



Re: PMRE 2011 Archaeological Survey Report

Barbara Hotchkin

to:

Catherine.Glidden

02/10/2012 06:20 PM

Cc:

"Brian Lindamood", "Judy Bittner", shina.duvall, "Summer Rickman",

Elizabeth.Grover, Vicki.Rutson

Hide Details

From: "Barbara Hotchkin" <Hotchkinb@akrr.com> Sort List...

EI-18810

CG

FD 35095

To: <Catherine.Glidden@stb.dot.gov>

Cc: "Brian Lindamood" <LindamoodB@akrr.com>, "Judy Bittner" <judy.bittner@alaska.gov>, <shina.duvall@alaska.gov>, "Summer Rickman" <summer.rickman@alaska.gov>, <Elizabeth.Grover@hdrinc.com>, <Vicki.Rutson@stb.dot.gov>

Cathy and Shina,

We are looking forward to working with you on the draft 2011 Survey Report. We think it would be beneficial to have a call to discuss your thoughts early next week. We are pleased to take on the responsibility to revise the report and plan to begin some initial edits right away. We would appreciate your thoughts on the following approach.

Proposed Approach – ARRC, with assistance from HDR, will:

1. Review and edit the report to correct grammatical errors and improve overall organization and readability
2. Remove information regarding the Haul Road survey and discovery of the possible cultural feature from the report. The report will only include discussion of the surveys for Segment 1 and the Section 6 Borrow Area and recommendations for no additional surveys in Segment 6 (due to previous surveys and heavily disturbed area/existing ROW). This approach is consistent with the Working Group MOU, which acknowledges in Section 5(K)(1) that reports may be submitted as surveys for each project segment/component are completed. Our ongoing consultation with SHPO as we were preparing the draft report did not lead us to believe that keeping the information on the access road and findings in the report would be a concern since the Haul Road survey is not part of the APE, but since it seems to be creating problems, we will remove it.
3. Address any additional comments provided by STB and SHPO on the draft report submitted on January

26, 2012

4. Submit the final report (covering survey results for Segment 1 and the Section 6 Borrow Area) in accordance with the PA and MOU, with a revised cover letter seeking approval to proceed with construction in Segment 1, the Section 6 Borrow Area, and Segment 6.
5. Notify contractors that they cannot under any circumstances, use the proposed Haul Road until additional surveys, as necessary, are conducted and necessary approvals are obtained. If you would like, we will submit a revised APE drawing showing this area is excluded from the APE.
5. Prepare a separate report addressing the Haul Road, and submit it in draft form for your review. We may need further consultation with you on this item, as the access road is no longer part of the APE, and may never be part of the APE, so it is unclear if additional surveys are needed or if a DOE is needed. The possible cultural feature has been reported to the Office of History and Archaeology for inclusion in their statewide database. Typically DOE's are only needed for resources identified in the APE. As Shina may have mentioned, sufficient information regarding the possible cultural feature is not available at this time to make recommendation of National Register eligibility. Additional information would need to be obtained in the spring after the snow melts. If there are future plans to construct the proposed Haul Road, we may try to realign the road to avoid the possible cultural feature.

I know you are both very busy, but please try to find the time for a brief conference call. Shina – is there any chance you can fit it in your schedule on Tuesday? Please let me know your availability ASAP. Thanks, Barb.

>>> <Catherine.Glidden@stb.dot.gov> 2/10/2012 1:55 PM >>>

Barbara,

I will be out of the office until Tuesday of next week. However, if you want to start editing the document pursuant to my comments to date, please feel free to do so. Many of the grammatical and format issues could be done quickly. You can also make the document more fluid and easier to follow and make certain that it meets the SOI and AK SHPO standards. Both can be downloaded. I would also address the issue regarding the National Register eligibility of the site on the Haul Road. Please provide updated eligibility recommendations. If not, we will work directly with the SHPO to sort this out.

I will be discussing the entire report issue with Victoria Rutson, Director of the Office of Environmental Analysis, next week. She is already aware of the report's deficiencies as I have discussed in past emails to you.

All the best,
Cathy

Catherine Glidden
Environmental Protection Specialist
Office of Environmental Analysis
Surface Transportation Board
Washington, DC 20423
(202) 245-0293

-----"Barbara Hotchkin" <Hotchkinb@akrr.com> wrote: -----

To: "Shina A (DNR) duVall" <shina.duvall@alaska.gov>, <Catherine.Glidden@stb.dot.gov>
From: "Barbara Hotchkin" <Hotchkinb@akrr.com>
Date: 02/10/2012 03:54PM
Cc: "Brian Lindamood" <LindamoodB@akrr.com>, "Elizabeth Grover" <Elizabeth.Grover@hdrinc.com>
Subject: Re: PMRE 2011 Archaeological Survey Report

Catherine and Shina - I would like to have a brief conference call with both of you and Elizabeth ASAP if possible, so we can make some progress on revisions this afternoon. We have had previous discussion with SHPO on some the items in your e-mail. Please let me know your availability. We can use the ARRC bridge line (907-265-2252). Thanks, Barb

>>> <Catherine.Glidden@stb.dot.gov> 2/10/2012 10:30 AM >>>
Barbara,

I did get your voice mails, but need to head out of the office in a few minutes, so I thought I'd respond via email.

