

4350 W Cypress Street, Suite 600 Tampa, Florida 33607-4178 United States T +1.813.874.0777

www.jacobs.com

Subject Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting 12

Project BNSF Bismarck Bridge Replacement

Prepared by Aimee Angel Phone No.

Location GoTo Meeting **Date/Time** September 18, 2020/11:00 a.m. CDT

Participants

				Time in
Name	Email Address	Join Time	Leave Time	Session
				(minutes)
		11:50 AM	3:05 PM	195
		12:02 PM	3:05 PM	183
		11:59 AM	2:00 PM	121
		12:06 PM	3:05 PM	179
		12:02 PM	1:08 PM	66
		11:57 AM	3:04 PM	186
		1:02 PM	3:06 PM	123
Aaron Barth, Fort				
Abraham Lincoln				
Foundation		11:54 AM	2:49 PM	175
Aimee Angel,				
Jacobs		12:07 PM	3:06 PM	179
Alexis Clark, ACHP	webinar@achp.gov	11:50 AM	3:06 PM	196
Ben Ehreth, City of				
Bismarck	behreth@bismarcknd.gov	12:00 PM	3:06 PM	186
Betsy Merritt, NTHP	emerritt@savingplaces.org	12:04 PM	3:06 PM	181
Bill Peterson/Fern				
Swenson, North				
Dakota SHPO	billpeterson@nd.gov	11:50 AM	3:02 PM	192
Brian Dunn, USCG		11:59 PM	3:06 PM	185
Chris Wilson, ACHP		11:53 PM	3:05 PM	190
Dava Kaitala, BNSF	dava.kaitala@bnsf.com	12:01 PM	3:01 PM	179





Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting 12 September 18, 2020/11:00 a.m. CDT

David Mayer,				
Bismarck Parks and				
Recreation District		12:20 PM	2:03 PM	103
Emily Sakariassen,				
Preservation North				
Dakota	esakariassen@metcalfarchaeology.com	11:50 AM	3:05 PM	195
Jim Neubauer, City				
of Mandan	ehuber@cityofmandan.com	11:56 AM	2:32 PM	155
John Persson,				
FORB		11:59 AM	3:05 PM	185
Kathy Duttenhefner,				
North Dakota Parks				
and Recreation				
Natural Resources				
Division		11:52 AM	3:04 PM	192
Abby Korte, Jacobs		11:58 AM	3:05 PM	187
Mandy Persson,				
FORB		12:08 PM	3:06 PM	177
Mark Zimmerman,				
FORB		11:56 AM	3:05 PM	189
Matt Robertson,				
USCG		11:58 AM	3:06 PM	188
Amy G. McBeth,				
BNSF	Amy.Mcbeth@BNSF.com	12:09 PM	3:05 PM	175
Mike Herzog, BNSF		11:56 AM	3:06 PM	189
Mitch Flanagan,				
Burleigh County	mflanagan@nd.gov	11:54 AM	3:05 PM	191
Nicholas Bradbury,				
FORB		12:02 PM	3:06 PM	184
Lori Price, Jacobs		11:52 AM	3:05 PM	193
Robert (Susan)				
Wefald, FORB		11:51 AM	3:05 PM	194



Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting 12 September 18, 2020/11:00 a.m. CDT

Rob McCaskey,				
USCG		11:50 AM	3:06 PM	196
Ryan Ackerman,				
Ackerman + Estvold		11:58 AM	3:06 PM	188
Schaefer, Michael				
D, BNSF		12:01 PM	3:06 PM	184
Signe Snortland,				
FORB		12:02 PM	3:05 PM	183
Shelly Sugarman,				
USCG		11:50 AM	3:06 PM	196
Toni Erhardt,				
USACE	toni.r.erhadt@usace.army.mil	12:02 PM	2:32 PM	150
Amy Sakariassen,				
NTHP		11:52 AM	3:05 PM	193
Kitty Henderson,				
Historic Bridge				
Foundation	kitty@historicbridgefoundation.com	12:01 PM	1:51 PM	110

Notes

- 1. Introductions All
- 2. Meeting protocol Rob McCaskey, USCG
 - McCaskey reviewed protocol for the meeting
- 3. GoTo Meeting Capability Alexis Clark, ACHP
 - Clarke reviewed how to use GoTo meeting functions
- 4. Purpose of Meeting Chris Wilson, ACHP
 - We have been meeting for more than 2 years.
 - This PA will memorialize meeting discussions and provide a road map for moving forward. It is meant to inform the process.
 - PA needs to be completed to close the NEPA process.
 - A subsequent MOA will be developed.
 - Goal for today is to reach consensus to complete the PA.
 - Dava Kaitala (BNSF) expressed dissatisfaction with the length of the process and the idea of having a PA and an MOA.
 - Shelly Sugarman (USCG) discussed the merits of the process.



Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting 12 September 18, 2020/11:00 a.m. CDT

Notes

5. Statement from ND SHPO - Bill Peterson, SHPO

Peterson spoke about the project and indicated SHPO support for the process.

6. Statement of Findings - Brian Ackerman

- Brian Ackerman (Ackerman + Estvold) a water resources engineer, contracted by FORB, gave power point presentation (see attached).
 - Presentation discussed the two previous CLOMR submittals by BNSF and the models used to determine the potential rise in the river. Ackerman concluded that results under both scenarios are socially and environmentally unacceptable.
 Results were based on a "One-Dimensional HEC-RAS" model.
 - O Ackerman went on to present an alternative approach in which the existing bridge remains and that would result in a rise of less than .003-ft (1/32") (Slide: Alternative Hydraulic Modeling Approach [2-Dimensional Modeling]). This approach uses a single relief culvert to mitigate rise upstream of I-94. The culvert would cut through the I-94 embankment to divert water. Also recommends using 2-Dimensional Modeling. FEMA deferred to local flood plain administrators for guidance on use of 2-dimensional models. FEMA is attempting to facilitate a conversation between all the local administrators.
- Kaitala stated that it has taken at least 6 months for BNSF to get CLOMRs reviewed in the past.
- Sugarman asked Ackerman about the process to get a culvert through someone else's
 embankment when BNSF does not own the ROW. Ackerman suggested having a
 conversation with North Dakota DOT who would likely need to also talk with FHWA to see
 if they would approve something like this. Chris Wilson offered to arrange that
 conversation.
- Nick Bradbury asked if adding conveyance under the I-95 bridge would shave off elevation
 of the Heritage Riverboat Landing parking lot on the east side of the river? Would that be a
 way to increase conveyance in the instance of a flood event to mitigate rise? Ackerman
 responded that it is possible but could not speak credibly about that scenario.

BREAK

7. Draft Programmatic Agreement Walk-Thru - Lori Price, Jacobs (12:00 – 1:50 CT)

- Price reviewed the attachments sent with the meeting invite. For the purposes of this
 meeting we will be using the revised PA.
- Discussion of insertions, deletions, and edits to the PA. Significant points of discussion are as follows:
 - Discussion as to condition of the bridge and whether it needs to be replaced as soon as possible. Note that the bridge is under a current weight restriction limiting the types of cars that can utilize the bridge. Whereas clause will be amended.
 - Nearby Recorded Sites Attempted to summarize past research into two additional Whereas Clauses. See later discussion for visual APE.



Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting 12 September 18, 2020/11:00 a.m. CDT

Notes

- CRM Sites map Was developed as a result of the number of comments regarding nearby sites. Emily Sakariassen expressed concern about showing previously recorded archaeological sites. SHPO office concurred with concerns. As a result, archaeological sites will be removed. Map showing archaeological sites is confidential and should not be distributed.
- Crying Hill Site number only part of the site has been recorded. SHPO will have the whole site recorded and provide the site number.
- APE Will need to have a process for amendments to APE. There will also be a visual APE. Borrow and staging areas will be added once they are known.
- Vibration effects discussed vibrations would be covered within the already existing APE under "physical effects." ACHP will provide some vibration effects examples.
- APE stipulation added after Whereas clauses. This section was discussed in greater detail. The barracks buildings are part of National Guard complex adjacent to the APE and some have been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP. Merritt suggested developing a separate visual APE. Price agreed to add that.
- Time frames most time frames would be better placed in the MOA. Time frames are important and need to be achievable. Think about matching timeframes up with the NEPA process so that alternatives can be evaluated.
- Bridge Advisory Committee will be led by FORB. Timeline for establishment of the committee and their recommendations to be presented to BNSF was discussed. The recommendations should be included in the draft EIS. Discussion regarding the role of the committee. Brian Dunn explained the committee's recommendations would be limited to aesthetics and would not encompass engineering design.
- Potential economic impacts to commercial riverboat operation is not a Section 106 issue. The steamboat is not eligible for NRHP.
- Imminent failure issue was discussed. USCG discussed the process for notification.
 It is not an overnight process. Will look at adding a citation for USCG and USACE emergency approval process.

8. Section 106 Next Steps - Brian Dunn, USCG

- PA will be updated, MOA items will be removed, dates/timeframes will be added
- Create a visual timeline of future process(es)
- FORB will let USCG know when the meeting with floodplain administrators is scheduled
- Conversation with SHPO about starting point for the visual APE
- Chris Wilson will provide sample text on vibration impacts
- SHPO will record Crying Hill and provide updated site number

Jacobs

Meeting Minutes

Section 106 Consulting Parties Meeting 12 September 18, 2020/11:00 a.m. CDT

Notes

- Chris Wilson will facilitate FORB/Ackerman conversation with FHWA/MNDOT about adding culverts to I-94 bridge
- 9. NEPA Update Brian Dunn, USCG
 - Not addressed due to time constraints
- 10. Adjourn