# Attachment 2: Section 106 Consultation Summary

DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT AMONG

THE FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION, THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD,

THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS LOS ANGELES DISTRICT, THE CALIFORNIA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,

THE NEVADA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
AND DESERTXPRESS ENTERPRISES, LLC

**REGARDING** 

THE

BRIGHTLINE WEST – LAS VEGAS TO VICTOR VALLEY PROJECT IN BAKER, YERMO, AND BARSTOW IN SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA AND LAS VEGAS AND PRIMM IN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

### **Section 106 Consultation Summary December 2022**

#### **Summary**

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) prepared a re-evaluation pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the Brightline West – Las Vegas to Victor Valley project (Project) located in San Bernardino County, California, and Clark County, Nevada. Initially, FRA, in cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Surface Transportation Board (STB), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the National Park Service (NPS), prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in March 2009, a Supplemental DEIS in August 2010, a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in March 2011, and a Record of Decision (ROD) in July 2011. A Programmatic Agreement (PA) was executed on February 15, 2011 and lapsed in January 2018 pursuant to its terms before construction of the Project was initiated. FRA most recently completed a reevaluation of the FEIS and ROD in September 2020. In accordance with the re-evaluation, FRA has updated its Section 106 compliance documents.

#### **Initiation of Section 106 Consultation**

As part of its assessment of impacts, FRA formally initiated re-consultation with Tribes, agencies, and other consulting parties under the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106) in late March 2019 by identifying potential consulting parties and gathering information regarding historic properties which might be affected by the proposed Project.

#### **CRWG Meetings**

FRA conducted Cultural Resources Working Group (CRWG) telephone conference calls. FRA has held twelve CRWG teleconference workshops on the Project to date: October 10, November 21, and December 12, 2019; January 16, February 20, July 23, and August 27, 2020; July 22, August 26, November 16, and November 18, 2021; and June 15, 2022. CRWG workshops were cancelled in 2020 due to several factors, including in response to Tribal comments, but were resumed in July and August 2021. All Consulting Parties were invited to attend these CWRG workshops.

#### **CRWG Distributions**

- FRA distributed a draft Archaeological Survey Methodology Memorandum (ASMM) to the Consulting Parties on September 18, 2019. After receiving comments, FRA distributed the final ASMM to the Consulting Parties on November 22, 2020. A revised final ASMM was distributed on July 22, 2020. Consulting Tribes were also invited to participate in Tribal monitoring of archaeological surveys.
- To address concerns regarding the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the Project, FRA established the need for a visual analysis of the corridor to respond to the concerns more definitively and to expand the aboveground APE, if needed, as well as to provide additional detail on noise and vibration analyses. FRA presented the visual analysis to the CRWG on February 20, 2020, and requested that Consulting Parties provide comments on the approach of the analysis and any additional concerns prior to distribution of a revised APE. FRA subsequently distributed a revised draft APE on September 4, 2020, with expanded boundaries and an expanded visual

- analysis. After receiving further comments, FRA distributed a revised draft APE on June 15, 2021, and a revised final APE on September 30, 2021.
- FRA distributed the first draft of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) to the Consulting Parties on September 25, 2020, for review and comment. Several Consulting Parties provided comments.
- FRA distributed a draft Subsurface Archaeological Survey Work Plan to the Consulting Parties on August 20, 2021. After receiving comments, FRA distributed the final Subsurface Archaeological Survey Work Plan to the Consulting Parties on September 28, 2021.
- FRA distributed the draft Inventory Reports for archaeology and built environment on November 11, 2021, and after receiving and incorporating comments from Consulting Parties, FRA distributed the final reports to Consulting Parties on March 18, 2022. The Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred with FRA's eligibility determinations for the built environment in Nevada on December 6, 2021, and the California SHPO likewise concurred with FRA's eligibility determinations for the built environment in California on February 3, 2022.
- FRA distributed the draft built environment Findings of Effect and archaeology Findings of
  Eligibility and Effect reports to Consulting Parties for review and comment on May 27, 2022.
  The Nevada SHPO concurred with FRA's eligibility determinations for archaeological resources
  in Nevada on August 22, 2022 and the California SHPO likewise concurred with FRA's
  eligibility determinations for archaeological resources in California on MONTH DAY YEAR.
  Several Consulting Parties provided comments, and FRA distributed the revised final documents
  on October 21, 2022.

