



Consultation & Coordination

History of Community Participation

There are many different public agencies, local governments, non-profit organizations and individual citizens who have an interest in this plan. Reaching out to the community for their ideas and expertise and listening to their concerns is an important step in the GMP planning effort. A combination of formal public forums as well as phone conversations, individual meetings, electronic mail, and letters have all contributed important input into the development of this draft GMP/EIS.

FORMER GMP PROCESS

A Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on April 1, 1997. From 1997-2000, the park and the Northeast Regional Office were engaged in the first GMP planning process. An internal draft document was produced that focused on minor boundary adjustments to protect existing park resources, expanding the interpretive themes, and developing new facilities. This document was never officially released to the public. As part of the NPS internal review process, it was determined that the park should pursue a boundary expansion in order to protect nationally significant battlefields associated with the Petersburg Campaign. The GMP planning process was redirected and new efforts resulted in scoping and conceptual alternative meetings with the public, consultations with the state and federal agencies and elected officials and the development of this draft GMP/EIS.

LANDOWNER MEETINGS

Two open house meetings were held in Dinwiddie County in May 2001 to inform landowners about the GMP process and potential boundary expansion. The park sent 200 letters to landowners whose properties were located on or adjacent to the nationally significant battlefields considered for boundary expansion. During the meetings, residents were first presented with information about the historic events of the Petersburg Campaign and the need for conservation and interpretation. Landowners were invited to sit down with the park's historian to review the location of their property and discuss if they were interested in battlefield conservation on their land and if they would like assistance. Additionally, residents were provided with information about all those who are involved in conservation and interpretation in Dinwiddie County. Finally, landowners were given information about the GMP process, Dinwiddie County's Comprehensive Planning process and the proposed County Battlefield Trails planning effort. Twelve landowners attended and participated in the meetings.

Scoping: Public Workshops

Four scoping workshops were held in May 2001 in Dinwiddie County, Fort Lee (Prince George County) Hopewell, and Petersburg. The park sent over 700 letters to residents and agencies and distributed press releases to Petersburg and Richmond area papers. At the workshops, community members heard a brief presentation on the continuation of the park's GMP process. Participants were then involved in a variety of small and large group exercises to gather ideas and issues on visitor use, interpretation, resource protection and partnerships. Comment sheets were also distributed to participants who wanted to capture more extensive thoughts. More than 140 community members and agency staff participated at the workshops.

A summary of the comments received at the workshops was posted on the park's website in June 2001. The summary reflected the thoughts of many participants and was not edited, appearing as they were originally recorded. Following the workshops, the park superintendent and other staff met with locality representatives from cities of Hopewell and Petersburg and Dinwiddie County to discuss their ideas, concerns and potential partnerships. The results of these meetings helped the planning team to determine the key issues for the GMP and develop different options for future park management.

Conceptual Alternatives Public Workshops

In March 2002, the park sent over 800 letters to residents and agencies and distributed press releases to Petersburg and Richmond area papers in April 2002 inviting the community to participate in conceptual alternatives workshops for the GMP. Recommendations from the draft lands

assessment plus an explanation of the philosophy for each of the four alternatives was presented at four meetings in Dinwiddie County, Fort Lee, Hopewell and Petersburg in May 2002. A newsletter detailing the key issues, alternatives and planning process was distributed at the meeting, by mail to 800 residents and posted on the park's website. Participants at the meetings were asked for comments on what they liked or disliked about each of the four alternatives. Comment sheets were provided again for more in-depth thoughts. Over 50 residents and agency staff attended the four workshops.

The workshop participants' comments were posted on park's website in July 2002. The GMP planning team collected hundreds of ideas and concerns that were taken into consideration in the development of this draft GMP/EIS.

Briefings to Elected Officials

Throughout this GMP planning effort, the park superintendent and other staff in conjunction with local elected officials, have met with Congressman Randy Forbes, Senator George Allen and Senator John Warner. During these visits, information about the proposed boundary expansion, community support, conceptual alternatives and future park development was presented and discussed. These members of Congress and their staff provided ideas, suggestions and support for the continuation of the GMP process.

A detailed list of the recipients begins on page 189. In addition, this document is available on the park's website at www.nps.gov/pete and in all public libraries of municipalities adjacent to the park.

Compliance With Specific Laws & Regulations

In developing Petersburg NB General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, the NPS will follow all applicable regulations, laws, policies and executive orders. A list of those relevant to this planning effort follows.

Federal Laws and Regulations

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and Council of Environmental Quality Regulations as amended

This planning document includes an environmental impact statement to evaluate the impact of NPS actions on the quality of the environment. Important benefits are expected to accrue within Petersburg NB, but minor short-term impacts would be expected in specific areas where vegetation would change or new construction would cause disturbance. A number of issues will require further inventory and analysis when more information becomes available or ongoing studies are completed. In these cases, further compliance would be required when specific actions, not identified or evaluated in this document, are considered for implementation.

