

APPENDIX E

UPDATED SECTION 106 AND SECTION 4(f) COMMENTS & COORDINATION



D.C. TO RICHMOND SOUTHEAST HIGH SPEED RAIL

Appendix E

UPDATED SECTION 106 AND SECTION 4(f) COMMENTS & COORDINATION

This appendix includes data associated with the coordination of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 with pertinent federal agencies, state governments, and localities, as well as consulting parties and other involved members of the public. Data presented here is reflective of coordination efforts that occurred from August 2017, after the publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), through the publication of the Final EIS. For coordination that occurred prior to August 2017, see Appendix U of the Draft EIS.

Section E.1 involves all correspondence associated with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and any other cultural resource topics. Cultural resource studies have included coordination with agencies since the fall of 2014 to comply with cultural resource and environmental legislation. In particular, coordination has involved extensive dialogues with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR, the Virginia State Historic Preservation Office [SHPO]), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and over 30 consulting parties spanning the entire corridor. This chapter includes data on correspondence with all groups and includes the following documentation in separate PDFs in chronological order:

- Appendix E1: SHPO, ACHP, DRPT, and FRA Meeting Summaries
- Appendix E2: SHPO Technical Study Correspondence
- Appendix E3: SHPO Project Effect
- Appendix E4: SHPO Memorandum of Agreement Correspondence
- Appendix E5: Consulting Party and Public Invitations, Emails, Letters, and Other Correspondence
- Appendix E6: Consulting Party and Public Meeting Summaries

Section E.2 includes documentation related to the Section 4(f) process, including parks, recreational resources, trails, and wildlife refuges, and historic properties as they relate to Section 4(f). The following documentation includes separate PDFs in chronological order:

- Appendix E7: *De Minimis* Concurrence Letters
- Appendix E8: Temporary Occupancy Concurrence Letters

E.1 SECTION 106/OTHER CULTURAL RESOURCE COMMENTS & COORDINATION

DRPT coordinated with numerous federal and state agencies with jurisdiction over resources protected under Section 106 and Section 4(f), both before and after the issuance of the Draft EIS (see Appendix E1 of the Final EIS). For Section 106, this includes project initiation, definition of an area of potential effects (APE), technical studies on above- and below-ground resources (see Appendix E2 of this Final EIS for correspondence since the Draft EIS), resource eligibility, determinations of effect (see Appendix E3 of the Final EIS), and production of a Section 106 Draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to outline measures to mitigate adverse effects, where appropriate (see Appendix E4 of the Final EIS for coordination efforts; the Section 106 Draft MOA document is Appendix K of the Final EIS). Beyond agencies, extensive coordination with consulting parties and others with a vested interest in area history and prehistory has occurred since the Project began (see Appendices E5 and E6 of the Final EIS for coordination with consulting parties since publication of the Draft EIS).

For Section 4(f), each historic property – defined as a resource that is eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) – was evaluated for Project “use” as defined by Section 4(f). Where FRA determined that the Project will result in a Section 4(f) use and there are no feasible and prudent alternatives, FRA provided individual Section 4(f) evaluations to the U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) Office of Environmental Compliance and Policy for review and concurrence.

E.1.1 Consulting Parties

While FRA continued to be the primary point of contact for all federally recognized tribes, FRA delegated all other state agency and consulting party coordination to DRPT in 2014. As such, DRPT sent invitation letters to agencies, local governments, and other stakeholders in the Section 106 consultation process. FRA sent a letter to the federally recognized tribes along the DC2RVA corridor.

Table E.1-1 provides information on the 50 distributed consulting party invitations. Of these, 23 elected to participate in the process; the table below lists these groups, along with their response dates. For an additional 11 stakeholders, DRPT assumed that they would want to participate and has treated them as consulting parties. Although a formal response was not received from these 11 groups, they have requested participation on similar projects and have shown a noted interest in the current undertaking through telephone calls or attendance at associated meetings. These 11 are noted by “assumed yes” in Table E.1-1.

