Appendix F-1: Section 106 Coordination
Section 106 Meeting Materials
MEETING NOTES

RE: Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting

DATE: July 15, 2013

CHAIRPERSON: Joseph Iacobucci, CTA

LOCATION: CTA

TO: Distribution and All Attendees

ATTENDEES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Organization / Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Iacobucci</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>CTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Assam</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>FTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ball</td>
<td>RB</td>
<td>CDM Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Goodreau</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>CDM Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Mazza</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>CDM Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Metille</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>CDM Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenifer Palmer</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>CDM Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Thompson</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>CDM Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Keller</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Chicago Art Deco Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benet Haller</td>
<td>BH</td>
<td>City of Chicago - DHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Tatum</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>City of Chicago- Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghian Foreman</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Greater Southwest Development Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Halpin</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>Illinois Historic Preservation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa DiChiera</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Landmarks Illinois</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PREPARED BY: Jenifer Palmer, AICP – CDM Smith

ISSUE DATE: July 22, 2013

Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Objective: Section 106 Consultation and Project Briefing

Handouts: Meeting Agenda, Cultural Resources Draft Memorandum

Meeting Notes

1. Overview of Section 106 Consultation
   1.1. JI provided introductions and agenda of items to be reviewed today.
1.2. RB provided a general overview of the Section 106 process and requirements. Section 106 includes a four-step process grounded in stakeholder input and involvement to identify and address any potentially adverse effects of a project. RB also went over standard definitions used in the Section 106 process.

1.2.1. Attendees were asked whether there were any questions concerning the Section 106 process. No questions arose.

2. Project Vision

2.1. JI provided the project overview, contextual background of the project, status of the project today, and next steps.

2.2. JI noted that this project is now approximately one and half years into the planning process. An Alternatives Analysis was conducted last year, and a Preferred Alternative of center running BRT was chosen to move forward. Now the project is in the NEPA environmental and conceptual engineering phase.

2.3. JI provided some background information along the corridor, including information on bus and automobile speeds, identifying areas in the corridor that are industrial corridors, and describing the high transit mode split in the corridor.

2.3.1. About half of the people today already take the train or bus and commute times are slow, especially on transit.

2.3.2. In addition, safety is a major concern as the project moves forward. Given the high pedestrian volumes, crashes are disproportionately high. The conceptual design is investigating ways of addressing this concern.

2.4. JI went through the four major alternatives that were investigated through the Alternatives Analysis Process and the two-screening level process that was undertaken to identify this Ashland Avenue BRT Project Preferred Alternative. These included different designs for both curbside and center running BRT.

2.4.1. JI noted that a lot of outreach was done in 2012 as part of this process. In total, six public meetings were held in identifying the Preferred Alternative.

2.5. CTA and the Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) have now adopted the project vision for the 16 mile corridor - center running BRT with stations in the middle at intersections, removing a lane of traffic in both directions. The project is now in concept design to refine this vision. Phase 1 limits for the project have been identified between Cortland and 31st Street (5.4 miles).

2.5.1. The concept vision will focus on the Phase 1 limits but conceptual plans are being developed for the entire 16-mile corridor.

2.6. Because of the vision for this project, most impacts for project are expected to be related to traffic. A lot of traffic work is currently being done to make sure there is sufficient analysis to help make decisions. Counts have been taken at every signalized intersection along the corridor. In addition, regional model analysis has determined that nearly 1/3 of existing traffic would be diverted to other parallel roadways and the analysis includes looking at potential impacts to these other roadways as well.
2.6.1. CTA is coordinating with CDOT as a project partner, as well as the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), the Mayor’s Office for People with Disabilities, and other stakeholders through this phase of project development.

2.7. As CTA finalizes NEPA environmental analysis and conceptual design, public meetings are expected to occur in late August. JI noted that as the concept plans are finalized, they will be approximately 20-30% of final design plans. These concepts are not final and CTA and CDOT will continue to coordinate and involve stakeholders as concepts are refined in subsequent phases.

2.8. JI showed the BRT video for attendees. Attendees by phone were provided a link to view the video.

2.8.1. JI noted that BRT will create a rail like experience and understanding the impacts is important as we go through this process. Parking and traffic, with one lane being removed in each direction are keys to this analysis.

2.8.2. In addition, removal of left turns will be worked through in final design to ensure access to interstates and other roadways. There are many areas where the street grid is robust and continuous and where turn movement restrictions can be accommodated without impacting the ability for traffic to re-route.

2.8.3. JI also showed a station rendering to attendees. Stations will include a sloped sidewalk entrance for pedestrians and customers to access stations with a crosswalk at signalized intersections. The platform will be approximately 12 to 14 feet in width and about 120 feet in length. This is enough to accommodate two articulated buses. Benches and other amenities will be provided at all stations. Concept design is mainly looking at geometric considerations and station amenity specifics will be refined in final design.

2.9. JI concluded and asked attendees if they had any questions about the project and project vision. No questions were asked.

3. Analysis Methodology

3.1. RB provided an overview on the cultural resources analysis methodology, noting that it is based on limited impacts associated with constructing the project within existing right of way.

3.1.1. As such, the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the corridor has been confined to within current right of way. Limited actions will occur within the right of way, primarily consisting of milling and repaving, and therefore would not affect surrounding historic resources.

3.1.2. Around stations, the APE was expanded; although around stations the project will not demolish any historic resources, the APE was expanded to understand any indirect effects to visual or other resources. The APE was expanded on a station by station basis to ensure a context sensitive approach.

3.2. Once APE was established, a methodology was developed to evaluate potential impacts. Archived data was reviewed from a number of sources. Including the City of Chicago, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and various databases on known, documented or national register historic sites.
3.3. Field visits were conducted at all 35 station locations. These sites were photographed and documented, as referenced in Appendix B of the Effects Technical Memorandum. Only resources that were recommended eligible were then included in the technical memorandum.

4. **Presentation of Identified National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Sites within APE**

4.1. RB asked attendees if they had had a chance to review the technical memorandum and if they had any questions about identified resources within the APE.

4.2. AK and LD noted that they are very concerned about Ashland Bridge and whether it is included in the analysis. They believe this site to be eligible.

4.2.1. MA asked for specifics on the location of this bridge. AK and LD noted this bridge is located north of Webster along the north branch of Chicago. RB clarified that this locations is north of the Phase 1 area.

4.2.2. RB answered that there is no station location proposed in that area. The APE for the corridor only reviewed impacts within the right of way, however this could be included. No impacts would be anticipated given the limited construction that would be conducted where stations are not planned.

4.2.3. LD and AK provided further information on deteriorating conditions of the bridge. There are some railing and other limestone work incorporated into the bridge that are of historic concern. They further noted this is the only remaining bridge designed by the Art Deco architect Del Campo. Del Campo also designed the Ogden Avenue Bridge, which was demolished. While the bridge is not on a designated list, they would like to make sure the bridge is considered as improvements are made. If any upgrades could be provided as part of the project work, they requested this be considered. LD will send out website information to attendees for additional information on the bridge.

4.2.4. TT of the City of Chicago noted that they will take a closer look at the proposed route to note whether any additional properties to consider need to be brought to the project team’s attention.

4.3. RB asked if there were any other questions on the APE. He asked if LD or AK had any concerns about the bridge along the south branch and they noted they did not have any comments on that bridge.

4.4. BH noted that development and policies along the corridor are being reviewed by the Chicago Department of Economic Development and Housing (DHED) as they relate to existing buildings. Given the pedestrian enhancements anticipated to result from the project, future development is expected to be more compatible with the traditional and 1920s styles of many buildings in area.

4.5. RB continued to note historic resources identified based on the conducted field investigations. He noted that on page 4 of the technical memorandum, there are four historic districts touched by the APE. In addition, 24 structures are listed or recommended as eligible buildings. RB asked if anyone had questions on those identified resources.

4.5.1. TT stated that City of Chicago had no comments at this point. They will further review the corridor to look at the broader picture and to make sure that there are no additions to
identified sites that need to be included. He will provide this information within the requested comment period.

4.5.2. AK does not believe that there are any other resources located near the corridor of concern. She noted that they have done a comprehensive survey of Art Deco buildings. She will further review this survey information and let the project team know if there are any additions.

5. Analysis of Effects at Stations

5.1. RB provided an overview of effects at stations. He noted that most stations would be in the center median. There may be some smaller instances where, for geometric reasons, stations could need to be located curbside. As such, the analysis looked at both potential station location options.

5.1.1. Based on the analysis, RB noted that there would be no direct effects or relocations needed to accommodate stations regardless of location.

5.1.2. Indirect effects, including noise, vibration, and visual impacts were reviewed as well. The proposed project would follow the current bus route and no new elements would be introduced that are anticipated to impact noise or vibration. From a visual impacts perspective, based on the station design and the reason for the determination of eligible resources, the project team found no adverse visual impacts either. RB noted that Appendix B of the technical memorandum provides greater information on each resource identified and the effects determination.

5.2. AK asked whether the project team assessed construction impacts and whether any adverse effects were noted. RB answered that the proposed construction consists of standard activities within the right of way and any bus shelter on the curbside would be similar in type and size as existing bus stops. In addition, the station itself would be a transparent object. As such, no adverse effects were noted.

6. Wrap Up and Next Steps

6.1. RB and AM confirmed that the deadline for providing comments is 30 days from the initial invitation, making the deadline August 2\textsuperscript{nd}.

6.2. RB stated that based on discussions as part of this meeting and written comments received during the comment period, the project team will then finalize the report and send it out to attendees.

6.3. If there are any questions in the meantime, RB asked that attendees please reach out to the project team. The project team wants to make sure attendees have everything they need as comments are made and this will help the project team in the process.

6.4. RB thanked everyone for their participation and asked if there were any final questions.

6.4.1. DH noted that Garfield Boulevard is historic and to make sure the analysis ensures no impacts there. RB noted that the project team would review this and note any secondary/indirect impacts.
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Comments from Section 106 Consulting Parties
CTA, FTA
Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project

July 18, 2013

Joe Iacobucci
Chicago Transit Authority
567 W. Lake St., 10th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661-1465

Dear Mr. Iacobucci:

Thank you for requesting comments from our office concerning the possible effects of the referenced project on cultural resources. Our comments are required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR 800: "Protection of Historic Properties".

