

# **Cultural/Historic Resources Technical Report**

## **I-5 Trade Corridor Study**

*Prepared for:*

**Oregon Department of Transportation  
Region 1  
123 NW Flanders  
Portland, OR 97209**

*and*

**Washington Department of Transportation  
Southwest Region  
P.O. Box 1709  
Vancouver, WA 98668-1709**

*Prepared by:*

**David Evans and Associates, Inc.  
2828 SW Corbett Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97201**

**October 2001**

# **Cultural/Historic Resources Technical Report**

## **I-5 Trade Corridor Study**

*Prepared for:*

**Oregon Department of Transportation  
Region 1  
123 NW Flanders  
Portland, OR 97209**

*and*

**Washington Department of Transportation  
Southwest Region  
P.O. Box 1709  
Vancouver, WA 98668-1709**

*Prepared by:*

**David Evans and Associates, Inc.  
2828 SW Corbett Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97201**

**October 2001**

## Table of Contents

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2 METHODS.....	1
1.2.1 Study Area.....	1
1.2.3 Data Mapping.....	2
1.3 RELATED LAWS AND REGULATIONS.....	2
1.3.1 Federal.....	2
1.3.2 State.....	3
1.3.3 Local.....	3
<b>2.0 OPTION DESCRIPTIONS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 BASELINE OPTIONS.....	5
2.1.1 Baseline Option 1a: No Build.....	5
2.1.2 Baseline Option 1b: Constrained Baseline without Delta/Lombard & Rose Quarter Improvements.....	6
2.1.3 Baseline Option 1c: Constrained Baseline with Delta/Lombard & Rose Quarter Improvements:.....	6
2.1.4 Baseline Option 1d: Priority Baseline with Planned Regional Improvements.....	6
2.2 OPTION 2: EXPRESS BUS WITHOUT CORRIDOR-WIDE CAPACITY INCREASE.....	7
2.3 OPTION 3B: LRT FROM EXPO PARK-AND-RIDE TO CLARK COLLEGE ON LRT-ONLY BRIDGE.....	7
2.4 OPTION 3C: CLARK COUNTY LRT LOOP WITH JOINT-USE ARTERIAL/HOV BRIDGE.....	8
2.5 OPTION 4: COMMUTER RAIL.....	8
2.6 OPTION 6: EXPRESS BUS WITH CORRIDOR-WIDE CAPACITY INCREASE.....	8
2.7 OPTION 7: LRT WITH CORRIDOR-WIDE CAPACITY.....	9
2.8 OPTION 8: NEW WESTERN ARTERIAL CORRIDOR.....	9
<b>3.0 PROJECT IMPACT ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA.....	10
3.1.1 Direct Impacts.....	10
3.1.2 Indirect Impacts.....	11
3.2 IMPACTS TO HISTORIC/CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	11
3.2.1 Baseline Option 1a.....	12
3.2.2 Baseline Option 1b.....	13
3.2.3 Baseline Option 1c.....	13
3.2.4 Baseline Option 1d.....	13
3.2.5 Option 2.....	13
3.2.6 Option 3b.....	13
3.2.7 Option 3c.....	13
3.2.8 Option 6.....	14
3.2.9 Option 7c.....	15
3.2.10 Option 8.....	15
<b>4.0 PLAN CONSISTENCY.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5.0 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>21</b>
5.1 DOCUMENTS.....	21

5.2 PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS ..... 21

**APPENDIX A: Unidentified Resources**

## List of Tables

TABLE 1: POTENTIAL IMPACTS BY OPTION (OREGON) .....	12
TABLE 2: POTENTIAL IMPACTS BY OPTION (WASHINGTON) .....	12
TABLE 3: IMPACTS TO HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN WASHINGTON .....	16
TABLE 4: IMPACTS TO HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN OREGON .....	17

## List of Figures

FIGURE 1: POTENTIALLY IMPACTED HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN OREGON.....	11
FIGURE 2: POTENTIALLY IMPACTED HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN WASHINGTON .....	11

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Project Background**

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), in partnership with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), conducted the Portland/Vancouver I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Study to identify and evaluate options for managing travel demand on I-5 between I-84 in Portland and I-205 in Clark County.

Phase I of the I-5 Trade Corridor Study was completed in March 2000. It identified the major current and projected future deficiencies in the corridor and developed criteria for evaluating and comparing a broad range of scenarios for addressing those deficiencies. The project has progressed to Phase II, which includes conceptual design and evaluation of a set of options developed following extensive public input and in consideration of the results from the Phase I analysis.

One of the evaluation criteria relates to historic and archaeological (or cultural) resources:

Minimize impacts to the environment, including historic and cultural resources.

This technical report outlines the methodology used to identify and analyze the potential impacts from each option.

### **1.2 Methods**

#### **1.2.1 Study Area**

The cultural/historic resources analysis examined properties 500 feet from the widest point of each side of each proposed option disturbance area. The exceptions are a few new interchanges, park-and-rides, and an arterial corridor approximately 0.6 miles west of I-5, through North Portland and Vancouver. In keeping with National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 requirements, the area of potential effect for this project includes land that will be disturbed or cleared by the proposed project in the process of right-of-way acquisition, as well as the area immediately adjacent to this area that may also be impacted by project actions and activities. In addition, properties with historic designations adjacent to the buffer area were included as well, to ensure that indirect impacts would be addressed.

#### **1.2.2 Data Sources**

No field surveys or historic research was completed. The properties identified are those listed on the inventories of state and local agencies responsible for historic preservation. In order to identify properties listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or NRHP-eligible resources within the project study area, several databases were examined. The Washington Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP) and the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) databases were used to identify NRHP resources along the corridor. The SHPO and OAHP databases were checked against the database that is available online from the National Park Service in order to ensure that all NRHP properties were identified. OAHP also provided a list of Washington

Heritage Register (WHR) sites. SHPO provided a list of NRHP-eligible resources. Both the WHR and NRHP-eligible sites are resources that have been identified by the states as historically significant. Currently some SHPO NRHP-eligible sites are listed in a database, although the database has not been updated recently. The hard copy records of NRHP-eligible sites potentially within the project area were searched and merged with the database.