Table E.1-1: List of Invited Consulting Parties

Stakeholder	Invite Letter Date	Response (Date)
American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP)	January 6, 2015	Assumed Yes
Marine Corps Base Quantico	January 6, 2015	Assumed Yes
National Park Service—Northeast Regional Office	July 11, 2018	Yes (7/11/18)
National Park Service—Captain John Smith Chesapeake NHT	January 6, 2015	Yes (1/22/15)
National Park Service—Fredericksburg	January 6, 2015	Assumed Yes
National Park Service—GW Memorial Pkwy	July 1, 2017	Yes (7/1/2017)
National Park Service—National Capital Region	January 6, 2015	Assumed Yes
National Park Service—Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail	January 22, 2015	Yes (3/4/2015)
National Park Service—Richmond	January 6, 2015	Yes (1/14/15)
National Park Service—Washington-Rochambeau NHT	January 22, 2015	Assumed Yes
Alexandria Archaeology	January 6, 2015	Yes (1/21/15)
Arlington County	January 6, 2015	Yes (1/14/15)
Caroline County	January 6, 2015	Yes (2/3/15)
City of Alexandria	January 6, 2015	Yes (10/11/17)
City of Fredericksburg	January 6, 2015	Yes (1/12/15)
City of Richmond	January 6, 2015	Yes (1/16/15)
Hanover County	January 6, 2015	Yes (2/3/15)
Prince William County	January 6, 2015	Yes (2/13/15)
Town of Ashland	January 23, 2017	Yes (2/23/17)
Ashland Museum	January 6, 2015	Yes (1/21/15)
Central Virginia Battlefields Trust (CVBT)	January 6, 2015	Yes (1/22/15)
Civil War (now Battlefield) Preservation Trust (CWT)	January 6, 2015	Yes (2/11/15)
Historic Fredericksburg Foundation, Inc. (HFFI)	January 6, 2015	Yes (1/9/15)
Historic Richmond Foundation	January 6, 2015; Resent November 13, 2016	Yes (11/28/16)
Preservation Virginia	June 21, 2018	Yes (6/21/18)
National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP)	January 6, 2015; Resent December 22, 2016	Yes (12/22/16)
Pamunkey Indian Tribe	July 9, 2015; Resent April 12, 2017	Assumed Yes
Chickahominy Indian Tribe	February 13, 2018 from FRA	Assumed Yes
Eastern Chickahominy Indian Tribe	February 13, 2018 from FRA	Assumed Yes
Upper Mattaponi Indian Tribe	February 13, 2018 from FRA	Yes (2/23/18)
Rappahannock Indian Tribe	February 13, 2018 from FRA	Assumed Yes
Nansemond Indian Tribe	February 13, 2018 from FRA	Assumed Yes

► Continued – see end of table for notes.

Table E.1-1: List of Invited Consulting Parties

Stakeholder	Invite Letter Date	Response (Date)
Monocan Indian Tribe	February 13, 2018 from FRA	Assumed Yes
Fairfax County	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Henrico County	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Spotsylvania County	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Stafford County	January 6, 2015	No Reply
ACL & SAL RR Historical Society	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Center for Neighborhood Revitalization	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Arlington Historical Society	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Caroline Historical Society	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Chesterfield Historical Society	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Hanover County Historical Society, Inc.	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Henrico County Historical Society	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Historic Alexandria Foundation	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Historic Prince William, Inc.	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Historical Society of Fairfax County, Virginia, Inc.	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Stafford County Historical Society	January 6, 2015	No Reply
Catawba Indian Tribe (based in South Carolina)	January 6, 2015	No Reply per FRA protocol for Catawba

Note: 1. The letters to the Native American tribes were sent by FRA. None of the tribes were federally recognized at the time the initial letters (dated 1/6/15) were disseminated. They were recognized at a later date (2/13/18), at which time the FRA invited them to participate.

E.1.2 Meetings

DRPT has held numerous in-person and telephone-based meetings with DHR, ACHP, consulting parties, and other vested individuals and groups. They included a Section 106 kick-off and an abundance of follow-up meetings to update participating agencies and parties on the Project initiation; determination of APE; cultural resource methodology for the reconnaissance predictive model, identification surveys, and evaluation studies; survey results and list of historic properties; Project effect on historic properties; stipulations to mitigate adverse effects; and crafting the Section 106 Draft MOA. Multiple invitations to each meeting and reminders were sent to consulting parties.

