



Maple Elementary School Field Improvements Project

Draft SEPA Checklist

Seattle Public Schools is committed to making its online information accessible and usable to all people, regardless of ability or technology. Meeting web accessibility guidelines and standards is an ongoing process that we are consistently working to improve.

While Seattle Public Schools endeavors to only post documents optimized for accessibility, due to the nature and complexity of some documents, an accessible version of the document may not be available. In these limited circumstances, the district will provide equally effective alternate access.

For questions and more information about this document, please contact the following:

Tom Gut
Senior Project Manager
twgut@seattleschools.org

While the Maple Elementary School Field Improvement Project Draft State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist is accessible and ADA compliant, the attached figures and appendices, which support the checklist, contain complex material that are not accessible. The following is a description of what is contained in the figures and appendices:

- **Figure 1, Maple Elementary School Vicinity, Seattle, Washington**
Figure 1 is an aerial photograph of the Maple Elementary School site and its surrounding neighborhood to within an approximately three-block radius. The project area is outlined in red.
- **Figure 2, Site Plans – Maple Elementary School, Seattle, Washington**
Figure 2 consists of two site plans showing the work proposed. Sheet L1.01 is the southern portion of the site showing the new synthetic turf field, drainage system, concrete paving around the field, concrete stairs, and other site amenities. Sheet L1.02 is the northern portion of the site showing the proposed new concrete paving, new asphalt paving, and other site improvements.
- **Appendix A: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Worksheet**
Appendix A is the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Worksheet prepared by Environmental Science Associates (ESA). This worksheet estimates the embodied Greenhouse Gas Emissions that could be created from this construction project. Note that it is an estimate that analyzed potential emissions that may be created through the extraction, processing, transportation, construction, and disposal of building materials, as well as emissions created through landscape disturbance (by both soil disturbance and changes in above ground biomass).

This concludes the SEPA checklist.

**Maple Elementary School
Field Improvements
DRAFT SEPA Checklist**

December 2022

PREPARED FOR:

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
2445 THIRD AVENUE SOUTH
SEATTLE, WA 98134

PREPARED BY:

ESA
5309 SHILSHOLE AVENUE NW, STE. 200
SEATTLE, WA 98107

CONTENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	1
A. Background	1
B. Environmental Elements.....	3
1. Earth	3
2. Air	5
3. Water.....	6
4. Plants.....	8
5. Animals.....	9
6. Energy and Natural Resources	10
7. Environmental Health	11
8. Land and Shoreline Use.....	13
9. Housing.....	15
10. Aesthetics	16
11. Light and Glare	16
12. Recreation	16
13. Historic and Cultural Preservation	17
14. Transportation.....	22
15. Public Services	24
16. Utilities	24
C. Signature	25
D. References.....	27

FIGURES

Figure 1. Vicinity Map

Figure 2. Site Plans

APPENDIX

A. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS WORKSHEET

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. BACKGROUND

- 1. Name of the proposed project, if applicable:**
Maple Elementary School Field Improvements
- 2. Name of Applicant:**
Seattle Public Schools (SPS)
- 3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:**
Conrad Plyler
Seattle Public Schools, Seattle School District No. 1
2445 3rd Ave S
Seattle, WA 98134
206-252-0662
- 4. Date checklist prepared:**
December 2022
- 5. Agency requesting checklist:**
Seattle Public Schools (SPS)
- 6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):**
Construction is anticipated to occur in the Summer of 2023.
- 7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.**
There are no plans for future additions or expansions associated with this proposal.
- 8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.**
 - SDCI Drainage Report Maple Elementary School – Playfield Replacement (Jacobsen Consulting Engineers 2022)
- 9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.**
No other government approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property are known to be pending.

10. List any governmental approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known:

The following permits/approvals may be required for this project:

- City of Seattle Clearing and Grading Permit

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.

Seattle Public Schools (SPS) is proposing to improve a grass field at Maple Elementary School (See Figure 1 Vicinity Map, and Sheets L1.01 and L1.02). The Friends of Maple community group received a capital improvement grant from the City of Seattle to have a masterplan for the Maple Elementary School site prepared in 2018. That master planning process, conducted through the Self-Help division of SPS, had community meetings and robust input from Maple Elementary School staff, students, parents and community members. SPS is implementing portions of the approved master plan and have reviewed the current field drawings with members of that group and the Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) and principal and the group is in favor and full support of the project.

Improvements at the field will include installation of a new synthetic turf playfield with a concrete perimeter jogging path, installation of a new amphitheater, new benches, new picnic tables, a natural learning area, and new play equipment at the existing play area. New tree and shrub plantings will occur at landscape areas. A seal coat will be applied over the existing asphalt hard surface play area and restriping of surface games to match existing games. Installation of the natural learning area will include a picnic table and log seating, boulders, crushed gravel surfacing, and landscape beds with trees and shrubs. Along the eastern edge of the site, a new 12-inch wide concrete mowstrip will be placed under the fence to allow easier maintenance of grass and new chain link fabric at the existing fence will be installed. Existing landscape beds will be restored by removing weeds by hand and adding mulch.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not

required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The school is located at 4925 Corson Ave S, Seattle, WA 98108. The site is bounded by Maple Wood Playfield to the north, single family residences along S Pearl St to the south and Corson Ave S to the west, and Interstate-5 to the east. The site is located in Section 20, Township 24N, Range 4E. The site is made up of the following parcel and legal description (King County 2021).