The OAHP also maintains records of “surveyed properties.” These are resources that local governments have photographed and completed forms for, but for which the OAHP has not made a determination of eligibility. Because the records are not readily accessible by site address, because the OAHP has not made determinations on these resources, and because information about sites of local importance was obtained from local preservation coordinators, records of surveyed properties were not examined.

Lists of locally identified resources were also consulted. Clark County records, as well as the City of Vancouver’s Heritage Conservation Program records were supplied by Clark County. The City of Portland’s Archives and Records Management Program was also consulted. These programs are described in Section 1.3.3, below.

### **1.2.3 Data Mapping**

Once the spreadsheets of potentially impacted historic resources for the affected cities and counties were compiled, the information was converted to database format and addresses were geocoded using ESRI ArcView. Sites that did not geocode were examined for errors. Corrections were made when the errors were apparent, i.e. misspelled street names, etc. After corrections were made, a second attempt to geocode the addresses was made. In examining the various databases, every effort was made to identify historical properties located within the project area and assess the degree of impact to these properties. However, some records within the databases contained incorrect or incomplete information that made locating the resources to complete this assessment difficult. There is therefore the possibility that some historical properties located within the project area have not been identified. A list of historic properties that were not successfully geocoded and assessed is included in Appendix A.

## **1.3 Related Laws and Regulations**

### **1.3.1 Federal**

Section 106 of the NHPA applies to actions undertaken by federal agencies, actions that include federal funding, and actions that require a federal permit. Its purpose is to provide a process for the identification of historic and archaeological resources and guidelines for adequately assessing impacts to these properties. The Section 106 process affords its protection to properties listed on, or determined eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The NRHP includes resources of national significance, as well as resources of state or local significance. Section 106 is administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior National Parks Service and state historic preservation offices.

The Section 106 process has two basic requirements: The sponsoring agency must take into account the effect of the proposed undertaking on any site, district, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for the NRHP; and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), an independent

reviewing body established by the NHPA, must be given a reasonable opportunity to comment on the project impacts and proposed mitigation.

Section 110 of the NHPA provides direction for historic preservation by federal agencies for resources owned or controlled by the agencies. Section 110 also provides additional protection for National Historic Landmarks (designated under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935). National Historic Landmarks are NRHP resources of outstanding national significance that have been specially designated by the Secretary of the Interior. Under Section 110, National Historic Landmarks require special treatment that obliges agencies to minimize, to the maximum extent possible, harm done to these landmarks in the course of development projects and actions. The Fort Vancouver Historic Site, which is within the project study area, is listed as a National Historic Landmark.

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 applies to federally funded transportation projects that may have an adverse effect on an NRHP-listed or NRHP-eligible historic property. If a proposed project may adversely affect an NRHP or NRHP-eligible historic resource, Section 4(f) requires the evaluation of alternatives that would avoid impacts to the resource. If there is an available alternative that is both prudent and feasible and avoids impacts to the resource, then this alternative must be pursued. If no avoidance alternatives are available, the project must incorporate all possible means to minimize harm to the resource.

### **1.3.2 State**

In Washington, any division of state government or recipient of state funds must comply with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (Washington Administrative Code 197-11-330). This process requires that significant properties, specifically those listed on or eligible for the Washington Heritage Register, be given consideration when state or state-funded actions impact historic and cultural resources. If significant resources are identified, the OAHF considers the impacts of a proposed project on those resources and suggests appropriate mitigation measures.

Washington's Growth Management Act (GMA) includes a goal to "identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures that have historical, cultural, and archaeological significance" (Revised Code of Washington 36.70A .020 (13)). Although the GMA does not require a historic preservation or cultural resources element in a comprehensive plan, under the GMA cities and counties must consider and incorporate the historic preservation goal. Clark County and the City of Vancouver have included historic preservation elements in their comprehensive plans.

In Oregon, Statewide Planning Goal 5, Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces, outlines a process for the identification and conservation of the state's cultural and historic resources. This process requires that local governments inventory and evaluate cultural and historic resources within their jurisdiction and that they use the NRHP and the State Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation in designating historic sites.

### **1.3.3 Local**

Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, in Chapter 13, Historic Resources, sets out general guidelines to ensure a coordinated approach to the preservation of cultural and historic resources in the county. These guidelines include the following elements: counties and cities are to identify and



inventory cultural and historic resources in urban growth areas and the county; financial and other incentives are to be offered to owners of historic properties in order to encourage preservation; county-wide programs to identify historic resources, protect them, and educate the public are to be created; and criteria for the identification of historic resources are to be established, along with a process for resolving conflicts between preservation and development activities.

In Washington, Clark County Code, in Chapter 18.328A , Historic Preservation, provides for the identification, evaluation and protection of historic and prehistoric resources within Clark County. This ordinance applies to properties that are listed or are eligible for listing on any historic or cultural resource inventory within the county; it also applies to properties that are listed or that are eligible to be listed on the NRHP, the WHR, Clark County Heritage Register, or other local registers. The historic preservation ordinance outlines the process that must be followed when construction, alteration, or demolition make any material changes that impact significant features of historic structures or sites. The process involves a review by the Clark County Historic Preservation Commission, which assesses impacts to those features of historic properties that contribute to their historic designation.

Vancouver's comprehensive plan includes a general discussion of policies and techniques that are to be followed and used to preserve cultural and historic resources within the community. This includes adequately funding programs that relate to historic preservation; using regulatory techniques, such as historic overlay districts, to facilitate historic preservation; increasing public awareness of the area's cultural and historic resources and their significance; and encouraging the restoration and rehabilitation of historically or architecturally significant older buildings in a manner that preserves the exterior character of the structure or area.

The City of Vancouver Municipal Code, Chapter 17.39, Historic Preservation, establishes procedures for the identification, evaluation, and protection of cultural and historic resources within the city. This ordinance outlines the role of the Clark County Historic Preservation Commission, which serves as the review authority on matters of historic preservation, for the City of Vancouver. The Commission maintains a comprehensive inventory of historic and cultural resources. Inventoried properties are listed in the Clark County Cultural Resources Inventory and in the Clark County Heritage Register. This ordinance also outlines the responsibilities of the City's Office of Heritage Services, which assists the Clark County Historic Preservation Commission in its duties.

