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1 Introduction
The Redmond area has been home to people for thousands of years. Located in the central Puget Sound region of the state of Washington (Figure 1-2), the City of Redmond (COR) lies on the shores of Lake Sammamish, in proximity to Lake Washington, and accessible to the forests of the Cascade foothills. Multiple glaciations carved the deep troughs that make up the topography characteristic to the region, the largest of which are now occupied by the waters of Puget Sound, Lake Washington, and Lake Sammamish. The glaciations occurred between 1.8 million years ago and 10,000 years ago. A unique archaeological site located in the COR—the Bear Creek Site (45KI839)—was discovered during a 2008 cultural resources survey. During archaeological investigations conducted with the restoration of the Bear Creek stream the site yielded artifacts that date to over 12,000 years ago.

Oral histories of Indian tribes, the descendants of those who occupied the Bear Creek Site, refer to living here since time immemorial. Generations of people have been drawn to the location, with an abundance of water in the lakes, creeks, and rivers; plentiful fish and game; and rich soils in the area supporting fishing and hunting and later timber harvesting and agriculture. The area has been a place of occupation as well as a gathering place for trade and community for centuries. The residents and visitors to Redmond have left their mark on the land and waterways in both tangible and intangible ways.

This Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) was developed by the COR as a tool for its staff, community members, and development applicants. The development of the CRMP was initiated to meet requirements of mitigation described in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Regarding Treatment of Adverse Effects to the Bear Creek Site, Redmond, King County, Washington and its addendum dated September 29, 2014. The Bear Creek Site is located near downtown Redmond. The artifacts found at this site confirm North American settlement of the Puget Sound lowlands prior to 12,000 years ago.

This unique site is among the earliest found on the Pacific Coast of North America. Examination of the site allowed modeling of land use patterns in the region and has contributed to our understanding of the peopling of the Americas. Data recovery at the site provided an unprecedented picture of how people lived near Bear Creek at the end of the Ice Age and what their environment was like.

The Bear Creek Site, along with other known archaeological sites dating to later periods, confirms the importance of the Redmond area and the need to manage and protect its known and undiscovered resources. In working with the local tribes, their enduring connections to the area became apparent as did the need for a more collaborative approach to planning for its future. Application of thoughtful planning informed by best management practices and sound science is essential to complying with laws and regulations and developing strong partnerships with the agencies and affected Indian tribes.

Although the MOA provided the impetus to develop the CRMP, the plan will be the latest of many tools to demonstrate the COR’s commitment to protecting and promoting cultural resources. Upon adoption by the City Council, the CRMP will guide the City in managing and protecting cultural
resources within Redmond. General management practices, standards, and procedures for protecting and promoting cultural resources are included here. The document and associated tools also establish and clarify procedures and protocols for obtaining permits and other approvals for private, city, county, and state activities within the COR boundaries.

1.1 Cultural Resources: An Overview

Cultural resources are generally the physical evidence or place of human activity. Sites, objects, landscapes, and structures can all be considered cultural resources. A cultural resource can also be a site, structure, landscape, object, or natural feature of significance to a group of people traditionally associated with it. These resources provide the community a tangible connection to its long-standing history and heritage.

Common types of cultural resources include archaeological sites and artifacts, historic buildings and structures, and cultural landscapes. Other types of cultural resources include properties/places of religious and cultural significance (TCPs) such as the location for seasonal berry gathering or a place of ceremony. These cultural resources, often a place, are significant for its associations with the cultural practices, traditions, beliefs, lifeways, arts, crafts, or social institutions of a living community.

Figure 1-1: Snoqualmie Falls is culturally significant to the Snoqualmie Tribe
Figure 1-2: City of Redmond Location Map
1.2 Vision

This CRMP will be an important component of an overall framework designed to support the COR's long-term planning goals and to protect and maintain its cultural resources. The CRMP, along with the COR's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, will be a critical tool in preserving cultural resources within Redmond, while maintaining and developing housing, recreation facilities, transportation systems, and other infrastructure to support its growing population.

The area has a rich history and long-standing use by native communities. The area was used by native peoples for fishing, hunting and gathering; trade and commerce; and residence drawn to the area by its natural resources. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, settlers from around the globe including eastern America, Europe, and Japan developed an agricultural community built on the area's abundant forests, water, and soils. In the later twentieth century, the growth of a technology-centered economy once again made the area a magnet for people from around the world.

The area is rich with prehistoric and historic period archaeological sites, historic buildings and structures, and areas of cultural significance to Indian tribes. These resources are important tangible evidence of the heritage of both Indian tribes and descendants of early historic period residents. To native people, these resources are increasingly important for cultural survival and renewal. Cultural resources also hold scientific value for historians and archaeologists, and educational and interpretive value for the general public. They are an opportunity to connect new arrivals to the history of the area and offer potential economic value as generators of heritage tourism.

Figure 1-3: Artifacts identified in excavation of an archaeological site

Figure 1-4: Darker soils revealed in an archaeological investigation indicate a period of previous human use
The CRMP will facilitate the COR’s efforts to:

- Preserve and protect known cultural resources with the City limits.
- Identify new resources for their documentation and protection.
- Maintain the confidentiality of archaeological sites and areas of traditional significance to Indian tribes.
- Comply with state, federal, and local regulations in a timely, efficient, and fiscally responsible manner.
- Provide cost-effective measures that balance the management of cultural resources with other resources such as recreation and transportation.
- Establish and promote partnership with others including affected Indian tribes and members of the public in acting as a cultural resources steward.
- Provide clear, early and more predictable direction to developers and other groups seeking to develop property within the COR boundaries.
- Provide tools to graphically represent areas with sensitive resources while ensuring the confidentiality of those resources.
- Provide clear direction in the event of inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources.

1.3 Purpose and Layout
The primary purpose of the CRMP is to facilitate the management of cultural resources by COR staff members. The CRMP will also be a useful tool for community members and developers seeking to understand the resources present in the area and the best management strategies to protect, preserve, and avoid impacts to the resources. The plan includes an:

- overview of the prehistoric and historic-period human presence in the area;
- summary of cultural resources found in the area;
- description of regulations protecting cultural resources;
- cultural resources management standards; and
- procedures for cultural resources management.

The document include terms and definitions (Appendix A), a copy of the data sharing agreement with DAHP (Appendix B), and a contact list of affected Indian tribes, community organizations, and government officials for use in consultation (Appendix C).

A Geographic Information Systems (GIS)-based Analytic Tool was developed in tandem with the CRMP. The Analytic Tool is based on a sensitivity model developed using GIS data and layers. The purpose of the Analytic Tool is to help the COR obtain a preliminary understanding of areas within the City limits with known cultural resources as well as the approximate probability of encountering cultural resources throughout the city. The Analytic Tool in combination with other information and mapping tools will help the COR track resources; work with the DAHP and affected Indian tribes to advise developers and other property owners on how to plan their projects to avoid these resources; and better implement its long-term planning goals relating to the protection of cultural resources. Over time, updates to the tool will enhance the CORs familiarity with probable areas where cultural resources may be located, providing improved predictability for planning and protecting sensitive resources. More information on the Analytic Tool is provided in Appendix D.
Appendix E includes workflows, protocols, checklists, and other working tools for use in the long-term management of the cultural resources including:

- Determining the Approach to Cultural Resources
- Budgeting for City of Redmond Funded Projects
- Private Development Cultural Resources Review
- Cultural Resource Reporting (including consultant selection and scope of work approval)
- Maintenance and Operations
- Construction Monitoring
- Secure Document Management
- Coordination with agencies and affected Indian tribes

Appendix F provides a list of applicable cultural resources regulations. A description of the major laws and regulations is provided in Chapter 2. Appendix G contains a list of exempt activities and permits. Appendix H has a copy of the Bear Creek MOA.

1.4 Process for Development

The plan was developed by the staff of COR Planning and Community Development, Parks and Recreation, and Public Works with the assistance of DOWL archaeologists, historians, architectural historians, planners, and GIS personnel. Work on the plan included a review of resources currently in the area, an analysis of the geology, flora, fauna, and other natural resources in the area, and a review of planning and development and capital improvement processes within the City.

Throughout the process a group of federal, state, and regional agencies and affected Indian tribes provided input and review of documents, protocols, and GIS tools. The Snoqualmie Indian Tribe, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians, and Tulalip Tribes, as well as representatives of the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), King County Historic Preservation Program (KCHPP), Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) were actively involved in the process. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) provided invaluable leadership and support for the process.

The development team also consulted community members for their input on the plan. Meetings were held with a focus group comprised of developers, heritage organizations, and residents to obtain their feedback on the structure and content of the plan.
2 Regulatory Context

Federal, state, county, and local laws and regulations direct governmental bodies from the federal and state level to the local level to manage the cultural resources within its boundaries. The COR works closely with agencies, affected Indian tribes, and members of the community to comply with these laws and regulations and provide good stewardship for the resources under its protection. The following sections describe the existing regulatory framework. Table 2-1 provides a summary of the regulations discussed.

Table 2-1: Summary of Cultural Resources Regulatory Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td>Established protections for archaeological and historic resources and created the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Requires federal agencies to consider impacts of undertakings to resources listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
<td>Requires federal agencies to evaluate impacts to all cultural resources and those prehistoric and historical resources that are eligible for or listed in the NRHP before a project is approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Sites and Resources Act (RCW 27.53)</td>
<td>Describes measures to study and protect archaeological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Graves and Records Act (RCW 27.44)</td>
<td>Provides measures protecting Native American graves and penalties for disturbing these sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC Title 25</td>
<td>Establishes the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, its functions, and procedures to comply with the federal preservation program; authorizes the office to issue archaeological excavation and removal permits; and established the Washington Heritage Register of Historic Places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCW 27.34.200</td>
<td>Declares the public policy to designate, preserve, protect, enhance, and perpetuate structures, sites, buildings, and objects which reflect outstanding elements of the state’s archaeological, historic, architectural, or cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Management Act and Shoreline Rules (WAC 173-26-221)</td>
<td>Requires all Shoreline Master Programs to incorporate provisions to protect historic, archaeological, and cultural features and qualities of shorelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21c)</td>
<td>Requires counties and cities to develop an integrated project review process that combines both procedural and substantive environmental review to help identify possible environmental impacts that could result from governmental decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Executive Order 05-05</td>
<td>Requires all state agencies with capital improvement projects to integrate DAHP, Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs, and affected Indian tribes into their capital project planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management Act and Countywide Planning Policies</td>
<td>Established planning goals and a system of planning for cities and counties which had experienced rapid growth. RCW36.70A.070 directs counties to adopt Comprehensive Plans. As a part of the GMA, King County adopted and the cities endorsed Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs). Development Pattern 41 identifies King County’s policy to preserve significant historic, archaeological,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cultural, artistic, and environmental features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King County Historic Preservation Ordinance (20.62.15)</th>
<th>Established the King County Landmark program and protections for sites, buildings, districts, structures and objects which reflect significant elements of the county’s state’s and national heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redmond Zoning Code (21.30) Historic and Architectural Resources</td>
<td>Provides direction on which elements of the Redmond Zoning Code are applicable to archaeological sites, designated historic landmarks, and properties that are eligible for historic landmark designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Provides a statement of the community’s vision for the future. Plan element 5 describes policies to support protection of archaeological and cultural resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Laws and Regulations

Federal

National Historic Preservation Act

Enacted in 1966, The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) established protections for archaeological and historic resources and created the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The NRHP is the federal list of archaeological, historic, and other cultural resources worthy of preservation. Resources listed in the NRHP include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American prehistory, architecture, history, archaeology, engineering, and culture. The NRHP is maintained and expanded by the National Park Service (NPS) on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior.

In order for a particular property—a district, site, building, structure, or object—to qualify for the NRHP, it must be significant in American prehistory, history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. To guide the determination of eligibility of properties for inclusion in the National Register, the NPS has developed the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation (36 CFR Part 60.4). The criteria are standards by which every property is evaluated for listing in the NRHP. The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, or culture is possible in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity and meet one of the following criteria:

- Criterion A: Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- Criterion B: Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- Criterion C: Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- Criterion D: Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
Cultural resources less than 50 years old do not meet the NRHP criteria unless they are of exceptional importance under Criterion Consideration G, as described in the NPS Bulletin No. 22, “How to Evaluate and Nominate Potential National Register Properties That Have Achieved Significance Within the Last 50 Years” (NPS 1998).

Retaining integrity means that the property has the ability to “convey its significance” (NPS 1990:44) through its location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The NPS provides this guidance on the meaning of the elements of integrity:

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event took place.
- **Design** is the composition of elements that constitute the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
- **Setting** is the physical environment of a historic property that illustrates the character of the place.
- **Materials** are the physical elements combined in a particular pattern or configuration to form the property during a period in the past.
- **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history. Workmanship is important because it can furnish evidence of the technology of the craft, illustrate the aesthetic principles of a historic period, and reveal individual, local, regional, or national applications of both technological practices and aesthetic principles.
- **Feeling** is the quality that a historic property has in evoking the aesthetic or historic sense of a past period of time. Although it is itself intangible, feeling is dependent upon the property’s significant physical characteristics that convey its historic qualities.
- **Association** is the direct link between a property and the event or person for which the property is significant. A period appearance or setting is desirable; integrity of setting, location, design, workmanship, materials, and feeling combine to convey integrity of association.

Bulletin 15 states that in order "to retain historic integrity a property will always possess several and usually most of the aspects" (NPS 1990:44). Properties important under Criteria A or B ideally should retain some features of all seven aspects of integrity. However, integrity of design and workmanship might not be as important as other aspects to demonstrate significance under these criteria and eligibility for the NRHP (NPS 1990:46). Retention of the physical features that demonstrate design, workmanship and materials and characterize its type, period, or method of construction is important to be eligible under Criterion C.