- **3869400560.** KING COUNTY 2ND ADD BLKS 5 THRU 7 LY ELY OF PRIMARY STATE HWY NO 1 TGW VAC STS LY WITHIN & TGW POR OF VAC STS ADJ.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (underline):

Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

The steepest slope of the site is approximately 12% according to the NRCS Web Soil Survey. There is one steep slope mapped to the north of the school building on the SDCI GIS database (2022).

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

Urban Land composed of Alderwood complex are found at the site (NRCS 2022). Beacon Hill, on which the project site is situated, is a glacial drumlin. A preliminary review of archival resources, Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) imagery (King County 2022b), a preconstruction topographical survey of the proposed school site in 1968 and 1970 (Durham Anderson Freed 1970; Hugh G. Goldsmith & Associates 1968), and geotechnical test holes in 1969 (presented in Durham Anderson Freed 1970) revealed that the project site (prior to school construction) had approximately 1 to 2 feet of “brown silty organic topsoil” overlying “grey-brown dense clayey silt,” interpreted as likely Lawton Clay, deposited during recessional glaciolacustrine conditions (Mackin et al. 1950). Additional geotechnical tests performed in 2003 and 2004 (Krazan and Associates 2003, 2004) illustrated stratigraphic changes at the project site likely caused by site preparation for original school construction. Significantly, none of the geotechnical borings noted the presence of topsoil, suggesting this material likely had been graded from the parcel during site preparation. Several tests noted the presence of

several feet of placed fill where little to no fill had previously been noted in 1969.

d. Are there any surface indications or a history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

There are no surface indications of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity.

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities of total affected area of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

The project site is roughly 6.74 acres with the anticipated construction limits being approximately 0.85 acres. Approximately 325 cubic yards (cy) of soil will be exported and approximately 600 cy of fill will be utilized. Imported fill material to the site is anticipated to be sources from a City of Seattle approved location by the contractor and will be approved by the City as a clean source. Excavated material would be disposed of at an approved off-site facility.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Construction activities at the site would expose soils, increasing the potential for soil erosion; however, the implementation of Erosion Control Measures and the implementation of best management practices (BMPs) during construction would mitigate potential impacts.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

Approximately 58 percent of the 0.85 acre project will be covered with impervious surfaces, including artificial turf and asphalt, after project construction.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

Temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) best management practices will be employed during construction activities to ensure that sediment is not deposited onto City streets or allowed to flow into stormwater conveyance facilities. Planned measures include installing catch basin filter socks in existing catch basin structures, straw wattles, silt fencing, and interceptor swales setup around perimeter to capture and keep construction stormwater on-site and routed to sediment settlement tank(s). Additional measures for the project will be to utilize existing paved drives, fire lanes, and parking areas for construction access and staging and laydown areas for construction equipment and materials.

The TESC plan will be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the City's adopted stormwater manual.

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Project activities would produce air emissions during construction. Construction of this project could generate vehicle emissions, fugitive dust, and odors.

Another consideration regarding air quality and climate relates to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. To evaluate climate change impacts of the proposed project relative to the requirements of the City of Seattle, a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Worksheet has been prepared (Appendix A of this Environmental Checklist). This Worksheet estimates the emissions from the following sources: embodied emissions, energy-related emissions, and transportation related emissions. Approximately 5,578 square feet of concrete (sidewalks, stairs, and ramp), roughly 3,027 square feet of gravel (picnic and amphitheater seating spaces), and a 9,529 square foot synthetic turf play field with underdrains (considered impervious per City stormwater code) are proposed to be constructed for the project.

In total, the estimated lifespan emissions for the proposed project would be approximately 279 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂e). The proposed project would be estimated to generate approximately 5.58 MTCO₂e annually (King County 2007), assuming a lifespan of 50 years. For reference, Ecology's threshold for potential significant GHG emissions is 25,000 MTCO₂e annually. Therefore, the proposed project would not be anticipated to generate a significant amount of GHG emissions.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

There are no off-site sources of emissions or odors that would affect the proposed project.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any.

Because impacts to air are not anticipated, there are no proposed measures to reduce or control emissions.

3. Water

a. Surface Water:

1. **Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.**

There are no surface water bodies on or in the immediate vicinity of the site. According to the US Fish and Wildlife Service Wetlands Mapper, the nearest surface water bodies include: The Duwamish Waterway approximately 0.9 mile to the west and an unnamed stream approximately 0.8 mile to the southeast, south of the South Albro Place entrance to I-5 (King County 2022).

2. **Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.**

The project would not require any work over, in, or adjacent to water or wetlands.

3. **Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

No fill or dredge material would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands.

4. **Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities, if known.**

The project would not require surface water withdrawals or diversions.

5. **Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Maps, the site is not located within the 100-year floodplain (FEMA 2021).

6. **Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

The proposal does not include any discharges of waste materials.

b. Ground Water:

- 1. Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

Groundwater would not be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes.

- 2. Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals ... ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.**

No waste material would be discharged into the ground. The project site would not use septic tanks.

c. Water Runoff (including stormwater)

- 1. Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.**

Runoff from building roofs and existing impervious surfaces would be unchanged from current conditions. Stormwater runoff will be collected in catch basin structures and the playfield underdrain system and routed to a proposed StormTech Chamber detention system placed below the field. The field drains to a crushed rock base and then to a subdrainage collection system of 4" perforated pipes in gravel trenches that are connected to the StormTech Chamber stormwater detention system. The detention system will discharge stormwater at a controlled rate to the combined sewer system located in South Pearl Street located south of the project site. Currently, stormwater from the project site sheet flows across the existing grass playfield and into the ROW where the stormwater is collected in catch basins along the curb flowline and then conveyed to a combined sewer system located in the street (Jacobsen Consulting Engineers 2022).

2. Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

No waste material would be discharged to ground or surface waters as a result of the proposed project.

3. Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

The project involves the installation of a 9,529 square foot synthetic turf field with drainage underneath the field. The field would drain to a crushed rock base and then to a subdrainage collection system of 4-inch perforated pipes in gravel trenches that are connected to the storm tech chamber stormwater detention system.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

SPS would identify site-specific BMPs in the construction contract documents that the construction contractor would be required to implement to reduce potential impacts to surface and ground water quality.

4. Plants

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other

evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other

shrubs

grass

pasture

crop or grain

Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.

wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other

water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other

other types of vegetation: English Ivy (*Hedera helix*), Himalayan Blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*)

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

The project would not result significant vegetation removal or alteration. The lawn of approximately 16,500 feet would be replaced with a synthetic turf field.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

No threatened or endangered plant species are known to be on or near the site.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

A landscaping plan has been prepared for the site. Additional proposed measures to preserve and enhance vegetation may include the following:

- Plant material selection would draw from the regional character and include drought-tolerant, native, and adapted plants selected for suitability in the Puget Sound Lowlands, including shrubs and groundcovers.
- Existing soils would be amended and mulched to ensure the long-term health and success of the investments made in new landscape areas.

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

King County iMap does not map any noxious weeds as occurring on the site (King County 2022).

5. Animals

a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site. Examples include:

Animals present on the site are those that are typical urban birds and animals.

- **Fish:** Not applicable.
- **Amphibians:** None observed.
- **Reptiles:** None observed.
- **Birds:** Hummingbirds, gull, American crow, robin, Steller's jay, song birds.
- **Mammals:** Norway rat, racoon, squirrel, opossum.

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on near the site.

According to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) program maps, there are no listed species on the project site (WDFW 2022). The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Environmental Conservation Online System (ECOS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) online tool does not designate critical habitat for threatened or endangered species on the

site (USFWS 2022). The IPaC online tool does map north American wolverine, marbled murrelet, yellow-billed cuckoo, and monarch butterfly, all species listed as Threatened, as occurring within the region. However, suitable habitats for these species such as old-growth forests, riparian forests, and/or large prairies do not exist on-site or in the vicinity. There are no other threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the project site. Therefore, the potential for threatened or endangered animal species to be present is low.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

The Puget Sound area is located within the Pacific Flyway, which is a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl and other avian fauna. The Pacific Flyway extends from Alaska to Mexico and South America. No portion of the proposed project would interfere with or alter the Pacific Flyway.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any.

New trees and native plants with habitat attributes are proposed throughout the site. These improvements would increase habitat function and opportunities throughout the site.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

Invasive animal species in the area include Norway rat, raccoon, opossum, and rodents that are typically found in urban areas.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

No additional energy would be needed for the completed project.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

The project is located at an existing school site and would not affect the use of solar energy by adjacent properties.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

The completed project will not use energy; therefore, energy conservation measures have not been developed.

7. Environmental Health

- a. **Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.**

As with any construction project, there is the potential for accidental spills of hazardous materials from construction equipment and vehicles. Spilled materials could include fuels, lubricants, solvents, antifreeze, and similar materials. If not contained, these contaminants could enter groundwater or surface water.

Hazardous materials could be encountered during grading and excavation of the site. If present, disturbance of these materials during construction could release hazardous materials to the air or surface and groundwater or could expose construction workers unless proper handling methods are used.

- 1. Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.**

According to the Ecology Facility/Site(s) database (Ecology 2021), the Maple Elementary School site is not known to have contamination from present or past uses.

- 2. Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.**

There are no known existing hazardous chemicals or conditions that would affect project development.

- 3. Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.**

Chemicals stored and used during construction would likely be limited to gasoline and other petroleum-based products required for the maintenance and operation of construction equipment and vehicles.

- 4. Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

The project would not require any special emergency services.

5. Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards include those listed below:

- SPS would comply with applicable regulations for the removal and disposal of any hazardous materials if found on-site.
- Site-specific pollution prevention plans, and spill prevention and control plans would be developed to prevent or minimize impacts from hazardous materials.

b. Noise

1. What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

The site receives noise from sources that include traffic from I-5 and arterial streets, as well as overflights associated with Boeing Field and Sea-Tac International Airport. The City of Seattle regulates noise via the Seattle Noise Ordinance (SMC Chapter 25.08). The ordinance sets a limit for exterior sound levels based on land use, establishes quiet hours, and prohibits construction and maintenance activities during certain hours of the day.

2. What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Construction: Construction of school projects would generate short-term noise. Construction equipment and vehicles may include track hoes, back hoes, dump trucks, and forklifts.

School Operations: Use of the playfield would be audible to neighbors but is expected to be similar to existing noise levels. Noise sources from elementary schools typically include student voices, school bells, regular vehicular traffic, and building mechanical equipment. Noise during use of outdoor physical space is expected to be similar to existing levels. Noise generally occurs during normal school operating hours (approximately 7:55 a.m. to 2:25 p.m.).

3. Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

General measures that may be imposed on the project to reduce or control noise impacts may include those listed below:

- Construction equipment is maintained in a good condition and equipped with mufflers. If feasible, stay away from noise sensitive receivers. When equipment is not used, it should be turned off instead of idling.
- Residences in the vicinity of the school should be notified before construction starts.
- Construction activities would be restricted to hours designated by SMC 25.08.425. The Seattle Land Use Code allows construction equipment operations between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. on weekdays and 9 a.m. and 10 p.m. on weekends and holidays. Construction would generally occur between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekdays. Construction occurring at night or on holidays is not currently planned. Weekend construction could occur in some cases.
- If construction activities exceed permitted noise levels, SPS would instruct contractors to implement measures to reduce noise impacts to comply with the noise ordinance, which may include additional muffling of equipment.
- School operations would adhere to the Seattle Noise Ordinance.
- The code further regulates noises considered “unreasonable” including “*loud and raucous, and frequent repetitive or continuous sounds made by the amplified or unamplified human voice*” between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. During these hours, the maximum allowable noise from one property to another within residential districts is reduced to 45 Leq (dBA) (i.e., Equivalent Continuous Sound Pressure Level, A-weighted decibels).

8. Land and Shoreline Use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

The site is currently used as an elementary school. Interstate 5 is on the west side of the site, to the is north Maple Wood Playfield owned by the City of Seattle Parks Department, the properties to the south and east are residential.

- b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?**

The site has been developed as a school since 1971. The site is not used for working farmland or working forest lands.

- 1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:**

No working forest lands are located near the project site. The project would not affect or be affected by farm operations.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.**

On the site, there is currently an elementary school totaling approximately 28,200 square feet. No changes are proposed to the elementary school structure.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?**

No structures will be demolished.

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?**

The site is currently zoned as NR3, neighborhood residential (City of Seattle 2021).

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?**

The City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan designation of the site is a "Single Family Residential Area" (City of Seattle 2021).

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?**

The project site is not within a shoreline jurisdiction. Therefore, there is no applicable Shoreline Master Program designation (City of Seattle 2021).

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.**

No part of the site has been classified as a critical area by the city or county.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

The number of people who work at Maple Elementary School is expected to be the same with the completed project.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

The completed project would not displace any people.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

No displacement is expected; therefore, no mitigation measures have been proposed.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

The proposal is compatible with existing and projected land use. The site will continue to be used as a school, and the existing play areas will be enhanced.

m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

The site is not located near any agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance; therefore, no mitigation measures have been developed.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

No housing units would be provided as a result of this project.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

No housing units would be eliminated as result of this project.

c. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any.

No impacts to housing are anticipated as a result of this project, therefore, no measures have been proposed.

10. Aesthetics

- a. **What is the tallest height of any of the proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?**

There are no proposed structures associated with the playfield upgrades.

- b. **What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?**

No views in the immediate vicinity would be altered.

- c. **Proposed measures to control or reduce aesthetic impacts, if any:**

No views would be altered; therefore, no measures are proposed.

11. Light and Glare

- a. **What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?**

The proposal would not add any additional lighting.

- b. **Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?**

There is no lighting proposed.

- c. **What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?**

No off-site sources of light or glare would affect this proposal.

- d. **Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:**

Impacts from light and glare are not anticipated; therefore, no measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts have been developed.

12. Recreation

- a. **What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?**

Recreation opportunities on the Maple Elementary School site currently include the existing undeveloped field and existing play structures.

Parks and recreational opportunities in the vicinity of the Maple Elementary School site include the following:

- **Maple Wood Playfield.** Located north of/adjacent to Maple Elementary School at 4801 Corson Avenue S., the City-owned park

includes two baseball fields, a play area with slides and climbing features, open green space, and bathrooms.

- **Jefferson Park.** Located 0.9 mile northeast, the City-owned park includes the Jefferson Park Golf Course, Jefferson Community Center, Jefferson Lawn Bowling, Jefferson Skate Park, and Beacon Mountain. Additional amenities include basketball courts, tennis courts, soccer field, baseball field, picnic sites, spray parks, views, public art, children play area, bathrooms, and water fountains.
- **Beacon Food Forest.** Located 0.9 mile northeast of the project site, adjacent to Jefferson Park, a 7-acre food forest and community-driven garden located on S Dakota Street located on City-owned land. Amenities include raised beds, demonstration gardens, giving gardens, honeybees, meeting spaces, orchard, and public art.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

No recreational uses would be displaced as a result of this project.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreational opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

The plans include improved outdoor recreation space for the students including the installation of a new synthetic turf playfield, a natural learning area, and new play equipment.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.

There are no recorded buildings, structures, or sites located on the site that are currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), Washington Heritage Register, or Seattle Landmarks List (DAHP 2022, Seattle Department of Neighborhoods 2022).

Directly to the north of the site is Maple Wood Playfield, which is owned by the City of Seattle. The Playfield contains three recorded historic resources over 45 years in age: Maple Wood Playfield, Maple Wood Restroom, and Maple Wood Backstops; each was recorded as a separate resource (Scott et al. 2022). The Playfield and Restroom were determined eligible for listing in the NRHP; the Backstops were determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP (DAHP 2022). Parcels fronting the project site to the east along Corson Avenue South and to the south along South Pearl Street include residential buildings constructed between 1911 and

1971 (King County 2022a) and are, therefore, older than 45 years. The project does not propose direct impacts to any of these adjacent buildings or structures, including Maple Elementary School.