The City of Portland Comprehensive Plan, in Chapter 12, Urban Design, addresses historic preservation and establishes the overarching goal of enhancing the City's identity through the protection of Portland's significant historical resources. The comprehensive plan states that historic preservation is to be accomplished through public information, advocacy, and the use of regulatory tools. This process also includes the maintenance of a city-wide inventory of potentially significant historic resources.

The zoning code includes a historic resource protection overlay zone (Chapter 33.445). It applies to certain Portland historic resources and is meant to preserve significant parts of the City's heritage. The regulations that establish this overlay zone implement Portland's comprehensive plan policies that address historic preservation. Further, the provisions of the overlay zone establish four designations that are used to protect historic resources within the City. Individual resources can be designated as either historic landmarks or conservation landmarks, and concentrations of historic resources can be designated as either a historic district or a conservation district. The different designations offer different protection to historic resources. Under this ordinance, protection is automatically extended to

NRHP properties, while properties listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory undergo a review process to determine whether historic designation is appropriate.

City of Portland Code Title 24 (Building Regulations—Section 24.35.020), states that any permit application that involves the alteration or demolition of a building site or structure that has been designated as historic by the City Council must be submitted to the Portland Historical Landmarks Commission for approval, conditional approval, or rejection prior to issuing any permit.

## **2.0 OPTION DESCRIPTIONS**

Several options were designed and tested to determine the impacts specific corridor improvements might have on the existing traffic patterns within the I-5 corridor. These options are described below by a summary of the proposed improvements. The skipped option numbers refer to options no longer considered feasible based on discussions with designers and the project's advisory committee.

### **2.1 Baseline Options**

Four 2020 baseline options were evaluated to test variations in potential corridor performance and land use impacts. The baseline options encompass projects that are "in the pipeline" already. They address differing transit investment levels and certain key highway capacity improvements, namely in the Delta Park/Lombard and Rose Quarter areas.

Each baseline option includes projects identified in Metro's adopted 2020 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council's (RTC) Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Each baseline options builds upon the preceding baseline option.

#### **2.1.1 Baseline Option 1a: No Build**

Baseline Option 1a includes only projects that are already under construction or are planned for construction. This option is also referred to as the "financially committed" system, and represents the lowest level of I-5 corridor and regional transportation investment. It includes the existing transportation system, projects currently under construction, and projects committed to be built within the next six years. Key highway projects include the following:

- I-5 widening to add third lane each direction (southbound lane for HOV use during the morning peak period) from Main Street to 99th Street (under construction today);
- I-5 widening to add third lane each direction (southbound lane for HOV use during the morning peak period) from 99th Street to 134th Street; and
- Restriping southbound I-5 from Main Street to Mill Plain Blvd. to provide a continuous southbound HOV lane from 134th Street to Mill Plain Blvd.

This option does not include any construction projects in Oregon.

### **2.1.2 Baseline Option 1b: Constrained Baseline without Delta/Lombard & Rose Quarter Improvements**

Except for the improvements described in the Option 1a, no additional I-5 corridor projects are identified under Option 1b. Option 1b includes improvements outside of the I-5 Corridor that are not included in the historic resources impacts analysis because they fall outside of the study area described in Section 1.2.1 and because their effects have been analyzed in other studies. Option 1b includes a number of off-corridor transportation improvements:

- Widening of Marine Drive to five lanes from Terminal 6 to Portland Road;
- Providing a new four-lane bridge to Hayden Island from Marine Drive;
- Improving the Columbia/Killingsworth intersection area and its connection to I-205; and
- Providing a North Lombard overcrossing into Rivergate.

### **2.1.3 Baseline Option 1c: Constrained Baseline with Delta/Lombard & Rose Quarter Improvements:**

Option 1c includes improvements in the Delta Park/Lombard and Rose Quarter areas:

- Widening to add a third southbound travel lane through the Delta Park/Lombard area for morning peak period HOV use, and improving I-5's northbound shoulders in this area; and
- Improving Rose Quarter ramps to address specific weaving, merging, and diverging issues associated with the existing close ramp spacing along this four-lane segment of I-5.

### **2.1.4 Baseline Option 1d: Priority Baseline with Planned Regional Improvements**

Option 1d would have the highest level of investment of the four baseline options. It includes specific transportation improvements identified in the RTP and MTP priority investment systems, and increased planned regional transit service levels. In addition to the improvements described in the previous options, Option 1d also would include the following:

- Adds a third lane on I-5 in each direction for general purpose traffic use through the Rose Quarter area between I-84 and I-405; and
- Implements specific ramp improvements that address specific weaving, merging, and diverging issues associated with the existing interchange ramp spacing.

Option 1d also tests two alternatives, labeled 1d(a) and 1d(c). Alternative 1d(a) provides new access between Columbia Boulevard and I-5 to/from the north. Traffic from Columbia Blvd. would access northbound I-5 via the Victory Boulevard interchange, while southbound I-5 would access Columbia Boulevard at a new at-grade signalized intersection.

If a decision is made not to build a new Columbia River crossing, Alternative 1d(c) offers a potential opportunity to remove the existing I-5/Hayden Island interchange by rerouting traffic through the Marine Drive interchange. Marine Drive to Hayden Island access under this spot improvement would be provided along a new arterial roadway across North Portland Harbor.

Both alternatives could occur with or without adding a fourth freeway lane throughout the I-5 corridor. Alternative 1d(a) is included in Option 6 as a part of the proposed improvements.

## **2.2 Option 2: Express Bus without Corridor-Wide Capacity Increase**

Option 2 includes the operation of directional peak period express bus transit service between Clark County and the Expo Center/PIR Interstate Max transit center. This option does not include a corridor-wide capacity increase except for the construction of a new four-lane arterial and HOV/express bus bridge over the Columbia River.