Section 106 of the NHPA requires that federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on cultural resources (resources listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP). The procedures for complying with Section 106 (36 CFR 800) are issued by the Federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. 36 CFR 800 requires the inventory of cultural resources, determination of NRHP eligibility, assessment of project effects, and consultation with interested parties including the SHPO (State Historic Preservation Officer) and affected Indian tribes. Projects within the COR that receive funding or require a permit from a federal agency will require compliance with Section 106. The COR may also be a consulting party to a project initiated by
another party, such as Sound Transit, that occurs within the City limits. Whereby, the COR would review and provide comment to the agency's approach for cultural resources management.

**National Environmental Policy Act**

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires federal agencies to evaluate impacts to all cultural resources and those prehistoric and historical resources that are eligible for or listed in the NRHP before a project is approved. NEPA states that the policy of the Federal government is to preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our heritage. NEPA is implemented through regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1500-08). Projects in the COR that may require compliance with NEPA including applications to the USACE for permits under the Clean Water Act or funding from the FHWA to improve roadways.

**Washington State**

Chapter 27 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) includes measures for protecting Native American graves and penalties for disturbing these sites (Chapter 27.44). This chapter also describes measures to study and protect archaeological resources (Chapter 27.53). The Washington Administrative Code (WAC) (Title 25) established the State Office of Archaeology and History Preservation, its functions, and procedures to comply with federal historic preservation program, and authorizes the office to issue archaeological excavation and removal permits.

The DAHP also administers the Washington Heritage Register (WHR), an honorary designation for resources of local, state and national significance. Although there are no restrictions on resources with this designation, projects requiring review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), must give properties with this designation, and other cultural resources including NRHP listed properties, consideration for state undertakings. Many projects in the COR will require SEPA review including projects receiving assistance from a state agency and development projects requiring a City land use development permit.

**Shoreline Management Act**

The Shoreline Management Act (SMA) and Shoreline rules (WAC 173-26-221) require all Shoreline Master Programs to incorporate provisions to protect historic, archaeological, and cultural features and qualities of shorelines. The Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Guidelines have provisions that apply to “archaeological and historic resources that are either recorded at the state historic preservation office and/or by local jurisdictions or have been inadvertently uncovered.” SMPs shall:

- Include policies and regulations to protect archaeological, cultural, and historic resources.
- Require developers and property owners to immediately stop work if resources are uncovered during excavation.
- Specify that permits issued in areas documented to contain archaeological resources require a site inspection or evaluation by a professional archaeologist.

**State Environmental Policy Act**

In 1971, the Washington Legislature enacted SEPA (Chapter 43.21C RCW). The act declared a “state policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between humankind and the environment; (2) to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment
and biosphere; (3) and [to] stimulate the health and welfare of human beings; and (4) to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the state and nation.

Among other things, the law requires all state and local governments within the state to:

"Utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision making which may have an impact on man's environment;" and

Ensure that "...environmental amenities and values will be given appropriate consideration in decision making along with economic and technical considerations...." [RCW 43.21C.030(2)(a) and (2)(b)]

Under RCW 36.70B.050 all counties and cities are required to develop an integrated project review process that combines both procedural and substantive environmental review to help state and local agencies in Washington identify possible environmental impacts that could result from governmental decisions such as:

- Issuing permits for private projects such as an office building, grocery store, or apartment complex.
- Constructing public facilities like a new school, highway, or water pipeline.
- Adopting regulations, policies, or plans such as a county or city comprehensive plan, critical area ordinance, or state water quality regulation.

SEPA applies to all decisions made by state and local agencies including:

- Washington state agencies;
- Cities;
- Counties;
- Ports; and
- Special districts such as school and water districts

Under SEPA, one government agency is usually identified as the lead agency for every proposal determined not to be exempt from review. The lead agency identifies and evaluates potential adverse environmental impacts of a proposal. In practice:

- For most private projects, the lead agency is typically either the city or county where the project is located.
- For public projects, the lead agency is normally the agency proposing the project.

The SEPA checklist guides agencies through the process of determining potential impacts from a project and evaluating if an Environmental Impact Statement or other review is required. Known historic and archaeological resources, methods to identify these resources, and plans to minimize or mitigate impacts to these resources are identified in question 13 of the SEPA checklist (WAC 197-11-960).
**Governor’s Executive Order 0505 (GEO 05-05)**

Executive Order 0505 was signed into action in November of 2005. This order requires all state agencies with capital improvement projects to integrate DAHP, Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs, and affected Indian tribes into their capital project planning process.

**Growth Management Act**

In 1990, the Washington Legislature passed the Growth Management Act (GMA) which established planning goals and a system of planning for cities and counties which had experienced rapid growth. RCW36.70A.070 directs counties to adopt Comprehensive Plans. As a part of the GMA, King County adopted and the cities endorsed Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) which are a series of policies that provide a standard framework to guide each city’s own comprehensive plan, which must be consistent with the overall vision for the future of King County.

The CPPs address issues that transcend city boundaries, such as setting Urban Growth Areas, accommodating housing and job demand, and addressing capital facilities that are regional in nature, as well as providing a framework to promote consistency between the plans adopted in each city. Also as part of the GMA, the Puget Sound Regional Council adopted Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs) which are adopted as part of VISION 2040. The MPPs serve as the regional guidelines and principles used for the Regional Council’s certification of policies and plans. Cities and counties are required to periodically update their plans to comply with updates in regional and state requirements, as well as changes in local conditions. The CPPs identify development patterns as a framework to focus improvements to transportation, public services, the environment, and affordable housing. Development Pattern 41 identifies King County’s policy to “preserve significant historic, archaeological, cultural, artistic, and environmental features, especially where growth could place these resources at risk. Where appropriate, designate individual features or areas for protection or restoration. Encourage land use patterns and adopt regulations that protect historic resources and sustain historic community character” (King County 2012).

**King County**

King County cooperates with the DAHP and is a participant in the Certified Local Government Program. Under the King County Historic Preservation Ordinance (20.62.150), King County will not approve any development proposal that would alter, demolish, or relocate any property listed in the King County Historic Property Inventory (HPI). Coordination with the King County Historic Preservation Officer would occur to establish effects to the resource. A historic property may be designated a King County Landmark (KCL) if it is more than forty years old or, in the case of a landmark district, contains resources that are more than forty years old, and possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:

1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of national, state, or local history; or
2) Is associated with the lives of persons significant in national, state or local history; or
3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, style or method of design or construction, or that represents a significant distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
4) Has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history; or
5) Is an outstanding work of a designer or builder who has made a substantial contribution to the art.

King County will also designate resources as a community landmark. A community landmark is a resource which has been designated but which may be altered or changed without application for or approval of a certificate of appropriateness.

COR established an Interlocal Agreement (4672) whereby the County provides landmark designation and protection services for the City. The agreement between the COR and King County required the city to establish regulations and procedures for the designation of historic buildings, structures, objects, sites, and archaeological sites as landmarks. The agreement gives the King County Landmarks Commission (KCLC) the authority to designate and protect landmarks within the COR limits in accordance with the City ordinance. One of the requirements in the City ordinance is that the owner must approve and sign the nomination of a property or structure for proposed landmark designation. The KCLC also acts as the review board for special tax valuations and eligibility for low interest loans, grants, and other incentives administered by King County. Under the agreement the County serves as an advisory and provides consulting services in the review of Certificates of Appropriateness (COA) for City Landmarks (CORLs). The King County Historic Preservation Officer reviews and comments on applications for permits which affect CORLS.
City of Redmond

COR established regulations and procedures for the protection and designation of archaeological sites and historic buildings, structures, objects, districts, and sites as part of the Redmond Zoning Code (RZC). The objectives of the regulations include meeting the goals of the GMA by preserving lands, site, and structures with archaeological or historical significance and providing guidance for land use decisions affecting properties with archaeological significance and designated landmarks, considering the effects on historic properties, and protecting Redmond’s unique community and character.¹

The Redmond Zoning Code Title 21 of the Redmond Municipal Code (RMC) provides standards and regulations for development including allowed uses, setback requirements and lot coverage, design standards, parking, landscaping, and other like standards. Historic Preservation is addressed in Section 21.30 Historic and Archaeological Resources which provides direction on what sections of RMC – Title 21 are applicable to archeological sites, designated historic landmarks, and properties that are eligible for historic landmark designation.

The RZC (21.30.070) provides for the investigation of archaeological sites to identify recommended excavation and preservation techniques, appropriate mitigation or other treatment, and further needs for evaluation. In areas with known or high probability of containing archaeological artifacts, the COR can require investigations by a qualified archaeologist to prepare a study, identify the boundaries of sites, and recommend mitigation or construction monitoring.

21.30.070.D directs the COR to stop work in the event of an inadvertent discovery and use a qualified archaeologist to investigate and recommend further measures including preservation, excavation, or other appropriate treatment. Such discoveries may occur in Redmond because the area is relatively lightly developed and development was often limited to the surface. For example, many historic-period houses did not have full basements so materials were preserved below the structure of the residence. Paving for surface parking lots or properties where only limited grading occurred may also protect subsurface layers of cultural materials.

21.030.030 established the Redmond Heritage Resource Register. There are currently 16 properties designated as CORLs under the Redmond Heritage Resource Register. One of these resources, the Redmond Trading Company is designated as a Community Landmark. Nominations to the register require property owner’s consent. The owner may be eligible for incentives through the Heritage Restoration and Preservation Grant Program King County including tax benefits, grants, and loans.

¹ The complete list of objectives is available in Section 21.30.010.
RZC 21.20.50 Certificate of Appropriateness ensures against the loss of archaeological sites and designated historic landmarks of historic significance and that prior to consideration of a demolition that alternatives have been explored and that mitigation, if appropriate, is required. Property owners wishing to make significant changes to City Landmarks must apply for a COA. There are three levels of COAs for historic landmarks. Level I COAs apply to restorations and repairs using identical materials. Level II COAs apply to additions, replacement of historic materials with alternate materials, or painting that does not match the original color. Level III COAs apply to moving or building an addition to a structure. Level III COAs are also required for filling, grading, excavation, paving or building over or in an archaeological site. The City’s Landmark Commission reviews applications for these changes to ensure that the property maintains its archaeological and historical integrity. Level II and III reviews will also require review by the COR Technical Committee.

City of Redmond Comprehensive Plan (Redmond 2030)
Adopted in December 2011, the COR’s Comprehensive Plan – Redmond 2030 (Plan) provides a broad statement of the community's vision for the future and contains policies that are intended to guide the built environment as well as aspects of Redmond’s social and economic character. Specifically, the Plan reflects the long-term values and aspirations of the community and addresses how aspects such as land use, housing, transportation, capital facilities and services, and historic preservation work together to achieve the desired vision. Ultimately, the Plan anticipates how development should be guided over the next 20 years. The Plan is implemented through zoning regulations, functional plans, capital facility improvements, and other implementation measures such as this CRMP. Principles and policies relating to the protection of archaeological resources and other cultural resources are included in several elements of the Plan.

The policies relating to Community Character and Historic Preservation are found in Element 5, Community Character and Historic Preservation, supporting historic preservation of archaeological, historic, and other cultural resources. This element provides a series of goals that specifically address: Preservation, Survey and Evaluation, Landmark Nomination, Implementation Measures, and Regional and Community Involvement.

Several policies directly support protection of archaeological and other cultural resources including:

- Plan policies CC-42-43 encourages protection of significant archaeological resources from adverse impacts of development, protection of historic landmarks from demolitions, or modification, and provides for mitigation of adverse effects to archaeological or landmark sites.
- Plan policies CC-32 and CC-33 addresses the identification of archaeological sites and historic resources as essential steps toward preservation and encourages the COR to conduct ongoing surveys and maintain an inventory to guide planning and decision making.
- Plan policies CC-46-CC-49 encourage cooperation, information sharing, and collaboration on the development of education programs and materials with affected Indian tribes, King County, DAHP, and other entities.
• Plan policies CC-40 and CC-41 encourage the maintenance and preservation of cultural resources through financial incentives, fee reductions, and flexibility within the Zoning Code.

In addition to protecting the existing character of the shoreline, where many cultural resources are located, the SMP adopted by the COR as part of the Plan provides specific requirements to identify and protect archaeological and historic sites (SF-12, SL-83, and SL-87). The protections include requirements for developers and property owners working in shorelines to:

• Identify potential development impacts to and to protect and respect, valuable archaeological and historic sites and cultural resources.
• Try to incorporate interpretation of on-site archaeological and historic resources into the design of shoreline development.
• Stop work if archaeological resources are uncovered during excavation.
• Engage a professional archaeologist to perform a site inspection or evaluation for permits issued in areas documented to contain archaeological resources.

The Natural Environment element of the Plan also addresses issues related to sustainability, low-impact development, and conservation of natural resources that are beneficial in maintaining the setting and character of cultural resources in the area.

The policies of the Plan are supported through programs such as the Heritage Grant Program implemented by the Planning Department and also enforced through the Zoning Code.

2.2 Affected Indian Tribes
COR is the home and traditional use area for numerous Indian tribes. These tribes maintain an interest in the management of natural and cultural resources in the city boundaries. In addition to village sites and other archaeological resources, there are ancestral homes, as well as streams, fishing and gathering areas, and other areas of continued significance and importance in sustaining tribal culture. The COR consults with these Indian tribes in compliance with laws and regulations such as NEPA, NHPA Section 106, SEPA, and the RZC. Through consultation, the COR seeks input on actions that may affect the natural and cultural resources in the City limits and ways to mitigate or reduce affects. COR works very closely with the Snoqualmie Tribe, the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, the Tulalip Tribes, and the Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians. These federally recognized Indian tribes have documented habitation and a long history of use in the area. The COR also coordinates with the Yakama Indian Nation and the Suquamish Tribe and will consult at their request. COR also maintains contact with the non-federally recognized Duwamish tribal organization regarding cultural and historical resources.