Table E.1-2 highlights the meetings held with these groups. Minutes for meetings held prior to the publication of the Draft EIS in September 2017 can be found in Appendix U of the Draft EIS. Minutes for meetings held since the publication of the Draft EIS can be found in Appendices E5 and E6. The public was invited to the Shockoe area meeting on October 12, 2018 but in general, consulting party meetings were limited to that group. Rather, numerous public meetings were held as part of the larger NEPA process, and details can be found in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. The exception to this is within Richmond, where a number of vested individuals and groups requested additional data on the parameters of the Project and its potential impacts on cultural resources. Meetings were held to discuss historic properties in Shockoe Bottom and the Grave Yard for Free People of Color and Slaves (44HE1203) near Hospital Street to address specific concerns. Additional data on these meetings can be found in the table below.

Table E.1-2: Section 106 and Section 4(f) Cultural Resource Meetings

Date	Attendees	Topics
November 7, 2014	DHR, DRPT	Kick-off meeting; discussions on APE, methodology, reporting
March 19, 2015	VDOT, DRPT	Roadway bridges and Section 106 coordination
February 18, 2016	DHR, DRPT	Update on corridor and status of studies
June 14, 2016	CWT	General discussion on results to date; Richmond to Raleigh Memorandum of Agreement
August 10, 2016	DHR, DRPT	Preliminary dialogue on historic properties and Project effect
May 15, 2017	Ashland Museum, Town of Ashland	Overview of 106 process and technical studies to date
June 8, 2017	NPS- Fredericksburg, DRPT	Update on technical studies and Project plans
July 14, 2017	Town of Ashland; Ashland Museum	Update on technical studies and Project plans
July 26, 2017	DHR, DRPT	Update on technical studies and Project schedule
August 14, 2017	NPS—Richmond, DRPT	Update on technical studies and Project plans
October 11, 2017	Hanover County, Town of Ashland, Ashland Museum	Update on technical studies and Project plans
October 20, 2017	Alexandria Archaeology, City of Alexandria, Arlington County, NTHP, DRPT	Update on technical studies and Project plans
October 24, 2017	ACHP, ABPP, CWT, DRPT	Update on technical studies and Project plans
October 27, 2017	Prince William County, Caroline County, City of Fredericksburg, CVBT, HFFI, DRPT	Update on technical studies and Project plans
October 30, 2017	City of Richmond, Historic Richmond Foundation, DRPT	Update on technical studies and Project plans
February 8, 2018	Rose Center/Urban Land Institute, DRPT	Overview of Project and history of Shockoe Bottom
February 13, 2018	DHR, DRPT	Update on technical studies and Project schedule
April 4, 2018	DHR, DRPT	Discussion of Project limits of disturbance and APE
June 18, 2018	Town of Ashland, Ashland Museum	Historic property list and 106 process
June 19, 2018	DHR, DRPT	Historic properties and Project effect
June 21, 2018	CWT, Historic Richmond Foundation, Town of Ashland, Ashland Museum, Preservation Virginia, DRPT	Historic properties and Project effect
June 26, 2018	ABPP, City of Fredericksburg, NPS Fredericksburg, DRPT, FRA	Historic properties and Project effect
June 28, 2018	NTHP, Alexandria Archaeology, NPS—Mount Vernon Parkway, ACHP, DRPT	Historic properties and Project effect
July 2, 2018	DHR, FRA, DRPT	Revisit of historic properties and Project effect
July 16, 2018	Town of Ashland, Ashland Museum	Technical reports and Project effect
July 17, 2018	NPS- Fredericksburg	DC2RVA LOD and Jackson's Shrine

► Continued.