Maple Elementary School is an open-concept school, constructed in 1971 and designed by Durham Anderson and Freed (Thompson and Marr 2002). The School is currently 51 years old. To date, no NRHP eligibility recommendation or determination has been made for the school (DAHP 2022). Seattle Public Schools self-nominated the school for review by the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board (LPB) in 2003 in advance of the addition of the gym and lunchroom. The LPB denied the nomination.

b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

To date, there are no archaeological sites, cemeteries, or traditional cultural properties within or adjacent to the project boundaries that have been recorded with DAHP (DAHP 2022). SPS contacted the Duwamish Tribal Services Cultural Preservation Department on November 9, 2022 via email to inquire about any specific concerns the Tribe may have regarding unrecorded archaeological resources or other cultural resources at this location and information the Tribe would want included in review (Plyler 2022). In the response received on November 16, 2022, the Duwamish Tribal Services Cultural Preservation Department staff commented that the project *“is in an area the Duwamish Tribe considers culturally significant and has a moderate probability to have unknown archaeological deposits, especially if excavation cuts below current fill. The school is located on the bluffs (now Beacon Hill) above the former estuary of the Duwamish river where the Tribe used resources and gained access to a trails between the river and Lake Washington”* (Sackman 2022).

More than 20 cultural resources assessments have been completed within 1 mile of the project site, and there are eight recorded archaeological sites located between 0.14 mile and 1.0 mile of the project site (DAHP 2022). All eight recorded sites are historic-era, and none have been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP.

Two archaeological assessments have been completed immediately adjacent to the project site (Scott et al. 2022; Syvertson et al. 2018). In 2018 an assessment was conducted in advance of drainage improvements and examined Corson Avenue South from South Ferdinand Street to South Dawson Street and a portion of 12th Avenue South; no archaeological resources were recorded (Syvertson et al. 2018).

In 2022, an assessment of the Maple Playfield directly north of the project site was conducted for proposed improvements (Scott et al. 2022). As noted in Question 13a, three historic resources were identified and recorded: Maple Wood Playfield, Maple Wood Restroom, and Maple Wood Backstops. The Playfield and Restroom were determined eligible for listing in the NRHP; the Backstops were determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP (DAHP 2022).

The project location is classified in the DAHP Statewide Predictive Model as a range of Very High, High, and Moderate Risk for containing precontact-era cultural resources (DAHP 2022). However, there are no recorded archaeological sites with Indigenous components within 1 mile of the project site.

Maple Elementary School is located within the ancestral lands of the Duwamish people, whose traditional language is Southern Lushootseed and who are part of a larger cultural group known generally as the Southern Coast Salish people (Lane 1975a; Suttles and Lane 1990). The Southern Coast Salish group encompasses the Duwamish, Snoqualmie, Suquamish, and Tulalip Tribes, and additional groups in the Puget Sound region whose ancestral lands were primarily farther from the project site: the Puyallup, Nisqually, and Squaxin people (Suttles and Lane 1990). The memberships of the Snoqualmie, Suquamish, Muckleshoot, and Tulalip Tribes include successors of the Duwamish at the time of the 1855 Treaty of Point Elliott (Lane 1974; Lane 1975b; Lane 1988; Miller and Blukis Onat 2004:24-25, 56-108; Muckleshoot Indian Tribe 2022; Suquamish Tribe 2015). The Duwamish, Snoqualmie, and Suquamish Tribes state they have been in the Puget Sound region since time immemorial; this is also supported by archaeological evidence within the region (Duwamish Tribal Services 2018; Kopperl et al. 2016; Snoqualmie Indian Tribe 2020; Suquamish Tribe 2015).

Today's Beacon Hill landform is known in Lushootseed as *qWátSéécH* or Greenish-Yellow Spine, in reference to the colors of the hillside's deciduous trees, which consisted of maples, alders, and other deciduous trees (Thrush 2007:230, map no. 38; U.S. Surveyor General 1861). No places with Lushootseed names are known to exist directly within the project site (Hilbert et al. 2001; Thrush 2007; Waterman 1922). Named places are documented approximately 0.50 mile west of the project along the base of today's Beacon Hill and the original banks and mouth of the Duwamish River. Approximately 2 miles south of the project location was a trail over Beacon Hill leading between the locations on the Duwamish River and Lake Washington shoreline (Thrush 2007:246).

The project site is approximately 0.30-mile east/southeast of the former Road from Steilacoom to Seattle, also known as the Old Military Road and a trail once connected with the road approximately 0.90-mile

northeast of the project; both are depicted on an 1861 survey map (U.S. Surveyor General 1861). The connecting trail led east to today's Seward Park on Lake Washington. The project site is within the Luther M. Collins land claim, who was one of the earliest non-Indigenous residents of the area; Collins lived west of the project site, at the base of the hill along on the banks of the Duwamish (Bagley 1916).

Prior to construction of the school, historical maps and aerial photographs document the project site as residential with dwellings present since at least 1908 (Baist Map Company 1908, 1912; Kroll Map Company 1920; NETROnline 2022; Pacific Aerial Surveys 1937; Sanborn Fire Insurance Company 1917). The project site was annexed by the City in 1921 (Phelps 1976:222).