2.3 Agency Partners
The COR interacts with numerous agencies in its management of cultural resources. The roles of the agencies will vary based upon the laws and regulations described in Section 2.1 and the type of project or undertaking.
Federal Agencies
Certain projects in the COR require a permit from and/or coordination with federal agencies. The most common include the FHWA and Federal Transit Authority (FTA) for projects involving road, rail, and other transportation infrastructure and the USACE for projects affecting waters of the United States including wetlands. COR may be asked to follow the procedures of these agencies for projects receiving grants and other federal funding. COR has the responsibility to provide these agencies with information on the effects of proposed action on those cultural resources that are listed in, or eligible for listing in, the NRHP. COR may also be contacted by these agencies to serve as a consulting party for projects in the city limits proposed by other parties or directly by the agency.

State Agencies
The COR interacts with many state agencies regarding cultural resources. Many projects in Redmond receive grants from state agencies such as the Washington Department of Ecology. Additionally, WSDOT often serves as the contact for FHWA for projects receiving federal funds. COR interacts with the staff of these agencies and follows their procedures for implementing reviews under SEPA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

COR frequently coordinates and consults with DAHP on projects with the potential to impact cultural resources. DAHP works with agencies, tribes, private citizens, and developers to identify and develop protection strategies for cultural resources in Washington. DAHP administers the WHR and the NRHP program in Washington under the direction of the SHPO as required under 36 CFR Part 61 and RCW 27.34.210.

DAHP has review responsibilities for impacts to archaeological, historical, and other cultural resources under SEPA (WAC 197-11-340), Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR Part 800), and Executive Order 0505. DAHP responsibilities include maintaining records of known cultural resources; reviewing reports, nominations, and determinations of eligibility to the NRHP and WHR; and approving permits for investigations at or alterations to archaeological sites (RCW 27.44 and RCW 27.53). DAHP works closely with the COR staff to determine the best approach and necessary investigations for compliance with Section 106, Executive 0505, and SEPA.

COR staff also use DAHP's Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD). This is a repository of information on known cultural resources in Washington. WISAARD also contains records relating to surveys and other efforts to identify and protect archaeological and other cultural resources. The database has a publically accessible search tool for information on historic resources. Approved consultants and staff from agencies and local governments use a secure interface to search for and enter data on archaeological sites and other confidential resources; submit cultural resources inventory forms and reports to the DAHP; and to track the administrative record of compliance projects submitted to the DAHP. Data on cultural resources in Redmond in the WISAARD system is described in more detail in Section 3.5.

King County
Some projects in the COR receive funding from King County and require coordination with County officials and staff on issues ranging from road improvements to natural resource protection. KCHPP provides training and educational support to the COR in addition to designation and protection services for historic properties and landmarks.
2.4 Members of the Public

In addition to city residents, there are many other groups and organizations with an interest in cultural resources or whose activities may impact cultural resources.

Owners and developers of both residential and commercial properties routinely seek to alter existing buildings, remove trees and vegetation, increase the amount of development on an existing parcel, build on undeveloped land, or undertake other activities that could impact cultural resources. The majority of these activities require review and permitting by the COR.

Additionally, there are interested groups such as the Master Builders Association and One Redmond and the Redmond Historical Society. The COR seeks and weighs the input of various viewpoints when adopting policies and regulations to manage cultural resources.
3 Cultural Resources in Redmond

3.1 Setting and Environment

Geology and Climate

Redmond is situated in the Sammamish River Valley at the eastern boundary of the Puget Lowland physiographic province. The Puget Lowland region is a wide low-lying area between the Cascade Range to the east and the Olympic Mountains to the west. The region extends from the San Juan Islands in the north to past the southern end of the Puget Sound. The gently rolling hills of the Puget Lowland are the remnants of moraines and broad riverine floodplains and deltas (Franklin and Dryness 1988). The Puget Sound lowlands are dominated by water: Rivers and lakes surround the glacier-carved Puget Sound with its many bays and small islands as well as the larger Salish Sea which extends from the north end of the Strait of Georgia to the south end of the Puget Sound and west to the mouth of the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

Holocene fluvial activity and Pleistocene glacial events shaped the Sammamish River Valley. The most recent glacial event, The Vashon State of the Fraser Glaciation, scoured out the area now occupied by the Sammamish River and Lake Sammamish approximately 17,500 years ago. The subglacial erosional processes formed a large trough. As the glaciers retreated, gravel, sand silt, and clay were deposited into the trough forming a layer known as Vashon till. The retreating glaciers released meltwaters, draining into the lowland and depositing outwash. Glacial lakes were formed when ice sheets blocked drainages (Kopperl et al 2010). In the twentieth century, the straightening and ditching of the Sammamish River as well as draining of wetlands altered the drainage patterns of the area (Kerwin 2001). Seasonal heavy rainfall, erosional slide activity, and frequent flooding continually shape the drainage patterns in the foothills and floodplains of the River Valley.

The Redmond area is characterized by a maritime climate, with historically cool, dry summers and wet, mild winters. After the Fraser Glaciation, the region has experienced cycles of warming/drying followed by cooling and increased moisture. After the last glacial advance, a period of rapid warming and lower precipitation level occurred until approximately 7,000 years before present [BP]) temperatures began cooling. This neoglacial cooling period lasted until approximately 2,000 BP. The little Ice Age was the last major fluctuation. This period from approximately 500 to 100 years BP resulted in a climate of increased precipitation and cooler temperatures (Ames and Maschner 1999).

Fauna

The diversity of species found in the Sammamish River Valley has been influenced by settlement and hunting activities. Historically, the region would have supported waterfowl and birds, as well as large and small mammals. Although some species are no longer present, the area continues to support mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), various avian species, salmonids, and suckers. Salmon species include Fall Chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), coho (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), sockeye (*Oncorhynchus nerka*), kokanee (*Oncorhynchus nerka*), steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkia*), and bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) are likely the only salmon species that were historically present in the Sammamish subwatershed (Kerwin 2001). Other species such as white sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*),
mountain whitefish (*Prosopium williamsoni*), northern pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus oregonensis*), suckers (*Catostomidae*), peamouth (*Mylocheilus caurinus*), sculpins (*Cottoidea*), sticklebacks (*Gasterosteidae*), and lamprey (*Petromyzontidae*) were likely present as well. The western pearl shell mussel (*Margaritifera falcata*) is one of only three species of native freshwater mussels in western Washington and is known to occur in Bear Creek, which drains to Lake Sammamish (King County 2005). It is likely that other native species of freshwater mussels and clams were historically present in the Sammamish River Corridor.

**Vegetation**

The Puget Lowland is currently covered with stands of coniferous forest that make up the *Tsuga heterophylla* (western hemlock) vegetation zone. Douglas fir is the dominant species followed by western hemlock and western cedar. The dense understory of the remaining old growth forest consists of shrubs and herbaceous species including salal, Oregon grape, ocean spray, sword fern, blackberry, red elderberry, and huckleberry (Franklin and Dryness 1988). Red alder, black cottonwood, bigleaf maple, and other riparian plants dominate the floodplains. Red alder and bigleaf maple are the predominant species found along rivers and streams. River valleys support wetlands with willow, cranberries, alder, cattail, reeds, wapto, skunk cabbage, and nettles (Crawford 1981).

### 3.2 Archaeology

What follows is a brief culture chronology documenting the classification and archaeological evidence of prehistoric human occupation in western Washington. Several cultural chronologies have been developed to describe the evolution and distribution of cultural materials in the archaeological record. The chronology adopted here uses Analytic Periods (AP) developed for the King County Native American Archaeological Resources Sensitivity Model as described by Kopperl et al. (2016). The five APs are derived from a combination of geological, paleobotanical, and archaeological data. In addition, this section also describes major traditions, defined in Peregrine and Ember (2001) as “groups of populations sharing similar subsistence practices, technology, and forms of sociopolitical organization…” (xi). These traditions are primarily identifiable by their tools and other evidence visible in the archaeological record. While the time scales represented in each system are similar, there are some notable differences. Table 3-1 shows how the APs developed by Kopperl et al. (2016) correlate to the relevant major traditions used by Peregrine and Ember (2001).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years BP</th>
<th>Analytic Period</th>
<th>Paleo-Indian</th>
<th>Early Northwest Coast</th>
<th>Middle Northwest Coast</th>
<th>Late Northwest Coast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14000</td>
<td>Mobile Foragers - Colonization</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>12200-10800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11500</td>
<td>Mobile Foragers – Localized Adaptation</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>11000-6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>Foragers with Decreasing Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td>9500-5500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>Semisedentary Foragers/ Collectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Sub-Region 3500-1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5500</td>
<td>Semisedentary Collectors</td>
<td></td>
<td>5500-1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1500-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Kopperl et al. 2016, Peregrine and Ember 2001
Period 1: Mobile Foragers - Colonization Period (14,000 BP–12,000 BP)
Beginning roughly 17,000 BP, climatic shifts resulted in a warmer and drier environment than that seen previously. By 15,000 years BP, glacial remnants from the last ice age began to recede and the ice encasing the Pacific Northwest began to free travel routes into the area. The receding ice exposed the Cascade Range, foothills, and glacial drift plains. Newly deglaciated areas were characterized by gravelly outwash plains and impacted by fluctuating sea levels. Within a few hundred years, the raw soils of the Puget lowlands began to support Lodgepole pine, and then Sitka spruce and western hemlock. At higher elevations, extensive spruce-pine parkland dominated until 12,000 BP. This period corresponds to the earliest evidence of human occupation in the area. The first peoples to colonize western Washington were highly mobile and few in number. Although mobility early in this AP was likely driven by pursuit of larger game animals, towards the end of this period mobility was more seasonally-driven. Expected site types from this AP include small residential base camps and some game acquisition sites. To date most sites associated with AP1 and Early Paleoindian habitation are characterized by isolated artifacts (stone tools) and artifact scatters (stone tool chipping debris/manufacture sites). Early Paleoindian bifaces in Washington were of the Clovis regional subtradition and consisted of large fluted projectile points used to target now extinct fauna of Puget Sound (Carlson 1990; Gustafson et al. 1979; Meltzer and Dunnell 1987; Osborne et al 1956).

Period 2: Mobile Foragers – Localized Adaptation (12,000 BP–8,000 BP)
Between roughly 13,000 BP and 7,000 BP continued warming and decreased precipitation contributed to summer droughts and colder winters than those typical today. Nevertheless, this period (particularly between 12,000 and 8,000 BP) maintained a somewhat stable climate. The warm, dry conditions encouraged the establishment of forests even at upper elevations of the Cascades. In the lowlands forests of Sitka spruce and western hemlock were invaded by Douglas fir, red alder, and bracken fern. From 10,000 BP to roughly 6,000 BP, western Washington saw the warmest and driest climate of the Holocene, conditions which contributed to a fire-prone environment. Frequent summer dry periods and fires resulted in the periodic creation of open grasslands surrounded by oak and Douglas fir.

Peoples living during AP2 responded by developing adaptive land use strategies suited to their local environments. Generalized subsistence strategies targeted terrestrial and marine/riverine resources and seasonal rounds were well established. Expected site types from AP2 are similar to those described for AP1, although they are expected to be more numerous due to increased population. These include small residential base camps, field hunting camps, resource acquisition sites, and quarry sites.

Period 3: Foragers with Decreasing Mobility (8,000 BP–5,000 BP)
The terminal end of the last major glaciation was a period of rapid environmental change during which the climate shifted drastically from warm and dry to cool and moist. Roughly 7,000 BP, the climate began its shift from warm and dry to cool and moist and temperature ranges began to approximate those observed today. Vegetation likewise changed dramatically over this period. The warming conditions preceding this shift had encouraged the expansion of subalpine parklands into alpine zones on the Olympic Peninsula and colonization of the upper elevations of the Cascades by mixed conifer forests.
The resources exploited during this period likewise shifted. During this period (8,000 BP to 5,000 BP), there is evidence of increased interest in marine resources, likely due to the extinction of North American megafauna. Site types typical of AP3 include established base camps, seasonal camps, and various resource acquisition sites. Tool traditions corresponding to this AP include both Late Paleoindian (11,000 BP to 6,000 BP) and Early Northwest Coast (9,500 BP to 5,500 BP).

Late Paleoindian assemblages typically feature stemmed lanceolate projectile points and bifaces manufactured using locally available materials. This period also saw the introduction of microblade technology, especially in the Pacific Northwest (Ames and Maschner 1999). This toolkit is most often associated with highly mobile hunter-gatherer groups. Extant coastal sites associated with Late Paleoindian and earlier traditions are few as sea-level rise continuing up until roughly 5,000 BP inundated coastal sites.

The Early Northwest Coast tool tradition (9,500 BP to 5,500 BP) is marked by the disappearance of microblade technology and the increased use of chipped and ground-stone tools and bone and antler tools. The variety of forms and styles suggest diversification of subsistence strategies with an increased use of marine resources. This period is also differentiated from prior culture groups by the appearance of human burials in cemeteries.

Period 4: Semisedentary Foragers/Collectors (5,000 BP to 2,500 BP)

After 6,000 BP and continuing to the present, modern vegetative communities began to advance, and by 5,000 BP, a maritime climate had been established. As of roughly 5,000 BP, red cedar and western-hemlock forests were advancing into the Puget Lowlands. From 5,000 BP to the present, there were several brief periods of fluctuation in terms of precipitation and temperature. One of these climatic fluctuations occurred towards the end of AP4, when western Washington experienced neoglacial cooling lasting roughly 300 years.

Technological advances during this period supported larger populations which led to increasingly complex sociopolitical relations within and between groups, including the establishment of circumscribed territories (Kopperl et al. 2016, Neusius and Gross 2007). This is evidenced by the appearance of plank houses during this period, which suggests that the increased focus on salmon as a resource also led to the development of long-term settlements for larger groups of people.

Site types associated with AP4 include base camps; resource acquisition sites for marine, terrestrial and plant gathering; quarry sites; and possibly village sites. Technologies at this time were characterized by further diversity of tool forms and styles, and the appearance of specialized tools associated with salmon resources. The Middle Northwest Coast tradition (5,500 BP to 1,500 BP) corresponds favorably with AP4 and demonstrates increased specialization geared toward exploitation of marine resources including implements for deep-sea fishing, wooden fish weirs, stone net sinkers, and long-term food storage.