Our staff has reviewed the specifications and assessed the impact of the project as submitted by your office. We have determined, with the following conditions, that this project, as proposed, will have no adverse effect on any Historic Properties.

1. Please provide plans and specifications for bus stops located within National Register Historic Districts and for those that are adjacent to historic properties.

2. We would also like to review any proposed changes to street or sidewalk configurations within historic districts.

3. Provide plans and specifications for the treatment of the North Ashland Avenue Bridge, a "Bascule" bridge constructed in 1936. Please note that Bascule bridges are included among the 2013 Ten Most Endangered Historic Places identified by Landmarks Illinois, and this Art Deco Style bridge is eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

If you have questions, please contact David J. Halpin, Cultural Resources Manager, at 217-785-4998.

Sincerely,

Anne E. Haaker
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Reginald Arkell, U.S. Department of Transportation
Mark Assam, U.S. Department of Transportation
August 2, 2013

Mr. Joseph Iacobucci, Manager
Strategic Planning and Policy
Chicago Transit Authority
567 W. Lake St., 10th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661

RE: CTA Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project

Dear Mr. Iacobucci,

Thank you for inviting Landmarks Illinois to participate in the Section 106 process for the review of CTA’s proposed plans for the Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project. As requested at the July 15th consulting parties meeting, we have the following comments:

- We are pleased to see that the project will not have any physical impact on buildings listed in the National Register or determined eligible for listing in the National Register.
- We would like to see expansion of the APE to include the North Ashland Avenue Bridge, which we believe will meet the criteria necessary to be determined eligible for listing in the National Register. This bascule bridge was built in 1936, designed by noted architect and engineer Scippione Del Campo, and is currently part of a thematic listing of Chicago’s historic bascule bridges on our Ten Most Endangered Historic Places list. It has numerous repair needs and has been in a deteriorated state for many years. Due to its close proximity to the project area, we would like to see consideration made by CTA to include some repairs to the bridge area that connect to the project scope as part of the infrastructure improvements planned for the Ashland BRT. We think this connectivity will help enhance the project overall and bring focus to the repair needs of the bridge.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Ashland BRT project. Please let me know if we can be of further assistance before the next consultation.

Sincerely,

Lisa DiChiera
Director of Advocacy

cc: Anne Haaker, IHPA
    Dave Halpin, IHPA
    Benet Haller, City of Chicago, HED
    Terry Tatum, City of Chicago, HED, Historic Preservation Division
    Amy Keller, Chicago Art Deco Society
Dear Mr. Iacobucci:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on historic resource identification efforts for the Ashland BRT project as part of the ongoing Section 106 consultation process for this project. Our office appreciates the importance of this undertaking, and we commend the CTA’s efforts to incorporate historic preservation issues and concerns into its larger planning efforts.

As part of the Section 106 consultation process, we wish to bring to your attention both general observations on this historic resource identification effort, as well as comments on specific properties that may be impacted by the project.

**Chicago Historic Resources Survey red- and orange-rated properties**

With the help of your consultant team, you have preliminarily identified properties that are eligible for National Register of Historic Places listing. These properties have been listed in the draft historic resources memorandum, dated June 24, 2013, prepared by CDM Smith, Inc.

Your historic resources consultants have noted when these potentially National Register-eligible properties are designated Chicago Landmarks or are red- or orange-rated properties in the Chicago Historic Resouces Survey. Our office believes that there should be a separate category and listing in the final historic resources memorandum for all properties rated as "red" or “orange” on the Chicago Historic Resources Survey, regardless of whether they subsequently are determined to be National Register-eligible.
Conducted between 1983 and 1995, the Chicago Historic Resources Survey was a city-wide survey that identified properties constructed prior to 1940 that were perceived to have, within at least the context of their neighborhoods, some historic significance to these neighborhoods. These buildings were either color-coded red or orange, depending upon the level of their historical and architectural significance as known at the time of the survey.

Although not designated Chicago Landmarks, these CHRS “red” and “orange”-rated properties are covered by the City’s Demolition-Delay Ordinance, enacted by City Council in 2003, which allows for an up-to-90-day hold on building permit applications for demolition by the Department of Housing and Economic Development (DHED) for these properties. (More information on this ordinance can be found at [http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/dcd-supp_info/demolition_delay.html](http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/dcd-supp_info/demolition_delay.html). Regardless of whether such properties have also been determined eligible for National Register listing, we believe that it is prudent of the CTA to separately identify all CHRS orange-rated properties within the Ashland BRT APE in the historic resources memorandum. The effect of the Ashland BRT project on these properties can then be determined and, if necessary, mitigated through direct discussions with DHED as early in the project as possible.

The following is a list of CHRS "orange" rated properties that were not included in the draft historic resources memorandum as determined eligible for National Register listing. They should be evaluated for National Register eligibility if they haven't already been evaluated. I am grouping these properties by the intersections where BRT stations are planned. Because the draft memorandum did not include maps of all of these intersections, it is possible that some of these properties may fall outside the APE.
Belmont & Lincoln

- 3149-61 N. Lincoln Ave. - two- and six-story commercial building
- 1541-47 W. Belmont Ave. / 3165-67 N. Lincoln Ave. - four-story commercial building
- 3200-06 N. Lincoln Ave. / 1600-08 W. Belmont Ave. - two-story commercial building
- 3223-25 N. Ashland Ave. - two-story commercial building

Division & Milwaukee

- 1184 N. Milwaukee Ave. / 1535-37 W. Division St. - four-story commercial building
- 1201-03 N. Milwaukee Ave. / 1530-34 W. Division St. - two-story commercial building
- 127 N. Milwaukee Ave. - two-story commercial building
- 1210-20 N. Ashland Ave. / 1224-30 N. Milwaukee Ave. - two-story commercial building

Chicago

- Goldbatt Brothers Department Store, 1613-1635 W. Chicago Ave. (designated Chicago Landmark; also CHRS orange) - Chicago Landmark designation report attached
- 1553 W. Chicago Ave. - two-story commercial/residential building

Jackson

- 234 S. Ashland - three-story residential building with one-story front commercial addition - note that 236 and 238 S. Ashland, part of this row, were preliminarily determined eligible for NR listing.
18th St.

- 1718 S. Ashland - three-story commercial / residential building
- 1722-24 S. Ashland - four-story commercial / residential building
- 1804 S. Ashland - four-story commercial / residential building
- 1815 S. Ashland - three-and-a-half-story residential building
- 1820 S. Ashland - four-story commercial / residential building

35th St.

- 3538 S. Ashland - one-story brick garage

79th St.

- 7901 S. Ashland - 3-story commercial building

91st St.

- 9101-09 S. Ashland - 3-story commercial / residential building

In addition, we wish to support the request of Landmarks Illinois and the Chicago Art Deco Society that the Ashland Avenue bridge, a CHRS-orange rated structure that crosses the North Branch of the Chicago River between N. Clybourn and W. Webster, be evaluated for National Register eligibility and included in the final historic resources memorandum. The project APE includes the bridge roadway. It seems reasonable and prudent to our office to evaluate the bridge for NR listing and to include the bridge in the historic resources memorandum.

Again, regardless of the outcome of these National Register eligibility evaluations, we recommend that all CHRS orange-rated properties in the project APE be listed as such in the final historic resources memorandum.

**Chicago Park Boulevard System Historic District - determined eligible for National Register listing**
Lastly, the Chicago Park Boulevard System Historic District, which includes the City's historic park boulevards and historic buildings facing them, has been determined eligible for National Register listing by the National Park Service, pending final revisions of the nomination. The following buildings at or near the intersection of Garfield Blvd. and Ashland Ave. (the planned location of a BRT station) have preliminarily been determined contributing to the district:

- 1544 W. Garfield Blvd. - two-flat
- 1546 W. Garfield Blvd. - two-flat
- 1601-05 W. Garfield Blvd. - three-story commercial / residential building
- 1607-09 W. Garfield Blvd. - two-flat
- 1614 W. Garfield Blvd. - one-story commercial building

I would be pleased to assist the CTA’s consultant team as they gather additional information on historic resources within the APE for this project.

Sincerely,

Terry

Terry Tatum

Coordinating Planner I

Historic Preservation Division, Dept. of Housing and Economic Development
August 1, 2013

Via Electronic Mail

Joseph Iacobucci
Manager, Strategic Planning
Chicago Transit Authority
567 West Lake Street, 10th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661-1465
jiacobucci@transitchicago.com

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project, Comments from the Chicago Art Deco Society

Dear Mr. Iacobucci:

On behalf of the Chicago Art Deco Society ("CADS"), I wanted to extend our thanks for involving us in the Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting. I appreciated the presentation and the work done by the Chicago Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Economic Development, and the Federal Transit Administration on this important project, and was able to share the information provided by the Ashland BRT Project to the CADS Board.

CADS is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization, and its over 500 members located worldwide all have a shared appreciation of Chicago Interwar Period architecture, art, and design. On April 18, 2013, the CADS Preservation Committee submitted a Suggestion for Landmark Status to the Commission on Chicago Landmarks for the Ashland Avenue Bridge (attached), a 1937 structure designed by Chicago’s own Scipione Del Campo. Landmarks Illinois has also identified the Ashland Avenue Bridge in its annual “Ten Most Endangered Historic Places” list. The Bridge is very special as it is the only remaining bascule bridge in the City designed by Del Campo, and contains many unique features exemplar of Art Deco design in the Interwar period. The CADS community submitted this landmarks suggestion after the Bridge was identified as threatened in a comprehensive survey CADS is conducting to document over 700 Art Deco buildings, sites, and monuments in the Chicagoland area, which will allow us to advocate for the preservation and restoration of these unique and historic structures in the future.

CADS is especially interested in the Ashland BRT Project because of its potential impact to the Ashland Avenue Bridge. Mr. Del Campo designed two bridges for the City of Chicago in the 1930s. The other bridge, which extended over Ogden Avenue, was demolished several years ago. The Ashland Avenue Bridge, while still standing, is in need of long-deferred maintenance and restoration.
We appreciate the work done by CDM Smith, Inc. to identify the BRT Project’s potential impact on cultural and historic resources in and around the City. Per my comments at the Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting on July 15, CADS would encourage and support the inclusion of the Ashland Avenue Bridge on CDM Smith’s Cultural Resources report, in order to identify any potential impact the project would have on the Bridge, and to encourage much-needed restoration and deferred repair to the Bridge. We would also recommend that the Ashland BRT Project invest in infrastructure repairs—not only for the safety of the Bridge's drivers, bus passengers, and pedestrians—but to ensure that future generations can enjoy Mr. Del Campo’s work, as well.