Table E.1-2: Section 106 and Section 4(f) Cultural Resource Meetings

Date	Attendees	Topics
July 17, 2018	Preservation Virginia	DC2RVA Project summary and list of historic properties
July 19, 2018	City of Richmond, DRPT	Historic properties and Project effect
July 24, 2018	DHR	Resources in Shockoe Bottom
July 26, 2018	FRA, DHR, DRPT	Resources in Shockoe Bottom
July 27, 2018	ACHP	Resources in Shockoe Bottom
July 31, 2018	DHR, FRA, DRPT	Resources in Shockoe Bottom
August 3, 2018	DHR	Resources in Shockoe Bottom
August 6, 2018	DHR, DRPT, VA Secretary of Transportation, VA Secretary of Natural Resources	Discussion on historic resources in Shockoe Bottom
August 29, 2018	City of Richmond, DHR	Resources in Shockoe Bottom, City preservation initiatives near Main Street Station and future projects
September 5, 2018	VA Secretary of Transportation, DHR, DRPT, City of Richmond	Discussion of cultural resources in Shockoe Bottom
September 10, 2018	NTHP, Preservation Virginia, Sacred Ground Project, ACHP, DHR, DRPT	Discussion of upcoming meeting in Shockoe/Richmond, including meeting content and attendees
October 2, 2018	FRA, DHR, ACHP, DRPT	Summary of three October 2018 consulting party meetings, Resources in Shockoe Bottom, Next steps in I06 process
October 2, 2018	DRPT, City of Alexandria	List of historic properties, Project effect
October 4, 2018	City of Fredericksburg, Prince William County, Ashland Museum, Alexandria Archaeology, DRPT, FRA	APE, list of historic properties, Project effects, Section 106 Draft MOA mitigation
October 5, 2018	American Battlefield Trust (Civil War Trust), ABPP, Alexandria Archaeology, NPS- Mount Vernon Parkway, NPS- National Capital Region	APE, list of historic properties, Project effects, Section 106 Draft MOA mitigation
October 12, 2018	NTHP, Shockoe Partnership, ACHP, Preservation Virginia, City of Richmond, Slave Trail Commission, Historic Richmond Foundation, Untold RVA, DHR, FRA, DRPT, private citizens	On-site visit at Main Street Station, APE, list of historic properties, Project effects, Section 106 Draft MOA mitigation
October 15, 2018	Historic Richmond Foundation, DRPT	Resources in Shockoe Bottom, list of historic properties, Project effect, Section 106 Draft MOA mitigation
October 23, 2018	ACHP, DHR, FRA, DRPT	Update on consulting party meetings, list of historic properties, Project effect
October 24, 2018	Ashland Museum, Town of Ashland, DRPT	List of historic properties, Project effect, Section 106 Draft MOA mitigation
November 1, 2018	Preservation Virginia, DRPT	Resources in Shockoe Bottom, list of historic properties, Project effect, Section 106 Draft MOA mitigation
November 2, 2018	Elegba Folklore Society, DRPT	Summary of Project, Resources in Shockoe Bottom, list of historic properties, Project effect, Section 106 Draft MOA mitigation

► Continued.

Table E.1-2: Section 106 and Section 4(f) Cultural Resource Meetings

Date	Attendees	Topics
November 28, 2018	NTHP, DRPT	Discussion on reply sent to NTHP on Historic Properties
December 2, 2018	NTHP, Preservation Virginia, Historic Richmond Foundation, Elegba Folklore Society, City of Richmond, DRPT, FRA, ACHP, DHR	Additional discussion on reply sent to NTHP, historic properties in Shockoe Bottom, and effect on historic properties
January 31, 2019	DRPT, DHR	Site 44HEI203 (Grave Yard for Free People of Color and Slaves)
February 13, 2019	Rivanna Archaeology, Historic Richmond Foundation, Sacred Ground Project, Richmond Archaeology, DRPT, DHR, VDOT	Onsite meeting to discuss site 44HEI203 (Grave Yard for Free People of Color and Slaves)

E.1.3 Correspondence

Since the Project’s initiation, correspondence has occurred between DRPT and the cultural resource agencies, localities, and consulting parties to keep them informed on the progress of the studies, resource eligibility, the Project’s effects on historic properties, and Section 106 Draft MOA mitigation strategies. DRPT held meetings at milestones or as necessary throughout the Project. In particular, meetings and e-mail exchanges with DHR and ACHP have occurred regularly to provide information on Project plans. Data on the study results in specific Project areas were also sent to consulting parties to garner comments on the Project. The architectural reports were posted on the Project’s webpage for general public comment as well. The archaeological reports were only distributed to the agencies, localities, and consulting parties due to the sensitivity of site location mapping and to meet stipulations set forth in the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979.

Table E.1-3 includes correspondence conducted as part of the process. Note that this table only lists formal correspondence and group emails. In addition to this roster, hundreds of one-on-one emails were exchanged with consulting parties and the general public to convey additional cultural resource data pertaining to the Project. Copies of relevant correspondence prior to September 2017 are included in Appendix U of the Draft EIS and post-September 2017 correspondence can be found in Appendices E1 through E6.