Key features of this option package include:

- Converting the inside existing/planned third northbound travel lane from Mill Plain Blvd. to 134<sup>th</sup> Street for afternoon peak period HOV use;
- Establishing a new four-lane joint use arterial and HOV/express bus bridge across the Columbia River -- serving Hayden Island and matching existing/planned HOV lanes in Oregon and Washington;
- Establishing a northbound HOV system from Going Street to 134<sup>th</sup> Street and a southbound HOV system from 134<sup>th</sup> Street to approximately Lombard Street;
- Adding direct express bus ramps to/from Expo/PIR transit center;
- Removing the existing I-5/Hayden Island interchange and providing a new connection with Hayden Island via the new bridge; and
- Providing mid-day truck access between Marine Drive and the new arterial/HOV facility.

## **2.3 Option 3b: LRT from Expo Park-and-ride to Clark College on LRT-Only Bridge**

Option 3b is centered around a regional light rail transit (LRT) system without corridor-wide freeway capacity increases. Two variations have been established for this option package to test the performance/benefits of two separate investment levels in light rail, construction of an arterial parallel to I-5 from Vancouver south to Columbia Blvd., and no investment in I-5 freeway capacity. Key features of each variation follow:

- Constructing an LRT segment from Expo/PIR to Clark College only;
- Constructing an LRT only bridge over the Columbia River;
- No additional investment in I-5 freeway or parallel arterial roadways; and

Option 3b represents a pure LRT only option.

Since the impacts associated with this option are already documented in the *South-North Corridor Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement*, this option was not included in this evaluation.

## **2.4 Option 3c: Clark County LRT Loop with Joint-Use Arterial/HOV Bridge**

Option 3c includes highway and Columbia River crossings that are nearly identical to those described in Option 2.

In addition, this option would involve the following:

- A new four-lane arterial roadway west of and parallel to I-5, with access to downtown Vancouver, Hayden Island, Marine Drive, and Columbia Blvd;
- A new joint use arterial/LRT bridge across the Columbia River to supplement the existing I-5 structures, increasing Columbia River crossing capacity to 10 lanes;
- An LRT loop system with the following segments:
  - Expo park-and-ride to Clark College
  - Clark College to 83<sup>rd</sup> park-and-ride lot with service to Vancouver Mall
  - 83<sup>rd</sup> park-and-ride to Parkrose transit center with service to Vancouver Mall
- The existing I-5/Hayden Island interchange would be removed and access to Hayden Island would be provided via the new bridge.

## **2.5 Option 4: Commuter Rail**

Option 4 envisions a dual passenger-only rail line from the Coliseum/Rose Quarter area (alongside existing UPRR & BNSF freight rail tracks) to the City of Woodland. This rail line would be located on the east side of, and adjacent to, the existing freight rail tracks on east side of Willamette River. There would also be another set of single rail tracks (joint use by freight and passenger rail traffic) from near the existing railroad bridge over the Columbia River (as well as proposed new dual passenger rail tracks over or under the Columbia River) to the Camas/Washougal area.

The impacts associated with this option are not included in this evaluation. They are being evaluated separately.

## **2.6 Option 6: Express Bus with Corridor-Wide Capacity Increase**

Option 6 includes the operation of directional express bus transit service in I-5 HOV lanes between Clark County and downtown Portland. It also includes widening I-5 to add a fourth travel lane in each direction between I-405 and I-205. Option 6 would require additional Columbia River Bridge crossing capacity.

Key features of this option include the following:

- Widening I-5 from 134<sup>th</sup> Street to approximately I-405 to support operation of three general purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction, resulting in a directional corridor HOV system from 134<sup>th</sup> Street to approximately I-405;
- Adding Columbia River crossing capacity compatible with four-lane, six-lane and ten-lane bridge and Columbia River tunnel concepts; and
- HOV-specific facility treatments such as a directional HOV/express bus connection between I-5 and SR 14 to/from the south.

## 2.7 Option 7: LRT with Corridor-Wide Capacity

Option 7 includes an LRT loop system, as well as a corridor-wide highway capacity increase in the form of a two-lane reversible express lane facility on I-5 between 134<sup>th</sup> Street and I-405.

Key features of this option include the following:

- Providing five lanes of peak direction roadway capacity, including HOV, resulting in the maximum person carrying capacity for any of the alternatives under consideration;
- Constructing an LRT loop system with the following segments:
  - Expo Center to Clark College
  - Clark College to 83<sup>rd</sup> park-and-ride lot with service to Vancouver Mall
  - 83<sup>rd</sup> park-and-ride lot to Parkrose transit center with service to Vancouver Mall
- Adding limited express lane access at 134<sup>th</sup> Street, SR 500, SR 14, Columbia Blvd., and the I-405/I-5 interchange;
- Columbia River crossing capacity improvements, including four-lane, six-lane, and ten-lane Columbia River Bridge concepts and with Columbia River tunnel concepts

No conceptual design work was completed for this option; therefore, impacts to historical properties could not be evaluated. However, the components of this option are included in other options that have been evaluated.

## 2.8 Option 8: New Western Arterial Corridor

Option 8 would build upon Option Package 1d (Priority Baseline) and would involve construction of a new arterial connecting US 30 near the Linnton neighborhood and St. John's Bridge in Portland to Vancouver at Mill Plain Blvd. The new arterial would be four lanes (two in each direction) with bicycle lanes and sidewalks. Access to/from the arterial and adjacent street system would be limited to Mill Plain Blvd., Hayden Island, Marine Drive, Columbia Blvd., Lombard Street, and US 30.

The arterial would follow an alignment from Vancouver near Mill Plain Blvd., across the Columbia River, and along North Portland Road. Just north of Columbia Blvd., the arterial would transition to a grade-separated structure above the existing BNSF rail lines to a point just north of the Willamette River. From there the arterial would cross the Willamette River on a new bridge to US 30.

The arterial is intended to draw "local" freight and general-purpose traffic between North Portland and Vancouver from I-5 and major east-west arterials including Columbia Blvd. and Lombard Street.