Beginning in the late 1960s, the Seattle School District petitioned the City to vacate utilities and streets within the project site under City Ordinances 98664 and 102506 (Seattle Public Utilities 1951). Site surveys prepared in 1968 for school construction document multiple remnant foundations across the project site at the time of project start (Durham Anderson Freed 1970; Hugh G. Goldsmith & Associates 1968). A 1972 survey of the southern portion of the project site (today's athletic fields) recorded numerous remnant landscaped plantings (e.g., hedges, fruit trees, and holly bushes) across the area (Seattle Public Schools 1972). In 1971 Maple Elementary School opened (Thompson and Marr 2002).

Beacon Hill, on which the project site is situated, is a glacial drumlin unlikely to have experienced substantial natural deposition since the end of the last Ice Age. As a result, past cultural traces, if deposited, would have tended to remain at ground surface or become shallowly mixed into the topsoil. A preliminary review of archival resources, a preconstruction topographical survey of the proposed school site in 1968 and 1970 (Durham Anderson Freed 1970; Hugh G. Goldsmith & Associates 1968), and 6 geotechnical test holes in 1969 (presented in Durham Anderson Freed 1970) revealed that the school grounds (prior to school construction) had approximately 1 to 2 feet of "brown silty organic topsoil" overlying "grey-brown dense clayey silt." The clayey silt is interpreted as likely Lawton Clay, deposited during recessional glaciolacustrine conditions (Mackin et al. 1950), and the topsoil likely consisting of a mixture of imported material and native soil. Based on the age and environment of deposition, strata of Lawton clay would not be expected to contain buried archaeological sites. An additional 14 geotechnical borings and 5 hand augers performed in 2003 and 2004 in advance of school additions (Krazan and Associates 2003, 2004) illustrate stratigraphic changes on the school grounds likely caused by site preparation for original school construction. Significantly, 10 of the 19 recent tests noted the presence of glacial-aged matrix directly at ground

surface, while seven noted glacial-aged material directly beneath 1.5 to 9 feet of fill. This implies that site preparation for construction of the original school involved stripping of topsoils across the property with substantial upslope cutting, followed by backfilling where needed. A series of flattened and stepped ground surfaces can be readily discerned on Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) imagery (King County 2022b). Because site preparation for original school construction appears to have removed the topsoil, the potential for the project site to contain intact archaeological sites appears low.

- c. **Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.**

The following information was reviewed: previous archaeological survey reports (DAHP 2022), historical maps (Baist Map Company 1908, 1912; Bortleson et al. 1980; Kroll Map Company 1920; McKee and Reynolds 1894; U.S. Surveyor General 1861, 1863), government landowner records (U.S. Bureau of Land Management 1995), aerial photographs (NETROnline 2022; Pacific Aerial Surveys 1937), published ethnographies and regional histories (Bagley 1916; Burke Museum 2019; Duwamish Tribal Services 2018; Hilbert et al. 2001; Kopperl et al. 2016; Lane 1975; Snoqualmie Indian Tribe 2020; Thompson and Marr 2002; Thrush 2007; Waterman 1922), and geological maps and reports (Durham Anderson Freed 1970; King County 2022b). In addition, Seattle Public Schools consulted with the Duwamish Tribal Services Cultural Preservation Department (Plyler 2022; Sackman 2022) and the Seattle Department of Neighborhoods Landmark Preservation Board staff (Doherty 2022).

- d. **Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.**

Because the project is expected to occur within fill and/or glacial matrix and is expected to have a low potential for intact archaeological deposits, ESA is not recommending a preconstruction subsurface archaeological survey or archaeological monitoring during construction. The Duwamish Tribal Services Cultural Preservation Department provided the following comments recommendations: *“An IDP should not be used in lieu of an archaeological investigation. However, based on the boring logs provided in the geotechnical report [Durham Anderson Freed 1970; King County 2022b], the Tribe recommends that an archaeologist be present to monitor (inadvertent discovery plan) when excavating starting from depths below current fill to about 10 feet below ground surface (bgs) and especially in soil lenses that include organics. Cultural and archaeological*

resources are non-renewable and are best discovered prior to ground disturbance. In addition, the Tribe supports native plants for proposed landscaping” (Sackman 2022).

SPS has prepared an archaeological resources Inadvertent Discovery Plan for use during project construction and will ensure that the contractor receives cultural resources orientation prior to beginning ground disturbance.

SPS will notify the Duwamish, Muckleshoot, Snoqualmie, Suquamish, and Tulalip Tribes in advance of construction, and invite them to observe the work. At all times during construction, state laws regarding cultural resources, including Archaeological Sites and Resources (RCW 27.53), Indian Graves and Records (RCW 27.44), Human Remains (RCW 68.50), and Abandoned and Historic Cemeteries and Historic Graves (RCW 68.60), are in force if archaeological sites or human remains are discovered. Based on the result of the analysis, measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for the loss of, changes to, and disturbance to resources would be determined based on the nature, location, and potential impacts on any archaeological resource.

Seattle Public Schools contacted Landmarks Preservation Board (LPB) staff on October 24, 2022 to review the current proposed project. On November 10, 2022 LPB staff stated they were *“not concerned about impacts from the proposed south end work because it so far from the historic building, and there is another building in between these two areas. The north end work seems like minor alterations to the existing outdoor play area, as necessary for security, maintenance, and small-scale programmatic improvements. I do not think they will adversely impact the historic property in any way”* and that *“while we agree that it [the proposed work] exceeds the threshold for referral, we do not feel that additional review is required beyond what we have just completed. If in the future the building is proposed for demolition, or major alterations (addition) that exceed the SEPA referral threshold, we think we would likely request an Appendix A document, in light of the Board’s previous review of the property and extensive alterations that have already occurred” (Doherty 2022).*

14. Transportation

- a. **Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.**

The existing Maple Elementary School is bounded on the north by Maple Wood Playfield, on the east by Corson Avenue South, on the south by South Pearl Street, and on the west by Interstate 5 (See Figure 1: Vicinity Map).