Thank you for allowing us to review and comment on the Ashland Avenue BRT Project. We look forward to working together in the future, and appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

Amy E. Keller
AEK: mgs

cc: Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting Attendees
June 4, 2013

Marisol R. Simon, Regional Administrator
U.S. DOT
200 West Adams Street
Suite 320
Chicago, IL 60606

Re: Chicago Transit Authority Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project Environmental Assessment – Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation

Dear Marisol R. Simon:

This letter is in response to the proposed project referenced above, as provided in the letter dated May 1, 2013. As this project occurs within Potawatomi ancestral and previously occupied lands, we would like to express our concerns with any impacts to historic and cultural properties located within the project area of potential effect for the project mentioned above.

We appreciate receiving results of an archival review, cultural resource investigation studies, and archaeological reports. Should there be an impact or effect to cultural or historic properties as a result of this project, we will request consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended.

You may send the results of the archival review, cultural resource assessments, and archaeological report to:

Forest County Potawatomi Community
Attn: Melissa Cook, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
8130 Mish ko swen Drive
P.O. Box 340
Crandon, WI 54520
Melissa.Cook@fcpotawatomi-nsn.gov (for digital format)

If you have any questions, please contact me at 715-478-7248 or by email Melissa.Cook@fcpotawatomi-nsn.gov.

Respectfully,

Melissa Cook
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

5460 Everybody’s Road • Crandon, Wisconsin 54520
Telephone (715) 478-7474 • (800) 960-5479 • Fax (715) 478-7482
Good morning Illinois DOT Reps,

The Ho-Chunk Nation thanks you for contacting us regarding your proposed undertaking known as the “Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project”. We have no questions or concerns at this time, but would like to remain as an interested party throughout the duration of your project.

Thank you for your time in this matter,

William Quackenbush  
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer  
Cultural Resources Division Manager  
Ho-Chunk Nation
June 18, 2013

Joe Iacobucci
Manager
Chicago Transit Authority
Strategic Planning & Policy, 10th Floor
567 West Lake Street,
Chicago, IL 60661-1465

Re: Chicago Transit Authority Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project
Environmental Assessment – Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation

Dear Mr. Iacobucci,

The Ridge Historical Society (RHS) received your invitation to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party for the CTA's Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project. RHS will participate as a Consulting Party.

The Ridge Historical Society (RHS) serves the Beverly, Morgan Park and Washington Heights community areas on Chicago's south side. For this reason, we are particularly interested in the preservation of impacted properties in the project area within our serviced community areas.

Please direct all correspondence to the Ridge Historical Society's designated representative:

Jennifer R. Kenny
Architectural Historian, Ridge Historical Society
9927 South Longwood Drive
Chicago, IL 60643
773-429-9831
jennifer.kenny@mindspring.com

Thank you,

[Signature]

Jennifer R. Kenny
Architectural Historian
Mr. Iacobucci-

West Lakeview Neighbors would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Yael Hochberg, whom I have copied on this email, will be our single point of contact.

If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Thanks,

Will DeMille
President
West Lakeview Neighbors
Section 106 Comment Responses
Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project
Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Responses to Comments

RE: Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting and Responses to Comments Received

DATE: August 30, 2013

AUTHOR: Robert Ball, CDM Smith, Inc.

TO: All Consulting Parties

On behalf of the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA), we would like to thank you for your participation in the Section 106 Process. An Eligibility and Effects Meeting was held for this project on July 15, 2013. In addition, a 30-day comment period (ending August 2, 2013) was provided to obtain additional input from all consulting parties.

The following summary presents key issues raised during the July 15, 2013 Eligibility & Effects Meeting as well as additional comments from follow-up letters received during the comment period. Updates to the technical analysis memorandum have been made based on comments received, and all consulting parties are being provided with meeting material details as well as the updated Eligibility and Effects Memorandum. CTA is committed to continued coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) through final design on this project. At this time, no impacts are anticipated to result from this project. Final determination on the Section 106 process will be made by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and SHPO.

Responses to Comments

1. A number of consulting parties requested that the project team update the technical memorandum to include a review of the eligibility of the North Ashland Avenue Bridge for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and identify any impacts to the bridge that could result from the proposed project. In addition, comments received asked the project team to identify any repairs to the bridge that would be incorporated into the proposed project to improve safety or better preserve the existing bridge.

As requested, the North Ashland Avenue Bridge was examined for its eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. After reviewing the resource, the bridge is recommended as eligible and the technical memo has been revised to reflect the new recommendation. Please see Table 1 of the technical memorandum for addition of this bridge into the list of NRHP eligible recommendations on structures within the APE.

The technical memorandum provides explanation on why a no adverse effects determination is recommended for the project, and this now includes the assessment of the North Ashland Avenue Bridge.
Avenue Bridge. No historic structures, including the North Ashland Avenue Bridge, would be demolished or relocated for the project. Since a bus route currently exists along the corridor, there would not be new transportation elements introduced that would cause vibratory or noise impacts along the corridor. Based on the station designs, locations, and the characteristics that make each of the resources eligible (including the North Ashland Bridge), there would be no adverse impacts upon the eligible resources or districts (including the North Ashland Bridge). Because of these factors the determination of no adverse effects is recommended. If substantially different design parameters are used during final design, reassessment and/or additional coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and other consulting parties may be required. This explanation is provided in the technical memorandum and addresses comments received regarding assessing impacts of the proposed project on the North Ashland Avenue Bridge.

No stations are proposed proximate to the North Ashland Avenue Bridge. Project improvements between stations (including the area along the corridor through the North Ashland Avenue Bridge) would include milling of pavement, re-paving, re-striping, median improvements, and spot landscaping improvements. These improvements would not result in any potential adverse proximity effects to the location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association of this bridge. These project activities would serve to enhance safety and provide some minor improvements to the existing structure.

2. The Department of Housing and Economic Development (DHED) requested that a separate category and listing of all the properties rated as “red” or “orange” on the Chicago Historic Resources Survey which fall within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) to be included in the technical memorandum regardless of eligibility.

An appendix (Attachment B) was added to the technical memo to list all the properties that fall within the APE that were rated either “red” or “orange” on the Chicago Historic Resources Survey. All these resources were field surveyed and the ones recommended eligible were placed within the body of the technical memorandum. Reference to the addition of this appendix has been incorporated into the technical memorandum. Please see the last sentence of paragraph three under the Identification Methodology section of the technical memorandum for reference.

In addition, CTA is committed to continuing coordination with DHED, a project partner in the proposed project, through final design to ensure that potential effects of the project continue to be coordinated, and if necessary, mitigated through project development.

3. DHED provided information on contributing structures included as part of the historic Chicago Park Boulevard System Historic District near Garfield Boulevard and Ashland Avenue and asked that this information be added to the technical memorandum along with an evaluation.

The Chicago Park Boulevard System Historic District was added to the technical memo along with an effects analysis. The finding of No Adverse Effect was recommended for this location. Please see the last bullet under the NRHP Listed Districts section and Attachment C (Station Area 26) of the technical memorandum for addition of this district into the assessment.
Finally, the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) provided conditional concurrence on the recommendation of a No Adverse Effect determination for this project, and has requested that the project team continue to share plans and specifications for the project, particularly for plans related to historic districts and properties within the project corridor and with regard to treatment of the North Ashland Avenue Bridge, a "Bascule" bridge constructed in 1936.

As part of the Section 106 coordination process, CTA and FTA will be providing the IHPA with conceptual development plans as they continue to develop. Furthermore, CTA and FTA are committed to continuing coordination with the IHPA as final design development commences to ensure that plans and specifications for BRT stations within National Register Historic Districts and those adjacent to historic properties are fully coordinated with the IHPA.

All proposed changes to the street layout for this proposed project would be constructed within existing right of way and no adverse impacts to historic properties or districts are anticipated to result from the proposed project.

No stations are proposed proximate to the North Ashland Avenue Bridge. Project improvements between stations would include milling of pavement, re-paving, re-striping, median improvements, and spot landscaping improvements. These improvements would not result in any potential adverse proximity effects to the location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association of this bridge. These project activities would serve to enhance safety and provide some minor improvements to the existing structure. More specific plans and specifications for the treatment of the North Ashland Avenue Bridge will be determined through final design. FTA and CTA are committed to continuing coordination with the IHPA as final design commences on these plans and specifications.
September 19, 2013

Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
Attn: Ms. Anne E. Haaker
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
1 Old State Capitol Plaza
Springfield, Illinois 62701-1512

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project, Conditional Concurrence Response
IHPA Log # 012030513

Dear Ms. Haaker:

The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are continuing to prepare the Ashland Avenue BRT Project Environmental Assessment in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As part of the Section 106 process, an Eligibility and Effects Meeting was conducted on July 15, 2013 in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act. Meeting materials, as well as a summary of the responses to comments and an updated Cultural Resources Eligibility and Effects Memorandum have been sent to all consulting parties who attended this meeting, and are being provided to you as well for your records.

Thank you for your July 18, 2013 letter of conditional concurrence on the recommendation of a No Adverse Effect determination for the Ashland Ave BRT Project. In response to your letter, we are enclosing a copy of the most current conceptual design plans with this letter for your review. Below are specific responses to your three requests for additional information on plans and specifications for the project.

1. Please provide plans and specifications for bus stops located within National Register Historic Districts and for those that are adjacent to historic properties.

Conceptual plans are enclosed with this response. In addition, Attachment C of the Cultural Resources Eligibility and Effects Memorandum is enclosed and provides detailed information on all historic districts and historic properties near proposed stations, as well as determinations of potential effects for potential station locations. For reference, we have highlighted the planned conceptual station location configurations within this memo and corresponding effects determination (please see red text in Attachment C). When the effects assessment was initially conducted, a number of potential station layouts were under consideration and evaluated for a comprehensive analysis of potential effects. As shown in the conceptual plans as well as this memorandum, all stations are now planned to be constructed in the center median using existing right of way. Below, we have provided reference to the conceptual plan sheets related to stations located within National Register Historic Districts and
those adjacent to historic properties. No adverse effects are expected to result from the proposed station layouts and configurations.