I will be providing some general comments to you early next week regarding some examples of problems I see with the report. I will also mark up a few pages with specific comments. I have been advised by members of my staff to request that you make the changes on your end and then provide the SHPO and STB with revised DRAFT documents for another round of reviews. In the meantime, I would suggest that you work with the SHPO to determine the likely eligibility of the site that was discovered along the Haul Road. This should be done since the area was surveyed and described in the report. The fact that "there is a strong possibility that the proposed Haul Road will not be constructed" does not justify skipping this step, especially since Site TYO-00276 appears to be the only significant site identified during the entire survey. What if the Haul Road IS constructed and the site is destroyed?

I would also have members of your staff begin an editorial overhaul of the report. There are multiple grammatical errors in the report that can be addressed right away. I would also be certain that the organization of the report is improved. For instance, the discussion of the probability areas and how they were derived needs to be more clearly discussed (discussion on pages 3 and the bottom of page 4 should be combined).

I understand that you have a tight schedule, but we will need to ensure that we only approve documents that meet the SOI and AK SHPO standards agreed to by all in the project MOU.

-Cathy

Catherine Glidden
Environmental Protection Specialist
Office of Environmental Analysis
Surface Transportation Board
Washington, DC 20423
(202) 245-0293

"Barbara Hotchkin" <Hotchkinb@akrr.com> wrote on 02/09/2012 12:59:10 PM:

> From: "Barbara Hotchkin" <Hotchkinb@akrr.com>
> To: <Catherine.Glidden@stb.dot.gov>
> Date: 02/09/2012 01:02 PM
> Subject: Re: PMRE 2011 Archaeological Survey Report
>
> Catherine,
>
> A copy of the word document is attached, with the maps and cover
> page removed to make it a manageable size. I agree that the
> document could been better written, and we would be happy to make
> any editorial corrections you would like. I noticed a few edits
> that I would like to make myself. However, given the risk of
> delaying construction and the associated costs, I hope that we can
> focus on the substance and conclusions in the report first, to get
> approval to proceed. I believe the report provides enough
> information to support the recommended finding of no historic
> properties affected for Segments 1 and 6 and the Section 6 Borrow

> Area based on the archaeological surveys. Prompt approval to proceed
> will not prevent us from making editorial corrections and finalizing
> the report, even if it is after clearing activities planned to begin
> this month have been initiated. We spoke with SHPO representatives
> yesterday, and they expect to have comments to us by Friday, and
> seem to agree with the findings. Thanks, Barb
>
>
> >>> <Catherine.Glidden@stb.dot.gov> 2/9/2012 5:25 AM >>>
> Barbara,
>
> Could you send me the report in Word? I am finding that the
> document has multiple grammatical errors and it would be much more
> efficient for me if I could just make the changes in Word. I find
> the report somewhat confusing and not well written. It appears to
> have been put together by multiple authors in a rather hurried,
> sketchy fashion. It will take me some time to sort through the
> document and figure out what changes to provide to you. If the
> report had been professionally edited I think I could have made the
> 15-day requested deadline, but now I'm not sure.
>
> -Cathy
>
> Catherine Glidden
> Environmental Protection Specialist
> Office of Environmental Analysis
> Surface Transportation Board
> Washington, DC 20423
> (202) 245-0293
>
> "Barbara Hotchkin" <Hotchkinb@akrr.com> wrote on 01/26/2012 08:50:49 PM:
>
> > From: "Barbara Hotchkin" <Hotchkinb@akrr.com>
> > To: "Judy Bittner" <judy.bittner@alaska.gov>,
> > <Catherine.Glidden@stb.dot.gov>
> > Cc: "Brian Lindamood" <LindamoodB@akrr.com>, "Shina A (DNR) duVall"
> > <shina.duvall@alaska.gov>, "Summer Rickman"
> > <summer.rickman@alaska.gov>, "Elizabeth Grover"
> > <Elizabeth.Grover@hdrinc.com>, "Angie Wade" <AWade@kniktribe.org>,
> > "Brad Sworts" <Brad.Sworts@matsugov.us>, "Fran Seager-Boss"
> > <Fran.Seager-Boss@matsugov.us>
> > Date: 01/26/2012 09:02 PM
> > Subject: PMRE 2011 Archaeological Survey Report
> >
> > Judy and Catherine,
> > In accordance with Stipulations III.B and IV of the Port MacKenzie
> > Rail Extension (PMRE) project PA, I am pleased to submit the Working
> > Group's 2011 Survey Report for a formal review. The PA stipulates a
> > 30-day review period. However, based on the negative results of the
> > survey for Segments 1 and 6 and the Section 6 Borrow Area, the
> > ongoing consultation between the Working Group and SHPO, and the
> > forthcoming onset of construction in Segment 1 (planned for
> > February), we respectfully request an expedited review. Please
> > provide comments or concurrence for the recommended finding by
> > February 10, 2012 if possible.
> > Please contact me at 907.265.2313 or Brian Lindamood at 907.265.3095
> > if you have questions or require additional information. Thanks, Barb
> >
> >
> >

> > Barbara C. Hotchkin
> > Alaska Railroad Corporation
> > 327 W. Ship Creek Ave.
> > Anchorage, AK 99501
> > Phone: (907) 265-2313
> > Fax: (907) 265-3961
> > hotchkinb@akrr.com
> > [attachment "2011 PMRE Survey Report letter to STB and SHPO
> > 012612.pdf" deleted by Catherine Glidden/STB] [attachment
> > "PMRE-2011Survey_OHA-crrcvrsht.pdf" deleted by Catherine Glidden/
> > STB] [attachment "2011 PMRE Final report-01262012.pdf" deleted by
> > Catherine Glidden/STB] [attachment "2011 PMRE Final
> report-01262012-nofigures.docx" deleted by Catherine Glidden/STB]