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

King County Metro Transit (Metro) provides bus service along 15th Avenue S. Route 60 and route 107 have a stop at 15th Ave S and S Shelton St 0.3 mile away. Route 124 has a stop approximately 0.7 mile away Airport Way S and S Lucile St.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?**

The completed project would not add or eliminate any additional parking spaces.

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).**

The proposal would not require any new roads or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle, or state transportation facilities.

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

The project would not use or occur in the immediate vicinity of water, rail, or air transportation.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?**

The completed project would not generate additional vehicular trips. During construction, approximately 100 to 150 truck trips are expected for product delivery and hauling.

- g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.**

The proposal would not interfere with the movement of agricultural or forest products on streets in the area because no agricultural or working forest lands are located within the vicinity of the project site.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

There are no adverse impacts to the transportation system in the site vicinity, so no mitigation measures are proposed.

15. Public Services

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

Construction and implementation of the project would not result in an increased need for public services.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

Local public service providers would be made aware of any potential roadway impacts that could adversely affect response times during construction. If public streets are blocked, transportation plans would be prepared and include provisions to maintain emergency service access.

16. Utilities

a. Underline utilities currently available at the site:

electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other _____

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

There are no changes to utilities proposed as a part of this project.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: _____

Name of signee: _____

Position and
Agency/Organization: _____

Date Submitted: _____

D. REFERENCES

- Bagley, Clarence B. 1916. History of Seattle: From the Earliest Settlement to the Present Time. S. J. Clarke, Chicago.
- Baist Map Company. 1908. Surveys of Seattle. Baist Map Company, Seattle. On file, Seattle Public Library.
- Baist Map Company. 1912. Surveys of Seattle. Baist Map Company, Seattle. On file, Seattle Public Library.
- Bortleson, G. C., M. J. Chrzastowski, and A. K. Helgerson. 1980. Historical Changes of Shoreline and Wetland at Duwamish River and Elliot Bay, Washington. Prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Justice and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Hydrologic Investigations Atlas HA-617, Sheet 7. On file, University of Washington Libraries, Seattle.
- Burke Museum. 2019. Seattle: Discover and Explore Past Landscapes – the Waterlines Project. Burke Museum, Seattle.
- City of Seattle. 2021. Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Council Adopted 2021.
- Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). 2022. Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD). Secure database. Accessed October 31, 2022. <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/>.
- Doherty, Erin. 2022. Seattle Department of Neighborhoods Landmarks Preservation Board Staff Correspondence with Tingyu Wang, Seattle Public Schools. 10 November. On file, Seattle Public Schools.
- Durham, Anderson, Freed. 1970. Maple Elementary Survey and Site Plan. On file, Seattle Public Schools Archives.
- Duwamish Tribal Services. 2018. History of the Duwamish People. Electronic document. <https://www.duwamishtribe.org/history>. Accessed October 31, 2022.
- Hilbert, Vi, Jay Miller, and Zalmi Zahir. 2001. Puget Sound Geography: Original Manuscript from T. T. Waterman. Lushootseed Press, Federal Way, Washington.
- Jacobsen Consulting Engineers. 2022. SDCI Drainage Report Maple Elementary School – Playfield Replacement. November 4, 2022.
- King County. 2022a. King County Parcel Viewer. Accessed October 2022. <https://www.kingcounty.gov/services/gis/Maps/parcelviewer.aspx>.
- King County. 2022b. King County iMap. Accessed January and October 2022. <https://gismaps.kingcounty.gov/iMap/>.
- King County. 2022b. King County Lidar Swipe. Electronic document. Accessed October 31, 2022. <https://kingcounty.gov/services/gis/Maps/LidarViewer.aspx>.
- King County. 2007. SEPA GHG Emissions Worksheet. Department of Development and Environmental Services. Version 1.7. Revised March 2019.