Federal Water Pollution Act as amended, Clean Water Act as amended, and Interagency Chesapeake Bay Agreement as amended

Any NPS action with the potential to affect water quality must comply with these laws and applicable agreements and regulations. Careful siting of ground disturbing activity would minimize the impact, and plans would include all appropriate erosion and sedimentation control measures to maintain mandated water quality. Recommendations

from the ongoing earthworks project would be followed, along with guidelines in the Earthworks Management Manual, and experience of other national parks.

Endangered Species Act of 1973 as amended, Endangered Species Act as amended, and Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act as amended

This planning process included consultation with the Virginia Natural Heritage Program and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure that NPS actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or critical habitat. These consultations and inventories by Petersburg NB staff have not identified any critical species or habitat within the park; however, several are located in the immediate vicinity. The actions identified in this document will increase the amount of habitat favored by these species.

Clean Air Act, as amended

Petersburg NB is classified as a Class II clean air area. Maximum allowable increases of sulfur dioxide, particulate matter and nitrogen oxides beyond baseline concentrations established for Class II areas can not and will not be exceeded through NPS actions resulting from this document. Antiquities Act as amended, Historic Sites, Buildings and Antiquities Act as amended, National Historic Preservation Act as

amended, Archeological Resources Protection Act as amended, Archeological and Historic Preservation Act as amended, Museum Properties Act as amended, and Executive Order 11593, "Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment" The protection and preservation of cultural resources by NPS are mandated by these authorities. Consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council is required for all activities that identify, preserve, impact or otherwise affect cultural resources. The proposals for the Five Forks Unit in Alternative C would require inventory, submission of Determinations of Eligibility and review by both the state and federal compliance agencies before these actions could be implemented. All mitigation appropriate to ongoing maintenance activities, new construction or changes in management practice, or emergencies would be completed in consultation with these state and federal partners.

Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

In keeping with the intent of these laws, all NPS structures would be accessible to all Americans to the greatest degree possible.

Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations"

More than 76 percent of the Petersburg, Virginia population could be identified as low-income or minority. Federal agencies are required to evaluate the effects of their actions on minority or low-income populations. The proposals in each of these alternatives could affect these populations. The specific impacts are identified above,

in this chapter's sections on each alternative. Potential overlay zones targeting economic development funding and other actions by local and state partners could attract significant investment into the Petersburg region. This would have a positive impact on the economy and the quality-of-life for all residents.

Executive Order 11988, "Floodplain Management" and Executive Order 11990, "Protection of Wetlands"

The protection of floodplain and wetland values is mandated by these orders. Development of new buildings and roads would not be located in critical areas. The historical trail system would be extended and a bridge constructed within the 100-year flood plain in Alternatives B and C. These trails would be no more than five feet wide and would not have hard surfaces. Grading would be kept to a minimum, and erosion would be controlled through siting, water bars and other erosion control techniques. Construction of the bridge will require a statement of finding and a separated environmental compliance document.

Executive Order 13112, "Invasive Species"

Federal agencies are required to restrict introduction of invasive species into natural ecosystems on lands and in waters they administer and to encourage states, local governments and others to prevent their introduction into the country's natural ecosystems. Resource management strategies, including vegetative conservation strategies on earthworks, would be designed to comply with this order. This supersedes Executive Order 11987 "Exotic Organisms".

Director's Order #77-1, "Wetland Protection", and Procedural manual #77-1

Wetlands have been identified in all the park units. Alternatives B and C create unavoidable impacts to wetlands. As per the NPS no-net-loss policy, mitigation has been proposed in the form of compensation-in. In Alternative B this would occur in the Hatcher's Run watershed in Five Forks and in Alternative C it would occur in the same watershed on Poor Creek. In both cases, the mitigation would exceed a 1:1 ratio.

Agreement of Federal Agencies on Ecosystem Management in the Chesapeake Bay-July 14, 1994, Chesapeake Bay Riparian Buffer Plan, and Clean Water Action Plan

Restoring and Protecting America's Waters: This plan considered the recommendations and NPS commitments contained in these documents. Alternatives B and D would create an impact on the riparian corridors along tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay. The decisions to impact these corridors are made in compliance with the guidelines for evaluation identified on page 8 of the Chesapeake Bay Riparian Buffer Plan and again in Appendix C: Riparian Buffering Options of the same document.

Commonwealth of Virginia Statutes and Regulations Title 10.1-1188 (b) "State Environmental Review Process"

This statute identifies the state role in the environmental review process.

