Archaeologist, Bureau of Land Management
Ms. Laurene Monoer, Archaeologist, City of Phoenix
Ms. Michelle Dodds, Historic Preservation Office, City of Phoenix
Mr. Richard Anduze, Archaeologist, Salt River Project
The four historic properties near the Dobbins Road/59th Avenue intersection that were reevaluated include:

1) Hudson Farm, 9100 South 59th Avenue
2) Hackin Farmstead/Dairy, 10048 South 59th Avenue
3) Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy, 6159 West Dobbins Road

4) Dobbins Road Streetscape, 6100 block of West Dobbins Road

Hudson Farm

The Hudson Farm, a historic district, was previously determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under criterion A. The boundaries of the district encompass nearly 40 acres. Reassessment of the farm and historic farming in the Laveen area determined that the boundaries should encompass nearly 80 acres rather than 40. From the earliest times, the family farms in this area included two quarter-quarter sections, both before the Western Canal irrigated Laveen, and after construction of the canal and the establishment of 40-acre farm units. The original 80-acre farm contains intact, minus rights-of-way for roads and irrigation features.

The current state sites at the farm were previously determined to be individually eligible for listing under criterion C. The reassessment agrees with this earlier determination.

Hackin Farmstead/Dairy

As a district, the Hackin Farmstead/Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy

As a district, the Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

Dobbins Road Streetscape

The Dobbins Road Streetscape District was previously determined eligible for listing on the NRHP under criteria A and D. The reassessment has found that the district is ineligible. There are several characteristics of the Dobbins Road Streetscape that impact the integrity of the resource as a rural agricultural streetscape. The historic rural landscapes include rural streets surrounding agricultural properties. The 325 feet of roadway along Dobbins Road is inadequate in length to convey the rural agricultural character that once dominated this area. In addition, there are modern intrusions easily visible from the streetscape. At the west end there is a prominent 1977 house on the south side of the road and a mobile home on the south side of the road that was moved onto the site about 1970. A recently constructed subdivision of two-story houses is located just over a quarter-mile east of the streetscape, and is clearly visible from within the streetscape boundaries. Additionally, many components of the historic streetscape have lost their historic character, as detailed in the enclosed report. Therefore, FHWA recommends that this district is ineligible for listing on the NRHP.

Following is a summary of the reassessment:
Dr. David Jacobs, Compliance Specialist  
State Historic Preservation Office  
Arizona State Parks  
1300 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007  

Dear Dr. Jacobs:  

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the 2021 South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler to I-10 in west Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

This project has been the subject of extensive prior consultation (SHPO-2003-1890). Recently four historic rural properties along Dobbins Road and 59th Avenue in Laveen were reevaluated by AZTEC Engineering Group, Inc. The results of the reevaluation are presented in a copy of which is enclosed for your review and comment.

Dr. Jacobs, you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at (602) 712-8676 or e-mail LDavis2@azdot.gov.  

Sincerely yours,  

Karla S. Perry  
Division Administrator  

[Signature]  
13 July 2012  

Encl.
Hudson Farm

The Hudson Farm, a historic district, was previously determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under criterion A. The boundaries of the district encompassed nearly 40 acres. Reassessment of the farm and historic farming in the Laveen area determined that the boundaries should encompass nearly 80 acres rather than 40. From the earliest times, the family farms in this area included two quarter-quarter sections, both before the Western Canal irrigated Laveen, and after construction of the canal and the establishment of 80-acre farm units. The original 80-acre farms remain intact, minus rights-of-way for roads and irrigation features.

The current state site at the farm was previously determined to be individually eligible for listing under criterion C. The reassessment agrees with this earlier determination.

Hackin Farmstead/Dairy

As a district, the Hackin Farmstead/Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy

As a district, the Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

Dobbins Road Streetscape

The Dobbins Road Streetscape District was previously determined eligible for listing on the NRHP under criteria A and D. The reassessment found that the district is ineligible. There are several characteristics of the Dobbins Road Streetscape that impact the integrity of the resource as a rural agricultural streetscape. Historic rural landscapes often include miles of roadway and surrounding agricultural properties. The 325 feet of roadway along Dobbins Road is of inadequate length to truly convey the rural agricultural character that once dominated this area. In addition, there are modern intrusions easily visible from the streetscape. At the west end there is a prominent 1977 house on the north side of the road and a mobile home on the south side of the road that was moved onto the site about 1978. A recently constructed subdivision of two-story homes is located just over a quarter-mile east of the streetscape, and is clearly visible from within the streetscape boundaries. Additionally, many components of the historic streetscape have lost their historic character, as detailed in the enclosed report. Therefore, FHWA recommends that this district is ineligible for listing on the NRHP.

