

JEFF CAR 2015 S106 FINAL Meeting Notes #4, JULY 3, 2012

Topic: Review of Outstanding Issues & Project Review Process & Effect Determination/Mitigation

Call Information: 9 AM Central Time Call #: 866-712-4580 Passcode: 8485149#

Participants:

<i>Invited</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Email</i>	<i>Participated</i>
Peggy Casey	FHWA	peggy.casey@dot.gov	
Greg Budd	FHWA	gregory.budd@dot.gov	
Louise Brodnitz	ACHP	lbrodnitz@achp.gov	
Najah Duvall-Gabriel	ACHP	ngabriel@achp.gov	
Alan Edmonson	USCAE, St. Louis Regulatory Branch	Alan.R.Edmondson@usace.army.mil	x
Matthew Mangan	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Marion IL Suboffice	Matthew_Mangan@fws.gov	
Charlie Scott	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Columbia Ecological Services Field Office	columbiaES@fws.gov	
Justin S. Coder	Sector Upper Mississippi River Command Center, Eighth District U.S. Coast Guard	Justin.S.Coder@uscg.mil	
Susan Trautman	Great River Greenway	strauman@grgstl.org	
Janet Wilding	Great River Greenway	jwilding@grgstl.org	x
Judith Deel	MO Historic Preservation Office	Judith.deel@dnr.mo.gov	x
Bob Reeder	MO Department of Transportation	Robert.reeder@modot.mo.gov	
Anne Haaker	IL Historic Preservation Agency	anne.haaker@illinois.gov	
Betsy Bradley	St. Louis Planning and Urban Design Agency	BradleyB@stlouiscity.com	
Walter L. Metcalfe, Jr.	CityArchRiver 2015 Foundation	wlmetcalfe@BryanCave.com	
Maggie Hales	CityArchRiver2015 Foundation	Maggie.hales@cityarchriver.org	x
Jenny Nixon	Metro Business Enterprises	jnixon@metrostlouis.org	
Andrea Hunter	Osage Nation-Tribal Historic Preservation Officer	ahunter@osage-tribe.org	x
James Munkres	Osage Nation	jmunkres@osage-tribe.org	x
Thomas Gamble	Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	tgamble@miamination.com	
George Strack	Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	gstrack@miamination.com	

John Froman	Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma	jfroman@peoriatribe.com	
Frank Hecksher	Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma	fhecksher@peoriatribe.com	
Jeff Durbin	NPS Washington Office	Jeffrey_Durbin@nps.gov	
Nick Chevance	NPS Midwest Region	Nicholas_Chevance@NPS.gov	
Kathy Schneider	NPS Midwest Region	Kathy_Schneider@nps.gov	x
Don Stevens	NPS Midwest Region	Don_Stevens@nps.gov	x
Karin Roberts	NPS Midwest Region	Karin_Roberts@nps.gov	x
Dawn Bringelson	NPS Midwest Region	Dawn_Bringelson@nps.gov	x
Tim Schilling	NPS Midwest Region	Tim_Schilling@nps.gov	x
Mark Lynott	NPS Midwest Region	Mark_Lynott@nps.gov	
Tom Bradley	NPS Jefferson National Expansion Memorial	Tom_Bradley@nps.gov	
Frank Mares	NPS Jefferson National Expansion Memorial	Frank_Mares@NPS.gov	
Ann Honious	NPS Jefferson National Expansion Memorial	Ann_Honious@nps.gov	x
Kathryn Thomas	NPS Jefferson National Expansion Memorial	Kathryn_Thomas@nps.gov	x
Dan Niosi	NPS Environmental Quality Division	Dan_Niosi@nps.gov	x
Greg Cody	NPS Denver Service Center	Greg_Cody@nps.gov	x
Margo Brooks	NPS Denver Service Center	Margo_Brooks@nps.gov	x
Ron Shields	NPS Denver Service Center	Ron_Shields@nps.gov	x
Rich Kagiyama	NPS Denver Service Center	Rich_Kagiyama@nps.gov	x

I. Introductions

- Documents sent for review prior to this meeting included:
 - Agenda
 - Draft meeting notes
 - Revised APE map
 - Justification for the expansion of the APE to include the St. Louis Mound Group
 - New text for archeological identification efforts

II. Review of Meeting #3 Draft Notes

- No changes. Draft accepted as final.

III. Discussion of New Area of Potential Effect

- New APE map tentatively accepted.

IV. Identification of Historic Properties

- Ann Honious is working with the City to see if there are any additional potential resources in the APE.
- Additional resources can be added as deemed necessary.
- Archeology plan tentatively accepted and will be added to the next PA draft.

- Janet Wilding asked if Great River Greenways would need to do archeology for its project and should budget money and time for that process. The discussion indicated that until design plans were available, it is unclear whether their project has the potential to affect archeological resources. For now, the PA provides a plan for conducting archeological studies, but we will be able to evaluate the need later as design is reviewed. Great River Greenways should understand that additional studies **could** be needed and budget for it accordingly, but the decision of whether and where studies would be needed is premature.

V. Cumulative/Connected Project Discussion (continued)

- Tabled for discussion until the ACHP can participate.