Table E.1-3: Project Correspondence

Date	Medium	Recipient	Topic
September 25-October 15, 2014	E-mail; Letter	DHR, FRA, DRPT	Initiation of Section 106 Process
January 5-February 2, 2015	E-mail, Letter	DHR, FRA, DRPT	Defining Project APE
June 8, 2015	E-mail	VDOT	VDOT/DHR PA on Historic Bridges
June 22, 2015	Letter	Civil War Trust, DRPT	Receipt of comments on Project screening review
July 30, 2015	E-mail	All Consulting Parties, DRPT	Distribution of Archaeological Predictive Model report for review
July 17, 2015; August 28, 2015	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Archaeological Predictive Model Report; DHR Reply

► Continued.

Table E.1-3: Project Correspondence

Date	Medium	Recipient	Topic
August 3-September 4, 2015	E-mail	Arlington County, City of Alexandria, Prince William County, City of Fredericksburg, DRPT	Receipt of comments on Archaeological IA Predictive model
August 28, 2015	E-mail	All Consulting Parties, DRPT	Reminder to submit comments on Predictive Model Report
October 20, 2015; December 18, 2015	Letters	NPS (FSNMP)	<i>Archaeological Resources Protection Act</i> (ARPA) permit to dig on federal land (Original Segment 7)
December 9, 2015; February 5, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segment 7); DHR Reply
December 15, 2015	Letter	DHR	Application to conduct archaeology on state lands (Original Segment 11)
March 18-31, 2016	E-mail; Memo	DHR	Discussion of alternative methodology for architecture in Original Segment 18
April 13-April 26, 2016	E-mail	David Hamilton (Consulting Party), DHR, DRPT, FRA	Mr. Hamilton is a private property owner along the Ashland Bypass. Numerous E-mails were exchanged with Mr. Hamilton regarding his concerns, his position as a consulting party, and distributing Project data
May 20, 2016; June 8, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segment 6); DHR reply
May 31, 2016; June 22, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segment 3); DHR reply
May 31, 2016; June 22, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segment 4); DHR reply
June 21, 2016; June 28, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segments 8-9); DHR reply
July 6, 2016; July 22, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segment 1); DHR reply
July 6, 2016; July 15, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segment 2); DHR reply
July 25, 2016; August 15, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segments 10-12); DHR reply
December 21, 2016; February 21, 2017	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segment 13); DHR reply
August 3, 2016; August 22, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segment 14); DHR reply
September 6, 2016; October 11, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Archaeological Phase I Report (Original Segments 1-20); DHR reply

► Continued.

Table E.1-3: Project Correspondence

Date	Medium	Recipient	Topic
October 21, 2016; November 30, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segments 15, 16, 20); DHR reply
November 14, 2016; December 22, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segments 17, 19); DHR reply
October 21, 2016; November 3, 2016	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Original Segment 18); DHR reply
January 20, 2017; March 1, 2017	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase I Report (Structures); DHR reply
January 6, 2017; February 3, 2017	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Phase IA Ashland Bypass Report; DHR reply
January 20, 2017; February 3, 2017	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Phase IA Fredericksburg Bypass Report; DHR reply
February 24, 2017; March 24, 2017	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Distribution of Architectural Reports for review; Consulting Party comments
March 28, 2017	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Update on technical study distribution
April 14, 2017; May 14, 2017	Letter; E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Distribution of All Phase IA and IB reports for review; Consulting Party comments
May 17, 2017	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Reminder of comment deadline for reports
June 1, 2017	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Extension of deadline for comments on reports
September 19, 2017	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Summary of upcoming Draft EIS meetings and offer for on-on-one meetings
October 7, 2017	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Reminder of Draft EIS meetings
November 2, 2017	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Distribution of historic map overlays showing Shockoe Bottom
November 21, 2017	Letter; E-mail	Professor J.V. Moeser, Secretary of Transportation	Resources in Shockoe Bottom
February 7, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Update on LOD and technical studies progress
February 13, 2018	Letter; Email	Tribes who received federal status in 2018	Invitation to participate in Project; Updates on Project to date and future steps (Tribes were included on all subsequent All Consulting Party communication)
May 8, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Update on distribution of LOD and Phase II technical reports
May 14, 2018; June 12, 2018	E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Archaeological LOD Expansion Areas Report; DHR reply
May 17, 2018; July 20, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Distribution of Archaeological LOD Expansion Areas Report for review; Consulting Party comments

► Continued.