- **Station 1 – Irving Park Road (see Concept Plans p. 44):** A median station is planned south of Irving Park Road.
- **Station 4 – Belmont Avenue (see Concept Plans p. 42):** A median station is planned north of Belmont Avenue.
- **Station 9 – Division Street (see Concept Plans p. 35):** A median station is planned north of Division Street.
- **Station 12 – Lake Street (see Concept Plans p. 32):** A median station is planned south of Lake Street.
- **Station 13 – Madison Street (see Concept Plans p. 31):** A median station is planned north of Madison Street.
- **Station 14 – Jackson Street (see Concept Plans p. 31):** A median station is planned south of Jackson Street.
- **Station 16 – Polk Street (see Concept Plans p. 30):** A median station is planned north of Polk Street.
- **Station 17 – Roosevelt Road (see Concept Plans p. 29):** A median station is planned north of Roosevelt Road.
- **Station 18 – 18th Street (see Concept Plans p. 27):** A median station is planned south of 18th Street.
- **Station 19 – Blue Island Road/Cermak (see Concept Plans p. 26):** A median station is planned north of Blue Island Road.
- **Station 21 – 31st Street (see Concept Plans p. 22):** A median station is planned north of 31st Street.
- **Station 24 – 47th Street (see Concept Plans p. 18):** A median station is planned south of 47th Street.
- **Station 25 – 51st Street (see Concept Plans p. 17):** A median station is planned north of 51st Street.
- **Station 26 – Garfield Boulevard (see Concept Plans p. 16):** A median station is planned north of Garfield Boulevard.
- **Station 28 – 63rd Street (see Concept Plans p. 14):** A median station is planned south of 63rd Street.
• Station 31 – 79th Street (see Concept Plans p. 9): A median station is planned north of 79th Street.

• Station 35 – 95th Street (see Concept Plans p. 4): A median station is planned north of 95th Street.

2. We would also like to review any proposed changes to street or sidewalk configurations within historic districts.

Typical sections for the proposed project are provided on the conceptual plans on pages 2 and 3. A typical station layout is also provided on page 54. Sidewalk widths and configurations between stations would be retained (at approximately 15 feet). At stations, sidewalk widths would be increased by between two and thirteen feet (between 17 feet and 28 feet) throughout the project corridor to provide enhanced pedestrian space and safe crossings at each station. These enhancements would be accommodated using existing right of way, and are expected to positively impact station areas within all historic districts by providing additional pedestrian accessibility within these districts.

CTA and FTA are committed to continuing coordination with the IHPA through final design to confirm that any proposed changes to street and sidewalk configurations within historic districts have no adverse effect on historic districts and contributing structures within the project Area of Potential Effect.

3. Provide plans and specifications for the treatment of the North Ashland Avenue Bridge, a "Bascule" bridge constructed in 1936. Please note that Bascule bridges are included among the 2013 Ten Most Endangered Historic Places identified by Landmarks Illinois, and this Art Deco Style bridge is eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

Page 38 of the conceptual plans shows the North Ashland Avenue Bridge. It is located just north of Webster Avenue. No stations are proposed proximate to the North Ashland Avenue Bridge. Project improvements between stations would include milling of pavement, re-paving, re-striping, median improvements, and spot landscaping improvements. These improvements would not result in any potential adverse proximity effects to the location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association of this bridge. These project activities would serve to enhance safety and provide some minor improvements to the existing structure.

More specific plans and specifications for the treatment of the North Ashland Avenue Bridge will be determined through final design, and CTA is committed to continuing coordination with the IHPA as final design commences on these plans and specifications.

After you have reviewed the enclosed materials, please let us know if you have any additional comments or require any additional information to satisfy the conditions outlined in your July 18, 2013 letter. CTA and FTA are committed to continued coordination with the IHPA as plans develop and through the final design process. Should any changes or modifications to design plans be determined by
FTA or the IHPA to change the Section 106 effects determination, we understand that additional Section 106 coordination may be required.

Once FTA has reviewed and approved the draft Environmental Assessment, a Notice of Availability for the Environmental Assessment will be issued and public hearings will be scheduled. We will continue to keep you informed of the status of the project as these next steps occur, so that you may review the draft Environmental Assessment and provide comments on this project as it proceeds. In the meantime, should you have any questions or comments on this project, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Joe Iacobucci
Manager, Strategic Planning and Policy
Chicago Transit Authority
567 West Lake Street
Chicago, IL 60661-1498

cc: Reginald Arkell, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Mark Assam, U.S. Department of Transportation
    David J. Halpin, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
September 19, 2013

Amy Keller
Chicago Art Deco Society
PO Box 1116
Evanston, IL 60204-1116

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project
Response to Comments, Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting

Dear Section 106 Consulting Party:

Thank you for your participation and attendance at the Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting for the Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. This meeting was conducted on July 15, 2013 in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Based on comments received during and subsequent to this meeting, the project Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum has been updated.

The following documents are included with this letter:

1. July 15, 2013 Section 106 Eligibility and Effects meeting notes
2. Responses to comments received at the Section 106 meeting and through the 30-day comment period
3. Updated Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum

Based on review with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), no adverse effects on historic or archaeological resources are anticipated to result from the proposed project. The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) and FTA are committed to working with the IHPA through final design to ensure that any potential effects of the proposed project are identified and addressed, as appropriate. The Chicago Department of Housing and Economic Development (DHED) is a project partner and will also continue to be involved through final design of this project.

CTA and FTA are continuing to prepare the Ashland Avenue BRT Project Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once FTA has reviewed and approved the EA, a Notice of Availability for the EA will be issued and public hearings will be scheduled. We will continue to keep you informed of the status of the project as these next steps occur, so that you may review the EA and provide comments on this project as it proceeds. In the meantime, should you have any questions or comments on this project, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Sincerely,

Joe Iacobucci
Manager, Strategic Planning and Policy
Chicago Transit Authority
567 West Lake Street
Chicago, IL 60661-1498

cc: Reginald Arkell, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Mark Assam, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Anne E. Haaker, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
September 19, 2013

Lisa DiChiera
Director of Advocacy
Landmarks Illinois
53 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 1315
Chicago, IL 60604

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project
Response to Comments, Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting

Dear Section 106 Consulting Party:

Thank you for your participation and attendance at the Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting for the Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. This meeting was conducted on July 15, 2013 in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Based on comments received during and subsequent to this meeting, the project Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum has been updated.

The following documents are included with this letter:

1. July 15, 2013 Section 106 Eligibility and Effects meeting notes
2. Responses to comments received at the Section 106 meeting and through the 30-day comment period
3. Updated Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum

Based on review with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), no adverse effects on historic or archaeological resources are anticipated to result from the proposed project. The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) and FTA are committed to working with the IHPA through final design to ensure that any potential effects of the proposed project are identified and addressed, as appropriate. The Chicago Department of Housing and Economic Development (DHED) is a project partner and will also continue to be involved through final design of this project.

CTA and FTA are continuing to prepare the Ashland Avenue BRT Project Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once FTA has reviewed and approved the EA, a Notice of Availability for the EA will be issued and public hearings will be scheduled. We will
continue to keep you informed of the status of the project as these next steps occur, so that you may review the EA and provide comments on this project as it proceeds. In the meantime, should you have any questions or comments on this project, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Joe Iacobucci
Manager, Strategic Planning and Policy
Chicago Transit Authority
567 West Lake Street
Chicago, IL 60661-1498

cc: Reginald Arkell, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Mark Assam, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Anne E. Haaker, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
September 19, 2013

Ghian Foreman
Executive Director
Greater Southwest Development Corporation
2601 W. 63rd Street
Chicago, IL 60629

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project
Response to Comments, Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting

Dear Section 106 Consulting Party:

Thank you for your participation and attendance at the Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting for the Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. This meeting was conducted on July 15, 2013 in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Based on comments received during and subsequent to this meeting, the project Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum has been updated.

The following documents are included with this letter:

1. July 15, 2013 Section 106 Eligibility and Effects meeting notes
2. Responses to comments received at the Section 106 meeting and through the 30-day comment period
3. Updated Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum

Based on review with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), no adverse effects on historic or archaeological resources are anticipated to result from the proposed project. The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) and FTA are committed to working with the IHPA through final design to ensure that any potential effects of the proposed project are identified and addressed, as appropriate. The Chicago Department of Housing and Economic Development (DHED) is a project partner and will also continue to be involved through final design of this project.

CTA and FTA are continuing to prepare the Ashland Avenue BRT Project Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once FTA has reviewed and approved the EA, a Notice of Availability for the EA will be issued and public hearings will be scheduled. We will continue to keep you informed of the status of the project as these next steps occur, so that you may review the EA and provide comments on this project as it proceeds. In the meantime, should you have any questions or comments on this project, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Sincerely,

Joe Iacobucci
Manager, Strategic Planning and Policy
Chicago Transit Authority
567 West Lake Street
Chicago, IL 60661-1498

cc: Reginald Arkell, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Mark Assam, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Anne E. Haaker, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
September 19, 2013

Terry Tatum  
Coordinating Planner I  
City of Chicago  
Department of Housing and Economic Development  
Historic Preservation Division  
33 N. LaSalle Street, Room 1600  
Chicago, IL 60602

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project  
Response to Comments, Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting

Dear Section 106 Consulting Party:

Thank you for your participation and attendance at the Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting for the Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. This meeting was conducted on July 15, 2013 in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Based on comments received during and subsequent to this meeting, the project Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum has been updated.

The following documents are included with this letter:

1. July 15, 2013 Section 106 Eligibility and Effects meeting notes
2. Responses to comments received at the Section 106 meeting and through the 30-day comment period
3. Updated Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum

Based on review with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), no adverse effects on historic or archaeological resources are anticipated to result from the proposed project. The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) and FTA are committed to working with the IHPA through final design to ensure that any potential effects of the proposed project are identified and addressed, as appropriate. The Chicago Department of Housing and Economic Development (DHED) is a project partner and will also continue to be involved through final design of this project.