- Kopperl, Robert, Charles Hodges, Christian Miss, Johonna Shea, and Alecia Spooner. 2016. Archaeology of King County, Washington: A Context Statement for Native American Archaeological Resources. Prepared for King County Historic Preservation Program by SWCA Environmental Consultants, Seattle. On file, Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia.
- Krazan and Associates, Inc. 2003. Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, Proposed Maple School Additions, 4925 Corson Avenue South, Seattle, Washington. Prepared for Heery International, Inc., Seattle. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://fortress.wa.gov/dnr/geologydata/subsurface_pdfs/17100-17199/017175.pdf.
- Krazan and Associates, Inc. 2004. Additional Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, Proposed Maple School Additions, 4925 Corson Avenue South, Seattle, Washington. Prepared for Heery International, Inc., Seattle. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://fortress.wa.gov/dnr/geologydata/subsurface_pdfs/17100-17199/017175.pdf.
- Kroll Map Company. 1920. Kroll's Atlas of Seattle. Kroll Map Company. On file, Seattle Public Library.
- Lane, Barbara. 1974. Identity, Treaty Status and Fisheries of the Suquamish Tribe of the Port Madison Reservation. Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Suquamish Indian Tribe. On file, ESA.
- Lane, Barbara. 1975a. Identity, Treaty Status and Fisheries of the Duwamish Tribe of Indians. Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Duwamish Tribe of Indians. On file, ESA.
- Lane, Barbara. 1975b. Identity, Treaty Status and Fisheries of the Tulalip Tribes. Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior and the Tulalip Tribe of Indians. On file, ESA.
- Lane, Barbara. 1988. The Duwamish Indians and the Muckleshoot and Port Madison Indian Reservations. Prepared for the Suquamish Indian Tribe and Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. On file, ESA.
- Mackin, J.H., D.R. Mullineaux, and W.J. Stark. 1950. Glacial geology of Seattle. Washington University-Seattle Trend in Engineering 2(4):19–21.
- McKee, Redick H., and Alexander M. Reynolds. 1894. McKee's Correct Road Map of Seattle and Vicinity, Washington, U.S.A. Electronic document. Accessed October 31, 2022. <https://digitalcollections.lib.washington.edu/digital/collection/imismohai/id/13401/>.
- Miller, Jay, and Astrida R. Blukis Onat. 2004. Winds, Waterways, and Weirs: Ethnographic Study of the Central Link Light Rail Corridor. Prepared for Sound Transit, Central Link Light Rail, by BOAS, Seattle. On file, Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia.
- Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. 2022. Accessed October 31, 2022. <http://www.muckleshoot.nsn.us/default.aspx>.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2022F. Web Soil Survey: King County. Accessed October 17, 2022. <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.

- NETROnline. 2022. Aerial Coverage. Electronic document. Accessed October 31, 2022. www.HistoricAerials.com.
- Pacific Aerial Surveys. 1937. Aerial Photograph, Township 24 North, Range 4 East, Section 20. Accessed October 31, 2022. <https://info.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/roads/mapandrecordscenter/mapvault/>.
- Phelps, Myra L. 1978. Public Works in Seattle: A Narrative History of the Engineering Department 1875-1975. Seattle Engineering Department, Seattle.
- Plyler, Conrad. 2022. Letter to Duwamish Tribal Services Cultural Preservation Department, attention Nancy Sackman and John Boddy, 9 November. On file, Seattle Public Schools.
- Sackman, Nancy. 2022. Letter to Seattle Public Schools, attention Conrad Plyler, 16 November. On file, Seattle Public Schools.
- Sanborn Fire Insurance Company. 1917. Seattle, Vol. III, Sheet 349. On file, Seattle Public Library.
- Scott, Emily, Kate Hannah, and Meagan Scott. 2022. Maple Wood Playfield Renovation Project, Seattle, King County, Washington - Cultural Resources Assessment. Prepared for Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation by ESA. On file, Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia.
- Seattle Department of Neighborhoods. 2022. Landmarks Map. Accessed October 31, 2022. <https://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/programs-and-services/historic-preservation/landmarks/landmarks-map>.
- Seattle Public Schools. 1972. Maple Elementary Survey & Topography – South Portion of Property. On file, Seattle Public Schools Archives.
- Seattle Public Utilities. 1951. [Hand Updated] NE 20-24-4 Public Utilities ¼ Sec 277. On file, Seattle Public Utilities Engineering Map Vault.
- Snoqualmie Indian Tribe. 2020. Snoqualmie Sovereignty. Accessed October 31, 2022. <https://snoqualmierightsday.snoqualmietribeweb.us/>.
- Suquamish Tribe. 2015. Home. Accessed October 31, 2022. <https://suquamish.nsn.us/>.
- Suttles, Wayne, and Barbara Lane. 1990. Southern Coast Salish. In Northwest Coast, edited by Wayne Suttles, pp. 485-502. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 7, William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Tobin, Caroline. 2004. Beacon Hill Historic Context Statement. Prepared for City of Seattle Department of Neighborhoods by Caroline Tobin with assistance of Artifacts Consulting Inc. On file, ESA.
- Thompson, Nile, and Carolyn J. Marr. 2002. Building for Learning: Seattle Public School Histories, 1862-2000. School Histories Committee, Seattle School District, Seattle.
- Thrush, Coll P. 2007. Native Seattle: Histories from the Crossing-Over Place. University of Washington Press, Seattle.

- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) 2022. Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC). Accessed October 2022. <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>.
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management. 1995. Township 24 North, Range 4 East Master Title Plat. Electronic document. Accessed October 31, 2022. https://www.blm.gov/or/landrecords/survey/yPlatView1_2.php?path=PWA&name=240n040em01.jpg.
- USFWS. 2021. Rep. National Wetlands Inventory. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>.
- U.S. Surveyor General. 1861. Township 24 North, Range 4 East Survey Map. Electronic document. Accessed October 31, 2022. https://www.blm.gov/or/landrecords/survey/yPlatView1_2.php?path=PWA&name=t240n040e_001.jpg.
- U.S. Surveyor General. 1863. Township 24 North, Range 4 East – Donation Land Claims Map. Electronic document. Accessed October 31, 2022. https://www.blm.gov/or/landrecords/survey/yPlatView1_2.php?path=PWA&name=t240n040e_002.jpg.
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 2022. Priority Habitat and Species (PHS) on the Web. Accessed October 2022. <https://geodataservices.wdfw.wa.gov/hp/phs/>.
- Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). 2021. What's in My Neighborhood. Accessed October 2022. <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/neighborhood/>.
- Waterman, T. T. 1922. The Geographical Names Used by the Indians of the Pacific Coast. *Geographical Review* 12 (2):175–194.