Table E.1-3: Project Correspondence

Date	Medium	Recipient	Topic
May 4, 2018; June 11, 2018	E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural LOD Expansion Areas Report for review; DHR reply
May 17, 2018; July 20, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Distribution of Architectural LOD Expansion Areas Report for review; Consulting Party comments
March 22, 2018; April 25, 2018	E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase II Report A; DHR reply
April 19, 2018; May 1, 2018	E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase II Report B; DHR reply
May 10, 2018; June 12, 2018	E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Architectural Phase II Report C; DHR reply
May 17, 2018; July 20, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Distribution of Architectural Phase II Reports (A-C) for review; Consulting Party comments
June 13, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Reminder of upcoming series of Project meetings
June 20, 2018; June 28, 2018	Letter, E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Project effects letter; DHR reply
June 20, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Update on Project effects and reminder of upcoming series of Project meetings
July 9, 2018; July 18, 2018	Letter; E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Addendum Project effects letter; DHR reply
July 9, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Update on Addendum Project Effects
July 20, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Reminder of deadline for report and effects comments
August 14, 2018	E-mail	FRA, DHR, DRPT	Framework of Section 106 Draft MOA for review
August 23, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Update on Project including receipt of comments on reports, APE, and list of historic properties
September 21, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Invitation to three October Consulting Party Meetings
September 21, 2018	E-mail	Shockoe Bottom Neighborhood Assn; Historic Shockoe Partnership; Slave Trail Commission; Elegba Folklore Society; Black History Museum Virginia Untold VA; Virginia African American Cultural Resources Task Force; Southern Environmental Law Center; Sacred Ground Project; Community Unity in Action, Richmond Branch NAACP; Wesley Memorial United Methodist Church; VCU Department African American Studies; Richmond Crusade for Voters; First Unitarian Universalist Church; Sacred Ground Historical Reclamation Project; VCU, Building on Sacred Ground	Invitation to Shockoe Bottom/ Richmond Consulting Party Meeting
October 11, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Reminder of three October Consulting Party Meetings

► Continued.

Table E.1-3: Project Correspondence

Date	Medium	Recipient	Topic
October 11, 2018	E-mail	Shockoe Bottom Neighborhood Assn; Historic Shockoe Partnership; Slave Trail Commission; Elegba Folklore Society; Black History Museum Virginia Untold VA; Virginia African American Cultural Resources Task Force; Southern Environmental Law Center; Sacred Ground Project; Community Unity in Action, Richmond Branch NAACP; Wesley Memorial United Methodist Church; VCU Department African American Studies; Richmond Crusade for Voters; First Unitarian Universalist Church; Sacred Ground Historical Reclamation Project; VCU, Building on Sacred Ground	Reminder of Shockoe Bottom/ Richmond Consulting Party Meeting
November 13, 2018	Letter; E-mail	DRPT, Preservation Virginia, Historic Richmond Foundation, DHR, ACHP	Reply to NTHP, Preservation Virginia, and Historic Richmond Foundation on July 20, 2018 letters
November 27, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Distribution of updated list of historic properties and revised effects; Solicitation of additional Section 106 Draft MOA mitigation ideas
November 19, 2018; January 4, 2019	Letter; E-mail	DHR	Submittal of Second Addendum Project effects letter; DHR reply
December 21, 2018	E-mail	FRA, DHR, ACHP,	Revised Section 106 Draft MOA for review
January 22, 2019	E-mail	FRA, DHR, ACHP	Revised Section 106 Draft MOA for review based on DHR feedback (received January 16, 2019)
November 30, 2018; January 4, 2019	Letter; E-mail	DHR	Section 4(f) concurrence letter; DHR reply
December 21, 2018	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Distribution of Section 106 Draft MOA for review to Consulting Parties
January 29, 2019	E-mail	All Consulting Parties	Extension of deadline for Section 106 Draft MOA comments
February 11, 2019	E-mail	FRA, DHR, ACHP	Second revised Section 106 Draft MOA for review based on Consulting Party feedback
February 26, 2019	E-mail	FRA, DHR, ACHP	Third revised Section 106 Draft MOA for final review based on signatory feedback

E.2 SECTION 4(f) COMMENTS & COORDINATION

Table E.2-1 includes the correspondence subsequent to the publication of the Draft EIS in September 2017 related to Section 4(f) for parks, recreation areas, trails, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges (this information is also provided in Table 6.8-1 of the Final EIS). Section 4(f) correspondence prior to the Draft EIS publication is included in Appendix U of the Draft EIS.