Title 10.1 "Virginia Water Quality Improvement Act of 1997" and Title 10.1 "Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law" as amended

These statutes establish the regulations concerning water quality, point and non-point pollution programs, and control of soil erosion, sediment deposition and runoff impacts on surface water and other natural resources.

Title 10.1-1308 "Virginia Air Quality Regulations"

This statute establishes the regulations for air quality.

Section 29.1-564-568 "Virginia Endangered Species Act" as amended and Section 3.1-1020-1030 "Virginia Endangered Plant and Insect Act"

These statutes identify the regulations that protect threatened or endangered plants, animals and insects.

Title 10.1-2200 "Virginia Cultural Resources", Title 10.1 "Virginia Antiquities Act", and Title 15.2-2306 "Preservation of Virginia Historic Resources"

These statutes identify local ordinances and state regulations that protect cultural, historic and archeological resources.

TABLE 8
RELEVANT STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

Federal Statutes

Clean Air Act, as amended (Public Law 88-206)
 Farmland Protection Policy Act
 Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Public Law 93-205)
 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 United States code 661, et seq.)
 National Historic Preservation Act of 1969 (Public Law 89-665)
 Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended
 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (Public Law 94-580)
 Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (Public Law 93-523)
 Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 (16 USC 1101, et seq.)
 Wetlands Conservation Act (Public Law 101-233)
 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act
 Clean Water Act, as amended (Public Law 95-217)
 Coastal Zone Management Act
 Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990

Executive Orders (E.O.)

E.O.	11296	Flood Hazard Evaluation Guidelines
E.O.	11514	Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality
E.O.	11593	Protection and Enhancement of Cultural Environment
E.O.	11988	Protection of Floodplains
E.O.	11990	Protection of Wetlands
E.O.	12898	Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations
E.O.	13007	Sacred Indian Trust
E.O.	13112	Invasive Species
E.O.	13123	Greening the Government Through Efficient Energy, Management Energy Conservation and Production Act

Commonwealth of Virginia Statutes

Chesapeake Preservation Act of 1988
 Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management
 Virginia Coastal Resources Management Program
 Erosion and Sediment Control Law and Regulations (VESCL 10 1-5467)
 Stormwater Management Law and Regulations (VSWM 10 1-60315)
 Regulations for Control and Abatement of Air Pollution
 Asbestos Removal and Disposal ((VAC 20-80-640)

National Park Service Director's Orders

D.O.	2	Park Planning
D.O.	12	Environmental Impact Analysis
D.O.	17	Tourism
D.O.	25	Land Protection
D.O.	28	Cultural Resources Management
D.O.	47	Sound Preservation and Noise Management
D.O.	61	National Cemetery Operations
D.O.	77	Natural Resource Protection
D.O.	87B	Alternative Transportation Systems

Agency Consultation

Cultural Resources

Potential impacts on the park's cultural resources will be addressed under the provisions for assessing effects outlined in 36 CFR Part 800, regulations issued by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) implementing section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA; 16 USC 470 et seq.) Under the "Criteria of Effect" (36 CFR Part 800.9(a)), federal undertakings are considered to have an effect when they alter the character, integrity, use of cultural resource, or the qualities that qualify a property for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

The NPS will consult with the Virginia State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO) and the ACHP to ensure that NPS operations, management and administration provide for the site's cultural resources in accordance with the intent of NPS policies and with sections 106, 110, and 111 of the NHPA, as stated in the 1995 programmatic agreement (PA) among the NPS, the ACHP and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. Under section V.A. of the programmatic agreement, all undertakings that are not considered programmatic exclusions would be reviewed in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.

Internally, the NPS will complete an "Assessment of Actions Having an Effect on Cultural Resources" (XXX form) prior to implementation of any proposed action. The form would document any projected effects and outline actions proposed to mitigate any effects. All implementing actions for cultural resources will be reviewed using the XXX form and reviewed by the park's team of cultural resource advisors as specified in the 1995 PA, as amended.

Before any ground-disturbing action by the NPS, the park's archeologist will determine the need for archeological inventory or testing. Any such studies will be carried out and evaluated for effect before construction, in consultation with the state historic preservation officer, and the ACHP.

Staff from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources participated in the May 2001 scoping meetings and the May 2002 conceptual alternatives workshops. The park superintendent and staff briefed the State Historic Preservation Officer in June 2002 about the GMP process, expansion of interpretive themes and the likely impact of potential future development on historic resources. The SHPO provided favorable comments on the conceptual alternatives in a letter dated June 24, 2002.