Period 5: Semisedentary Collectors (2,500 BP to 200 BP)

Although the maritime climate had been established in western Washington as of roughly 5,000 BP, several climatic fluctuations occurred during AP5, including persistent drought conditions from 2,400 BP to 1,100 BP, a warming period from 1,100 BP to 700 BP known as the Medieval Climatic Anomaly, and yet another period of cooling during the Little Ice Age (500 BP to 100 BP).
This period saw further development of those social and political structures present in the Early and Middle Pacific periods. Up until the Little Ice Age (which began roughly 1,350 AD), the warming climate became increasingly drier. Continued population growth resulted in extreme social stratification, intergroup warfare, and slavery. The material culture of this period is characterized by an overall decline (although not disappearance) in the manufacture and use of chipped-stone tools and the advent of heavy wood-working tools which were necessary for the production of elaborate art pieces and architecture (Neusius and Gross 2007). Site types typical of AP5 include winter villages, base camps, field camps, resource acquisition sites similar to those noted in AP4, and quarries. Archaeological evidence also suggests an increased focus on funerary ritual and burial ceremony during the period (Ames and Maschner 1999).

Beginning roughly 2,500 years BP, AP5 overlaps the terminus of the Middle Northwest Coast tool tradition and beginning of the Late Northwest Coast tradition (1,500 BP to 1,775 Anno Domino [AD]). The Late Northwest Coast tradition continues to the protohistoric period (this is occasionally defined as European contact but is also marked by the introduction of smallpox, which does not necessitate direct contact). This period is characterized by specialized social patterns and adaptations to sudden environmental and social change wrought by natural disasters and European contact (both indirect and direct).

Table 3-2 summarizes diagnostic site types/artifact types and key archaeological sites associated with each AP.
Table 3-2: Diagnostic Tools and Key Sites Representative of Analytic Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic Period</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Important Sites in Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period 1: Mobile Foragers -</td>
<td>14,000 to</td>
<td>Large, fluted projectile points. Bifaces and unifacial tools such as scrapers, knives, gravers, and burins.</td>
<td>Luckey Clovis Site, Manis Mastodon Site, Ayer Pond Bison Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonization</td>
<td>12,000 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2: Mobile Foragers –</td>
<td>12,000 to</td>
<td>Lanceolate projectile points, cores, processing sites, notable non-stone tools (such as wood implements)</td>
<td>Ross Lake, Slab Camp, Bear Creek Site, Manis Mastodon Site, Cedar River Outlet Channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localized Adaptation</td>
<td>8,000 to 5,000 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3: Foragers with</td>
<td>8,000 to 5,000 BP</td>
<td>Large chipped-stone chopping implements and lanceolate projectile points</td>
<td>Manette Site, Marymoor Site, Ross Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 4: Semisedentary Forager</td>
<td>5,000 to 2,500 BP</td>
<td>Chipped stone, ground stone, and ground organic (shell, bone, antler) tools common. Shell midden sites common and artifacts forms varied.</td>
<td>Marymoor Site, Dupont Southwest Site, West point Site Complex, Ross Lake, Sequim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 5: Semisedentary</td>
<td>2,500 to 200 BP</td>
<td>Ground-stone and carved implements made from naturally-occurring materials (antler, bone, stone, etc.) Chipped stone primarily as expedient technology, but more common in southern and central subregions.</td>
<td>Muckleshoot Amphitheater Site, Marymoor Site, Old Man House, Duwamish No. 1 Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Kopperl et al. 2016, Peregrine and Ember 2001

### 3.3 Ethnography

The southern portion of the Salish Sea (Puget Sound) has historically been occupied by independent but related groups including the Duwamish, Muckleshoot, Nisqually, Puyallup, Shohamish, Smulkamish, Skokomish, Skopamish, Skykomish, Snohomish, Snoqualmie, Stkamish and Suquamish (Haberlin and Gunther 1930; Kopperl et al. 2016; Sutlles and Lane 1990).

Collectively, these groups are identified by their shared language, Salish, or Lushootseed, a term meaning “salt water language,” (Thrush 2016). The area is also of interest to the Yakama, who followed well-known and established trails and trade routes through the Cascade Mountains. These routes provided considerable contact and trade between the Puget Sound region tribes and the Yakama (Sutlles and Lane 1990:488).

A driving force of cultural continuity for these tribes is *Huchoosedah* which is exemplified through cultural knowledge (both practical and spiritual) and knowledge of self. Concepts of nature, culture and self are learned through oral tradition.
Lushootseed speaking peoples made use of the great diversity of resources available in the lands and waters that surround the Salish Sea. Typical seasonal rounds consisted of residence at permanent fall and winter villages and removal to smaller spring-summer camps. Resources were gathered, hunted, stored, and traded. The people who resided in the region were experienced environmental managers who actively shaped their landscape to optimize production of target resources and thus benefit and sustain their lifestyles. These efforts included controlled burns to create optimal habitat for game species and growth of berries, leveling of shellfish beds, and terracing of salt marshes to encourage the growth of clover and Pacific Silverweed (Kopperl et al. 2016:64-65). They also constructed fish weirs, or *stukwalukw* to efficiently catch salmon during fish runs, while ensuring that enough fish were allowed to pass upstream to reproduce (Thrush 2016).

Permanent settlements were located on or near the coast, along river corridors or upland on the slopes of the Cascade Mountains (Haberlin and Gunther 1930). Villages were positioned to take advantage of staple resources and were populated primarily in the fall and winter months. These large settlements consisted of multi-family longhouses lined with sleeping platforms. Villages could include one to ten of these large houses and additional ceremonial spaces, depending on the group (Kopperl et al. 2016: 59). Groups such as the Snoqualmie, whose villages were located primarily in upland areas, targeted medium and large game animals while those living on or near the coast, such as the Duwamish, were primarily reliant on marine resources. Groups living alongside inland lakes and river corridors (Lake Sammamish) employed more diverse subsistence strategies, frequently targeting both aquatic (primarily but not exclusively riverine) and game resources (Ballard 1929:38).

Small autonomous towns were linked to larger villages and tribes through trade and marriage, and relationships maintained through social gatherings such as the Sgwigwi, or “inviting” during which towns and villages would gather and wealthy members displayed their status through distribution of wealth. These gatherings, known more commonly as potlaches, also provided the opportunity to celebrate marriages and births, extend social networks and engage in competitive sports. Ceremony and ritual play an important part of the history of the Lushootseed speaking peoples. It was through the Winter Dance that individuals could commune and release their spirit powers; the Power Board ceremony was used to cleanse houses and people who lived in them; and it was through the Spirit Canoe ceremony that doctors would join together to retrieve the souls of the ill from the Land of the Dead.

During the spring and summer larger communities would split into smaller seasonal groups to target game, fish, and plants (Suttles and Lane 1990). Early observers noted that these camps were frequently located centrally to several origin stories are foundational to the understanding of how the world came to be, and form the background against which stories informing the worldview of the Lushootseed speaking peoples are set. Lushootseed origin stories take place in the distant past, at a time when the world was still shifting. Many origin stories revolve around a figure called the Transformer, through whose life and agency order was brought to the world. It was through the telling of these stories that young people learned lessons guiding behavior, familial connections, and relationships (both human and animal), all fundamental to *Huchoosedah*.

The specialized ecological knowledge employed to maximize both resource use and management/preservation was an integral part of *Huchoosedah*.}
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different types of resources (Kopperl et al 2016). Food processing could consist of fresh preparation, partial curing (for transport), or full preservation (for winter storage or trade). Spring and summer housing could take a variety of shapes including tent/tipi, square lean-to, or square with gable-like roof. Tent/tipi and square lean-to structures were typically constructed using frame poles covered with mats. Gable-frame structures were more often held together with narrow cedar branches and covered on the roof and three sides with mats (Haberlin and Gunther 1930).

During the proto-contact period, disease epidemics coursed through the Native American population that resided in the southern area of the Salish Sea, necessitating shifts in some of the above-described seasonal rounds (Kopperl et al. 2016). There were upwards of 60 historically-recorded village sites associated with the ethno-historic period but many of these (and broader traditional territories) were ceded through treaties signed in the 1850s (Table 3-3). These treaties resulted in the establishment of several reservations, although some who were not explicitly included in these treaties continued to live in traditional village locations up until the early twentieth century. The reservations were situated in areas where Native Americans would not “interfere with existing [non-Indian] claims or with the progress of settlements,” which left many traditional fishing and hustling sites outside of reservation lands. To accommodate for this, the treaties reserved the rights of Native Americans to fish “at all usual and accustomed grounds and stations” (Getches 1971:265).

The treaties were not universally accepted, and in some cases benefits and/or payments promised to signatory tribes were left owing. The ensuing conflict saw violence on both sides, and eventually some villages were burned and their residents forced onto reservations.

Table 3-3: 1850s Treaties and Associated Tribes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treaty</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tribes Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treaty of Medicine Creek</td>
<td>December 26,</td>
<td>Nisqually, Puyallup, Squaxin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty of Point Elliott</td>
<td>January 22, 1855</td>
<td>Duwamish, Suquamish, Snohomish, Snoqualmie,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lummi, Swinomish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point No Point Treaty, 1855</td>
<td>January 26, 1855</td>
<td>S’Klallum, Chimakum, Skokomish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakama Treaty of 1855</td>
<td>June 9, 1855</td>
<td>Yakama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs, Washington State.

In time, new life was given to old ceremonies as they were integrated into other spiritual traditions, such as that represented by the Indian Shaker Church. Identity and sense of community were retained through participation in cultural and sporting activities (such as canoe races and Indian baseball leagues). Many tribal members also participated in the growing Puget Sound economy, performing jobs in farming, logging, fishing, and other industries.

The mid- and later-20th century saw a resurgence of conflicts between tribes and the Washington State government. Declining fish runs starting as early as the 1940s culminated in the
implementation of restrictions on fishing during the 1950s and 1960s. For those who used to fish in Bear Creek and Lake Sammamish, restrictions on fishing caused concern over reprisals from local game wardens. Some, targeting kokanee and even king salmon, would hide gaffing hooks and nets in the trees and shrubs near ideal fishing spots in Bear Creek and small streams flowing from Lake Sammamish (Elsie Irma Zackuse Erickson, quoted in ILTF:4; Mary Anne Hinzman, quoted in ILTF:6).

Proponents of the fishing regulations argued that fish stocks were being depleted by fishing methods used by the tribes (such as the use of fish nets and weirs), and that, in the interests of conservation, Native American off-reservation fishing rights should be restricted just as commercial and sport-fishing were. Puget Sound tribes argued that declining fish populations were a result of commercial overfishing and poor ecological management. The agricultural industry polluted the rivers, while the logging industry, installation of culverts, and diversion of streams choked off healthy runs (Hinzman, quoted in ILTF nd:7; Maine Law Review 1971:269). Curtailment of Native American fishing off-reservation was in violation of treaty rights guaranteed them more than a century prior.

More importantly, fishing was an integral piece of cultural identity. The fish wars, as they came be called, were characterized by acts of civil disobedience and occasionally violent clashes between State actors, commercial fishermen, and tribes. Through organization and litigation which gained nationwide notoriety, the Tribes eventually secured a favorable ruling entitling treaty tribes to 50% of harvestable salmon and steelhead in the state in 1974. The ruling was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1979 (Getches 1970; Price 2014).

The fish wars represented one of many legal battles the tribes have waged over the past half century. Tribes have also challenged laws curtailing hunting rights, and fought for federal recognition and sovereign autonomy. Today, tribal affiliations are reflective of the expansive treaties signed during the 1850s and subsequent recognition by the Federal Government. The Puyallup and associated band of Shohamish are members of the federally recognized Puyallup Tribe of Indians, while the Suquamish and Snoqualmie are also federally recognized Indian tribes. Other groups are coalesced into larger tribes. The Skopamish, Smulkamish and Stkamish are members of the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe and the Skykomish and Snohomish are primarily members of the Tulalip Tribes. To date, the Duwamish have not been federally recognized and members are enrolled in other tribes (Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs, Washington N.D.; Duwamish Tribe N.D.).
3.4 Historic Context

Settlement and Civic Growth

Settlement of the Sammamish Valley by Euro-Americans began in the early 1870s. The plentiful water and fertile lands of the valley drew settlers and investors eager to take advantage of federal programs including the Homestead Act of 1862 intended to transfer land in the western United States to private ownership. The Homestead Act of 1862 allowed people, through certain criteria, to claim a 160 acre parcel of land by filing their intention and paying a filing fee of $10 and a $2 commission to the land agent at the nearest Land Office. A homesteader who could demonstrate they lived on the land, built a home, made improvements, and farmed the property was able to claim the property after five years. Upon payment of the $6 fee, the homesteader received the patent for the land (NPS N.D.).

As the community grew in number so did the services and infrastructure. Communication and commerce grew with the establishment of new roads including County Road 33 and County Road 54 (Road History Packet R Langdon Road, Road History Packet RDNO 54). Steamboats also connected the small communities such as Adelaide, Donnelly, and Monohan on Lake Sammamish and the Sammamish River. (Bagley 1929, Krafft and Melton 2005, Seattle Times 1998).

In addition to Redmond, several other small communities formed along Lake Sammamish and in the Sammamish River Valley including Happy Valley, Avondale, and Union Hill (Kroll’s Atlas 1912). Many of the settlers of these small hamlets worked as loggers eager to make money from the fir and cedar forests on or near their properties. Logs were initially floated in logjams on the river. After the completion of the Seattle, Lake Shore, and Eastern Railroad in 1889 timber resources were often transported by rail. (Krafft and Melton 2005 King County 2002).

