

Abbreviated Assessment for Small Land Disposals

State: Washington

State Area (WSFR-interest Lands) Affected: Port Susan Bay Phase II - South of SR532, North of Livingston Bay, and northwest of Livingston Bay Shore Drive in Camano Island, WA

Federal Grant Number: C-48-L-1

Name of Proposed Project/Facility (if applicable): WSDOT SR532 Davis Slough Bridge Replacement & Widening for Flood Prevention

Transaction Type (check or circle one):

☐ Easement ☐ Lease ☐ License ☒ Exchange ☐ Trade ☐ Sale (Disposal)

Compliance of the Proposed Land Transaction with the Programmatic EA Conditions (provide a brief summary of the site-specific status of the proposal and answer yes or no for compliance with each criterion outlined in the table below):

Criteria	Programmatic EA - Conditions for Use of Abbreviated Review Process	Site-Specific Status/Explanation of Anticipated Impacts	Proposal Complies with Criterion Limits (Yes or No)	New alternatives, impacts, or other info.? If yes, specify.
1. <i>Cat Ex.</i>	The proposed land transaction does not qualify for approval under an existing categorical exclusion, or the State partner agency prefers to use the Programmatic EA.			
2. <i>Purpose of Property</i>	The land transaction is proposed for property that is no longer needed for or meeting the purpose(s) for which it was originally purchased, as determined by the State agency (WSFR has the discretion to disagree).	The disposal property is on and behind existing dikes and therefore not high value for fish habitat.	Yes	
3. <i>Disposition Instructions</i>	The land transaction proposal includes a commitment by the State agency to a) provide replacement lands of at least equal or greater monetary (current market) and fish and wildlife value or b) repay a sum sufficient to purchase replacement lands of at least equal or greater monetary (current market) value and adequate to ensure that the fish and wildlife values of the lands directly, indirectly, and cumulatively impacted by the project are fully replaced.	The replacement lands are of greater monetary value and provide greater opportunity for ecological preservation/restoration value.	Yes	
4. <i>Acreage</i>	4a. The amount of FA land to be exchanged, traded, or sold, or that requires a permanent easement, lease, or license does not exceed three acres for State areas under 300 acres or 1 percent of area for State areas over of 300-1000 acres, 1 percent of State area for 1000-10000 acres (maximum of 25 acres), and 1 percent for State areas of more than 10,000 acres (maximum 100 acres).	The disposal property is approximately 3,627 square feet (0.08 acres). The replacement property is approximately 100,349 square feet (2.30 acres).	Yes	

	OR 4b. If the WSFR land involved is not part of a larger management area, such as remote or satellite properties, the State agency must determine that the acreage involved and the resulting impacts from the loss of the federal interest on those lands would not be significant (i.e., impact limit, not acreage limit).			
5. <i>Alternatives to Disposal</i>	There is no feasible and prudent alternative that would avoid the disposal of WSFR lands and the project plan includes all feasible and prudent measures to minimize the disposal of and impacts to these WSFR-interest lands.	The WSDOT proposed project has minimized the amount of land needed to the greatest extent possible while meeting the purpose and need of the transportation project.	Yes	
6. <i>Impacts, Generalized</i>	The direct, indirect, and cumulative adverse impacts of the proposed action on Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program lands would be minor or temporary.	The property is on and behind existing dikes and therefore not high value for fish habitat.	Yes	
7. <i>Impacts, Specific</i>	The proposed land transaction would: a. Not adversely affect Federally listed, proposed, or candidate species; and/or designated or proposed critical habitat (property involved could not be proposed or designated critical habitat); and/or state listed or priority species or habitats; b. Not have meaningful adverse impacts to wetlands; c. Not have meaningful adverse impacts to floodplains; d. Not result in a meaningful decrease of public access or recreation; e. Not result in a significant impact to another Federal or State entity with a financial interest in the property involved; f. Not result in disproportionate impacts to low income or minority populations; and g. Not result in a decrease in the amount of land designated as wilderness by either the State or Federal government.	The disposal property is on and behind existing dikes and is small in size in relation to the total size of the property. The transportation project that will use the disposal property is undergoing ESA and NRHP Section 106 consultation (Lead federal agency is US Army Corps of Engineers). Use of the disposal property will meet all of the criteria noted in parts a-g.	Yes	
8. <i>Infrastructure</i>	The land transaction would not adversely affect historic or other cultural infrastructure resources (attach documentation), or other WSFR-interest facilities beyond the impact standard of negligibility. Facility value included in determining "market value" at time of disposal.	The Army Corps of Engineers has determined that there would be no historic properties affected by the proposed use of the disposal property (please see attached letter).	Yes	
9. (a). <i>Govt-to-Govt Consultation</i> (b). <i>Tribal Communication Regarding Treaty Rights*</i>	The land transaction would not adversely affect: 9(a). Historic/cultural resources, or 9(b). The access to and/or utilization of resources covered by Tribal Treaty Rights.	The Army Corps of Engineers has determined that no historic properties will be affected by the transportation project, and has initiated Section 106 consultation on that undertaking.	Yes	
10. <i>Controversy</i>	Substantial controversy regarding the proposed land transaction does not exist.	None known.	Yes	