CTA and FTA are continuing to prepare the Ashland Avenue BRT Project Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once FTA has reviewed and approved the EA, a Notice of Availability for the EA will be issued and public hearings will be scheduled. We will
review the EA and provide comments on this project as it proceeds. In the meantime, should you have any questions or comments on this project, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Joe Iacobucci  
Manager, Strategic Planning and Policy  
Chicago Transit Authority  
567 West Lake Street  
Chicago, IL 60661-1498  

cc: Reginald Arkell, U.S. Department of Transportation  
    Mark Assam, U.S. Department of Transportation  
    Anne E. Haaker, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
September 25, 2013

Jennifer R. Kenny
Architectural Historian
The Ridge Historical Society
9927 South Longwood Drive
Chicago, IL 60643

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project
Response to Comments, Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting

Dear Section 106 Consulting Party:

Thank you for your participation in the Section 106 process for the Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. The Eligibility and Effects Meeting was conducted on July 15, 2013 in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Based on comments received during and subsequent to this meeting, the project Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum has been updated.

The following documents are included with this letter:

1. July 15, 2013 Section 106 Eligibility and Effects meeting notes
2. Responses to comments received at the Section 106 meeting and through the 30-day comment period
3. Updated Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum

Based on review with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), no adverse effects on historic or archaeological resources are anticipated to result from the proposed project. The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) and FTA are committed to working with the IHPA through final design to ensure that any potential effects of the proposed project are identified and addressed, as appropriate. The Chicago Department of Housing and Economic Development (DHED) is a project partner and will also continue to be involved through final design of this project.

CTA and FTA are continuing to prepare the Ashland Avenue BRT Project Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once FTA has reviewed and approved the EA, a Notice of Availability for the EA will be issued and public hearings will be scheduled. We will continue to keep you informed of the status of the project as these next steps occur, so that you may review the EA and provide comments on this project as it proceeds. In the meantime, should you have any questions or comments on this project, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Sincerely,

Joe Iacobucci
Manager, Strategic Planning and Policy
Chicago Transit Authority
567 West Lake Street
Chicago, IL 60661-1498

cc: Reginald Arkell, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Mark Assam, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Anne E. Haaker, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
September 25, 2013

Yael Hochberg
West Lakeview Neighbors

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project
Response to Comments, Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Meeting

Dear Section 106 Consulting Party:

Thank you for your participation in the Section 106 process for the Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. The Eligibility and Effects Meeting was conducted on July 15, 2013 in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Based on comments received during and subsequent to this meeting, the project Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum has been updated.

The following documents are included with this letter:

1. July 15, 2013 Section 106 Eligibility and Effects meeting notes
2. Responses to comments received at the Section 106 meeting and through the 30-day comment period
3. Updated Historic Eligibility and Effects Memorandum

Based on review with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), no adverse effects on historic or archaeological resources are anticipated to result from the proposed project. The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) and FTA are committed to working with the IHPA through final design to ensure that any potential effects of the proposed project are identified and addressed, as appropriate. The Chicago Department of Housing and Economic Development (DHED) is a project partner and will also continue to be involved through final design of this project.

CTA and FTA are continuing to prepare the Ashland Avenue BRT Project Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once FTA has reviewed and approved the EA, a Notice of Availability for the EA will be issued and public hearings will be scheduled. We will continue to keep you informed of the status of the project as these next steps occur, so that you may review the EA and provide comments on this project as it proceeds. In the meantime, should you have any questions or comments on this project, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Sincerely,

Joe Iacobucci
Manager, Strategic Planning and Policy
Chicago Transit Authority
567 West Lake Street
Chicago, IL 60661-1498

cc: Reginald Arkell, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Mark Assam, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Anne E. Haaker, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
September 19, 2013

Melissa Cook, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Forest County Potawatomi Community
8130 Mish ko swen Drive
P.O. Box 340
Crandon, WI 54520

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project Section 106 Coordination

Dear Ms. Cook:

Thank you for your letter dated June 4, 2013 in response to an invitation to participate in the Section 106 consultation process for the Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. Based on the findings of the project team’s review, and additional coordination with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) and other Section 106 consulting parties, no adverse effects on historic or archeological resources are anticipated from the proposed project. Due to the limited ground disturbance anticipated to occur from project activities within the existing right-of-way of Ashland Avenue, no subsurface archaeological field investigations were conducted or are planned, and no archaeological monitoring of construction is planned.

As you requested, enclosed are the results of the cultural resources effects technical analysis. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) are committed to working with the IHPA through final design to ensure that any potential effects of the proposed project are identified and addressed, as appropriate.

FTA and CTA are continuing to prepare the Ashland Avenue BRT Project Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once the EA has been reviewed and approved by FTA, a Notice of Availability for the EA will be issued and public hearings will be scheduled. We will continue to keep you informed of the status of the project as these next steps occur, so that you may review the EA and provide comments on this project as it proceeds.
Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project, Section 106 Coordination

In the meantime, should you have any questions or comments on this project, please contact either of the following: Joseph Iacobucci of CTA at (312) 681-4182, jiacobucci@transitchicago.com; or Reginald Arkell of FTA at (312) 886-3704, reginald.arkell@dot.gov. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marisol R. Simón
Regional Administrator

cc: Joe Iacobucci, Chicago Transit Authority
    Anne E. Haaker, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency

Enclosure: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project Cultural Resources Effects Technical Analysis
September 24, 2013

William Quackenbush
Ho-Chunk Nation
P.O. Box 667
Black River Falls, WI 54615

Re: Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project, Section 106 Coordination

Dear Mr. Quackenbush:

Thank you for your email dated May 21, 2013 in response to an invitation to participate in the Section 106 consultation process for the Ashland Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. Based on the project team’s review, in addition to coordination with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) and other Section 106 consulting parties, no adverse effects on historic or archeological resources are expected from the proposed project. Due to the limited ground disturbance anticipated from project activities within the existing Ashland Avenue right-of-way, subsurface archaeological field investigations and archaeological monitoring of construction will not be conducted.

Enclosed are the results of the cultural resources effects technical analysis. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) are committed to working with the IHPA through final design to ensure that any potential effects of the proposed project are identified and addressed, as appropriate.

FTA and CTA are continuing to prepare the Ashland Avenue BRT Project Environmental Assessment (EA) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once the EA has been reviewed and approved by FTA, a Notice of Availability for the document will be issued and public hearings will be scheduled. We will continue to keep you informed of the project status as these next steps occur, so that you may review the EA and provide comments.

If you have any questions or comments on this project, please contact either of the following: Joseph Iacobucci of CTA at (312) 681-4182, jiaacobucci@transitchicago.com; or Reginald Arkell of FTA at (312) 886-3704, reginald.arkell@dot.gov. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marisol R. Simón
Regional Administrator

cc: Joe Iacobucci, Chicago Transit Authority
    Anne E. Haaker, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency

Enclosure: Ashland Avenue BRT Project Cultural Resources Effects Technical Analysis
IHPA Finding of No Effects Letter
Cook County
Chicago
Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project
Ashland Ave. between Irving Park Road and 95th St.
IHRA Log #012030513

October 10, 2013

Joe Iacobucci
Chicago Transit Authority
567 W. Lake St., 10th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661-1465

Dear Mr. Iacobucci:

We have reviewed the specifications and assessed the impact of the project as submitted by your office.

In our opinion the project meets the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings" and we concur in a finding of no adverse effect pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800 provided that the following conditions are met:

1. The proposed BRT stations and shelters located within historic districts must be placed in the median.
2. The proposed BRT stations and shelters located adjacent to properties listed on, or eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places must be placed in the median or the opposite side of the street.

We look forward to continuing coordination with the CTA and FTA through the final design of all elements of this undertaking.

If you have questions, please contact David J. Halpin, Cultural Resources Manager, at 217-785-4998.

Sincerely,

Anne E. Haaker
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

C: Terry Tatum, City of Chicago, Illinois
    Marisol R. Simon, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Reginald Arkell, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Mark Assam, U.S. Department of Transportation
    Marlise Fratinaro, Chicago Transit Authority

A teletypewriter for the speech/hearing impaired is available at 217-524-7128. It is not a voice or fax line.
Section 106 Final Determination Correspondence
November 7, 2013

Amy Martin, Director
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
Old State-Journal Register Building
313 South Sixth Street
Springfield, IL 62701

RE: Chicago Transit Authority Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project,
Chicago, Illinois: FTA Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Determination

Dear Ms. Martin:

On February 27, 2013, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) submitted a Section 106 initiation letter to the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) for the proposed Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project (Ashland BRT Project) in Chicago, Illinois. The Ashland BRT Project is a federal undertaking and subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and its implementing regulation (36 CFR Part 800). The Ashland BRT Project would extend along Ashland Avenue from Irving Park Road on the north to 95th Street on the south for a distance of approximately 16 miles. Modifications to be made on Ashland Avenue include construction of 35 BRT stations, spaced roughly every half mile and located in the roadway median, adjacent to one northbound and one southbound bus-only traffic lane. General traffic access on Ashland Avenue would be reduced to one lane in each direction. Other expected modifications to the Ashland Avenue right-of-way (ROW) include pavement milling/resurfacing, median/curb alterations, traffic signal upgrades, left turn restrictions, and removal of some street parking.

On March 5, 2013, the CTA submitted to IHPA a proposed methodology for Section 106 compliance on the Ashland BRT Project. This included an identified area of potential effect (APE) for cultural and historic resources within the corridor, approach for archival research and a field survey, coordination with consulting parties, and a 30-day comment period. The IHPA responded to CTA via correspondence dated March 18, 2013 and stated that the survey should not be limited to structures on or previously determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).
RE: Chicago Transit Authority Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project, Chicago, Illinois: FTA Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Determination

IHPA indicated this could be remedied by conducting site visits at proposed locations of the 35 stations, and recording structures potentially eligible for the NRHP.

On July 15, 2013, the CTA held a Section 106 consulting parties meeting for the Ashland BRT Project. In correspondence to the CTA, dated July 18, 2013, the IHPA stated that conditionally the project will have no adverse effect on any historic properties. The conditions specified by IHPA were that the CTA provide: 1) plans and specifications for bus stops within and adjacent to National Register Historic Districts; 2) proposed changes to street/sidewalk configurations within historic districts, and; 3) plans and specifications for treatment of the North Ashland Avenue Bridge, constructed in 1936.