### **3.0 PROJECT IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

#### **3.1 Impact Assessment Criteria**

Criteria to determine potential impacts of a proposed project or action on historic resources are contained in the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. There are two sets of criteria: criteria to determine whether there is any effect at all on the property, either beneficial or adverse; and criteria to determine whether there is an adverse effect on the property. An effect occurs if the proposed project or action will in any way alter the characteristics of the property that qualify it for inclusion in the NRHP. An adverse effect occurs if the proposed project or action diminishes the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Under the Section 106 process, this investigation normally leads to a finding of no effect, no adverse effect, or adverse effect. As mentioned earlier, this report is intended as only a first-step screening and, while using Section 106 as a general guide for this assessment, follows a modified approach in terms of assessing impacts to historic properties. This modified approach is reflected in the categorization of impacts that has been used, which differs from those required by the Section 106 process.

##### **3.1.1 Direct Impacts**

Direct impacts to historic properties include those impacts that result from the acquisition of right-of-way. Impacts to historic properties within the I-5 corridor project area that are expected to occur *directly as a result* of the different options were determined by using GIS to geocode properties listed in the various databases of historic resources and overlaying the conceptual designs of the options onto GIS-generated maps showing parcel boundaries. Using these maps, an assessment was then made to determine the degree to which the various options would directly impact historic properties. However, an examination of the baseline options unexpectedly revealed that the base mapping for the conceptual drawings did not match the Clark County and RLIS parcel-based GIS system. This discrepancy makes it difficult to determine accurately what the impacts to specific parcels would be. This discrepancy is more noticeable in the Washington maps than in the Oregon maps. The incompatibility between the base mapping for the conceptual design and GIS information means that project impacts have been more generally assessed, using the following impact categories:

- Full Impact: The proposed option would require acquisition of the entire parcel for transportation improvements;
- Major Impact: The proposed option would require the acquisition of half or more of the parcel but the existing resource would likely not be affected; and,

- **Minor Impact:** The proposed option would require the acquisition of a small part of (less than half) of the affected parcel and the structure/resource would not be affected.

### **3.1.2 Indirect Impacts**

Indirect impacts would not involve the acquisition of property from the historic resource, but may result in impacts to the setting, to access or noise levels. For instance, indirect impacts may involve visual effects, noise, vibration, and access changes. These impacts can be either long- or short-term impacts. Short-term impacts are those usually associated with construction activity.

## **3.2 Impacts to Historic/Cultural Resources**

This analysis identified ten NRHP properties and eleven NRHP-eligible properties within the study area that would be affected by the options currently under consideration (see Figures 1 and 2). One NRHP property—Fort Vancouver—is also listed as a national landmark. Two properties—Columbia Cemetery and a private residence—that have been locally designated as historically significant by the City of Portland would be affected by the different project options. Three properties in Washington that have been locally designated as historically significant by the City of Vancouver were identified as properties subject to some degree of impact from the proposed options. These historic resources are located throughout the corridor study area, although many are clustered in downtown Vancouver.

Engineers working on the conceptual design made every effort to avoid identified resources. Tables 1 and 2 present a summary of potential direct and indirect impacts by option. In Oregon, Option 6 involves the most significant impacts of the options currently under consideration. Two properties would be subject to minor impacts and one property to a major impact. Under this option, four other properties may be indirectly affected due to the close proximity of new rights-of-way. Other options affect relatively few historic properties in Oregon. In Washington, impacts are generally more widespread, although most impacts would be indirect. Options 2 and 3c have the most impacts, with six minor impacts and ten possible indirect impacts among the two options.

In Oregon, one conservation district—the Mississippi Conservation District—would be affected under Option 6. Some parcels within this conservation district would be affected by right-of-way acquisition required by the new freeway alignment. The Kenton Conservation District will be affected by the new Interstate MAX (IMAX) line that runs parallel to I-5 and is within the project area. Impacts to historical properties in this area are already documented in the *North Corridor Interstate MAX Light Rail Project Final Environmental Impact Statement*. In Washington, two conservation combining districts overlay areas affected by different options. One combining district is located toward the south end of Main Street in downtown Vancouver; the other combining district is located near the Providence Academy.

The names, descriptions, registry, and locations of the affected resources are given in Tables 3 and 4 at the end of this section.



**Table 1**  
**Potential Impacts to Historical Properties by Option (Oregon)**

Option	Indirect	Direct			Total
		Full	Major	Minor	
1a	0	0	0	0	0
1b	0	0	0	0	0
1c	1	0	0	0	1
1d	1	0	0	0	1
2	3	0	0	0	3
3c	2	0	0	0	2
4	-	-	-	-	-
6	6	0	1	2	9
7c	-	-	-	-	-
8	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>

Sources: U.S. Department of Interior National Parks Service, SHPO, City of Portland

**Table 2**  
**Summary of Impacts to Historical Properties by Option (Washington)**

Option	Indirect	Direct			Total
		Full	Major	Minor	
1a	1	0	0	0	1
1b	0	0	0	0	0
1c	1	0	0	0	1
1d	1	0	0	0	1
2	6	0	0	2	8
3b	-	-	-	-	-
3c	5	0	0	4	9
4	-	-	-	-	-
6	2	0	0	2	4
7c	-	-	-	-	-
8	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24</b>

Sources: U.S. Department of Interior National Parks Service, OAHP, Clark County, City of Vancouver

### 3.2.1 Baseline Option 1a

Baseline Option 1a does not include any transportation improvements in Oregon; improvements are limited to a segment of the I-5 corridor in Washington. One historic property within this area (Covington House, located at 4012 Main Street) potentially would be affected under this option. The impacts to this property would involve no direct acquisition of property, but may involve some indirect impacts due to project construction and work-related activities. Covington House was added to the NRHP in 1972 and to the local register in 1985. The structure is officially registered for its architecture. Possible indirect impacts associated with this option would not adversely impact the essential historic qualities of this property.

There are no minor, major, or full impacts to historic properties associated with this option.

### **3.2.2 Baseline Option 1b**

There are no I-5 improvements in Option 1b, with the exception of those included under Option 1a; therefore, impacts to historic properties under this option are the same as Option 1a. Option 1b includes improvements outside of the I-5 corridor that have been evaluated in separate studies.