The Redmond town site was platted by Kate and Luke McRedmond on March 28, 1891 (Redmond Plat 1891). Other settlers and entrepreneurs soon platted land in the surrounding area. W.E. Sikes and his wife platted land to the west of the McRedmond Plat. Sikes initially platted what is known as Sikes First Addition in 1891 followed by Sikes 2nd Addition of 1906 (Sikes First Addition Plat 1897; Sikes 2nd Addition Plat 1906). William Perrigo filed the first residential plat in 1909 (Perrigo Plat).

The town of Redmond was formally incorporated in 1912 with a population of 303 residents (Bagley 1929). Electrical power and water distributed through a wood-pipe water system became available to residents soon after. New residences and commercial and civic buildings slowly began to fill in the areas once occupied by trees. (Krafft and Melton 2005).

New transportation developments helped fuel population and economic growth. Automobiles began to be used locally early in the twentieth century. As automobiles became more popular, the public demanded better roads and standards were set for construction. Dirt roads began to be paved with brick and asphalt (King County 2009). Paving of the Kirkland-Redmond wagon road not only made travel between the towns easier but also connected Redmond to Seattle via the ferry that operated between Kirkland and Madison Park in Seattle. In 1913, the segment of the Sunset and Yellowstone Trail was paved with brick and became known as the Red Brick Road (Gemperle 1972b). By 1916 there were 54 miles of paved roads in the county (King County 2009). Aerial photos show that Leary Way in Redmond was paved sometime between 1915 and 1922 (Hitzroth...
The 1916 opening of the locks lowered Lake Washington almost 10 feet and made the Sammamish River and other previously navigable waterways too shallow for many boats, leading to increased reliance on the automobile (Krafft and Melton 2005, King County 2002).

The Great Depression and the War
By the 1930s, the city center of Redmond was developed with a mixture of wood frame residences and commercial structures with a limited number of brick buildings. Outside of the downtown core, there were small residential neighborhoods north and east of downtown and near the shores of Lake Sammamish but the majority of the area remained agricultural with scattered farmhouses and agricultural buildings (Krafft and Melton 2005, Kroll’s Atlas of 1930).

During the Depression, agriculture was critical to the survival of the community. Although some farmers lost their property, many were able to survive off of chickens, gardens, and livestock raised on their farms. In addition to the smaller family farms, many large farms were established in this period that survived the Depression and served the region. (Way 1989). The presence of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) also helped the community through the Depression. WPA-sponsored projects in the area included the construction of several log buildings and a stone masonry retaining wall at Anderson Park (Brodie and Reinartz 2008, Krafft and Melton 2005).

World War II brought new jobs to the area for those not deployed. Redmond residents found positions working in the shipyard in Houghton/Kirkland. The jobs paid well and many community members were also able to supplement their income by taking in boarders from the plant. There was a great demand for housing in the area during and after the war (Way 1989, Krafft and Melton 2005).

Post-war Suburbanization
At the close of the war, Redmond was still primarily an agricultural community surrounding a small downtown core (Kroll’s Atlas 1946, 1958; Seattle Times 1956). The population in 1960 was around 1,500 but grew rapidly largely through a civic policy of annexing nearby land. Beginning in 1950 and continuing into the 1960s, the City annexed more than 40 surrounding neighborhoods and larger parcels (Krafft and Melton 2005).

With the added land, there was room to provide housing for returning veterans. Many of the residences were built in the ranch style, reflecting the popularity of this housing type throughout the country (Emerson 1998). Redmond’s popularity as a residential area increased after the
construction of the Evergreen Point Floating Bridge in 1963 and the extension of State Route 520 (Krafft and Melton 2005).

In the 1970s, large companies began to develop corporate campuses in the areas once occupied by family farms. Nintendo and Microsoft both developed facilities on land once homesteaded used as a chicken farm by the Morelli family. Other properties in the area once used for agriculture or owned by timber companies were sold for development for residences (Seattle Times April 1993, Kroll’s Atlas 1958, 1971). The population continued to grow rapidly, the 1980 census listed the population as 23,318. By 2005, it had grown to over 46,500 residents (Krafft and Melton 2005).

The presence of technology companies continues to drive growth in the Redmond area. The population of the City in 2016 is 60,560 (City of Redmond N.D.). The City currently has two urban centers with a variety of residential and mixed-use neighborhoods. While much of the land has been developed, there are some remaining farm complexes particularly in the areas near Novelty Hill Road. Additionally, the open space the Redmond Watershed and historical structures at Farrel-McWhirter Park and Conrad Olson Park continue to convey the importance of timber and agriculture in the historical development of Redmond.

3.5 Known Cultural Resources in the Redmond Area

There have been numerous cultural resources investigations in the Redmond area. Many of these studies have related to construction and development in the area. These previous studies have identified cultural resources throughout the City. Resources identified in these studies have been reported to the DAHP for inclusion in WISAARD.

Some of the resources in WISAARD have been formally evaluated and designated for listing on the NRHP, WHR, KCL, CORL, or Redmond Heritage Resource Register. Other resources have been located and noted in WISAARD but either fail to meet the threshold for listing or have not been sufficiently evaluated to establish their eligibility. As discussed in Section 2, SEPA, Executive Order 0505, and Section 106 of the NHPA require review of potential project impacts to resources eligible or determined eligible for the NRHP, WHR, and local registers.2

The following discussion presents the types of cultural resources currently identified in Redmond. Data on the specific resources will be available directly through WISAARD and summarized in the Analytic tool.

---

2 The data in WISAARD should be considered a starting point for determining the approach to cultural resources management and reviewing projects as some records may not be complete and not all areas of the City have been surveyed.
Prehistoric Period Archaeological Sites
Prehistoric sites are found throughout Redmond and adjacent to its city limits. The sites relate to the use of the area for trade, habitation, and subsistence activities. Site types include pre-contact lithic material and pre-contact camps. Many sites are clustered near creeks, rivers, and other waterbodies. The most significant site in the City boundaries area is the Bear Creek Site. The Bear Creek Site is located near downtown Redmond. The artifacts found at this site confirm North American settlement of the Puget Sound lowlands prior to 12,000 years ago. These sites, along with other known sites in Redmond, confirm the importance of the area and the need to manage and protect its known and undiscovered resources (Kopperl 2010).

Located less than a mile south of downtown Redmond, on the shores of Lake Sammamish is the Marymoor Site. More than 1,000 artifacts have been recovered from this King County site including projectile points from an occupation site dating to as early as 1750 BP (Lockwood 2016).

Traditional Cultural Properties/ Places
Although no TCPs in the Redmond area are currently identified in WISAARD, these sites might exist. The COR will continue to seek input from the affected Indian tribes regarding areas of cultural significance and regarding appropriate procedures and protocols for their protection.

Figure 3-2: Artifact Found at a Prehistoric Period Archaeological Site near Redmond
**Historic Period Archaeological sites**

Historic period archaeological resources in the COR relate to exploration, transportation, settlement, logging, and other activities in the present city boundaries. Many of the settlers who arrived in the Redmond area were drawn to the same locations that had attracted Native Americans, particularly the shorelines of the rivers and streams that provided water, food, and often served as transportation routes. Because the locations were universally attractive, prehistoric sites have been found below historic period and modern settlements.

Common site types from the historic period in Redmond include railroads, roads, farmsteads, and scatters of glass, cans, and other man-made materials. Isolated artifacts and sites have been found by individuals on private residential property and through the course of formal cultural resources investigations for large-scale projects. These resources are predominately located in areas that have been previously disturbed, particularly in places where there has been extended use but only limited ground disturbance. For example, many areas of the city that were paved during the middle of the twentieth century only received a light coat of asphalt, preserving cultural materials below the surfaces. Current development patterns often require deeper excavations, revealing intact buried materials.

**Historic Buildings and Structures**

There are many buildings and structures within the city boundaries that are significant for their association with the development of the area. Of these, 16 are designated as CORLs. The 16 designated CORLs include civic, educational, residential, and commercial structures in the downtown core, several farmhouses and farm complexes, and the Redmond Pioneer Cemetery. Other historic-period resources found in the city include roads, bridges, and railroad segments; however, there are no examples currently designated or listed in the city limits.

The most recent inventory of historic structures was completed in 2005 but did not focus on resources constructed after 1940 (Krafft and Melton 2005). This information is incorporated into the statewide inventory maintained by DAHP as required under 36 CFR Part 61. The inventory is useful to private developers and city staff in identifying resources that may be eligible for the NRHP, WHR, etc. when planning projects. Proactively surveying properties for
inclusion in the local and statewide inventory can streamline the review process for individual projects and help the COR identify programs to protect or otherwise avoid impacts to these resources.

**Cultural Landscapes**

Cultural landscapes are settings humans have created in the natural world. They reflect the ties between people and the land. Examples include farmsteads, ranches, formal gardens, and pilgrimage routes to village squares. Cultural landscapes have elements of the landscape integrated with built features and structures. For example, important features on a farmstead would include the pastures and the fence posts as well as barns or residential structures. There are no designated cultural landscapes in Redmond but some of the remaining large farms, such as the Conrad Olson Farmstead, a designated City of Redmond landmark, could be considered cultural landscapes. Future studies to protect these areas should be conducted.

![Figure 3-5: The integration of the built features with the pastures and open space are important elements of the Conrad Olson Farmstead.](image-url)
4 Standards for Cultural Resources Management

The COR is committed to managing cultural resources in a manner that complies with the requirements of Federal and state laws while supporting economic growth and a changing population. These goals are reflected in the Comprehensive Plan, Municipal Code, Zoning Code, and other documents. These plans and policies reflect the three main roles the COR plays in managing cultural resources. The COR directly manages resources on city-owned property such as the structures at Redmond City Park (Anderson Park) that are listed on the NRHP. The COR uses its financial resources to enhance the quality of life by developing infrastructure and investing in parks and other community resources. Many of these projects result in construction and development that have potential to impact cultural resources located on city land or in/or adjacent to roads and utility right-of-ways. The COR also reviews and decides on permit applications for projects and other activities by developers or property owners that have the potential to impact cultural resources such as tree removals and utility trenching. In these roles, the COR is currently using many of the best management practices for protecting cultural resources including commissioning its own surveys, proactively designating important resources as CORLs, and requiring developers to survey properties with a high potential of containing archaeological materials.

The following standards relate to management of the cultural resources within the COR. These recommendations are based upon the COR's existing goals, code, and policies. They are informed by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation. The standards are widely used by agencies throughout the United States and are currently used by the COR in maintaining structures it owns and in approving COAs for changes to CORLs.

The standards for management vary by resource type and the most important preservation considerations for those resource types. The greatest potential for damaging archaeological resources comes from ground disturbance. The majority of the COR's historic landmarks are considered historic structures. Historic structures benefit from the retention of their original architectural features but minimizing changes to the setting from new development is also important. Retaining the natural setting and the spatial relationships between the landscape and structures are important for protecting cultural landscapes. Minimizing disturbance of the natural environment helps protect traditional cultural places by creating an atmosphere suitable for performance and observation of spiritual practices and where traditional resources (bark and wood, berries, roots, and salmon) are available.

The management standards also reflect the multiple roles the COR plays in protecting cultural resources. Although the COR can include conditions relating to identifying archaeological and historic structures in its permit applications, some of the standards will be most applicable to projects on City property or constructed using City funds. These standards are intended to supplement the existing guidelines in the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code.
4.1 General Standards

- Ensure COR's compliance with state and federal laws.
- Recognize the importance of cultural resources to members of the public and Indian tribes.
- Recognize the responsibilities of Indian tribes and agencies to manage and protect cultural resources.
- Identify, preserve, and protect NRHP, WHR, and CORL resources.
- Coordinate with partner agencies.
- If preservation and protection of NRHP, WHR, and CORL resources is impossible, mitigate the adverse effects upon such resources.
- Provide for public interpretation and education regarding the cultural resources in the COR.
- Partner with other entities and members of the public in acting as a cultural resources steward.
- Provide tools and resources to assist owners and developers in protecting and managing resources located on their properties and work sites.
- Provide tools and resources for COR staff to ensure their knowledge of cultural resources protection and management techniques.

Archaeological resources

- Protect resources consistent with state and federal regulations.
- Avoid disturbance to archaeological sites.
- Maintain records of archaeological sites and cultural resources surveys within the COR boundaries.
- Safeguard the confidentiality of archaeological sites.
- Protect known archaeological sites from vandalism.
- If avoidance of impacts to archaeological sites is not possible, conduct data recovery.
- Develop and require the use of an inadvertent discovery plan (IDP) for COR and private development projects.
- Provide training to COR staff and community members to identify and protect archaeological resources.
- Require surveys and/or monitoring in areas with a moderate or high probability of containing archaeological resources.
- Arrange for and/or require the curation of archaeological resources that cannot be left in-situ.

Historic Structures Including Landmarked Structures and Structures Over 40 Years of Age.

Redmond’s historic preservation program recognizes historic structures that have been designated as landmarked properties in agreement with the respective property owner. The Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code provide the policies and regulations that direct the long-term maintenance

---

3 Historic period sites are afforded the same protections under NHPA and Washington State law as prehistoric sites. Decisions about the eligibility and treatment of historic archeological sites must be made by a professional archaeologist, DAHP, and the affected tribes.
and reuse of these properties, structures, and contributing elements consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The following are standards for preservation of these landmarked structures, an excerpt of the Standards for Treatment that also include standards and guidelines for rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction:

- A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.
- The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
- Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
- Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
- Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
- The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color, and texture.
- Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
- Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

**Historic Structures over 40 Years of Age and Not Landmarked**

At the time of application for proposed modification or redevelopment of historic structures, the RHPO assesses the respective property for preliminary significance. The RHPO works with property owners and developers to consider the effects of the proposed activities on historic structures and in some cases, also the property. This consideration, consistent with SEPA, could involve requests for site-specific survey of archaeological and historic resources, particularly when a survey had not been previously undertaken or was undertaken solely at a reconnaissance level. The RHPO provides the modification or redevelopment proposal to the DAHP and affected Indian Tribes for review and concurrence regarding site-specific requests such as the property owner’s or developer’s use of the DAHP’s non-professional EZ-forms for providing additional documentation or the need for a qualified professional in the completion of a Historic Property Inventory form. For properties that have a significant amount of remaining intact integrity of workmanship or other elements that support a property possibly being eligible for listing on a national or local register, the RHPO works with property owners at their discretion to interpret the possible eligibility and to inform them of opportunities such as landmark designation, property tax benefits, and other preservation support programs.