In subsequent correspondence dated September 19, 2013, CTA provided a summary of Section 106 consulting party comments and responses, and an updated historic eligibility and effects memorandum to IHPA and the other participating consulting parties. CTA also provided the IHPA with conceptual design plans. In correspondence to CTA dated October 10, 2013, the IHPA stated that conditionally the Ashland BRT Project will have no adverse effect on historic properties pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800. The conditions are as follows: 1) the stations within historic districts must be placed within the median, and; 2) stations located adjacent to properties listed on or eligible for the NRHP must be placed in the median or the opposite side of the street. As described above, all 35 stations proposed with the Ashland BRT Project would be located within the median of Ashland Avenue.

FTA is providing the following determinations on the Ashland BRT Project based on the aforementioned documentation, particularly the enclosed Cultural Resources Technical Memorandum, dated November 5, 2013:

- The defined APE includes the ROW of Ashland Avenue in addition to buildings visible from or immediately adjacent to proposed stations;
- Five NRHP listed or determined eligible historic districts are located within or adjacent to the APE: 1) East Ravenswood Historic District; 2) West Jackson Boulevard Historic District; 3) Pilsen Historic District; 4) Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Historic District; and 5) Chicago Park Boulevard System Historic District;
- 25 individual properties within the APE are on or eligible for the NRHP as listed in Table 1 of the enclosed memorandum;
- 2 previously recorded archaeological sites are located within or adjacent to the APE: 1) Site 11-Ck-350 is a historic site that contains the remaining endpoint of the Illinois and Michigan Canal; and 2) Site 11-Ck-781 is the Central Manufacturing District – part of the first American Industrial Park, established in 1905.
- The Ashland BRT Project would have no adverse effect on resources on or eligible for the NRHP.
RE: Chicago Transit Authority Ashland Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit Project, Chicago, Illinois: FTA Section 106 Eligibility and Effects Determination

Pursuant to the Section 106 implementing regulations at 36 CFR 800, FTA is seeking SHPO concurrence with the above eligibility and effects determinations within 30 days of receipt of this letter. If FTA can provide any assistance or additional information which would aid in your prompt reply, please feel free to contact Reginald Arkell, Community Planner at 312-886-3704. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marisol R. Simón
Regional Administrator

Cc: Reginald Arkell, FTA
Mark Assam, FTA
Joseph Iacobucci, CTA

Enclosure
Memorandum

Date: November 5, 2013

Subject: Cultural Resources

Prepared By: CDM Smith, Inc.

Introduction
The Chicago Transit Authority (CTA), in cooperation with the Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT), Department of Housing and Economic Development (DHED), and FTA, is proposing to implement Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) features and service along Ashland Avenue in Chicago, Illinois. The limits for the Ashland Avenue BRT Project are:

- Irving Park Road on the north to 95th Street on the south (approximately 16.1 miles)

CTA currently operates local bus service within the Ashland Avenue BRT Project limits. The proposed improvements are limited in scope and would be implemented within existing roadway rights-of-way:

- Construction of median BRT stations with shelters and pedestrian boarding areas
- Upgrade of traffic signal systems to include transit signal priority
- Implementation of queue jump lanes and turn restrictions at intersections
- Removal of travel lanes to accommodate a designated bus lane in each direction
- Pavement milling and resurfacing
- Streetscape improvements including medians, landscaping, and ADA-accessibility upgrades

There are 35 proposed BRT station locations, which are shown in Figure 1.

Purpose
The purpose of this memorandum is to evaluate the impact of the proposed project on cultural resources and for documenting compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
Figure 1: Proposed BRT Station Location Map
The following sections include a description of the Area of Potential Effect (APE), an overview of archival research activities, a description of the level of identification efforts conducted, and a summary of the documentation effort. Attachment A contains a primer which explains in more detail the concepts associated with the analysis and accompanying Section 106 consultation process.

**Identification Methodology**

Cultural resource specialists, in consultation with FTA and IHPA, developed an APE for cultural/historic resources along the Ashland Avenue BRT Project corridor. The APE takes into account the location of proposed BRT stations as well as the potential for other effects (e.g., visual changes) that could impact historic resources.

The APE is confined to the right-of-way in the areas between the station locations because the project activities between stations (including milling of pavement, re-paving, re-striping, median improvements, and spot landscaping improvements) would not result in any potential adverse proximity effects to the location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association of nearby historic resources. Because the project area is located within a heavily urbanized area, the boundaries for the APE at the proposed station locations were based on the area directly impacted by construction plus a buffer to account for potential visual changes. The exact size of the buffer varies for each station based on the location, setting and building sizes in the area.

To identify historic architectural resources in the APE, the Historic Architectural Resources Geographic Information System (HARGIS), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) database, and city records— including the Chicago Landmarks List and the Chicago Historic Resources Survey (CHRS)—were reviewed. Using this information, a list of NRHP listed and previously determined eligible properties within the APE was compiled. This effort included the identification of known archaeological sites, NRHP listed districts and structures, CHRS properties rated Orange or Red, locally listed historic landmarks, and any additional properties previously identified as eligible for the NRHP. CHRS Red properties denote resources that possess some architectural features or historical association that make them potentially significant at the city, state, or national level; CHRS Orange properties denote resources that possess some architectural features or historical association that make them potentially significant at the community level. Attachment B contains a complete listing of all properties rated as “red” or “orange” on the CHRS that fall within the APE.

Consistent with the regulations (36 CFR 800.4.b.1), the team has considered past planning, research and studies; the magnitude and nature of the undertaking; the nature and extent of potential effects on historic properties; and the likely nature and location of historic properties within the APE in its identification efforts. As with the development of the APE, the survey and documentation methodology was developed in consultation with FTA and IHPA.

The archival research identified five NRHP historic districts, four local landmarks, and 34 CHRS Red or Orange properties within the APE. Following archival research, the team’s architectural
A historian completed a windshield survey in March 2013 of the Ashland Avenue BRT Project APE, noting buildings within the APE that exhibit distinguishing architectural features associated with historic styles. During the March 2013 field visit, the historian examined structures surrounding each of the 35 station areas and noted individual structures within the APE (including the Red, Orange coded properties, local landmarks, etc.) that exhibited a level of historic architectural significance that could make them candidates for historic evaluation. Each of these were photographed and assessed within the context of their community to determine their eligibility for NRHP listing. Following this assessment, 25 individual properties within the APE have been NRHP listed previously or are recommended as NRHP eligible. **Table 1** depicts NRHP listed resources, additional resources recommended as NRHP eligible, CHRS Orange/Red properties, and local landmarks within the APE. The primer in **Attachment A** provides information on eligibility criteria.

**NRHP Listed Districts**

Portions of five NRHP listed or determined eligible historic districts fall within or adjacent to the APE:

- **East Ravenswood Historic District**, a collection of over 1,500 residential, commercial, and industrial buildings roughly bounded by Lawrence Avenue, Clark Street, Irving Park Road, and Ravenswood Avenue. The district is locally significant under Criterion A for its association with community planning and development and under Criterion C for its architecture.

- **West Jackson Boulevard Historic District**, which is bounded by Laflin, Ashland, Adams and Van Buren streets includes 40 contributing structures on approximately 8.5 acres. The district is listed under Criterion C for its architecture, with a period of significance of 1876-1890.

- **Pilsen Historic District**, roughly bounded by 16th Street, Cermak Road, Halsted Street, and Western Avenue, which contains over 4,400 contributing structures. The district is listed under Criterion A for its association with ethnic heritage (Bohemian-American and Mexican-American cultures), industry, and social history. It is also listed under Criterion C for its architecture.

- **Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Historic District**, within Chicago city limits, is bounded by the footprint of the waterway and extends from just east of Ashland Avenue (near 29th Street) to just west of Cicero Avenue (near 41st Street). The entire Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal is 28 miles long and forms a shipping link between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River system. The district is listed under Criterion A for its association with maritime history, commerce, transportation, community planning, and development and under Criterion C for its architecture, with a period of significance of 1875-1974.

- **Chicago Park Boulevard System Historic District**, is approximately 26 miles in length and contains a continuous system of parks and boulevards from the southeast part of Chicago at Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, west, north and back east, to the eastern end of Logan
Boulevard. It contains eight parks, 19 boulevards and six squares. The historic district intersects with the APE for the project where Ashland Avenue intersects with Garfield Boulevard, nearest to Sherman Park. The district was determined eligible under Criterion A for its association with community planning and development, and under Criterion C for its architecture and landscape architecture with a period of significance of 1869–1964.

Table 1: NRHP Eligibility Recommendations for Buildings and Structures within the APE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gothic Revival School, 4015 North Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible, Contributing element within the East Ravenswood Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Mixed Use Building, 3175 North Lincoln Avenue</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Mixed Use Building, 1545 West Division Street</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Mixed Use Bldg, 1200 North Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular Commercial Building, 238 North Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne Train Station, Lake Street at Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco/Moderne Gymnasium, 1545 West Lake Street</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco/Moderne Hotel, 1521 West Warren Boulevard</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italianate Mixed Use Building, 236-238 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanesque Revival Residential Bldg, 1539 West Jackson Boulevard</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible, Contributing element within the West Jackson Boulevard Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanesque Revival Residential Bldg, 315 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible, Contributing element within the West Jackson Boulevard Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Church, 733 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic Revival Church, 1132 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Known Archaeological Sites

Two previously recorded archaeological sites were identified along the Ashland Avenue corridor.

- **Site 11-Ck-350** is a historic site that contains the remaining endpoint of the Illinois and Michigan Canal.

- **Site 11-Ck-781** is the Central Manufacturing District. It is part of the first American industrial park, established in 1905.

No archaeological field investigations are expected due to the limited nature of the project and the location within the existing-right-of-way. This project does not include any monitoring or invasive investigations.
Assessment of Effects

Effects for each NRHP listed or eligible resource within the APE were assessed. The assessment of adverse effects has been conducted according to the criteria of adverse effect (36 CFR 800.5). Per regulations from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (See Attachment A), an Adverse Effect is an "alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places" such that a resource’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association is diminished.

A No Adverse Effect determination is found when the undertaking’s effects do not meet the criteria of the preceding paragraph on adverse effects or the undertaking is modified or conditions are imposed to avoid adverse effects. No Effect is found when there are no historic properties present or there are historic properties present but the undertaking will have no impact on them.