* Tribal Consultation and NHPA Section 106 consultation will be initiated by the WSFR Grant Specialist

Note: If any response in the "Complies" column is "No," the USFWS should be consulted to determine if compliance could be achieved through further project modification or whether development of a site-specific EA is required.

List of Attachments supporting analyses in Abbreviated Assessment:

- State Signed SF-424 (AFA) and **complete** proposal narrative (add here relevant additional documentation)
- Map showing existing WSFR-interest land and another map showing the proposed replacement land, if applicable – if no replacement proposed, just a map of the disposal
- Section 7 Phase 1 Form (add here other documentation used to complete Phase 1, if any)
- Archaeologist report
- Archaeologist Curriculum Vitae – Registered Professional Archaeologist
- Appraisal and Review (add here additional documentation, such as Timber Cruise Report) per Yellow Book
- Other maps and documentation, as needed

The following will be provided by WSFR:

- SHPO response to first request for information
- SHPO response to Survey reports
- THPO response to first request for information
- THPO response to Survey reports
- Section 7 Phase 2 Form

Assessment Concurrences/Approvals

It is important to note that when a State agency signs an Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424, AFA), which is required for all grants, they have committed to complying with all appropriate state rules, regulations, and policies. As there are only a few individuals in each State agency with the authority to sign an AFA, and they typically are not the project leads (with the site-specific knowledge), WSFR will accept that the Assessment be signed by the grant project leader, as defined in the grant narrative itself. The Assessment can be submitted via email (to RIFA_Grants@fws.gov and the WSFR Grant Specialist) and can be signed digitally.

Project Leader: _____



Date: _____

9/30/13

WSFR Grant Specialist: _____

Date: _____



Allyson Brooks Ph.D., Director
State Historic Preservation Officer

September 17, 2013

Dr. Fred Caslick
USFWS
911NE 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-4181

In future correspondence please refer to:

Log: 022013-05-COE-S
Property: SR 532 Davis Slough
Re: Archaeology - No Historic Properties

Dear Dr. Caslick:

Thank you for contacting our office regarding your land swap with the Washington State Department of Transportation associated with the SR 532 Davis Slough project and Port Susan Phase II grant. We concur with your finding of No Historic Properties Affected.

We would appreciate receiving any correspondence or comments from concerned tribes or other parties that you receive as you consult under the requirements of 36CFR800.4(a)(4).

These comments are based on the information available at the time of this review and on the behalf of the State Historic Preservation Officer in conformance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations 36CFR800.

Should additional information become available, our assessment may be revised. In the event that archaeological or historic materials are discovered during project activities, work in the immediate vicinity must stop, the area secured, and this office and the concerned tribes notified.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Lance Wollwage, Ph.D.
Transportation Archaeologist
(360) 586-3536
lance.wollwage@dahp.wa.gov