Following is a summary of the reassessment:

Please review the information provided in this letter, the attached project location map, and enclosed report. If you find the report adequate and agree with FHWA’s revised recommendation of eligibility, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at (602) 712-8636 or e-mail LDavis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Karla S. Petty
Division Administrator

[Date]
This project has been the subject of extensive prior consultation. The four historic properties near the Dobbin's Road/59th Avenue intersection that were reevaluated recently include:

1) Hudson Farm, 9300 South 59th Avenue
2) Hackin Farmstead/Dairy, 10048 South 59th Avenue
3) Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy, 6159 West Dobbin's Road
4) Dobbins Road Streetscape, 6100 block of West Dobbin's Road

**Hudson Farm**

The Hudson Farm, a historic district, was previously determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under criterion A. The boundaries of the district encompassed nearly 40 acres. Reassessment of the farm and historic farming in the Laveen area determined that the boundaries should encompass nearly 80 acres rather than 40. From the earliest times, the family farms in this area included two quarter-quarter sections, both before the Western Canal irrigated Laveen, and after construction of the canal and the establishment of 40-acre farm units. The original 80-acre farm remains intact, minus rights-of-way for roads and irrigation features.

The current state sites at the farm were previously determined to be individually eligible for listing under criterion C. The reassessment agrees with this earlier determination.

**Hackin Farmstead/Dairy**

As a district, the Hackin Farmstead/Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

**Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy**

As a district, the Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

**Dobbins Road Streetscape**

The Dobbins Road Streetscape District was previously determined eligible for listing on the NRHP under criterion A and D. The reassessment has determined that the district is ineligible. There are several characteristics of the Dobbins Road Streetscape that impact the integrity of the resource as a rural agricultural streetscape. Historic rural landscapes often include miles of roadway and surrounding agricultural properties. The 325 feet of roadway along Dobbins Road is inadequate length to truly convey the rural agricultural character that once dominated this area. In addition, there are modern intrusions easily visible from the streetscape. At the west end there is a prominent 1977 house on the north side of the road and a mobile home on the south side of the road that was moved onto the site about 1970. A recently constructed subdivision of two-story houses is located just over a quarter-mile east of the streetscape, and is clearly visible from within the streetscape boundaries. Additionally, many components of the historic streetscape have lost their historic character, as detailed in the enclosed report. Therefore, FHWA recommends that this district is ineligible for listing on the NRHP.

Following is a summary of the reassessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Tax Parcel No.</th>
<th>Property Name and Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Primary Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Reply Refer To:

FHWA, ADOT, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the City of Phoenix-Historic Preservation Office (COP-HPO), the City of Phoenix-Pueblo Grande Museum (COP-PGM), and Salt River Project (SRP).

The McShane Canal was previously determined to be eligible for listing on the NRHP under criterion C. The reassessment agrees with this earlier determination.

Mr. Laurence Montero
Pueblo Grande Museum
4619 East Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85044

Dear Mr. Montero:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler to I-10 in west Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

This project has been the subject of extensive prior consultation (SHPO-2003-1890). Recently four historic rural properties along Dobbin's Road and 59th Avenue in Laveen were reevaluated by AZTEC Engineering Group, Inc. The results of the reevaluation are presented in South Mountain Transportation Corridor Study: Evaluation of Historic Buildings and Districts, Maricopa County, Arizona (Solliday 2012), a copy of which is enclosed for your review and comment.

Consulting parties for this reevaluation include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the City of Phoenix-Historic Preservation Office (COP-HPO), the City of Phoenix-Pueblo Grande Museum (COP-PGM), and Salt River Project (SRP).

The four historic properties near the Dobbin's Road/59th Avenue intersection that were reevaluated include:

1) Hudson Farm, 9300 South 59th Avenue
2) Hackin Farmstead/Dairy, 10048 South 59th Avenue
3) Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy, 6159 West Dobbin's Road
4) Dobbins Road Streetscape, 6100 block of West Dobbin's Road

In addition, there are modern intrusions easily visible from the streetscape. At the west end there is a prominent 1977 house on the north side of the road and a mobile home on the south side of the road that was moved onto the site about 1970. A recently constructed subdivision of two-story houses is located just over a quarter-mile east of the streetscape, and is clearly visible from within the streetscape boundaries. Additionally, many components of the historic streetscape have lost their historic character, as detailed in the enclosed report. Therefore, FHWA recommends that this district is ineligible for listing on the NRHP.

