



**Meeting
Notes**

Attendees: Mary Hassell, FRA
Colleen Vaughn FRA
Margie Miguez, AAF
John Flint, AAF
Ginny Jones, SHPO
Tim Parsons, SHPO
Daniel Mclamon, SHPO
Melvin Brown, HNTB
Angelique Bochnak, AMEC
Martin Marchaterre, AMEC
Ken Hardin, Janus
Amy Streelman, Janus
Lisa Standley, VHB
Chris Rife, VHB
Lucy Wayne, SouthArc
Martin Dickinson, SouthArc

Date/ Time: 8 July 2013

Project No.: 61827

Place: Telecom

Re: AAF-FRA-SHPO Coordination

Notes taken by: Chris Rife

Following introductions, M. Hassell stated that FRA has decided not to use the “substitution approach” for streamlining the NEPA and NHPA Section 106 consultation process.

K. Hardin summarized the March 28, 2013 SHPO/ AAF meeting; minutes from that meeting were circulated by M. Miguez after the telecom. K. Hardin acknowledged the SHPO’s assistance and cooperation in expeditiously moving this project through the Section 106 process.

L. Standley stated that only one tribe, the Seminole Tribe of Florida, has responded to an invitation to be a consulting party, and they declined but want to be kept informed about the project.

C. Vaughn inquired if other parties were identified as potential consulting parties. K. Hardin responded that SHPO had recommended, for this project, that the scoping process be used to identify interested parties. For the prior EA, county and local historic preservation staff were invited, however this project will not involve new station locations that would extend into historic districts. He reported that during the scoping meetings no historic preservation staff or others indicated their interest in becoming consulting parties.

C. Vaughn inquired if the Hobe Sound National Wildlife Refuge had been contacted, as there is a known archaeological site within and adjacent to the Railroad ROW. K. Hardin responded that the Refuge had not been contacted but that AAF would reach out to the Refuge management. FWS was contacted during scoping project and has not yet responded. M. Hassell noted that National Park

Service had been contacted during the scoping process and provided comments, but did not request to be a consulting party.

K. Hardin and A. Strelman summarized the methodology used for determining the APE and conducting the reconnaissance work. The APE for the North-South Corridor duplicates the APE used for the EA in the West Palm Beach to Miami segment, as previously approved. The APE was the Railroad ROW, and the reconnaissance area extended 150 feet from the edge of the railroad ROW. For the East-West Corridor, the archaeological APE will consist of the proposed footprint of the limits of disturbance. The historic resources survey work will rely on previous investigations and conduct new work where construction is proposed outside of areas previously studied for an area up to 150 feet from the edge of proposed ROW. Although this was not specifically discussed during the conference call, for purposes of clarity, the APE for the Airport Rail Alignment and vehicle maintenance facility (VMF) is summarized here as well. The APE for the Airport Rail Alignment will include the limits of the site and 150 feet from the edge of the site limits. The APE for the VMF will include the site limits only.

J. Flint noted that the staging areas would be within the North-South Corridor Railroad ROW for construction, but along the East-West Corridor they would all be within the Project ROW; no additional study is required for these staging areas.

K. Hardin and A. Strelman summarized the study findings. The only historic properties within the Railroad ROW APE are bridges along the North-South Corridor, with the exception of historic platform supports that were identified within the ROW. The reconnaissance survey noted that individual resources and historic districts near the alignment were not as dense in the northern portion as in the southern portion.

K. Hardin summarized the archaeological sites. A known archaeological site at the National Wildlife Refuge, a scattering of shells and lithics in a dune, would have been impacted by a curve design in the original configuration. A redesign of the curve has avoided impacts to this site. SHPO has agreed that there would be no adverse impact to this site as proposed construction would not disturb the ground, and that appropriate avoidance measures have been taken. Field crews are currently investigating the East-West Corridor outside of the SR528 right-of-way; one site within the Orlando Airport was previously identified and determined ineligible for the National Register.

K. Hardin summarized potential effects to cultural resources. Thirteen bridges that may contribute to the FEC Railway as a linear historic district, that includes four individually NR-eligible bridges were described. SHPO has agreed that with consultation on design this would not result in adverse effects. Because of the nature of the project improvements, no known archaeological sites would be disturbed. The noise and vibration study underway will assess the potential for adverse effects to adjacent historic districts.

K. Hardin summarized consultation and public involvement. AAF will reach out to the NWR. Local preservation groups were previously contacted and did not express any concerns. Historic and archaeological sites will be avoided, and concurrence from SHPO on a conditional "no adverse effect" determination is expected, as was done for the EA.

C. Vaughn requested assurance from SHPO regarding these conclusions. G. Jones stated that SHPO is comfortable that AAF has properly consulted with them and that, at this point, with the preliminary finding that there would be no adverse effects to cultural resources from the project. C. Vaughn requested written concurrence from SHPO regarding the APE and methodology. She stated that meeting minutes and email statements would be sufficient.

K. Hardin stated that the project is now in the documentation phase. Because the project is on a tight schedule, the team is looking for ways to streamline the review process. They are working to produce a Cultural Resources Assessment Survey Report that will identify historic resources within the APE, which will be submitted to SHPO for concurrence. The next step would be the Determination of Effects Case Study. He suggested that the results of this study (determination of

effects) would be provided in the DEIS, rather than seeking SHPO review and concurrence prior to the DEIS. The results normally memorialized in the Case Study will be included in the DEIS. The DEIS would include a cover letter to SHPO explaining this modification of the typical procedure. G. Jones agreed that this, as a project-specific approach, was acceptable. She indicated that SHPO could provide a single letter of concurrence with the DEIS and the Findings, and noted that the DEIS should include information about avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. K. Hardin noted that the approach would streamline the process to the extent practical, with an “opt out” provision if needed. All agreed.