Although median stations are the preferred option and would be constructed at most stations, curbside stations may be provided at a few locations, due to roadway geometrics and/or access considerations to adjacent land uses. Because the exact placement for each station is not known at this time, the effects for six potential configurations at each of the 35 station locations are considered:

- Median station south of the cross street
- Median station north of the cross street
- Curbside station in the northeast quadrant of the intersection
- Curbside station in the northwest quadrant of the intersection
- Curbside station in the southeast quadrant of the intersection
- Curbside station in the southwest quadrant of the intersection

Figure 2 shows the six potential configurations graphically.
Attachment C presents information about each station area that contains NRHP listed or eligible resources. Of the 35 proposed station locations along the corridor, 17 contain historic resources and are included in this report. For each recommended eligible and listed resource, tables in Attachment C describe the six possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties. Figures depicting the APE and identified resources are also provided for each of the 17 stations. Analysis assumes all stations are located along Ashland Avenue, within existing right-of-way and in the immediate vicinity of the identified cross street.

Figures 3 and 4 show conceptual renderings for both a median and curbside station, respectively; these designs formed the basis of the effects analysis. For the median stations that fall outside of historic districts, given their location within the center of the roadway, they are far enough from the resources to not have an adverse effect in either the north or south locations. Median stations that do fall within historic districts would be designed in a context sensitive way as not to create an adverse effect upon the district. For curbside stations that fall within the same quadrant of a historic resource, since the design is similar to existing shelter designs, they would not have an adverse effect upon the resources.

No historic structures would be demolished or relocated for the project. Since a bus route currently exists along the corridor, there would not be new transportation elements introduced that would cause vibratory or noise impacts along the corridor. Based on the station designs, locations, and the characteristics that make each of the resources eligible, there would be no adverse impacts upon the eligible resources or districts. Because of these factors the determination of no adverse effects is recommended. If substantially different design parameters are used during final design,
reassessment and/or additional coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and other consulting parties may be required.

**Figure 3: Typical Median Station Conceptual Design**

![Figure 3: Typical Median Station Conceptual Design](image)

**Figure 4: Typical Curbside Station Conceptual Design**

![Figure 4: Typical Curbside Station Conceptual Design](image)
Attachment A
**Consultation Primer**

Cultural and historic resources are protected by various federal regulations. Most notably, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to consider impacts to historic resources from their actions, and to balance preservation needs with the need for the proposed project. The Section 106 process “seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns with the need of federal undertakings through consultation ... The goal of the consultation is to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects and seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties” (36 CFR 800.1(a)).

As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to (1) identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project; (2) assess project effects on these resources; and (3) develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties. A variety of organizations are eligible to participate in the consultation process, including the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPO), local governments, and other organizations/individuals with a demonstrated interest in the project or the affected properties.

**Definition of the APE**

Prior to historic resource identification efforts, the project team developed the Area of Potential Effects (APE) in consultation with the SHPO. The APE defines the geographic area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if such properties exist. Its boundaries are defined to encompass geographic areas where project effects may occur, independent of the presence of historic properties or districts.

**Eligibility Determinations for Aboveground Historic Resources**

Cultural historians then conducted research and field visits to identify properties which are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The NRHP is the nation’s official list of properties recognized for their significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. It is maintained by the National Park Service and includes districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects. To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a property must meet at least one of four criteria:

A. Association with events that have made a significant contribution to broad patterns in history  
B. Association with persons significant to the past  
C. Embodiment of distinctive architectural design or construction characteristics  
D. Potential to yield information important to history or prehistory (e.g. archaeological sites)

In addition, a property must also maintain a degree of integrity; that is, it must retain adequate integrity to convey the characteristics that make it significant. Table 1 summarizes the seven aspects of integrity, defined in 36 CFR 60, which identifies procedures to evaluate properties for listing on the NRHP.
Table 1: Aspects of Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Design is the combination of elements that create form, plan, space, structure and style of a property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of a time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmanship</td>
<td>Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>Feeling is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Determination of Effects**

Once NRHP listed and eligible resources were identified, the project team relied on technical analyses to identify project impacts such as displacements, changes in noise levels, or alterations to the visual environment. Impacts resulting from each alternative were examined to determine whether they would result in an adverse effect on aboveground historic resources.

Per the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, an **adverse effect** is an “alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places” such that the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association is diminished (36 CFR 800.5). This can include direct effects (caused by the action and occurring at the same time and place), indirect effects (reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the action but occurring later in time or farther removed), or cumulative effects (changes considered alongside effects from other projects).

A “No Adverse Effect” determination is found when the project’s effects do not meet the criteria of the preceding paragraph, the undertaking is modified, or conditions are imposed to avoid adverse effects. A “No Effect” determination is found when the project will have no impact on a particular historic resource. A “No Historic Properties Affected” determination is found for the overall project when either there are no historic properties present or there are historic properties present but the project will have no impact on any of them.

**Mitigating Adverse Effects**

Once the project team has determined which historic resources (if any) are adversely affected by the project, the team will work with consulting parties to identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate these impacts. As needed, commitments will be formalized in a Memorandum of Agreement between the federal agency, local lead agency, SHPO, and other signatories.
Attachment B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Nearest Proposed Station Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Revival Mixed Use Building 9109 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>91st Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco/ Moderne Mixed Use Bldg. 7909 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>79th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Mixed Use Building 7845 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>79th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Commercial Building 1534 West 63rd Street</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>63rd Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic Revival Church 1624 West 51st Street</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>51st Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Mixed Use Building 5043 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>51st Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Commercial Bldg. 4700 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>47th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Building 3538 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>35th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italianate Mixed Use Building 1724 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Revival Mixed Use Building 1718 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne Residential Building 1815 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanesque Revival Mixed Use Bldg. 1820 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Revival Mixed Use Bldg. 1812 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italianate Mixed Use Building 1804 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic Revival Church 1132 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Church 733 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanesque Revival Residential Bldg. 315 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanesque Revival Residential Bldg. 1539 West Jackson Boulevard</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italianate Mixed Use Building 234 - 238 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Mixed Use Building 36 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco/Moderne Hotel 1521 West Warren Boulevard</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco/Moderne Gymnasium 1545 West Lake Street</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>CHRS</td>
<td>Nearest Proposed Station Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne Train Station</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Street at Ashland Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular Commercial Building</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 North Ashland Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne Mixed Use Building</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553 West Chicago Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco/ Moderne Mixed Use Bldg.</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 North Ashland Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italianate Mixed Use Building</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184 North Milwaukee Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Mixed Use Building</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 North Milwaukee Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Revival Commercial Building</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214 North Ashland Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco/ Moderne Mixed Use Bldg.</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1227 North Milwaukee Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italianate Mixed Use Building</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548 West Fullerton Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco/ Moderne Mixed Use Bldg.</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3204 North Lincoln Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Deco/ Moderne Mixed Use Bldg.</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3225 North Ashland Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothic Revival School</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Irving Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4015 North Ashland Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C
**Station Area 1: Irving Park**
The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by a combination of early 20th century mixed-use, multi-family residences, a school, and modern buildings including a fast food restaurant. The East Ravenswood Historic District begins on the north side of the intersection. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 4015 North Ashland Avenue: Gothic Revival Lakeview High School</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible; Contributing element with the East Ravenswood Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. East Ravenswood Historic District: a collection of over 1,500 residential, commercial, and industrial buildings roughly bounded by Lawrence Avenue, Clark Street, Irving Park Road, and Ravenswood Avenue</td>
<td>1880-1940</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. 4015 North Ashland Avenue      | - Median Station north or south of Irving Park Rd  
|                                   | - SB Curbside Station north or south of Irving Park Rd  
|                                   | - NB Curbside Station south of Irving Park Rd  
|                                   | - NB Curbside Station north of Irving Park Rd*                                                      |
| 2. East Ravenswood Historic District | - Median Station south of Irving Park Rd  
|                                   | - SB Curbside Station south of Irving Park Rd  
|                                   | - NB Curbside Station south of Irving Park Rd  
|                                   | - Curbside or Median Station north of Irving Park Rd**                                               |

* Due to design of station being similar in size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor  
** Due to a design that fits the historic context and is of similar size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor

**Photos:**
See Next Page
Station Area 1: Irving Park Cont’d

Photos:

4015 North Ashland Avenue

East Ravenswood Historic District
Station Area 1: Irving Park Cont’d
Station Area 4: Belmont
The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by a combination of late 19th and early 20th century mixed-use, multi-family residential, and modern mixed-use buildings. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3175 North Lincoln Avenue: Classical Revival Mixed Use Building</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. 3175 North Lincoln Avenue | - Median Station north or south of Belmont Ave  
- SB Curbside Station north or south of Belmont Ave  
- NB Curbside Station north or south of Belmont Ave |

**Photos:**

![3175 North Lincoln Avenue](image-url)
Station Area 4: Belmont Cont’d
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Station Area 9: Division

The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by a combination of late 19th and early 20th century mixed-use, multi-family residential, and modern mixed-use buildings. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1543 West Division Street: Classical Revival Mixed Use Building</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1200 North Ashland Avenue: Classical Revival Mixed Use Bldg.</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. 1543 West Division Street | - Median Station north or south of Division St  
- SB Curbside Station north or south of Division St  
- NB Curbside Station north or south of Division St |
| 2. 1200 North Ashland Avenue | - Median Station north or south of Division St  
- SB Curbside Station south of Division St  
- NB Curbside Station north or south of Division St  
- SB Curbside Station north of Division St*          |

* Due to design of station being similar in size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor

**Photos:**

1543 West Division Street

1200 North Ashland Avenue
Station Area 9: Division Cont’d
Station Area 12: Lake

The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by a combination of early 20th century mixed-use, commercial, and recreational buildings as well as modern buildings. In addition the Lake Street train station is present. The buildings appear to be in good condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1545 West Lake Street: Art Deco/Moderne Gymnasium</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Queen Anne Train Station: Lake Street at Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 238 North Ashland Avenue: Vernacular Commercial Building</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effects Assessment:

For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. 1545 West Lake Street                     | - Median Station north or south of Lake St  
- SB Curbside Station north or south of Lake St  
- NB Curbside Station north or south of Lake St |
| 2. Queen Anne Train Station                  | - Median Station north or south of Lake St  
- SB Curbside Station north or south of Lake St  
- NB Curbside Station north or south of Lake St |
| 3. 238 North Ashland Avenue                  | - Median Station north or south of Lake St  
- SB Curbside Station north or south of Lake St  
- NB Curbside Station north or south of Lake St |

Photos (Cont’d on Next Page):
Station Area 12: Lake Cont’d

Photos Cont’d:

Queen Anne Train Station

238 North Ashland Avenue
Station Area 12: Lake Cont’d
Station Area 13: Madison
The intersection has experienced a slight downturn in activity and development as it is characterized by a combination of early 20th century mixed-use buildings and modern buildings along with vacant lots. The buildings appear to be in good condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1521 West Warren Boulevard: Art Deco/Moderne Hotel</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effects Assessment:
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1521 West Warren Boulevard</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of Madison St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station north or south of Madison St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NB Curbside Station north or south of Madison St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photos:

1521 West Warren Boulevard
Station Area 13: Madison Cont’d
Station Area 14: Jackson
The intersection falls within the West Jackson Boulevard Historic District and contains late 19th and early 20th century mixed-use, commercial, and multi-family residences, as well as modern multi-family residences and commercial buildings. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 315 South Ashland Avenue:</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible; Contributing element within the West Jackson Boulevard Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanesque Revival Residential Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1539 West Jackson Boulevard:</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible; Contributing element within the West Jackson Boulevard Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanesque Revival Residential Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 236-238 South Ashland Avenue:</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italianate Mixed Use Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. West Jackson Boulevard HD:</td>
<td>1876-1890</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Local District</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a collection of 40 buildings on 8.5 acres along Jackson Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effects Assessment:
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 315 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of Jackson Blvd - SB Curbside Station north or south of Jackson Blvd - NB Curbside Station north or south of Jackson Blvd*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1539 West Jackson Boulevard</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of Jackson Blvd - SB Curbside Station north or south of Jackson Blvd - NB Curbside Station north or south of Jackson Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 236-238 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of Jackson Blvd - SB Curbside Station north or south of Jackson Blvd - NB Curbside Station north or south of Jackson Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. West Jackson Boulevard Historic District</td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station north or south of Jackson Blvd - Median Station or NB Curbside Stations**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Due to design of station being similar in size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor
** Due to a design that fits the historic context and is of similar size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor
Station Area 14: Jackson Cont’d
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**Station Area 16: Polk**
The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by a large mid-20th
century hospital, modern buildings, and associated parking lots, as well as a religious facility. The buildings
appear to be in excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this
station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 733 South Ashland Avenue: Classical Revival Church</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station
configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. 733 South Ashland Avenue       | - Median Station north or south of Polk St
|                                   | - SB Curbside Station north or south of Polk St
|                                   | - NB Curbside Station south of Polk St
|                                   | - NB Curbside Station north of Polk St*                |

* Due to design of station being similar in size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor

**Photos:**

![733 South Ashland Avenue](image-url)
**Station Area 17: Roosevelt**

The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by a majority of modern mixed-use commercial buildings, including a gas station and apartments. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>1132 South Ashland Avenue</strong>: Gothic Revival Church</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**

For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. 1132 South Ashland Avenue | - Median Station north or south of Roosevelt Rd  
|                         | - SB Curbside Station north or south of Roosevelt Rd  
|                         | - NB Curbside Station north or south of Roosevelt Rd  |

**Photos:**

![1132 South Ashland Avenue](image-url)
Station Area 17: Roosevelt Cont’d
**Station Area 18: 18th**

The intersection falls within the Pilsen Historic District and contains late 19th and early 20th century mixed-use, commercial, and multi-family residences. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1812 South Ashland Avenue: Renaissance Revival Mixed Use Bldg.</td>
<td>1890s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible; Contributing element within the Pilsen Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pilsen Historic District: a collection of over 4,400 residential, commercial, and industrial buildings roughly bounded by 16th Street, Cermak Road, Halsted Street, and Western Avenue.</td>
<td>1871-1956</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**

For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1812 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of 18th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station north of 18th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NB Curbside Station north or south of 18th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station south of 18th St*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pilsen Historic District</td>
<td>- All six possible Station locations**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Due to design of station being similar in size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor
** Due to a design that fits the historic context and is of similar size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor

**Photos:**

See Next Page
Station Area 18: 18th Cont’d

Photos:

1812 South Ashland Avenue

Pilsen Historic District
**Station Area 19: Blue Island**
The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by a combination of early 20th century mixed-use, commercial, and modern buildings including a gas station and school. The Pilsen Historic District begins on the north side of the intersection. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pilsen Historic District: a collection of over 4,400 residential, commercial, and industrial buildings roughly bounded by 16th Street, Cermak Road, Halsted Street, and Western Avenue.</td>
<td>1871-1956</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pilsen Historic District</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of Cermak Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station north or south of Cermak Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NB Curbside Station north or south of Cermak Rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Photos:**

![Pilsen Historic District](image-url)
Station Area 21: 35th
The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by a combination of early 20th century mixed-use, industrial, and modern buildings including a gas station and retail. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3538 South Ashland Avenue: Industrial Building</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effects Assessment:
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 3538 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of 35th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station north or south of 35th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NB Curbside Station north or south of 35th St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photos:
Station Area 24: 47th

The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by a combination of early 20th century mixed-use/retail and modern buildings. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 4700 South Ashland Avenue: Goldblatt Brothers Department Store</td>
<td>1910s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 4700 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of 47th St&lt;br&gt;- SB Curbside Station north of 47th St&lt;br&gt;- NB Curbside Station north or south of 47th St&lt;br&gt;- SB Curbside Station south of 47th St*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Due to design of station being similar in size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor

**Photos:**

4700 South Ashland Avenue
Station Area 24: 47th Cont’d
Station Area 25: 51st
The intersection has experienced a downturn in activity and development as it is characterized by several vacant lots and a combination of early 20th century mixed-use and modern buildings. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1624 West 51st Street: Gothic Revival Church</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1614 West 51st Street: Classical Revival School</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5043 South Ashland Avenue: Classical Revival</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effects Assessment:
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1624 West 51st Street</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of 51st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station north or south of 51st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NB Curbside Station north or south of 51st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1614 West 51st Street</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of 51st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station north or south of 51st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NB Curbside Station north or south of 51st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5043 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of 51st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station north or south of 51st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NB Curbside Station north or south of 51st St</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photos (Cont’d on Next Page):

![1624 West 51st Street](image)
Station Area 25: 51st Cont’d

Photos Cont’d:

1614 West 51st Street

5043 South Ashland Avenue
Station Area 25: 51st Cont’d
Station Area 26: Garfield

The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by several modern mixed-use and commercial buildings including retail, fast food and a gas station along with late 20th century multi-residential buildings. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chicago Park Boulevard System Historic District</td>
<td>1896-1964</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Determined Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chicago Park Boulevard System</td>
<td>-All six possible Station locations**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Due to a design that fits the historic context and is of similar size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor

**Photos:**

![Photos of Garfield Station Area](attachment:image.jpg)

West Garfield & South Ashland Ave
Station Area 26: Garfield Cont’d
**Station Area 28: 63rd**

The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by several early 20th century buildings as well as more modern mixed-use buildings. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1534 West 63rd Street: Classical Revival Commercial Building</td>
<td>1900s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**

For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. 1534 West 63rd Street | - Median Station north or south of 63rd St  
- SB Curbside Station north or south of 63rd St  
- NB Curbside Station north or south of 63rd St |

**Photos:**

1534 West 63rd Street
Station Area 31: 79th
The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by modern commercial buildings—a gas station and retail stores—as well as several older mixed-use buildings. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 7922 South Ashland Avenue: Art Deco/Moderne Mixed Use Bldg.</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 7912 South Ashland Avenue: Art Deco/Moderne Mixed Use Bldg.</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 7845 South Ashland Avenue: Classical Revival Mixed Use Building</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. 7922 South Ashland Avenue            | - Median Station north or south of 79th St  
- SB Curbside Station north or south of 79th St  
- NB Curbside Station north or south of 79th St |
| 2. 7912 South Ashland Avenue            | - Median Station north or south of 79th St  
- SB Curbside Station north of 79th St  
- NB Curbside Station north or south of 79th St  
- SB Curbside Station south of 79th St * |
| 3. 7845 South Ashland Avenue            | - Median Station north or south of 79th St  
- SB Curbside Station north or south of 79th St  
- NB Curbside Station south of 79th St  
- NB Curbside Station north of 79th St*  |

* Due to design of station being similar in size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor

**Photos:**
See Next Page
Station Area 31: 79th Cont’d

Photos:

1. 7922 South Ashland Avenue
2. 7912 South Ashland Avenue
3. 7845 South Ashland Avenue
Station Area 35: 95th
The intersection is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by modern commercial buildings along its western side including a gas station and fast food restaurant as well as several older mixed-use buildings located on the eastern side of Ashland. The buildings appear to be in good to excellent condition. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this station area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 9459 South Ashland Avenue: Classical Revival Mixed Use Building</td>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource, the table below describes the 6 possible station configurations and whether or not they result in any adverse effects on nearby historic properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>No Adverse Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 9459 South Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>- Median Station north or south of 95th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SB Curbside Station north or south of 95th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NB Curbside Station south of 95th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NB Curbside Station north of 95th St*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Due to design of station being similar in size and scale to existing shelters along the corridor

**Photos:**

![9459 South Ashland Avenue](image)
**Between Station Area: North Ashland Avenue**
The location is a typical urban environment full of activity and characterized by modern commercial buildings as well as parking lots and industrial areas. The following NRHP historic resources were identified within this area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property / Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CHRS</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>NRHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. North Ashland Avenue Bridge: Art Deco</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects Assessment:**
For each recommended eligible and listed resource; potential effects were examined to see if they would occur based on the proposed project. As no station is proposed in this location and project activities would be limited to the milling of pavement, re-paving, re-striping, median improvements, and spot landscaping improvements, there would be no adverse effect on this resource.

**Photos:**

[Image of North Ashland Avenue Bridge]

North Ashland Avenue Bridge
Between Station Area: North Ashland Avenue