The COR also maintains a historic property inventory in consideration of these standards and in support of the National Historic Preservation Act. Proactive survey of historic resources can
enhance community awareness of resources and can provide predictability in addition to cost and time savings for property owners and developers in advance of proposed structural modifications and redevelopment.

**Traditional Cultural Property/ Places**

- Coordinate and consult with the Snoqualmie Tribe, the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, the Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians, and the Tulalip Tribes about the identification and treatment of TCPs and areas of cultural significance.
- Coordinate and consult with other Indian tribes including the Yakama, Duwamish, and Suquamish who have a traditional interest in the Redmond area about impacts from projects on places of tribal significance.
- Maintain regular communication with other affected Indian Tribes in the area to identify areas of cultural significance.
- Treatment may include identification of time periods when audible or visible impact should be restricted.
- Recognize that the natural setting, including the existing flora and fauna, contribute to the significance and integrity of many TCPs. When TCPs are identified, avoid altering natural features located within their boundaries or that are visible or audible from within the boundaries.

**Cultural Landscapes**

- Conduct studies to identify potential cultural landscapes in the COR.
- Treatment may include retaining the spatial arrangements between natural features and designed/built features such as structures and grazing areas.

### 4.2 Cultural Resources Management Structure and Responsibility

The responsibility implementing the CRMP is primarily with the Executive, Parks, Planning, and Public Works departments. Staff in these departments have the responsibility of working collaboratively to ensure the CRMP is used to comply with federal, state, and local regulations. The CRMP is maintained by the Planning department with significant guidance and participation from the other key departments though other staff such as emergency responders may play a role in maintaining certain portions of the CRMP.

**Specific management standards:**

- Consider potential for impacts to cultural resources early in project approval and budget process for Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects.
- Proactively review projects for potential impacts to cultural resources.
- Implement early review of projects by the Redmond Historic Preservation Officer (RHPO).
- Require cultural resources surveys, based on recommended requirements from the DAHP and affected Indian tribes in areas with a moderate or high probability of containing cultural resources.
- Facilitate early review and comment on potential impacts from projects and the results of cultural resources surveys by the affected Indian tribes and DAHP.
• Implement inspections for private development and COR projects to verify monitoring and other provisions to protect resources approved by DAHP or recommended in the cultural resources report are in place and maintained as necessary for the duration of construction.
• Communicate planned maintenance work and other long-range planning actions with consulting parties.
• Notify affected Indian tribes of annual comprehensive plan docket.
• Inform consulting parties immediately of inadvertent discoveries and impacts to cultural resources.

4.3 Personnel Qualifications
Although the COR has access to resources at KCHPP and DAHP, management of the cultural resources within the city limits requires a broad range of technical and professional specialties (archaeology, ethnography, historic architecture, historic preservation, landscape architecture, etc.). The COR will dedicate personnel resources to ensuring the CRMP is employed correctly and that consultation with DAHP and affected Indian tribes occurs for private development projects and CIP or other projects initiated by the City. The COR will seek out the expertise of cultural resources professionals and opportunities for training its staff.

Specific management standards:
• Maintain a staff member serving as the RHPO. At a minimum, the RHPO should have a degree in planning or similar discipline, possess a strong working knowledge of the Secretary of Interior’s Standards regarding cultural resources protection and management, and have attended training from the state or a similar group on cultural resources.
• Provide relevant training for the RHPO and other staff responsible for managing/maintaining cultural resources.
• Establish a relationship(s), potentially through an on-call agreement, with a firm(s) with personnel meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards in these disciplines to provide guidance, review, or services.

4.4 COR Employee Training
As described in the Bear Creek MOA, a five year training schedule will be implemented to provide training on cultural resources and the CRMP to members of the planning, construction, capital planning, and maintenance and operations groups including as part of respective new hire orientation. In addition to using the training materials developed for the CRMP, the COR will arrange for staff to receive specialized training relevant to their job duties.

Specific management standards:
• Construction Division Capital Project Managers, CIP Functional Leads, and Parks and Natural Resource Division Maintenance leads will attend the state’s training on cultural resources or a program with similar content.
• Key staff managing public and private projects that affect Redmond’s land will attend the Cultural Resources Protection Summit (Summit) or similar training opportunity to better understand tribal concerns and best management practices relating to cultural resources.
• COR will develop and maintain a staff attendance schedule for additional training and seminars.
4.5 Cultural Resources Surveys for Private Development

The COR currently issues land use development permits for projects proposed by private property owners and developers. Counter planners receive applications for proposed private development and direct the application to the project planner and RHPO for consultation on the need for surveys. The RHPO, with review and recommendations for requirements from the DAHP and affected Indian tribes, shall require surveys for projects based on site conditions including the probability for locating cultural resources in the project’s areas of effect. The extent of the survey will depend on the anticipated level of ground disturbing activities or other work that has the potential to impact cultural resources.

Specific management standards:

- Establish on-call relationship with qualified archaeological consultants who can facilitate the process of determining if a survey is required when DAHP is overloaded, when RHPO is uncertain, or if the developer is questioning the need for a cultural resources survey.
- Consult with DAHP and the affected Indian tribes to establish specific survey requirements for individual projects in moderate or high probability areas.
- Develop list of activities, such as deck construction or limited paving, requiring permits where cultural resources review is not required.

4.6 Affected Indian Tribes, Agency and Community Consultation

Projects in the COR impact many individuals and groups who have a wide variety of perspectives on the best approach to cultural resources management. These groups and individuals provide input to the COR through a variety of programs and processes.

The signatories to the MOA including the DAHP, USACE, KCHPP, and the WSDOT will continue to be important partners for reviewing potential impacts to cultural resources. The COR will continue to maintain communication with these groups as well as the Indian tribes who were signatories to the MOA including Snoqualmie Tribe, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians, and Tulalip Tribes. The COR will also continue to seek input from other Indian tribes who may have used the area as well as private developers, residents, and business owners on the effectiveness of the CRMP and for some, but not all, projects requiring permits or approval by the City.

The COR may also participate as a consulting party on projects where another agency is the lead. For these projects the COR will follow that agency's designated consultation process. For example, if Sound Transit is developing a rail station in the COR boundaries, the COR will likely be invited to participate as a consulting party under Section 106 of the NHPA. The FTA will be lead federal agency and may delegate some of its consulting responsibilities to Sound Transit. The COR will provide input and participate in processes as invited by Sound Transit/FTA.
During the private development application process, the RHPO shall reach out to DAHP and the Snoqualmie Tribe, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians, and Tulalip Tribes for input on the cultural resources management approach including whether a survey should be required for private or COR developed project. Through the SEPA process additional parties including other affected Indian tribes will be contacted for their feedback on projects (Appendix C).

The Natural Resources Division, Transportation Planning and Engineering Division, and the Parks and Recreation Planning and Administration Division also conduct outreach to affected Indian tribes and agencies for their work. This outreach will be coordinated with the RHPO to ensure consistency of procedures and requirements.

**Specific management standards:**

- Continue to hold regular meetings with MOA signatories.
- Coordinate consultation and outreach through the RHPO.
- Develop a list of projects that are exempt from consultation.
- Provide the list of exempt work to consulting parties.

### 4.7 Information Management

The COR maintains a variety of information on cultural resources within its boundary including information on the designations for CORLs, historic maps and archival materials, and reports on cultural resources for COR funded and private development projects.

Cultural resources reports are considered confidential and the information in the reports will be held in secure locations with limited access. Distribution of information relating to archaeological sites contained in the cultural resources reports will be limited to cultural resources professionals meeting the appropriate qualifications, the owner of the parcel, and consulting agencies and tribes. Periodically the COR receives requests for information from members of the public on resources within the boundary. Under RCW 42.56.300, information on archaeological sites is exempt from public disclosure. The COR may distribute redacted copies of reports to members of the public or direct property owners to DAHP to obtain details of archaeological and cultural resources on their property.

The RHPO has access to the WISAARD system and is able to locate information in this system on previously recorded cultural resources. The COR uses GIS-based tools including software called EnerGov to review development applications. EnerGov has limited information on previously recorded historic structures in the city and does not directly provide the age of existing structures on the parcel. Staff who are more familiar with cultural resource requirements use the King County IMAP system to determine the building’s date of original construction. The RHPO also uses maps and information on streams, utilities, etc. as well as IMAP and WISAARD to locate information on areas with a high probability of containing archaeological sites.

The COR and the DAHP entered into an agreement to share data relating to archaeological and other cultural resources (Appendix B). This information is used in the GIS-based Analytic tool developed as part of this project. The COR staff will use the GIS-based Analytic Tool with layers for identifying areas with a high potential for archaeological and cultural resources. The Analytic Tool
will be available to all staff who have participated in the CRMP training. More information on this tool is provided in Section 5.1 and Appendix D.

Specific management standards:

- Maintain and update as needed the data-sharing agreement with DAHP to obtain and provide information on cultural resources within the COR boundary.
- Maintain information related to archaeological sites and areas sensitive to the affected Indian tribes on secure servers within the COR with limited access.
- Mark correspondence relating to archaeological sites and investigations confidential.
- Redact information from cultural resources reports prior to public distribution.
- Implement training on the Analytic Tool.
- Make regular updates to the Analytic Tool (See CRMP Revision and Analytic Tool Procedures).
- Continue to reach out to the affected Indian tribes to share information and where appropriate incorporate into the Analytic Tool.
4.8 Curation

The context and setting of a resource is important to its preservation. Whenever possible, cultural resources identified in the COR boundaries shall be left in-situ. If artifacts are identified as part of a project, curation is discussed with the appropriate affected Indian tribe and local historical societies. For private development projects, the developer will continue to be responsible for any required curation. Curation of historic artifacts is a decision made during discovery and site analysis when the archaeologist, DAHP, and others can evaluate the significance of the site, the quality of the artifacts in relationship to the site, and the value of the artifacts for further study. Curation will be determined on a case by case basis with DAHP and the affected tribes based upon the significance of the site and the resources. If the site is not determined eligible for the NRHP or WHR, curation is typically not required.

Specific management standards:

- The City will enter into a curation agreement (s) with a repository or repositories, such as a Tribally-owned repository and/or the Burke Museum, which meets the standard of 36 CFR 79, for curation of materials other than human remains. The COR will discuss this issue with the signatories to the MOA and select an appropriate repository based upon their input and the availability of repositories to receive materials.
- The curation agreement should be available for all COR projects. In the event a large project will require curation of a large collection, the COR may wish to establish an agreement for that individual project.
- The City will work with local historical groups and other applicable groups to identify locations to display or store historic period artifacts that may not warrant curation at the Burke or other repositories.
- The City will include conditions on permits and special provisions in contractor specifications that, when appropriate, require the developer to follow the IDP and provide materials to a repository meeting the standard of 36 Code of Federal Regulations 79.
- The City’s curation agreement and any contractor provisions should allow developers or individual property owners to use to curate artifacts under the COR agreement. In such cases, the costs of curation and artifact preparations will be the responsibility of the developer.
4.9 Public Education and Interpretation
The COR has an active program of education related to cultural resources. The website provides information on the history of the area and known cultural resources. The COR sponsors programs on Redmond’s history throughout the year including events for Archaeology Month and Historic Preservation Month. The Bear Creek discovery and resulting agreement led to a collaboration with the affected Indian tribes to incorporate artwork at the Bear Creek site and develop educational material on local cultural resources for use in the schools. Area parks have interpretive signs and information on historic structures and other cultural resources located in the park. The COR plans to continue to create and sponsor periodic public education and interpretation programs for the benefit of the community.

Specific management standards:

- Coordinate with the affected Indian tribes to plan and sponsor community and educational programs.
- Highlight the artistic traditions of the affected Indian tribes by commissioning works for display at COR properties.
- Work with Eastside Historical Society and the Redmond Historical Society to sponsor programs.
- Use COR properties with historic structures as venues for city activities to highlight Redmond’s heritage.
- Collaborate with the Public Arts Commission, developers and COR project managers to commission works or otherwise encourage use of the 1% for Arts Program, Arts Program Activity Fund and other funds for artistic projects that incorporate themes relating to the history and heritage of the Redmond area including the art and traditions of Native culture.

Figure 4-3: Interpretive materials at the Bear Creek Site
5 Procedures and Policies

The procedures and policy direction summarized here are arranged into processes within COR activities during which the CRMP will be employed. Discussion of COR-funded maintenance and CIP projects is followed by procedures for privately-funded development; consultation and coordination with affected Indian tribes and DAHP; construction monitoring; and provisions for review and update of the CRMP and Analytic Tool. Protocols and checklists for use by COR staff are included in Appendix E.