Natural Resources

The NPS has worked through informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Virginia Department Game and Inland Fisheries (VDGIF) concerning endangered and threatened species and critical habitat. No action under the currently proposed alternatives will cause significant adverse effects on endangered or threatened species. VDGIF is a consulting agency under the U.S.

permits from the states or other federal agencies will be obtained prior to action.

In summer 2002, the park requested that the USFWS review the conceptual alternatives and other development actions proposed in the GMP. In a letter dated August 15, 2002 the USFWS stated that they believed that the selection of any of the conceptual alternatives is not likely to adversely affect federally listed species.



Bonaccord House at City Point.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), providing environmental analysis of projects or permit applications coordinated with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality and other state and federal agencies.

During the NEPA compliance process, consultation with the appropriate agencies will ensure compliance with all state air and water quality standards. Any actions in floodplains or wetlands in the park will comply with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 (floodplain management and wetlands protection). Any necessary approvals or

As individual projects are implemented from the GMP, and where environmental assessments are necessary, a determination will be made concerning the environmental consequences of the proposed action. If no significant adverse affects are identified, a finding of no significant impact will be prepared and appended to the GMP. This finding will conclude the compliance process for the National Environmental Policy Act for the involved actions.

Table 8 contains a partial listing of laws, regulations and policies that pertain to the planning process.

List of Preparers

National Park Service

Northeast Regional Office

Marie Rust, *Regional Director*

Robert W. McIntosh, *Associate Regional Director for Planning and Partnerships*

Terrence D. Moore, *Chief of Park Planning and Special Studies*

Helen Mahan, *Community Planner and Project Leader*

Christine Gobrial, *Community Planner*

Peter Iris-William, *Park Planner*

Deirdre Gibson, *Park Planning Program Manager (former)*

Petersburg National Battlefield

Bob Kirby, *Superintendent*

Chris Calkins, *Chief of Interpretation & Visitor Services*

Jerry Helton, *Chief of Maintenance*

Ike Kelley, *Chief Ranger*

Dave Shockley, *Chief of Resources Management*

James Blankenship, *Historian*

Tim Blumenschine, *Natural Resource Management Specialist*

Tracy Chernault, *Interpretive Specialist*

Richard Easterbrook, *GIS Specialist*

Robin Fuller, *Education Specialist*

Grant Gates, *Interpretive Specialist*

Harper's Ferry Center

Tom Tankersley, *Interpretive Planner*

Consultants

EA Engineering, Science, and Technology, Inc.

Christine Papageorgis, PhD, *Project Manager*

Mary Alice Koeneke, *Natural Resources*

Suzanne Boltz, *Social & Economic Resources*

Dan Raley, *Air Quality and Energy*

List of Recipients

State and Federal Elected Officials

Senator John W. Warner (VA)
Senator George Allen (VA)
Congressman Randy Forbes (4th District)
State Representative Riley E. Ingram (62nd District)
State Representative Fenton L. Bland, Jr. (63rd District)
State Representative J. Paul Council, Jr. (75th District)

Non-Governmental Organizations

Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Inc.
Civil War Preservation Trust
Civil War Round Table Associates
Eastern National
George Wright Society
The Izaak Walton League
Historic Petersburg Foundation, Inc.
Land Trust Alliance, Inc.
National Park and Conservation Association
National Park Foundation
National Trust for Historic Preservation
Pamplin Historical Park, Inc.
Richmond Civil War Round Table
Rincon Institute
Siege Museum
Sons of Confederate Veterans
The Conservation Fund
Virginia Council On Indians
Weston Manor, Inc.

Local Elected Officials

City of Colonial Heights Board of Supervisors
City of Hopewell City Council
City of Hopewell Mayor and Vice-Mayor
City of Petersburg City Council
City of Petersburg Mayor
Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors
Prince George County Board of Supervisors

Local Governments

Chesterfield County Planning Department
City of Colonial Heights Office of the City Administrator
City of Colonial Heights Historical Society
City of Hopewell Chamber of Commerce
City of Hopewell Office of the City Manager
City of Petersburg Chamber of Commerce
City of Petersburg Office of the City Manager
City of Petersburg Planning Department
Crater Planning District Commission
Dinwiddie County Office of the County Administrator
Dinwiddie County Planning Department
Dinwiddie County Recreation Department
Prince George County Office of the County Administrator

State Agencies

Office of the Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
Virginia Department of Economic Development
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
Virginia Department of Historic Resources
Virginia Department of Transportation
Office of the Provost, Virginia Military Institute
Office of the Provost, Virginia State University

Federal Agencies

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
American Battlefield Protection Program
Appomattox Court House National Historical Park
Chesapeake Bay Partnership
Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park
Gettysburg National Military Park
Quartermaster Museum- Fort Lee
Richmond National Battlefield Park
U.S. Army Combined Support Command and Fort Lee
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service