### **3.2.3 Baseline Option 1c**

Option 1c builds from Option 1a and includes spot improvements that are outside of the I-5 corridor. Under Option 1c, one property—the Columbia Cemetery on Columbia Boulevard—is located near a proposed right-of-way and may be subject to indirect impacts from project construction and work-related activities. There are no major, minor, or full impacts to historic properties associated with this option.

### **3.2.4 Baseline Option 1d**

Option 1d would build on previous options. Option 1d involves no impacts to historic properties beyond those associated with the preceding baseline options.

### **3.2.5 Option 2**

Option 2 builds from the priority baseline (Option 1d), which is described in Section 2.1.4 of this report. Under Option 2, six historic properties in Washington potentially would be affected. Five of the properties could be affected by indirect impacts, with no acquisition of property being necessary. Two properties—the House of Providence and a private residence—would be subject to minor impacts under this option. The House of Providence was added to the NRHP in 1978 and its significance is due primarily to its architecture. It is unlikely that the small portion of property required for new right-of-way would adversely impact the architectural character of the property. Under Option 2 there are no major or full impacts to any historical properties in Washington.

Option 2 affects two historic properties in Oregon—the Columbia River Interstate Bridge and the Columbia Cemetery. Both of these involve indirect impacts that may be associated with nearby construction activity or other work-related activities. The Columbia Cemetery is listed on the City of Portland's Historic Landmarks Register and is notable because it is one of the few extant pioneer cemeteries. Indirect impacts would not affect the essential historic qualities that qualify this property for historic status.

### **3.2.6 Option 3b**

The LRT alignment included in this option is documented in the *South/North Final Environmental Impact Statement*. Refer to this document for specific impacts to historical properties.

### **3.2.7 Option 3c**

Option 3c builds from the priority baseline (Option 1d). Option 3c involves potential indirect impacts to the Columbia River Interstate Bridge. The northbound portion of the bridge is on the NRHP, while the southbound portion has recently been nominated for listing. While no “taking” of the bridge would

occur that would alter the essential historic character of the bridge, it is possible that there could be indirect impacts from construction and other project-related activities associated with this option.

Nine properties in Washington would be affected under this option. Five of these properties may be indirectly impacted by construction and project-related activities. Four minor impacts would occur under this option, including impacts to Fort Vancouver/Vancouver Barracks, as new right-of-way is required for the LRT alignment. However, further refinement of the conceptual design could reduce or eliminate the potential impacts to this property. Under this option, several new park-and-rides are proposed, but they do not involve any impacts to identified historic resources.

### **3.2.8 Option 6**

Option 6 would add several park-and-rides, or increase the capacity of existing facilities, although additions/improvements are the same as those included under Option 2. Only three of these park-and-rides—Salmon Creek, 99<sup>th</sup> Street, and Central County—fall within the I-5 corridor and none of these facilities would involve any impacts to historic resources.

Option 6 also tests three separate alternatives for crossing the Columbia River: a four-lane tunnel, a six-lane bridge, and a ten-lane bridge. In Washington, two properties would be affected by the ten- and six-lane configurations. Under the ten-lane configuration, Kiggins House potentially would be affected by indirect impacts; under the six-lane configuration this property would be subject to minor impacts. The Kiggins House was added to the NRHP in 1995 and the qualifying criteria involved the property's association with the lives of significant historical figures. It is unlikely that the small portion of the property impacted under this option would adversely impact this historical site. With the ten-lane configuration, another property, the House of Providence, would be subject to possible indirect impacts, while under the six-lane configuration this property would be subject to minor impacts. In Washington, there would be no impacts associated with the four-lane tunnel.

Under all three configurations, the Columbia River Interstate Bridge potentially would be affected. Under the four- and six-lane configurations the bridge potentially would be affected by indirect impacts associated with nearby construction and other project-related activities. Under the ten-lane configuration the existing Columbia River Interstate Bridge would be removed and there would be a full impact to this structure.

In Oregon, there are also impacts associated with the three configurations. Under the four-lane configuration, one property, owned by Multnomah County and located at 1024 N. Skidmore Street—would be subject to a major impact. Another property—the Fellowship Missionary Baptist Church—would be subject to a minor impact under both the six-lane bridge and four-lane options.

Under Option 6, a minor impact would also occur to the YWCA of Greater Portland. Under the four-lane and six-lane bridge configurations, possible indirect impacts could occur to three other properties in the Oregon portion of the corridor study area.

### **3.2.9 Option 7c**

No separate conceptual design work was completed for Option 7; therefore, no assessment was made of the impacts this option would have on cultural/historic resources. However, the components of this option are evaluated in other options.

### **3.2.10 Option 8**

Option 8, which builds on Option 1d, involves the construction of a new arterial that would connect US 30 near the Linnton neighborhood and the St. John's Bridge in Portland to Mill Plain Boulevard in Vancouver. No impacts to identified historic properties would be associated with this option. However, further analysis could identify resources that have not previously been investigated.

**Table 3: Impacts\* to Historic Properties in Washington**

Map Ref.	Historic Resource/Owner	Registry	Option 1a	Option 1c	Option 1d	Option 2	Option 3c	Option 6
24	Covington House 4201 Main St.	NRHP	Indirect	Indirect	Indirect	Indirect	Not affected	Not affected
15	St. James Catholic Church 218 W. 12 <sup>th</sup> St.	Vancouver	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected	Not affected
9	The Kiggins House 411 E. Evergreen Blvd.	NRHP	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected	Minor-6 lane Ind.- 10 lane
10	House of Providence 400 E. Evergreen Blvd.	NRHP	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Minor	Not affected	Minor-6 lane Ind.-10 lane
11	Elks Club 916 W. Main Street	NRHP	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected	Not affected
12	GA and Nancy Anderson ? Main St.	NRHP	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected	Not affected
14	Vancouver Telephone Exchange Bldg. 112 W. 11 <sup>th</sup> St.	NRHP	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected	Not affected
17	Hidden Houses 100-11- W. 13 <sup>th</sup> St.	NRHP	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected
22	First Christian Church 1812 Main St.	Vancouver	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected
16	Luepke Flowers 1300 Washington St.	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Minor	Not affected
18	Spic 'n' Span 1411 Washington St.	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Minor	Not affected
13	Koplan's Furnishings 1012 Washington St.	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Minor	Not affected
21	Residence 502 E. McLoughlin St.	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected
20	Residence 510 E. McLoughlin St.	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected
19	Residence 700 E. McLoughlin St.	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Not affected
23	Ft. Vancouver National Historic Site 612 E. Reserve	NRHP	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Minor	Not affected
25	R.C. and Theresa Kenck 13910 NE 10 <sup>th</sup> Ave.	Vancouver	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Minor	Not affected	Not affected

