



Re: PMRE - Proposed IDSHD Report Scope Change

Catherine Nadals to: Barbara Hotchkin

12/05/2013 10:24 AM

"Brad.Sworts@matsugov.us", Elizabeth Grover, Fran Seager-Boss,
Cc: "Heather Ralston (Heather.Ralston@matsugov.us)", "Bittner, Judy",
"Klaudia Klaudi (KKlaudi@kniktribe.org)", Brian Lindamood, "Porter,

Hi Barbara,

The revised scope appears to be reasonable. It is clear that there would be major problems/issues stemming from the continued district designation. Accordingly, we are in agreement with the change to a multiple property designation as long as the SHPO concurs with this approach.

-Cathy

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

Barbara Hotchkin

Judy and Cathy, Per the Implementation Plan, th...

12/04/2013 01:11:17 PM

From: Barbara Hotchkin <Hotchkinb@akrr.com>
To: "Catherine.Nadals@stb.dot.gov" <Catherine.Nadals@stb.dot.gov>, "Bittner, Judy" <judy.bittner@alaska.gov>
Cc: Elizabeth Grover <Elizabeth.Grover@hdrinc.com>, "Duvall, Shina A (DNR)" <shina.duvall@alaska.gov>, "Rickman, Summer L (DNR) (summer.rickman@alaska.gov)" <summer.rickman@alaska.gov>, Fran Seager-Boss <Fran.Seager-Boss@matsugov.us>, "Heather Ralston (Heather.Ralston@matsugov.us)" <Heather.Ralston@matsugov.us>, "Brad.Sworts@matsugov.us" <Brad.Sworts@matsugov.us>, Brian Lindamood <LindamoodB@akrr.com>, "Porter, Richard" <rporter@kniktribe.org>, "Klaudia Klaudi (KKlaudi@kniktribe.org)" <KKlaudi@kniktribe.org>
Date: 12/04/2013 01:11 PM
Subject: PMRE - Proposed IDSHD Report Scope Change

Judy and Cathy,

Per the Implementation Plan, the draft IDSHD report was to have been submitted to your offices for review by the end of November. We had been working on the report, but received some information from Shina and Summer on the scope of the report that conflicted with the scope as identified in the Implementation Plan. Elizabeth and I recently met with Shina and Summer, and based on that consultation, we believe that the IDSHD property is better suited to designation as a multiple property rather than a district.

Under the current district designation, the IDSHD recommended contributing resources are scattered within a very large area (approximately 700 acres) that would also include a large number of non-contributing resources. Given the large area included within the current district boundaries and the nature of the recommended contributing resources, the IDSHD could present significant challenges for assessing impacts to historic properties from future undertakings in the Point MacKenzie area. As a management tool, the multiple property approach would alleviate many of these challenges as it would remove this extensive boundary within which undertakings could potentially be impacting the IDSHD. A

benefit of the multiple property approach is that it streamlines organization of information collected about thematically-related properties (e.g., collected during surveys and research) for preservation planning purposes. In addition, it facilitates the evaluation of individually significant properties by providing a framework within which they could be compared with resources that share physical characteristics and historical associations. Also, a large district boundary would not need to be identified or refined.

Please review the proposed revised report scope, and let us know if you have comments and/or questions. For comparison purposes, an excerpt from the Implementation Plan with the original scope is provided at the end of this e-mail.

- Introduction (why this document is being drafted, why we are changing the approach from what was presented in the Implementation Plan);
- Brief overview/description of the multiple property (e.g., property name, AHRs number if applicable, identification/brief description of the geographic area/study area, ownership, function/use, associated property types, period of significance, area of significance);
- Summary of consultation and studies done to date regarding the multiple property (primarily including consultation/studies associated with the IDSHD);
- Brief overview of the historic context associated with the multiple property (within the geographic/study area and focused on the period/area of significance) including maps and photographs as appropriate (based on SRB&A 2010);
- Brief overview/description of significance/NRHP eligibility for the multiple property (based on IDSHD significance/eligibility);
- Identification of potential properties within the multiple property listing, and the specific properties that will be addressed in this document; and
- Discussion of associated properties for the multiple property, and features needed to be considered eligible under the multiple property (includes discussion of important aspects of integrity needed to be eligible and how this information applies to associated properties within the APE).

Because we are proposing a modification of the original report scope, we would like your response to this e-mail to confirm that the revised scope is acceptable to you. Relative to schedule, we hope to have the draft report distributed to the Working Group for review by the mid December, and to STB and SHPO for formal review in early January. Thanks, Barb

EXCERPT FROM IMPLEMENTATION PLAN – ORIGINAL SCOPE

As reminder, the Implementation Plan (p. 28) says the following regarding the document:

“Consultation with SHPO identified the need for a clearly defined IDSHD boundary and guidelines for identifying contributing elements to the IDSHD to facilitate Section 106 consultation for entities considering future development. As currently defined, the IDSHD presents challenges for future undertakings in the general project area. ARRC, in consultation with SHPO and the Working Group, will address these challenges by preparing a separate report that refines the boundaries of the IDSHD, focusing on areas that best retain features representative of the IDSHD, and developing guidance for identifying and documenting property types that could be contributing elements [emphasis added]. The draft report will include:

- Brief overview/description of the IDSHD (e.g., name, site number, general location/setting, ownership, function/use, types of associated resources, period of significance, area of significance);
- Summary of consultation and studies done to date regarding the IDSHD;
- Brief overview of the historic context (based on SRB&A 2010) – what did the district look like/use during its period of significance (includes maps and photographs as appropriate);
- Explanation of why/how the district is significant/eligible for the NRHP;
- Discussion of the features that a contributing element to the district would have (e.g., what types of features, physical characteristics of these features that provide association with the district, important aspects of integrity needed to maintain association with the district);
- Identification of district boundaries (e.g., method for identifying the boundary, description of the boundary, justification for the boundary, maps); and
- Summary form that includes the essential elements of NRHP nomination form 10-900.”

