

JEFF CAR 2015 S106 Meeting Notes #6, JULY 31, 2012

Topic: Discussion of Draft Programmatic Agreement

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	X
Peter Clogston	FHWA	Peter.Clogston@dot.gov	
Louise Brodnitz	ACHP	lbrodnitz@achp.gov	X
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	strautman@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	X
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@metroslouis.org	
Andrea Hunter	Osage Nation-Tribal Historic Preservation Officer	ahunter@osagetribe.org	
James Munkres	Osage Nation	jmunkres@osagetribe.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@peoriatribes.com	
Frank Hecksher	Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma	fhecksher@peoriatribes.com	
Jeff Durbin	NPS Washington Office	Jeffrey_Durbin@nps.gov	X
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	
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
Don Klima	Consultant – CAR 2015	don@klimaconsultinggroup.com	X
Dan Niosi	NPS Environmental Quality Division	Dan_Niosi@nps.gov	
Greg Cody	NPS Denver Service Center	Greg_Cody@nps.gov	X
Margo Brooks	NPS Denver Service Center	Margo_Brooks@nps.gov	
Ron Shields	NPS Denver Service Center	Ron_Shields@nps.gov	
Rich Kagiyama	NPS Denver Service Center	Rich_Kagiyama@nps.gov	
Chris Lewis	NPS Denver Service Center	Christopher_lewis@nps.gov	
Phil Lawrence	NPS Denver Service Center	Philip_lawrence@nps.gov	

I. Introductions

II. Review of Draft PA's

The group agreed to use Margo's questions and comments (see her email of July 30, 2012) as the basis of discussion.

Questions & Comments

General

1. Whereas clauses: Has the Coast Guard, FHWA & US Army Corps designated NPS "lead federal agency" for this project? We can change the wording to say that by signing the agreement that we are designated lead federal agency.

Discussion Outcome: Project as currently planned will result in a river discharge and require permitting (presently anticipated to be nationwide permit). Alan (USACOE) will discuss project with the agency's Section 106 specialist to determine necessity of designating in writing the NPS as the lead federal agency (fourth whereas clause of CAR 2015 PA). Alan foresees minimal involvement of US Coast Guard in project, but will discuss further with Coast Guard.

2. Whereas Clause: NPS has identified the APE... and other places where ACHP wants us to indicate that the SHPO has concurred, we should state that by signing the agreement the SHPO concurs.

Discussion Outcome: Group consensus this is o.k.

3. The Osage Nation has been the only tribe actively consulting, but two additional tribes have expressed interest in this project. All should be given the opportunity to sign and be referenced in the agreement before the PA is finalized.

Discussion Outcome: Reserve discussion until later.

5. We should have one whereas clause for invited signatories and one for concurring parties.

Discussion Outcome: Reserve discussion until later.

7. Should the city be invited as a concurring party? What is their relationship with GRG?

Discussion Outcome: City was invited and chose not to participate. Great River Greenways is "working in lockstep with the City. Consensus among group this is not an issue.

8. Applicability and Scope—For the most part, NPS has agreed to do the DOEs for GRG—unless they decide to conduct an archeological study on their own. I am not sure NPS wants to consult on behalf of GRG. This is something that we should continue to work out.

Discussion Outcome: Further discussion/coordination needed.

New PA

1. The new PA does not cover public involvement, which has been a very big point of contention.

Discussion Outcome: Need to determine what exactly public involvement is designed to accomplish. Should public involvement be a component of design review? The current language in PA may be too vague.

2. Missouri Preservation have not actively participated in the process. Should they? If so, how do we get them involved? If they do not engage, I would not invite them as a signatory.

Bill Hart (Missouri Alliance for Historic Preservation) and Jennifer Sandy (National Trust for Historic Preservation) will be sent draft PA and invited to participate in consultations. Ann to provide an email address for each.

3. Archeological Resources—Identification & Mitigation

- The consultative process should be better defined so that we can add the appropriate amount of time into the design schedule and hopefully make a more effective consultative strategy.
- Survey Methodology: This is fine to sign; however, it would be beneficial for us to continue to consult to determine an appropriate survey methodology now, rather than wait until after the PA is signed.
- GRG may also be responsible for archeology. NPS will not do their archeology for them, so the strategy must be broad enough to include both GRG & NPS.

Conference call ended before item discussed.

4. Establishment of a Collaborative Design Review Team

- I would include all signatories to the PA in the team.
- Even if all signatories are not included, Great River Greenways must be included.
- This section must be more specific on the design review process, even if that is in an appendix.

Conference call ended before item discussed.

5. Great River Greenways has a defined role and must be a signatory

Conference call ended before item discussed.

III. Great River Greenways Design Review—Comments or Questions

Janet Wilding (Great Rivers Greenway) provided central riverfront graphics to facilitate review of the 20% schematic designs that are available for review until August 21, 2012. The graphics were posted to PEPC as an internal document on July 31, 2012 – title is Central Riverfront Conceptual Graphics.

IV. Next Steps

Comments regarding CAR 2015 PA due by close-of-business Friday, August 3. Please email comments to Don Klima (don@klimaconsultinggroup.com), Maggie (maggie.hales@cityarchriver.org), Margo (margo_brooks@nps.gov), and Greg (greg_cody@nps.gov).

Margo/Greg will consolidate comments, and Margo will forward comments with next conference call meeting announcement to the group on Monday, August 6.

Next consulting parties conference call is Tuesday, August 7 at 9:00 am (central time). The duration of the call will be two hours.

Thank you.