Following is a summary of the reassessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Tax Parcel No.</th>
<th>Property Name and Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Primary Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Historic Districts</th>
<th>INDIVIDUALLY ELIGIBLE HISTORIC BUILDINGS</th>
<th>Ineligible Historic Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>300 02 038-03A: Hudson Farm 9300 S. 59th Avenue, ca. 1926 A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>300 02 033: Hackin Farmstead/Dairy - Dairy Flat Barn 10048 S. 59th Avenue, 1952 C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>300 02 041: Dobbins Streetscape 6100 block W. Dobbins Road, 1930 N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please review the information provided in this letter, the attached project location map, and enclosed report. If you find the report adequate and agree with FHWA’s revised recommendation of eligibility, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at (602) 712-4636 or e-mail LDavis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Kara S. Petty
Division Administrator

Enclosures

ARIZONA DIVISION

July 11, 2012

In Reply Refer To: NH-202-D(ADY)

Ms. Michelle Dodds
CLG Contact, Historic Preservation Office
200 West Washington, 3rd Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Dear Ms. Dodds:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) are conducting technical studies in support of the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the 202L South Mountain Freeway, EIS & Location/Design Concept Report project. The EIS addresses alternative alignments for the proposed South Mountain Freeway, which would extend around the south side of South Mountain from Interstate 10 (I-10) in west Chandler to I-10 in west Phoenix. As this project would employ federal funds, it is considered a federal undertaking subject to Section 106 review.

This project has been the subject of extensive prior consultation (SHPO-2003-1890). Recently four historic rural properties along Dobbins Road and 59th Avenue in Laveen were reevaluated by AZTEC Engineering Group, Inc. The results of the reevaluation are presented in South Mountain Transportation Corridor Study: Evaluation of Four Historic Buildings and Districts, Maricopa County, Arizona (Solliday 2012), a copy of which is enclosed for your review and comment.

Consulting parties for this reevaluation include FHWA, ADOT, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the City of Phoenix-Historic Preservation Office (COP-HPO), the City of Phoenix-Pueblo Grande Museum (COP-PGM), and Salt River Project (SRP).

The four historic properties near the Dobbins Road/59th Avenue intersection that were reevaluated include:

1) Hudson Farm, 9300 South 59th Avenue
2) Hackin Farmstead/Dairy, 10048 South 59th Avenue
3) Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy, 6159 West Dobbins Road
4) Dobbins Road Streetscape, 6100 block of West Dobbins Road
Hudson Farm

The Hudson Farm, a historic district, was previously determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under criterion A. The boundaries of the district encompassed nearly 40 acres. Reassessment of the farm and historic farming in the Laveen area determined that the boundaries should encompass nearly 80 acres rather than 40. From the earliest times, the family farms in this area included two quarter-quarter sections, both before the Western Canal irrigated Laveen, and after construction of the canal and the establishment of 40-acre farm units. The original 80-acre farm remains intact, minus rights-of-way for roads and irrigation features.

The cement stave silos at the farm were previously determined to be individually eligible for listing under criterion C. The reassessment agrees with this earlier determination.

Hackin Farmstead/Dairy

As a district, the Hackin Farmstead/Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy

As a district, the Tyson Farmstead/Barnes Dairy was previously determined ineligible for listing on the NRHP. However, the dairy barn on the property was found eligible under criterion C. No changes are recommended for these previous determinations.

Dobbins Road Streetscape

The Dobbins Road Streetscape District was previously determined eligible for listing on the NRHP under criteria A and D. The reassessment has found that the district is ineligible. There are several characteristics of the Dobbins Road Streetscape that impact the integrity of the resource as a rural agricultural streetscape. Historic rural landscapes often include miles of roadway and surrounding agricultural properties. The 325 feet of roadway along Dobbins Road is of inadequate length to truly convey the rural agricultural character that once dominated this area. In addition, there are modern intrusions easily visible from the streetscape. At the west end there is a prominent 1977 house on the north side of the road and a mobile home on the south side of the road that was moved onto the site about 1970. A recently constructed subdivision of two-story houses is located just over a quarter-mile east of the streetscape, and is clearly visible from within the streetscape boundaries. Additionally, many components of the historic streetscape have lost their historic character, as detailed in the enclosed report. Therefore, FHWA recommends that this district is ineligible for listing on the NRHP.

Following is a summary of the reassessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory No.</th>
<th>Tax Parcel No.</th>
<th>Property Name and Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Primary Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Historic Districts</td>
<td>300 02 038</td>
<td>Hudson Farm - Cement Stave Silos 9300 S. 59th Avenue</td>
<td>ca. 1926</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually Eligible Historic Buildings</td>
<td>300 02 07A</td>
<td>Hudson Farm 9300 S. 59th Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please review the information provided in this letter, the attached project location map, and enclosed report. If you find the report adequate and agree with FHWA’s revised recommendation of eligibility, please indicate your concurrence by signing below. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Linda Davis at (602) 712-8636 or e-mail L.Davis2@azdot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Division Administrator

Jodey Elsner, Historian, COP Historic Preservation Office Phoenix, Ariz. (with enclosures)