## **Individual Section 106 Consulting Party Consultation Summaries, 2019 to Present**

A summary of the number and types of consultation undertaken with each Section 106 consulting party between February 2019 and October 1, 2022, is presented below (Tables 1 and 2) based on the Project administrative record. When required, materials for distribution were sent both via email and via hard copy. Calls included individual calls as well as group conversations with multiple consulting parties. In addition, many calls are fully detailed within emails from FRA distributing meeting notes, meeting attendees, or other information; as such, more calls have taken place than are coded in the Calls column.

**Table 1: Quantities of Consultation between FRA and Consulting Parties** 

	Section 106 Consulting Party	Emails or Hard Copy Distributions from FRA or Consultants to Consulting Party	Calls from FRA or Consultants to Consulting Party (phone call, conf- refence call, or web- based call via WebEx, Microsoft Teams, or other platform)	Government to Government Meeting between FRA and Tribe, often In-Person (Agency may be Attendee)
Agency	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	94	5	0
Other	Brightline West	28	1	0
Agency	Bureau of Land Management - Barstow Field Office	163*	5	2

Aganari	Bureau of Land	163*	6	1
Agency		105	U	1
	Management - Las			
Δ	Vegas Field Office	1.42		1
Agency	California Office of	143	6	1
<b>A</b>	Historic Preservation	106		1
Agency	Caltrans	126	6	1
Tribe	Chemehuevi Indian	104	6	0
	Tribe of the			
	Chemehuevi			
	Reservation,			
	California			
Agency	Clark County	29	1	0
	Department of			
	Aviation			
Tribe	Colorado River	150	18	2
	Indian Tribes of the			
	Colorado River			
	Indian Reservation,			
	Arizona and			
	California			
Agency	Federal Aviation	35	0	0
8 )	Administration			
Agency	Federal Highway	104	5	0
rigency	Administration	101	3	
Tribe	Fort Mojave Indian	127	13	3
11100	Tribe of Arizona,	127	13	3
	California and			
	Nevada			
Tribe	Las Vegas Tribe of	96	9	0
11106	Paiute Indians of the	90	9	U
	Las Vegas Indian			
	Colony			
Tribe	Moapa Band of	127	9	0
Tribe		127	9	U
	Paiute Indians of the			
	Moapa River Indian			
m 11	Reservation	105	10	
Tribe	Morongo Band of	197	19	2
	Mission Indians			
Agency	National Park Service	76**	0	0
	- Mojave National			
	Preserve			
Agency	National Park Service	76**	0	0
	- Old Spanish Trail			
Agency	Nevada Department	122	5	1
	of Transportation			
Agency	Nevada Office of	135	7	0
- •	Historic Preservation			
Other	Old Spanish Trail	21	2	0
	Association			
Tribe	Soboba Band of	145	11	2
	Luiseno Indians	-	-	
Agency	Surface	89	5	1
- 18-11-7	Transportation Board	Ü,	J	
Tribe	Timbisha Shoshone	141	17	0
11100	Tribe	171	1 /	
	11100			l

Tribe	Twenty-Nine Palms	160	13	2
	Band of Mission			
	Indians			
Agency	US Army Corps of	95	5	0
	Engineers, Los			
	Angeles District			
Tribe	Yuhaaviatam of San	201	25	4
	Manuel Nation			

<sup>\*</sup>Significant quantities of emails to both BLM jurisdictions in California and Nevada overlapped.

Table 2: Section 106 Letters from FRA to Consulting Parties and SHPOs

Date	Recipient	Topic
9/18/2019	All	Area of Potential Effects, Archaeological Survey Methodology
		Memo
11/22/2019	All	Archaeological Survey
		Methodology Memo
9/4/2020	All	Area of Potential Effects
9/25/2020	All	Draft Programmatic Agreement Distribution
6/15/2021	All	Area of Potential Effects
10/1/2021	All	Area of Potential Effects finalization and responses to comments
11/5/2021	All	Draft Archaeology Technical Report Distribution
11/5/2021	All	Draft Built Environment Technical Report Distribution
3/18/2022	All	Final Built Environment Technical Report and Archaeology
		Technical Report Distribution
5/27/2022	All	Draft FOEs for Built Environment and Archaeology
10/21/2022	All	Final FOEs for Built Environment and Archaeology

<sup>\*\*</sup> Significant quantities of emails to both NPS jurisdictions overlapped.