

## Meeting Minutes

Subject Ann Arbor Station

Date	March 5, 2016
Time	2pm EST
Location	Conference Call
Attendees	Melissa Hatcher - FRA Lydia Kachadoorian - FRA Eli Cooper – City of Ann Arbor Mike Nearing – City of Ann Arbor Jeffrey Martin – MDOT Lori Noblet – MDOT James A. Robertson, PhD – MDOT Robert Gorski – AECOM Chris Leary – AECOM
Prepared	March 9, 2018
Prepared by	Robert Gorski
Distribution	All

This meeting was requested by FRA to discuss the development of the Section 106 letter to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the letter to the City regarding FRA's Section 4(f) determination and some questions regarding archaeology. A call was set up to talk through the findings for archaeology and determine how best to proceed specifically with the SHPO consultation.

1. The Cultural Resources Assessment concludes by recommending a Phase 1 archaeological survey and a geomorphological study within the APE of Preferred Alternative 3A (and for all of the alternatives). Has this work occurred? Or did the report recommendations change (they are not included in the Cultural Resources section of the EA).

**A January 17, 2017 letter from SHPO indicated that a Phase I was not necessary and that coring and potentially trenching should be used. The FRA instructed the City and MDOT to stop coordinating directly with the SHPO in early 2017 as only FRA is authorized to dialogue with the SHPO, and maintains such responsibility under NEPA. The City of Ann Arbor immediately stopped coordinating with the SHPO and no further direction was received on this area until the FRA memo in advance of this teleconference.**

**The group discussed the viability and desirability of either entering an Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or actually conducting field work. The consensus is it would be preferred and perhaps time and resource efficient to conduct the field work rather than negotiating language of an MOA. It was discussed that coring and trenching, if**

**needed, are the appropriate discovery methods. In an urban setting shovel investigation would not be effective and construction monitoring is not needed.**

**City staff outlined the fact having just now received this guidance from the FRA, well after grant funding eligibility expired, creates issues that put more pressure on resources available for this project.**

2. Is this activity planned to occur during PE/NEPA or is the intent to prepare a Section 106 agreement document in order to complete Section 106 consultation and coordination? We are not sure if an approach was worked out with the SHPO.

**This activity has not occurred and the thought to enter into an MOA was put to rest earlier in the call. The consensus is to perform field discovery immediately, either before or during PE. FRA recommends that the City perform the investigations now and not pursue the MOA. FRA requested that the City prepare a draft letter to the SHPO (that will be sent to the SHPO by the FRA) indicating that the field work will begin as early as possible. The draft letter will include sufficient detail to describe the work anticipated to constitute a preliminary scope. The field work can occur on a separate track from advancing the EA. It was agreed that given a few weeks to draft and review the EA, the field work could be advanced with the findings described in the Finding of No Significance Impact (FONSI) document. The FONSI is expected to be prepared upon completion of the EA and a sufficient amount of PE. The archeological study should not impede the timeline for the revision for the EA and FRA releasing it for public comment. It is generally understood, with completion of the archeological study and the 4(f) determination process, the project is that much closer to qualifying for a finding by the end of this summer.**