

Graves, Natalie (Consultant)

From: Cade, Deborah (ATG) [DeborahC@ATG.WA.GOV]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 9:46 AM
To: Page, Heather (Consultant); Gray, Connie; Hanson, Allison
Cc: Costanza, Ann (Consultant); Halsted, Jesse (Consultant); Farley, Kimberly
Subject: RE: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

<http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~public/toc/25-32.htm>

From: Page, Heather (Consultant) [mailto:pageh@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 8:32 AM
To: Gray, Connie; Hanson, Allison; Cade, Deborah (ATG)
Cc: Costanza, Ann (Consultant); Halsted, Jesse (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?

Jesse and I spoke with Genna at the Pioneer Square District. She doesn't agree with our interpretation, but I think Jesse explained it well. He also informed her that the contingency would likely not happen anyway, so that's another factor. Genna said she would like an email so that our stance can be documented in writing—it sounded like she would forward the email onto other individuals, perhaps within the board.

Deborah ~ With that in mind, could you please help us craft the email? If you would like me or Jesse to draft it up and send it to you for review, let me know.

Thanks for everyone's feedback,
Heather

From: Gray, Connie
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2008 8:16 AM
To: Hanson, Allison; Cade, Deborah; Page, Heather (Consultant)
Cc: Costanza, Ann (Consultant); Halsted, Jesse (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?
Thanks all. I have more of an understanding of what's "usually" done and what the expectations are. I absolutely defer to Deborah for interpretation of the regs! Though I'll be interested to hear how the PSPB responds to our pulling the application.

I'm home today with the kids, and unable to look up the PSPD ordinance. I'm curious if this issue is addressed. I'm still unsure about how state ownership trumps the local district. If, down the road, the Viaduct is designated a Seattle Landmark, we would have to get a COA to make any alterations (such as removing the southern portion for the South End project). How is that different than our current situation, where we're making a (albeit minor) change w/in the historic district?

I'm asking these things to make sure I have a clear understanding of state law, and also to make sure that nothing is falling through the cracks (no pun intended).

I do want to point out that the Pioneer Square Preservation District does consider the Viaduct part of the district. I mention this because we should not make the assumption that it's not "integral to the actual district." Since it's within the district boundaries, the Viaduct is as much a part of the district as, for example, the Maynard Building is.

Connie

From: Hanson, Allison
Sent: Tue 2/26/2008 8:02 AM
To: Cade, Deborah; Page, Heather (Consultant); Gray, Connie
Cc: Costanza, Ann (Consultant); Halsted, Jesse (Consultant)
Subject: RE: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?

Thanks Deborah - I talked with Kimberly this morning and we agree and we are going to pull the application. Thanks for the feedback on this - Allison

-----Original Message-----

From: Cade, Deborah (ATG) [<mailto:DeborahC@ATG.WA.GOV>]

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2008 5:18 PM

To: Page, Heather (Consultant); Gray, Connie

Cc: Costanza, Ann (Consultant); Hanson, Allison; Halsted, Jesse (Consultant)

Subject: RE: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Page, Heather (Consultant) [<mailto:pageh@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov>]

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2008 10:57 AM

To: Gray, Connie

Cc: Cade, Deborah (ATG); Costanza, Ann (Consultant); Hanson, Allison; Halsted, Jesse (Consultant)

Subject: RE: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?

Thanks for checking this out, Connie. We will continue to move forward on the permit.

Heather

-----Original Message-----

From: Gray, Connie

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2008 10:55 AM

To: Page, Heather (Consultant)

Cc: Cade, Deborah; Costanza, Ann (Consultant)

Subject: RE: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?

Hi Heather,

I just left you a voice mail, but wanted to summarize on email, and cc Ann and Deborah as well.

The Pioneer Square Preservation Board (PSPB) is tasked to review any change to a building or structure w/in its boundaries that would be visible. So even though our proposed action is minor, it would still be visible and therefore still subject to

Board review. I don't have the regs in front of me, so I can't quote anything, but even though the State owns the AWV, the Viaduct is still subject to review since it's within the boundaries of the historic district. It would be the same if there was a state- or federally-owned building in question - it would still be subject to review.

