



**Surface Transportation Board
Uinta Basin Railway Environmental Impact Statement
Section 106 Consulting Parties Teleconference Notes
April 22, 2020**

Meeting Participants

Surface Transportation Board (STB), Office of Environmental Analysis (OEA) – Alan Tabachnick, Joshua Wayland
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) – Nicole Fresard, Erin Hess
U.S. Forest Service (USFS) – Jeffrey Rust
Bureau of Land Management (BLM) – Roger Bankert, Amber Koski, William Reitze, Nate Thomas
Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) – Chris Secakuku
Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) – Savanna Agardy
Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation (Ute Tribe) – Devin Pehrson
Utah Public Land Policy Coordinating Office (PLPCO) – Kris Carambeles, Sindy Smith
Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands (SITLA) – Joel Boomgarden
Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) – Rob Clayton, Liz Robinson
Carbon County – Casey Hopes
Duchesne County – Gregory Todd
Uintah County – Ross Watkins
Seven County Infrastructure Coalition (Coalition) – Mike McKee
 HDR – Melissa Cano, Andrea Clayton, Catherine Dobbs, Kevin Keller
 Jones and DeMille – Brian Barton, Jenna Jorgenson
 Venable – Amanda Crawford
 SWCA – Kelly Beck, Anne Oliver
Colorado Plateau Archeological Alliance – Jerry Spangler
Nine Mile Canyon Coalition – Dennis Willis
Utah Rock Art Research Association – Troy Scotter
ICF – Colleen Davis, Debi Rogers, Mikenna Wolff

Introductions, Background, and Project Updates

- OEA is continuing to reach out to potential Consulting Parties, including UDOT and the Utah Rock Art Research Association.
- All previous meeting materials are available for review on the project website (www.uintabasinrailwayeis.com).

Comments from Consulting Parties

- Area of Potential Effects
 - Since the last meeting, OEA has received input and questions on the Draft APE. In response, OEA has revised the APE mapbooks and the APE description memo. These revised materials will be distributed to Consulting Parties in the near future.
 - ACHP has prepared guidance on direct and indirect effects. Direct effects to be considered are any effects with a causative link to the undertaking. This includes visual and auditory effects. Indirect effects to be considered are any effects that are more distant or occur later in time.
 - The Draft APE has been revised to include a below-ground APE and an above-ground APE.
 - The below-ground APE is expected to include pre-contact and historic period archaeological deposits. This APE is the construction easement plus an additional 50 foot buffer.
 - The above-ground APE is expected to include, but is not limited to, historic architecture, infrastructure resources, rock art sites, and cairns. This APE is the average construction easement width (240 feet) plus a 1,500 foot buffer on either side of the centerline (total width of 3,480 feet).
 - Erin Hess (Corps) asked whether the Draft APE incorporates viewshed analysis. OEA confirmed that visual simulations are incorporated into the visual analysis and will inform the historic properties effects analysis.
- Rock art sites
 - Rock art sites will be considered in the above-ground APE. OEA has received comments from Consulting Parties about potential effects on rock art resources from dust deposition.
 - Typical fugitive dust dispersion area is approximately 1000 feet. Therefore, OEA believes that dust deposition impacts will be adequately captured in the above-ground APE which extends 1,740 feet on each side of centerline.
 - Kris Carambelas (PLPCO) asked whether the 1000 foot dust dispersion area occurs with or without a dust control program. OEA confirmed that this is without a dust control program. Such a program could be discussed in the Programmatic Agreement (PA) as a minimization feature.
 - OEA anticipates that there will be detailed discussion of rock art resources in the PA. OEA has also scheduled an additional call next week to discuss rock art in more detail. If any Consulting Parties want to participate in this call and have not received the invitation, please reach out to Alan Tabachnick.
- Coalition technical reports
 - OEA will be generating their own Section 106 technical memorandum with their own recommendations of eligibility. This technical memo will incorporate some of the work done by the Coalition.

Identification and Evaluation

- Phased approach
 - OEA is using the phased identification and evaluation approach for this project. The goal of this approach is to establish "likely presence" of historic properties. Final identification and evaluation will be deferred using a PA.
- Coalition technical reports
 - Revised versions of the Coalition's technical reports will be posted on the project website. These most recent versions of the technical reports will be used to inform OEA's Section 106 technical memo.
 - OEA gave a preview of selected sites that are recommended as eligible in the Coalition's technical reports.

Next Steps

- The rock art discussion will be held on Wednesday, April 29, 2020.
- The next regularly scheduled call will be held on Wednesday, May 27, 2020.
- Consulting Party Actions
 - If any Consulting Parties want to participate in next week's rock art call and have not received the invitation, let Alan Tabachnick know.
- OEA/ICF Actions
 - OEA will distribute the revised APE mapbooks and the revised APE description memo to all Consulting Parties.
 - OEA will post revised versions of the Coalition's technical reports to the project website.

Draft Agenda for Next Call

- Opportunities for comment on identification and evaluation effort
- Preliminary effects analysis discussion
- PA introduction