

From: Savanna Agardy <sagardy@utah.gov>

El - 31938

Sent: Monday, October 26, 2020 6:12 PM

To: Tabachnick, Alan <alan.tabachnick@stb.gov>

Cc: Wolff, Mikenna <Mikenna.Wolff@icf.com>; Christopher Merritt <cmerritt@utah.gov>;
Christopher Hansen <clhansen@utah.gov>

Subject: Re: Uinta Basin Railway Project, OEA's Draft Technical Memorandum

Hi Alan,

SHPO staff have looked over the Technical Memorandum, and consensus is that the document is really high quality and thoroughly addresses eligibility and effect considerations. We do have a couple of comments in relation to the historic properties:

42UT1370, the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad recorded segments, are described as ineligible. The proper term here for the ineligible segments of an eligible site is *non-contributing*, as the entire is eligible, regardless of whether specific segments contribute to its eligibility or not.

Several of the architectural properties are described as National Folk Style, however that is not really a term that Utah uses and it is not included in our architectural style database because the type is too broad. Another term, appropriate to each property, should be selected from the architecture style guide that SHPO has developed:

https://issuu.com/utah10/docs/architectural_guide_booklet

In addition to seeking SHPO concurrence on eligibility determinations, do you also intend to seek SHPO concurrence on the project determination of effect (i.e. Adverse Effect)?

Let us know if you have any follow-up questions.

Thanks,

Savanna

On Fri, Oct 23, 2020 at 11:46 AM Tabachnick, Alan <alan.tabachnick@stb.gov> wrote:

Dear Consulting Party,

As we have discussed during our Consulting Party teleconferences over the past months, we have been working on the Historic Properties Technical Memorandum for the Uinta Basin Railway project. Due to file size, the Tech Memo will be shared via OneDrive. Please look for an email with the subject line *"Wolff, Mikenna shared the folder "_UBR Historic Properties Technical Memorandum" with you."*. The files are ready for your review and I look forward to discussing them with you over the coming weeks. Your input is valuable and will help make the Section 106 process as strong and effective as possible. Please send your comments to me by email and copy Mikenna Wolff of ICF (Mikenna.Wolff@icf.com) by Monday, November 23rd.

To simplify your review, I have provided the text of the Tech Memo in Word format. To the greatest extent possible, please offer your comments in the form of tracked changes in the document. You may also wish to offer comments in an email. I have also provided the Tech Memo attachments in .pdf format.

Our regularly scheduled Consulting Party Teleconference is next week, Wednesday, October 28th. A portion of this month's teleconference will cover what you can expect in the Tech Memo. This meeting, as well as the November meeting, will provide a forum for you to verbally share comments and questions. This draft version of the Historic Properties Tech Memo will also be appended to the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Please feel free to email or call me if you have trouble accessing the Tech Memo or if you have questions or concerns. I look forward to your input on this important document.

Thank you for your ongoing participation in Section 106 consultation. Stay safe.

Alan Tabachnick

Historic Preservation Specialist Office of
Environmental Analysis Surface
Transportation Board 395 E Street SW
Washington, DC 20423
Office: 202-245-0367
Cell: 215-370-3579

--

Savanna Agardy
Compliance Archaeologist
Utah State Historic Preservation Office