I also talked to Genna Nashem, PSPB coordinator, who confirmed this information.

Let me know if there are any additional questions on this.

Connie

=====

Connie Walker Gray
WSDOT Cultural Resource Specialist
401 2nd Avenue South, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104
206.716.1138

-----Original Message-----

From: Page, Heather (Consultant)
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2008 9:42 AM
To: Gray, Connie
Cc: Page, Heather (Consultant); Cade, Deborah
Subject: FW: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?
Importance: High

Hi Connie,

This email provides a little background for my question today via voicemail. Pioneer Square Historic District's scope includes the buildings or structures within their jurisdiction (attached map).

However, work is only being conducted on the viaduct, which is owned by WSDOT and within their jurisdiction (see RCW in first email below).

Is there an expectation or precedent that WSDOT goes to the historic district whenever there is work in the vicinity?

I included the portion of the project within their area of scope for your information:

"The proposed contingency measure will include the installation of a suspended conduit system below the Viaduct from just south of S. King St. to Union St...This conduit would consist of four 6-inch diameter fiberglass ducts and would be suspended from the underside of the Viaduct structure using anchors drilled into the Viaduct structure and secured with epoxy. A 2-inch diameter sample of the same fiberglass pipe that would be used for this contingency conduit is being submitted with this application. The work within the District, from S. King St. to Columbia St., will not involve any excavation or alteration to buildings or street surfaces. If the contingency conduit is not needed, the conduit will be abandoned in place until the Viaduct is removed."

Heather Page
Permitting Manager
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
Phone: 206.267.6516
Email: PageH@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Ann Costanza [<mailto:acostanza@anchorenv.com>]

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2008 10:15 AM
To: Page, Heather (Consultant)
Cc: Chad Durand
Subject: RE: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?

Heather:

I can't see immediately why a COA is necessary either. You might want to ask Connie Walker Gray (across from you at our meeting yesterday), if there is an expectation or precedent that WSDOT goes to the historic district whenever there is work in the vicinity.

Connie works on M/W/Th - 206.716.1138

Ann

From: Page, Heather (Consultant) [<mailto:pageh@consultant.wsdot.wa.gov>]
Sent: Thu 2/21/2008 9:46 AM
To: Costanza, Ann (Consultant); Ann Costanza; Chad Durand
Subject: Pioneer Square District Certificate of Approval Required?

Hi Ann and Chad,

I'm trying to figure out why we're applying for a Certificate of Approval from the Pioneer Square District. Please review this email and let me know your thoughts.

The Pioneer Square District's scope includes the buildings or structures within their jurisdiction (attached map). However, the viaduct is owned by WSDOT and it's within their jurisdiction:

RCW 47.24.020: The jurisdiction, control, and duty of the state and city or town with respect to such streets is as follows:

(2) The city or town shall exercise full responsibility for and control over any such street beyond the curbs and if no curb is installed, beyond that portion of the highway used for highway purposes. However, within incorporated cities and towns the title to a state limited access highway vests in the state, and, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the department shall exercise full jurisdiction, responsibility, and control to and over such facility as provided in chapter 47.52 <<http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=47.52>> RCW;

I talked with Deborah Cade at the AG's office

One caveat to all of this is that the "contingency measure," which is the only portion of the project within their area of scope, may not happen. That means we may withdraw the application anyway.

I included the portion of the project within their area of scope:

"The proposed contingency measure will include the installation of a suspended conduit system below the Viaduct from just south of S. King St. to Union St...This conduit would consist of four 6-inch diameter fiberglass ducts and would be suspended from the underside of the Viaduct structure using anchors drilled into the Viaduct structure and secured with epoxy. A 2-inch diameter sample of the same fiberglass pipe that would be used for this contingency conduit is being submitted with this application. The work within the District, from S. King St. to Columbia St., will not involve any excavation or alteration to buildings or street surfaces. If the contingency conduit is not needed, the conduit will be

abandoned in place until the Viaduct is removed."

*** eSafe1 scanned this email and found no malicious content ***

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***