Many individuals, groups, and divisions have a responsibility for using the CRMP when reviewing and planning projects to avoid impacts to cultural resources. Table 5-1 provides a summary of COR groups and individuals and their management responsibilities related to the CRMP. Additional details on these responsibilities are provided in the procedures described in the following sections and the Protocols in Appendix E.
Table 5-1: COR Roles and Relationships to Cultural Resources Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Group</th>
<th>Typical Project Role</th>
<th>Relationship to Cultural Resources Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Range Planning/RHPO</td>
<td>Update and implement plans and codes in the COR related to cultural resources</td>
<td>Policies and codes provide guidance to staff and developers regarding the City’s implementation of federal, state, and local laws for managing and protecting cultural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review private and COR development for impacts to cultural resources</td>
<td>Private development, capital projects, and the City’s maintenance and operations are conducted in the context of the policies, codes, and laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Review Planners</td>
<td>Review private and COR development applications</td>
<td>Private development considers and plans for the possible presence of cultural resources early in the development process. The information obtained during early assessments supports completion of permitting including SEPA and shoreline management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Inspectors</td>
<td>Inspect work or staging areas of construction projects to ensure work meets permit conditions</td>
<td>Inspectors, as needed, ensure the ongoing protection of cultural resources through their engagement with the project applicant, project manager, and contractors working in the field during project development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Functional Leads (Public Works Water, Sewer, Wastewater; and Utilities; Transportation Planning and Engineering; Parks and Recreation; Natural Resources)</td>
<td>Propose and manage transportation, parks, utility and other civic infrastructure projects to 30% design</td>
<td>The functional lead considers and plans for the possible presence of cultural resources early in a CIP’s development workflow. In doing early due diligence and communicating with agencies and affected Indian tribes, the lead analyzes many levels of risk for the project and calculates appropriate project costs. The lead also establishes the path through which cultural resources, as needed, will be managed during project development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Division Capital Project Managers</td>
<td>Hire and oversee design and construction consultants and contractors for CIP projects</td>
<td>The project manager plays a key role, as needed, in managing and responding to cultural resources during project development. Their role varies significantly during the project’s workflow, ranging from confirming the qualifications of cultural resources specialists to implementing and permitting in accordance with an inadvertent discovery plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Division Leads</td>
<td>Manage the maintenance of restoration sites</td>
<td>Some City-owned properties include known cultural resources. The Natural Resources division lead carefully plans and implements management plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Group</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Maintenance and Construction</td>
<td>Maintain roads and associated infrastructure owned by the COR</td>
<td>Maintenance and operations staff consider cultural resources as part of their daily work in the field with infrastructure management. Often, staff work in already disturbed areas though also, on occasion, in undisturbed soil and therefore operate in similar manner to a functional lead and project manager for capital improvements. Staff also maintain a high degree of training that helps them respond to inadvertent discoveries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Maintenance Leads</td>
<td>Maintain parks and associated infrastructure owned by the COR</td>
<td>Maintenance and operations staff consider cultural resources as part of their daily work in the field with parks and facility management. Based on the location, staff operate in similar manner to a functional lead and project manager for capital improvements. Staff also maintain a high degree of training that helps them respond to inadvertent discoveries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Conservation Corps (WCC) Crews</td>
<td>Maintain restoration sites</td>
<td>Crew work is planned in advance through the Natural Resources division and therefore, takes into account appropriate planning for careful management of cultural resources. Similar to maintenance and operations staff, WCC crews work under the guidance of leads that have a high degree of training that helps them respond to inadvertent discoveries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Group Records Coordinator</td>
<td>Respond to Public Information Requests</td>
<td>Information regarding the location of archaeological resources is protected by federal and state law. Records regarding cultural resources are securely maintained and as directed, some information is exempt from disclosure. Staff who manage records receive frequent training regarding appropriate document and information management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 Analytic Tool
COR staff will use the Analytic Tool when planning for and reviewing proposed development and capital projects within Redmond to avoid impacts to cultural resources. The Analytic Tool integrates archaeological, historic, and ethnographic data and documentation with aerial photography, maps, and archaeological sensitivity models produced by King County.

The Analytic Tool will help the COR staff to complete a preliminary assessment of the probability of encountering cultural resources which could be adversely affected by development and construction activities. Because the Analytic Tool will not include information on all areas of significance to affected Indian tribes, it will be the basis for an initial though not final assessment of the potential to encounter cultural resources and the associated cultural resource management approach.

Analytical Tool Use
Use of the Analytic Tool will be restricted to COR staff. Community members, project applicants, developers, and residents will not have access to the Analytic Tool, but will receive information derived from the tool from within COR offices and from members of the COR Development Services team and will have access to static map copies showing high/moderate/low probability areas for planning purposes. The maps will not include information on confidential archaeological resources or areas of significance to affected Indian tribes.
5.2 Procedure for City of Redmond Funded Projects

The COR provides funding for a variety of projects that may impact cultural resources. The many buildings, parks, utilities, and streets require on-going maintenance. Larger investments in civic infrastructure are accomplished through the CIP Program. Figure 5-1 shows the groups responsible for project planning, implementation, and construction of COR funded projects.

![Figure 5-1: Groups Involved in CRMP Planning and Implementation](image)

**Maintenance and Operation Projects**

Various groups within the COR maintain the buildings, parks, utilities, streets and other land owned by the City. The Parks and Recreation and the Public Works departments have their own maintenance divisions that performs routine maintenance projects. Larger and more complex maintenance projects may be managed by the Public Works Construction Division.

The Parks and Recreation Maintenance & Operations division is responsible for landscaping work as well as maintenance of infrastructure in City parks. The Public Works Maintenance and Operations Division is responsible for ongoing maintenance needs of all streets, traffic, water, stormwater, and wastewater utilities. Maintenance falls into several categories: work on City owned buildings and structures; work performed on built features such as stormwater facilities; work in previously disturbed soils; and work on unimproved land or raw soils.

For both the Park and Facility maintenance divisions, Redmond staff coordinate with the RHPO to review projects and when necessary, follow the process to obtain a COA for work on or near the specified built cultural resources associated with designated features of the CORL.
Other maintenance activities are performed on assets delivered through the Capital Construction and Development Services process. The majority of these duties are performed on built elements such as utility pipes, constructed stormwater ponds, and sidewalk repairs.

There are other tasks that Public Works maintenance staff members perform that interface more directly with soils or the natural environment. Maintenance activities that are performed on underground utilities, such as water service line and stormwater pipe repairs, are performed in soils that have been previously excavated, backfilled, and compacted during the original construction projects. Out of the activities performed by the City’s maintenance divisions, it is estimated that a limited number add infrastructure or disturb raw soils. These include clearing of park lands that are categorized as unimproved, installing new utility infrastructure, or dredging streams to remove silts deposited from the stormwater system. Additional vegetation and other elements at stream restoration sites are managed by the Public Works Natural Resources division who contracts with the Washington Conservation Corps (WCC). When work is performed in proximity to known cultural resources (archaeological), a management plan takes precedence and the work might be monitored by a qualified archaeologist. In addition, some maintenance and operations activities are exempt from cultural resources review, as approved by the DAHP and affected Indian tribes.

The responsibilities and procedures for the group leads and RHPO for maintenance of non CIP projects are described in more detail in the Protocol for Agency and Tribal Coordination (Appendix E).

**Unplanned or emergency response**

The COR maintenance and operations groups may be required to implement unplanned or emergency responses in the event of fire, flooding, significant property damage from vandalism, or as a result of other unplanned, unexpected events. Emergency response may require that some response activities to protect human life or property occur prior to initiating this procedure. Appendix E provides the protocols for response to emergencies and vandalism.

**Capital Investment Program Planning**

The Capital Investment Program (CIP) is a six-year plan for infrastructure investments to implement Redmond’s vision and priorities. It includes project investments intended to preserve & maintain infrastructure, keep pace with growth, and enhance community character. Most CIP projects are initiated by a functional group such as the Transportation Planning & Engineering Division, Utilities, or Parks Planning. The functional lead from the respective division(s) often obtains necessary permits from the COR and from any state or federal agencies. This permitting activity might also occur later during construction phases by the Construction Division Capital Project Manager. The Construction Division manages construction work, typically through a contract with an outside construction company.

The City of Redmond manages capital projects in the context of cultural resources to increase predictability regarding the presence of resources and for efficient use of public funds in the development of capital projects. In doing so, inadvertent impacts to cultural resources can be avoided or reduced, additional time for mitigating unintended impacts once construction has
started avoided or limited, and compliance with federal, state, and local laws ensured. Procedures for cultural resources management as part of capital improvements are summarized below and workflows for each procedure provided in Appendix E.

Project Planning and Budgeting
Prior to being added to the CIP list a project must undergo risk assessment and cost estimating. Cultural resources are considered in the budgeting/risk assessments because projects requiring cultural resources survey or monitoring will need additional funding. Project funds are not yet assigned at this point in project lifecycle and it is, therefore, not possible to conduct cultural resources surveys or evaluations. However, consideration for the sensitivity of the location of the planned work will ensure adequate funds are available to conduct detailed studies if they are necessary.

The Functional Lead works closely with the RHPO to evaluate the probability of encountering cultural resources. The RHPO is responsible for coordinating with DAHP and the affected Indian tribes to identify the sensitivity of the proposed project area and recommending the initial cultural resources management approach for the project to the Functional Lead.

CIS and CIP List Review
The 6-year CIP list is revisited biennially. A project may be removed or added based upon changing priorities, and project elements may be revised. To account for changes, cultural resources are also reconsidered and any revisions incorporated into the cultural resources management approach.

The Mayor completes a recommendation to the City Council in the fall of the budget year. At this time, the budget becomes available for review and consultation with DAHP and the affected Indian tribes.

Capital Investment Program Project Planning and Design (Up to 30%) Procedures
Following project approval and the adoption of the budget by the City Council, projects are initiated with a kick-off meeting and development of the Project Charter document. The Project Charter identifies the goals and risks of the project including the probability of encountering cultural resources. Since a project’s first consideration as part of functional planning, conditions may have changed in the project area. For example, the project footprint may have been refined and/or new cultural resources may have been identified. A reassessment of the probability of cultural resources enhances predictability and clarity at this time in project lifecycle. While the RHPO is responsible for coordinating with the affected Indian tribes and DAHP and providing recommendations for the cultural resources management approach, formal government to government consultant required under NEPA or Section 106 of the NHPA is the responsibility of the respective federal agency or their designee (i.e. WSDOT for project receiving FHWA funds).

---

4 Applicable laws and regulations are described in Chapter 2 and Appendix F.
Consultation with DAHP and affected Indian tribes helps determine the appropriate response to moderate- to highly probable occurrence of cultural resources. Responses include the hiring of qualified cultural resources consultants and guidelines for reviewing, commenting on, and distributing the results of the survey for further review. Cultural resources surveys, initiated early in the project design process, allow ample time for developing project alternatives and/or planning for appropriate mitigation.

**Capital Investment Program Final Design and Construction Phase**

The final design and construction phase of projects is managed by the Construction Engineering Division in the Department of Public Works. With the exception of routine maintenance projects, construction is typically performed by a third-party contractor. Requirements regarding cultural resources monitoring and/or mitigation plans are integrated into the contractor bidding process.

At project completion, a cultural resources debriefing checklist summarizes the consultation process, any avoidance or minimization measures employed, summary of construction monitoring, and any inadvertent discoveries encountered during the project. If mitigation was required for the project such as development of interpretive materials, the results of these activities are incorporated into the debriefing checklist by the RHPO and their progress reported periodically to DAHP and the affected Indian tribes.

**5.3 Private Development Permitting and Review**

Private development projects require permits from the COR Planning Department. Private development projects requiring ground disturbing work may require a cultural resources survey to prior to receiving the permit to comply with State and Federal laws, and the Redmond Zoning Code. In addition, land-use permits, construction permits and demolition applications are handled by Planners in the Development Services Group.

There are multiple permit types and paths to submit applications. Certain permits will be exempt from cultural resources review, as approved by the DAHP and affected Indian tribes. The list of the exempt permit types is included in Appendix G to the CRMP and includes activities where the permit is obtained over the counter at the time of application and no additional staff review occurs.

The Redmond Historic Preservation Officer (RHPO) reviews permit applications for non-exempt activities in areas of moderate to high probability to propose a preliminary recommendation whether a cultural resources survey or other approach to cultural resources management is likely to be required. DAHP and affected Indian tribes review the preliminary recommendation and issue recommended requirements for the project’s cultural resources approach. Approaches may include using an archaeological monitor during geotechnical boring or construction. If a survey or other measures are required, the RHPO also reviews the cultural resources survey report, routes to affected Indian tribes and DAHP for review, and informs the planner of any permit conditions related to cultural resources management such as archaeological monitoring during construction.

---

5 Exemption provided in Appendix G
The protocol, located in Appendix E provides information on the responsibilities of Redmond staff members, flowcharts, and checklists.

### 5.4 Tribal, Community, and Agency Coordination and Consultation

COR recognizes that successful management and protection of cultural resources requires continued consultation and collaboration with affected Indian tribes, agencies, and community members. Mechanisms for continued communication and consultation include regular meetings with affected Indian tribes, agencies, and community groups to discuss sensitive areas and issues of concern; periodic review of the CRMP (see CRMP Review and Revision); and active consultation for projects funded or permitted by the COR.

**COR Funded Projects**

The timing and the parties involved will vary based on the type of project or undertaking. Some activities, such as planned routine maintenance activities, will only require limited communication. Other projects such as multi-year, multi-phase construction projects will entail frequent communication and coordination with DAHP and the affected Indian tribes.

For CIP Projects with extended planning periods, agencies, affected Indian tribes, and consulting parties will be involved during the planning phase and at key points in the project lifecycle. For a detailed discussion of consultation and coordination tasks see the Protocol for Agency and Tribal Coordination (Appendix E).

**Private Development**

COR will provide notice to affected Indian tribes and DAHP when applications for private development are received for areas identified as having moderate to high probability for archaeological resources or potentially eligible historic structures (properties with resources over 40 years old with minimal alterations to property and historic materials). Where necessary, the RHPO will distribute information on private development or demolition projects to affected Indian tribes and DAHP, and depending on feedback, may require a cultural resources survey prior to issuance of a permit. Results of any cultural resources surveys will be distributed to affected Indian tribes and DAHP by the RHPO. Tribal and DAHP feedback will also be considered when implementing monitoring and or avoidance measures into permit conditions.

Additional information on the consultation process and responsibilities in the Protocol for Private Development Cultural Resources Review (Appendix E).

### 5.5 Requests for Information from the Public

Periodically the COR receives requests for information from private developers or members of the public relating to cultural resources on particular parcels or the results of previous cultural resources survey reports. Under RCW 42.56.300, information on archaeological sites is exempt from public disclosure. With guidance from the City's attorney and City clerk, the COR may distribute redacted copies of reports to members of the public or direct property owners to DAHP to obtain details of archaeological and cultural resources on their property. The procedure for
responding to requests for information is described in the Protocol for Secure Document Management (Appendix E).