Sources: US Department of Interior National Parks Service, OAHP, City of Vancouver, Clark County

Full-Requires removal of structure/site

Major: Requires the acquisition of more than half the parcel\*

Minor: Requires the acquisition of less than half the parcel

Indirect: Requires no acquisition of property, but may involve other impacts related to changes in the neighborhood setting or from construction activities

**Table 4: Impacts\* to Historic Properties in Oregon**

Map Ref.	Historic Resource/Owner	Registry	Option 1a	Option 1c	Option 1d	Option 2	Option 3c	Option 6
7	Columbia Cemetery 1151 N. Columbia Blvd.	Portland	Not affected	Indirect	Indirect	Indirect	Not affected	Indirect
2	Fellowship Missionary Baptist Church	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Minor-4 and 6 lane
3	Multnomah County 1024 N. Skidmore	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Major- 4 lane
4	YWCA of Greater Portland 4620 N. Maryland Ave.	NRHP	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Minor
6	Denise L. Johnson 1019 N. Stafford Rd.	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect
5	Mary J. Callicrate 1204 N. Alberta St.	Portland	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect
8	Columbia River Interstate Bridge (Northbound)	NRHP	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Indirect	Full- 10 lane
8	Columbia River Interstate Bridge (Southbound)	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect	Indirect	Full- 10 lane
1	Charles R. Cummings 3723 N. Missouri Ave.	Eligible	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Not affected	Indirect

Sources: US Department of Interior National Parks Service, SHPO, City of Portland

*Full-Requires removal of structure/site*

*Major: Requires the acquisition of more than half the parcel\**

*Minor: Requires the acquisition of less than half the parcel*

*Indirect: Requires no acquisition of property, but may involve other impacts related to changes in the neighborhood setting or from construction activities*

## **4.0 PLAN CONSISTENCY**

Each option was evaluated to determine whether it would support or conflict with adopted state and local goals and policies related to historic preservation.

### **4.1 Baseline Option 1a**

Baseline Option 1a, described in Section 2.1.1 of this report, does not include any transportation project improvements in Oregon. A review of plans in Washington shows that this option is consistent with local and state policies that attempt to preserve, whenever possible, historic and cultural resources and that call for impacts to historic properties to be mitigated so that their essential historic character is retained. No element of this option directly conflicts with local or state historic preservation policies or goals. Under this option there is only one potential indirect impact to a historic property.

### **4.2 Baseline Option 1b**

Option 1b, described in Section 2.1.2 of this report, does not add any Interstate 5-related projects, but concentrates on other transportation improvements outside of the corridor. An evaluation of impacts to historic properties under this option is not included in this analysis.

### **4.3 Baseline Option 1c**

Option 1c, described in Section 2.1.3 of this report, includes adding capacity to a segment of the I-5 corridor in Oregon. This option is consistent with Goal 5 of the statewide planning program, with the comprehensive plans of both Portland and Multnomah County, and with local ordinances that address historic preservation issues. In addition to impacts from Option 1a, under Option 1c one historic property would be potentially affected—the Columbia Cemetery on Columbia Boulevard. It is possible that there will be some indirect impacts to this property due its close proximity to a new roadway. However, these impacts could be mitigated through a variety of measures that address possible indirect impacts, including noise, vibration, dust, and visual effects. Because this option would not involve the acquisition of right-of-way and its potential impacts could be mitigated, it is in keeping with statewide planning Goal 5, the comprehensive plan of the City of Portland, and Chapter 33.445 from the City's zoning ordinance, all of which call for the preservation of historic and cultural resources and the mitigation of adverse impacts.

### **4.4 Baseline Option 1d**

Option 1d, described in Section 2.1.4 of this report, adds an additional lane and specific ramp improvements through the Rose Quarter. This option, which builds upon previous baseline options, would add no further impacts to historical properties in either the Oregon or Washington segments of the project study area beyond those associated with the previous baseline options. This option is therefore consistent with relevant state and local plans and policies that relate to the preservation of cultural and historic resources.

#### **4.5 Option 2**

Option 2, described in Section 2.2 of this report, involves several impacts, most of them indirect, to historic properties in downtown Vancouver; therefore, Vancouver's zoning protections and procedures would apply. This option would possibly indirectly impact six properties. Two properties—the House of Providence and a residence (?) would be subject to minor impacts. This House of Providence's historical significance lies in its architectural design and character. The minor impact would involve a small portion of property required for a new right-of-way and should not affect the architectural integrity of the structure. A variety of mitigation measures are possible to minimize the effect of the changes to the structure's setting. Because this option would involve no direct impacts that would degrade the essential character of historic resources within the city and because any impacts associated with this option could be mitigated, this option is consistent with Vancouver's Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance that attempt to preserve historic and cultural resources within the City.

#### **4.6 Option 3b**

The consistency of Option 3b with state and local plans is documented in the *South/North Final Environmental Impact Statement*. Refer to this document for a discussion of plan consistency.

#### **4.7 Option 3c**

Under Option 3c, most impacts to historic properties occur in Washington. Five of the impacts associated with this option are indirect impacts; four impacts can be classified as minor and one will affect the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. This impact would involve the acquisition of a small portion of the site's property for new LRT right-of-way. Potential indirect impacts involve no right-of-way acquisition and could be mitigated with design treatments and construction practices; therefore this option is consistent with state and local policies that attempt to conserve historic resources. Further refinement of the design could reduce or eliminate adverse impacts to this important historical property.