VI. Project Design Review Process & Effect Determinations/Mitigation

- Margo Brooks reviewed the stipulations VI and VII, which call for public meeting as at schematic and design development stages in design. Because design will be done concurrently but on different schedules for different project elements, this could lead to many public meetings.
- Ron Shields confirmed that NPS is expecting 8-10 separate design packages (16-20 public meetings) in addition to the Great River Greenways package.
- Kathryn Thomas indicated that ACHP felt that design review by the public was very important. Greg Cody agreed and asked if there may be a more efficient way to provide this opportunity to comment than currently exists in the draft PA.
- Several options were discussed for ensuring public participation in the process:
 - Public meetings at schematic design and only one or two meetings to discuss mitigation for adverse effects
 - Public review of online documents only advertised via press releases
 - A combination of online design review and public meetings
 - Combining some review into a public meeting if packages are ready to go to the same Development Advisory Board (DAB)* for approval
- There was concern about how to keep different meeting topics separate—i.e. when we have a S106 meeting we want to discuss potential effects of projects to historic properties or mitigation possibilities—not general design preferences.
- Participants asked for clarification on the NPS design process.
 - Generally NPS begins with predesign, which develops the overall project package and defines what will be designed. There often aren't plans developed at that stage.
 - Schematic design is the first stage where plans are developed. Many of the specifics are yet to be worked out at this stage, but the general project footprint and design direction should be worked out. This stage usually provides enough information to determine effects.
 - Design development is about 50% through the design process. It would incorporate any mitigations or design changes identified in the Schematic design process.
 - Construction documents. Design is being finalized at this stage and it is more difficult to make changes.
- Ron Shields and Rich Kagiyama indicated that the NPS design schedule is on a fast track. The Courthouse and Eli Smith Square are currently scheduled to go to the November DAB and several more projects are scheduled for March.

- They will provide a design schedule to Greg and Margo to see if some review efficiencies can be built around the schedule.
- Margo Brooks asked if there were any special requirements from consulting parties regarding how they received documents for review.
 - Discussion indicated that either SharePoint or PEPC would be a good vehicle for distributing design documents
 - Ron Shields will look into how signatories to the PA could be given access to SharePoint and how they might set up such a site.
 - Margo and Greg will look into PEPC and how it might be used. PEPC would be the best vehicle for getting the information to the public since it is able to collect public comments.
 - Janet Wilding asked how her team would get access to comments. This will depend upon the method we use.
 - Andrea Hunter indicated that the Osage Tribe would require hard copies of plans to be sent to the Chief, who would then distribute them to her office.
 - Andrea Hunter and James Munkres asked about when in the process they would understand the footprints of disturbance since they were most interested in archeological impacts. The impact areas for each project and effect finding would most likely be made initially at schematic design for each project element and mitigations or changes for avoidance would be incorporated into design development. This project is unlike other projects in that it will be designed in pieces because of time and funding constraints rather than being designed all at once.
 - Margo Brooks and Greg Cody asked that any additional ideas on how to structure the review process be sent to them. They will produce a new draft PA for review next week with changes indicated in red and comments on the previous document indicated in another color. One or more scenarios may be presented for dealing with the consulting party and public review processes.

VII. List of Meeting Agenda Topics (subject to change)

#	Date	Topic
1	06/08/12	PA Development Introductory Meeting & Optional Web Ex
2	6/19/12	Definition of Undertaking & APE
3	6/26/12	Review of new Undertaking Description and Continuation of APE Discussion/Identification of Historic Properties Discussion
4	7/3/12	Review of Outstanding Issues & Project Review Process & Effect Determination/Mitigation
5	7/10/12	Continuation of Project Review Process & Discussion of Revised Draft PA
6	7/24/12	Discussion of Final Draft Document

VI. Other Issues/Confirmation of Next Meeting Topic Immediate Review Needs

- Great River Greenways is at 20% schematic design and would like to get early consulting party review to determine if the design makes sense to go forth with at this point. No public review needed yet.
- The team discussed different mechanisms to aid the review—SharePoint, public PEPC, internal PEPC. The DSC will discuss further with Great River Greenways and come up with a pilot for conducting future reviews.
- We will try to get this first design set on review this month

General Design Concerns

- Ron Shields asked Maggie Hales and Janet Wilding to be sure to build the review requirements into contract documents.

VII. Action Items

<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Task</i>	<i>Date Added/ Completed</i>
Margo Brooks	Send out meeting notes #4 and agenda #5	7/2/12
Margo Brooks & Greg Cody	Speak to ACHP regarding the status of other privately funded parking garage proposals.	ongoing
DSC Team	Determine and set up efficient way for plan review	See revised PA
Ann Honious	Speak to City regarding additional potential resources within APE	ongoing
Memorial	Post materials on park web site	Ongoing
Various	Provide advance comments on PA	Ongoing

VIII. Next Meeting Date: July 10 @ 9 Central

* The Development Advisory Board (DAB) is a board made up of executive level NPS employees and external advisors who review design and construction projects for cost-effectiveness and the responsible use of NPS construction monies. This usually occurs at the end of schematic design and prior to design development phases.