Table E.2-1: Section 4(f) Correspondence

Resource Owner	Type ¹	Date	Purpose
Arlington County	Response Letter	September 8, 2017	Expressed concern with <i>de minimis</i> assumption based on Draft EIS impacts
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries	Response Letter	October 12, 2017	Concurrence with temporary occupancy of Mattaponi Wildlife Management Area
Arlington County	Meeting	February 2, 2018	Review of Draft EIS comments
City of Richmond, Department of Public Works	Letter	October 22, 2018	Provided update of impacts, requested concurrence with <i>de minimis</i> use and temporary occupancy of Walker's Creek Retention Basin Park
City of Richmond, Department of Parks, Recreation, and Community Facilities	Letter	October 22, 2018	Provided update of impacts, requested concurrence with <i>de minimis</i> use and temporary occupancy of Walker's Creek Retention Basin Park
Arlington County Department of Parks and Recreation	Letter	October 29, 2018	Provided update of impacts to Long Bridge Park and Mount Vernon Trail, and requested concurrence with temporary occupancy for Long Bridge Park
NPS – George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters	Letter	October 29, 2018 and December 6, 2018	Provided update of impacts and requested concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of George Washington Memorial Parkway and Mount Vernon Trail
City of Alexandria	Letter	October 29, 2018	Provided update of impacts and requested concurrence with temporary occupancy of Dog Run Park at Carlyle, Four Mile Run Trail, Potomac Yard Park, Potomac Yard Landbay N., and Rail Park
NPS – Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park	Letter	October 29, 2018	Provided update of impacts and requested concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park
Prince William County Parks and Recreation Department	Letter	October 29, 2018	Provided update of impacts and requested concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of Veterans Memorial Park
Henrico County Recreation and Parks	Letter	October 29, 2018	Provided impacts and requested concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of Laurel Recreation Area
Henrico County Recreation and Parks	Response Letter	October 31, 2018	Concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of Laurel Recreation Area
Prince William County Parks and Recreation Department	Response Letter	November 2, 2018	Concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of Veterans Memorial Park
City of Richmond, Department of Public Works	Response Letter	November 16, 2018	Concurrence regarding <i>de minimis</i> use and temporary occupancy of Walker's Creek Retention Basin Park
NPS – Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park	Response Letter	December 7, 2018	Concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park

► Continued – see end of table for notes.

Table E.2-1: Section 4(f) Correspondence

Resource Owner	Type ¹	Date	Purpose
NPS – George Washington Memorial Parkway Headquarters	Response Letter	December 12, 2018	Concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of George Washington Memorial Parkway and Mount Vernon Trail
City of Alexandria	Response Letter	December 13, 2018	Concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of Dog Run Park at Carlyle, Four Mile Run Trail, Potomac Yard Park, Potomac Yard Landbay N., and Rail Park
Arlington County Department of Parks and Recreation	Response Letter	December 18, 2018	Concurrence regarding temporary occupancy of Long Bridge Park

Notes: 1. "Letter" denotes a letter from DRPT to the resource owner; "Response Letter" denotes a letter from the resource owner to DRPT.

Appendix E7 includes correspondence related to the *de minimis* impacts associated with Walker's Creek Retention Basin Park.

Appendix E8 includes correspondence related to concurrence that the temporary occupancy of the following parks does not result in a Section 4(f) use:

- Long Bridge Park
- Mount Vernon Trail
- George Washington Memorial Parkway
- Dog Run Park at Carlyle
- Four Mile Run Trail
- Potomac Yard Park
- Potomac Yard Landbay N.
- Rail Park
- Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park
- Veterans Memorial Park
- Laurel Recreation Area