In Oregon, Option 3c involves possible indirect impacts to the Columbia River Interstate Bridge. It is likely that these impacts can be mitigated so that they have no adverse affect on the qualities that define the bridge as historic. Option 3c is therefore consistent with state and local policies and ordinances that call for the preservation of historic properties.

#### **4.8 Option 4**

This option is being evaluated separately.

#### **4.9 Option 6**

Several impacts to historic properties in Oregon are associated with the freeway improvements Option 6, in addition to the impacts of the Columbia River Crossing alternatives. This includes two minor impacts and one major impact, as well as six possible indirect impacts. Under Option 6 only the ten-lane bridge would directly conflict with Oregon state or local historic preservation policies and ordinances, since it would result in removal of the historic bridges. The six-lane bridge could indirectly affect the existing bridges by altering access and context. Section 106 and Section 4(f) procedures for consultation would



need to be followed and mitigation attempted in order to preserve essential historic features and qualities. Option 6 also involves one minor impact to a historic property in Washington—the Kiggins House, which is listed on the NRHP. The Section 106 and Section 4(f) would be followed for all NRHP or NRHP-eligible properties to avoid or minimize impacts to identified resources.

#### **4.10 Option 7**

Since no conceptual design work was completed for this option, no assessment of impacts to historic properties was completed. However, components of this option are also included in other options.

#### **4.11 Option 8**

There are no impacts to historic properties in Oregon or Washington that are associated with this option.

## **5.0 REFERENCES**

### **5.1 Documents**

City of Portland. Title 33, Zoning Code.

Oregon State Parks & Recreation Department, State Historic Preservation Office. "National Register of Historic Places – Oregon Listings." Website: <http://www.shpo.state.or.us/databases/nr/>. Accessed July 31, 2001.

U.S. Department of Interior, National Parks Service. "National Register of Historic Places Research." Website: <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/research/nris.html>. Last modified July 16, 2001. Accessed July 31, 2001.

Washington Office of Archaeology & Historic Preservation. "Historic Places in Washington – Information." Website: <http://www.oahp.wa.gov/register/information.tpl>. Accessed August 6, 2001.

### **5.2 Personal Communications**

Banning, Diana, City Archivist. City of Portland Archives & Records Program. Telephone interview. August 16 and 20, 2001.

Dodds, Linda, TITLE. Oregon Department of Transportation, Environmental. Telephone interview. October 9, 2001.

Dust, Evan, Senior Transportation Planner. Clark County Community Development Department. Telephone interview. August 20, 2001.

Floyd, Linda, Heritage Program Coordinator. City of Vancouver. Telephone interview. August 31, 2001.

Houser, Michael, Architectural Historian. Washington Office of Archaeology & Historic Preservation. Electronic communication. August 22, 2001.

Houser, Michael, Architectural Historian. Washington Office of Archaeology & Historic Preservation. Telephone interview. August 6, 2001.

Niedernhofer, Nancy, National Register Coordinator. Oregon State Parks & Recreation Department, State Historic Preservation Office. Telephone interview. August 20, 2001.

Sullivan, Deann, Heritage Program Assistant. Oregon State Parks & Recreation Department, State Historic Preservation Office. Telephone interview. July 24, 2001.

O:/Project/O/ODOT0000-0364/914 Technical Memo/Cultural-Historic Resources/Tech Reports/Cultural.doc

**APPENDIX: Unidentified Resources**

<b>Owner/Place</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Use Designation</b>	<b>Registry</b>	<b>Possible Reason for No Geocode</b>
Phillip J. Campagn	1402 NE Highland St.	Residential	NRHP	Incorrect address
Pablo E. Leon	825 NE Holland St.	Residential	NRHP	Incorrect address
Shirley Freeman	733 NE Prescott St.	Residential	NRHP	Unknown
Joseph S. Taylor	1326 NE Freemont St.	Residential	NRHP	Unknown
Freemont Storefronts LLC	1303-1319 NE Freemont St.	Commercial	NRHP	Unknown
Woodlawn Lodge	700-704 NE Dekum St.	Commercial	NRHP	Incorrect address
Michael and Anne King	718 NE Dekum St.	Commercial	NRHP	Incorrect address
Byong Kyoo Kim	800 NE Dekum St.	Commercial	NRHP	Incorrect address
Ann LeDuc	806-808 NE Dekum St.	Commercial	NRHP	Incorrect address
Ted Wisniewski	814 NE Dekum St.	Commercial	NRHP	Incorrect address
Vanessa Smith	936-940 NE Dekum St.	Residential	NRHP	Incorrect address
Peter Matje	966 NE Dekum St.	Residential	NRHP	Incorrect address
George Hennessy	805 NE Portland Blvd.	Residential	NRHP	Incorrect address
Oregon Student Association	635 NE Dekum St.	Residential	NRHP	Incorrect address
Kenton (?)	7800-8400 N. Denver Ave.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
Unknown	10000 N. Denver Ave.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
Unknown	3500 N. Victoria Ave.	Residence	Portland	Incorrect address
Unknown	3000 N. Interstate Ave.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
Unknown	8401 N. Interstate Ave.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
Unknown	1103 N. Jessup St.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co.	Unknown	Commercial	Portland	No address

<b>Owner/Place</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Use Designation</b>	<b>Registry</b>	<b>Possible Reason for No Geocode</b>
Portland Union Stockyard Co.	2416 N. Marine Dr.	Industrial	Portland	Unknown
Unknown	3638 N Montana Ave.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
Mckay Bros. Block	927 N. Russell	Commercial	Portland	Unknown
Unknown	2603 N. Williams Ave.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
Unknown	3026 N. Williams Ave.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
Unknown	1034 NE Grand Ave.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
	703 NE Holladay St.	Unknown	Portland	Unknown
East Portland Rail Station	121 SE Oak St.	Industrial	Portland	Unknown