5.6 Cultural Resources Monitoring:
Cultural resources monitoring will be employed for COR funded projects or privately developed projects permitted by the COR when recommended in a cultural resources survey report or required by the RHPO in consultation with the affected Indian Tribes and DAHP. Monitoring will most frequently be required during ground disturbing work for construction projects. Based on coordination with the affected Indian tribes and/or DAHP, monitoring may also be required by the RHPO for projects by City maintenance and operation crews where the scope of ground disturbing work does not warrant a cultural survey but the work will occur in an area of moderate to high probability for or an area of known cultural resources. In some cases, with approval from the affected Indian tribes, it may be possible to substitute the use of an archaeological monitor with a cultural monitor from one of the tribes.

Monitoring protocols will depend on the scope, scale and nature of the activity or project. For example, ground disturbing activities such as road paving with limited widening within the established right-of-way in a heavily developed and well-documented area may only require monitoring in specific project areas, while new construction in previously undisturbed areas with high potential for archaeological, cultural or historic resources may require full-time monitoring of all ground disturbing activities. The protocol for Construction Monitoring provides additional information on required monitoring and templates for monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plans (Appendix E).
6 Review and Revision

Periodic review and amendment of the implementing protocols outlined in the CRMP and tools used to comply with them are essential to ensure all cultural resources regulations, restrictions, and policies are updated and revised as appropriate. Internal review of criteria requiring cultural resources survey, training protocols, consulting parties, Tribal contacts and other data will be conducted annually for the first three years following the adoption of the CRMP. After three years COR will coordinate with DAHP and the affected Indian tribes to establish the frequency of reviews for the CRMP. Updates to procedural aspects (such as exempt maintenance activities) are discussed under their respective headings. A review and update schedule is provided in Table 6-1.

6.1 CRMP Qualitative Review

The CRMP provides COR with the tools to effectively plan for and consider cultural resources in its project planning and permitting processes and is designed to be regularly updated and refined. Review of the CRMP and associated tools and policies is intended to assess the effectiveness and implementation of the plan, including evaluation of the utility of existing management, and the identification of management/protocol gaps. Qualitative review of the core cultural resources policies and procedures will be undertaken in consultation with affected Indian tribes and DAHP every three years.

This review will rely partly on changes to statutes, regulations and policies and partly on the results, comments, and reporting of protocol implementation. Project completion debriefing documents produced by the RHPO will be a primary source of data for the CRMP review. These documents are compiled from documentation of cultural resources consultations, planning documents, and agreements compiled over the course of each project.

Zoning Code

COR planning staff conduct periodic reviews of the Zoning Code in response to changing conditions in the city or questions resulting from code administration. Updates to sections of the Zoning Code pertaining to cultural resources including archaeological sites and CORLs will be reviewed internally and discussed with community members including developers, architects, property owners, and affected Indian tribes.

As part of the annual CRMP review process, the RHPO and other planning staff will discuss the Zoning Code requirements related to cultural resources including common issues and questions that arose in the permitting or inspection process to identify areas where the code language should be modified to clarify procedures. Proposed amendments will be presented to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation and to the City Council for review and decision. Table 6-1 provides the timeline for updates to CRMP features.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRMP Element</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and update cultural resources sites, surveys and published reports</td>
<td>COR Internal</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the Analytic Tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Analytic Tool with new data from DAHP</td>
<td>COR Internal, DAHP</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and conduct/commission surveys to update Historic Building Inventory</td>
<td>COR Internal</td>
<td>Every 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update list of standard consulting partners and contact info,</td>
<td>COR Internal</td>
<td>Ongoing, minimum Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including state and tribal authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update COR and Tribal and Stakeholder coordination tables</td>
<td>COR Internal</td>
<td>Annually, or As Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update list of activities that require or are excluded from</td>
<td>COR, affected Indian tribes, DAHP</td>
<td>Annually for 3 years *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural resources review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review criteria by which cultural resources actions are recommended for</td>
<td>COR Internal</td>
<td>Annually for 3 years *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update training protocol</td>
<td>COR Internal</td>
<td>Annually for 3 years*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review changes to federal and state regulatory requirements, private</td>
<td>COR Internal, affected Indian tribes,</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development requirements for potential code updates</td>
<td>DAHP, and Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Standards and Procedures</td>
<td>COR, affected Indian tribes, DAHP, and</td>
<td>Every Three Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Timeframe for future review schedule will be updated after 3 years based upon internal feedback and discussion about the process with DAHP and affected Indian tribes*
GIS Analytic Tool Update Procedures

The Analytic Tool will be updated through two mechanisms. The RHPO receives cultural resources reports with the results of surveys that are not currently included in WISAARD. These will be added to a layer within the Analytic Tool by the RHPO when the final cultural resources report is received from the consultant. The update will be reflected in the cultural resource probability maps accordingly. Other layers will be updated by the COR GIS team. Table 6-2 shows the GIS database layers and recommended update schedule.

Table 6-2: Data Layers and Frequency of Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Layer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Other verification or processing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim CR Survey Data</td>
<td>When received by the RHPO</td>
<td>RHPO verification cultural resources survey report is final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAHP Data</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Review/coding of archaeological survey data by qualified archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Assessor Data (building construction date)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Redmond Boundary Layers</td>
<td>When updated by COR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Roads</td>
<td>When updated by COR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR Historic Structures Surveys</td>
<td>Every 10 years or more frequently when updated by COR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Probability Maps</td>
<td>When updated by King County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Future Considerations

This CRMP is intended to be updated as COR processes and federal and state regulations change. There are also projects, such as work performed by franchise and large utility companies that would benefit from a coordinated review with input from DAHP and other municipalities. These issues will be addressed in future meetings and updates to this CRMP.
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Appendix A

Glossary of Terms

Archaeological Monitor

A person who observes construction activities or other ground disturbing work that has the potential to disturb archaeological materials. The person should have completed a formal training program in the identification of both prehistoric and historic cultural remains.

Archaeological resources

Resources that document and symbolize the social and cultural patterns of prehistoric and historic societies. Archaeological resources are generally, but not necessarily, buried below the surface. Examples include isolated artifacts, trash dumps, remnants of building foundations, and campsites.

Archaeological site / site

The place or places where the remnants of a past culture survive in a physical context that allows for the interpretation of these remains (National Register Bulletin 36, “Guidelines for Evaluation and Registering Historical Archaeological Sites and Districts” 1993, p.2). In Washington state, two or more artifacts are recorded as an archaeological site.

Area of potential effects

The geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause change in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The area of potential effects is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking (from 36 CFR 800.16(d) Protection of Historic Properties).

Archival resources

Written and graphic resources, including maps, photographs, oral histories, and primary and secondary sources that document historic period societies.

Artifact

Any object made or modified by human activity.

B.P. (Before Present)

Used as a designation following radiocarbon dates to express the point from which radiocarbon years are measured. This measuring point is arbitrarily taken to be 1950.

Biface

A stone tool or implemented shaped on both surfaces.

Cache

A collection of tools, equipment or food stuff which has been deliberately stored for future use.
**Cairn**

A heap of stone places to serve as a marker. Cairns ordinarily mark the location of graves, stored valuables, important landmarks, or orientation points.

**C-14**

Carbon 14 radiocarbon dating, main absolute dating tool used by archaeologists.

**Consultation**

The process of seeking, discussing, and considering the views of other participants, and where feasible, seeking agreement with them regarding matters arising in the process.

**Cultural or Tribal Monitor**

A person with knowledge of local ethnohistory and areas of tribal significance used to conduct monitoring during construction or other ground disturbing activities.

**Cultural Resource**

This term has various meaning in publications, environmental documents, and agency guidelines. It generally refers to resources of architectural, historical, archaeological or cultural significance associated with past human activity. These resources may include archival resources, artifacts, buildings, structures, landscapes, archaeological sites, and Traditional Cultural Places/Properties.

**Culturally Modified Trees (Basket Trees or Peeled Cedars)**

Living trees from which bark has been stripped or planks split off from their side.

**Curation**

Professional storage of archaeological materials and associated materials including photographs, research, and documents.

**Data Recovery**

The systematic collection and documentation of archaeological information. Often used to refer to excavation, but also includes systematic surface collection, coring and auguring, and various forms of remote sensing. May be employed as a method of mitigation for impacts to archaeological sites.

**Debitage**

Material produced during the process of producing stone tools. The material may include lithic flakes and blades and production rejects.

**Effect**

Alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in, or eligibility for, the NRHP (from 36 CFR 800.16(i), Protection of Historic Properties).

**Ethnography**

Anthropological studies of specific cultures.
**Ethnohistory**

The study of the development of a particular cultural group through time utilizing oral traditions and archaeological and linguistic data.

**Euro-American**

European cultures or those primarily derived from European cultures.

**Features**

Non portable objects or relationships produced by human activity.

**Field Survey**

The physical search for and recording of cultural resources on or in the ground.

**Flakes**

Stone fragments (waste material) left over from the process (flintknapping) of manufacturing stone tools. Flakes can serve as tools or are easily modified into artifacts.

**Ground Disturbance**

Any activity that disturbs the soil. It can range from excavation with a bulldozer to tree removal.

**Historic Archaeology**

Archaeology of sites of the historic period.

**Historic Period**

Resources that date from the period when Euro-Americans first visited or settled the area. Generally considered to include resources dating from the mid-18th century to the present.

**Historic Property or Historic Resource**

Any precontact or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the NRHP. The term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe that meet NRHP criteria (National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, Title III, section 301 (16 U.S.C. 470w(5)).

**Holocene**

The most recent life period ca 10,000 years ago to the present.

**In situ**

In its original place.

**Inventory**

One of the products of a field survey of cultural resources. The inventory includes an organized compilation of information on identified resources and an evaluation of their significance.
Isolate (Isolated Finds)

A small number of artifacts occurring by themselves. The definition and treatment of isolate varies by state law and managing agency. For example, in Washington a single artifact is an isolate, in Oregon 1-9 artifacts are considered an isolated find.

Lithics

Stone artifacts.

Midden

A mound or deposit containing shells, animal bones, and other material that indicates the site of a human settlement.

Mitigation

An action taken in response to an effect on a cultural resource. Mitigation may include a variety of actions agreed upon with the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and affected Indian tribes. Minimization of alteration, creation of specialized photography or education programs, and data recovery are the methods most frequently employed.

National Register/ NRHP Criteria

The criteria established by the Secretary of the Interior for use in evaluating the eligibility of properties for the National Register of Historic Places (36 CFR Part 60).

Paleoindian

Prehistoric cultures characterized by fluted projectile points.

Pedestrian Survey

A systematic walkover and visual inspection of exposed surfaces.

Professional Archaeologist

An individual who meets the U.S. Department of Interior (1997) Preservation Professional Qualification Standards for Prehistoric Archaeologist or Historical Archaeologist.

Projectile points

Chipped stone artifacts used to tip arrows, dart points or spears.

Shell Midden

Midden deposits that contain high frequencies of shell-fish remains.

Shovel Test

A method of archaeological survey. A shovel test consists of a hole measuring approximately 30 centimeters (12 inches) excavated to culturally sterile deposits. All materials removed from the shovel test are sieved using a screen.
Significance

An assessment of the relative importance of a particular cultural resource. Here significant sites are defined as those meeting the criteria for listing in the NRHP.

Smithsonian Numbering System

A national identification system used to assign permanent catalogue numbers to newly recorded archaeological sites. The system is composed of a state number, county abbreviation, and an individual site number.

Stratigraphy

The interpretation and ordering of geological cultural sediments.

Survey

Survey is the process used to identify and gather data on a community or area’s cultural resources. It may be limited to background research and presentation of existing data or include field survey, presentation of data from the field survey, development of inventories, and preparation of recommendations for NRHP eligibility, effects, and mitigation.

Traditional Cultural Property (TCP)

A NRHP-eligible or listed district, site, building, structure or object whose significance is derived from the role the property plays in a community’s historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices. For example, a location associated with the traditional beliefs of a Native American group about its origins, its cultural history, or the nature of the world (National Register Bulletin 38: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties). Traditional cultural properties may include gathering or fishing areas.
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Laws and Regulations
Federal

National Environmental Policy Act
National Historic Preservation Act
36 CFR Part 60 (National Register of Historic Places)
36 CFR Part 61 (Procedures for State, Tribal, and Local Government Historic Preservation Programs)
36 CFR Part 63 (Determinations of Eligibility for Inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places)
36 CFR Part 65 (National Historic Landmarks Program)
36 CFR Part 68 (The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties)
Section 106
Professional Qualification Standards
Executive Order 11593 (Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment)
Executive Order 13006 (Locating federal Facilities in Historic Properties)
Archaeological Resource Protection Act of 1979
Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

Washington State

State Environmental Policy Act
Shoreline Management Act
Growth Management Act
Executive Order 05-05
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (WAC 25-12)
Abandoned and Historic Cemeteries and Historic Graves (RCW 68.60)
Washington State Historic Building Code (RCW 19.27.120)
Heritage Barn Program (RCW 27.34.400)
State Historical Societies - Historic Preservation (RCW 27.34)
Indian Graves and Records (RCW 27.44)
Archaeological Sites and Resources (RCW 27.53)
Archaeological Excavation and Removal Permit (WAC 25-48)
Abandoned and Historic Cemeteries and Historic Graves (RCW 68.60)
Registration of Historic Archaeological Resources on State-Owned Aquatic Lands (WAC 25-46)
Aquatic Lands - In General (RCW 79.90.565)
Archaeological Site Public Disclosure Exemption (RCW 42.56.300)
Discovery of Human Remains (RCW 27.44)

King County

King County Landmark Ordinance (Chapter 20.62)
Appendix G
Exemptions
Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Regarding Treatment of Adverse Effects to the Bear Creek Site (45KI839), Redmond, King County, Washington and its addendum dated September 29, 2014.