Appendix F-4: Section 106 Correspondence

Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project

GO Triangle

October 2018
From: Gledhill-earley, Renee
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 11:09 AM
To: Meghan Makoid
Subject: FW: Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, ER12-0378 -- Addendum regarding Glenwood-Woodstock Neighborhood

<eghan:
I’m sending you Claudia’s comments in raw form so you have the gist of the matter. Yes, the subdivision is eligible and having reviewed the interiors of Asbury Temple, she agrees it is also eligible.
Hope this helps.

Will get the edited comments to you asap.
Renee

Please note, effective October 9th, my phone number will change to [redacted]

Renee Gledhill-Earley
Environmental Review Coordinator
State Historic Preservation Office

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Please Note: Requests for project review or responses to our review comments should be sent to our Environmental Review emailbox at [redacted]. Otherwise, I will have to return your request and ask that you send it to the proper mailbox. This will cause delays in your project. Information on email project submittal is at: http://www.hpo.ncdcr.gov/er/er_email_submittal.html

From: Brown, Claudia
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2018 7:01 PM
To: Gledhill-earley, Renee
Subject: Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, ER12-0378 -- Addendum regarding Glenwood-Woodstock Neighborhood

Renee,

This evening I reviewed the above-cited addendum as well as the “Durham Documentation of African American Historic Sites” report upon which the addendum largely relies (there’s a copy in my office). While it is true that almost every house in this subdivision has experienced some degree of alteration, most of the changes are limited to replacement siding and windows. The final bullet point in the addendum is not quite correct. Glenview-Woodstock (aka Rosewood) may be the only subdivision almost exclusively of Minimal Traditional houses developed by African Americans for African Americans, but there is at least one other, nearby subdivision, College View (aka Plum Street, also covered by the Durham Documentation report) of the same period developed by African Americans for African Americans that consists largely of Minimal Traditional houses as well as Ranch houses. In between these two neighborhoods there are what appear to be two largely intact public housing projects that I believe are more than fifty years old. It is possible that the entire area—the public housing projects and the two flanking subdivisions—constitute one large eligible district. It’s probably also likely that each of the subdivisions is eligible individually.
The fact that they appear to be the earliest post-WWII subdivisions developed by African Americans for African Americans seems to me to carry a lot of weight. I would err on the side of caution and agree that Glenview-Woodstock is eligible.

Claudia

Please note, effective October 9, 2018, my phone number has been changed to [redacted]

Claudia R. Brown
Supervisor, Survey and National Register Branch
State Historic Preservation Office

HPO Website | HPOWEB Mapping Site

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Facebook Twitter Instagram YouTube

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Good afternoon,
A hard copy and CD version of the supplemental photographs to the Architectural Resources Technical Report (June 2018) will be hand-delivered to Renee Gledhill-Earley’s office today, October 1, 2018. Attached is a copy of the transmittal letter and an electronic copy of the supplemental memo.

Thank you,
Kaitlin Hughes
Environmental Planner
GoTriangle
October 1, 2018

Renee Gledhill-Earley, Environmental Review Coordinator
North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office
4617 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4617

RE: Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Durham and Orange Counties, ER 12-0378 – Transmittal of Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report (Background and Eligibility Report)

Dear Ms. Gledhill-Earley:

In response to your letter dated July 24, 2018, GoTriangle is providing photographs of the interior of the Asbury Temple United Methodist Church (DH3964) as a supplement to the previously transmitted Architectural Resources Technical Report, Background and Eligibility Report (June 2018).

GoTriangle previously transmitted a historic architectural supplemental memo to your office on September 21, 2018 with further information on the Glenwood-Woodstock Neighborhood (DH3965). The photographs of the interior of the Asbury Temple United Methodist Church (DH3964) and the supplemental technical memo on the Glenwood-Woodstock Neighborhood (DH3965) completes the additional information you requested regarding the Architectural Resources Technical Report, Background and Eligibility Report (June 2018).

With this additional information, GoTriangle, on behalf of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), requests your concurrence on the Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report Survey, Background and Eligibility Report (June 2018).

A separate electronic submittal will be transmitted by email to all consulting parties for review. The submittal will include a copy of the photographs of the interior of the Asbury Temple United Methodist Church (DH3964).

If there is any additional information that you may need to assist in your review, please contact me at [redacted] or [redacted].

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kaitlin Hughes
Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Enclosures: One (1) Historic Architectural Resources – Supplemental Photographs
MEETING AGENDA

September 24th, 2018  10:30 AM-12:00PM

Subject:  0216 SHPO Coordination
Location:  Loblooly Conference Room- phone number: [REDACTED]

Discussion Items

1. **Objectives**

2. **Identified Design Issues**
   a. Roadway
   b. Railroad signaling

3. **Solution Requirements**
   a. Current pedestrian/bicycle access

4. **Alternatives Evaluated**
   a. Aerial alignment
   b. At-grade street connections
   c. One-way Blackwell Street
   d. Pedestrian underpass
   e. Pedestrian bridge

5. **Schedule**
   a. Supplemental Environmental Assessment and Section 106 Consultation
   b. Design charrettes

6. **Proposed Process for Effects Determination Consultation**

7. **Next Steps**
Meeting Objectives

The goals of this meeting are to:

- Review the *design constraints* along Pettigrew Street and adjacent roads in downtown Durham.

- Discuss the *avoidance and minimization alternatives* to the W.T. Blackwell & Co Building, a National Historic Landmark and important community feature.

- Request SHPO participation in avoidance of adverse effects to the W.T. Blackwell & Co Building during early planning.
Design Issues

Advancements in engineering and comments received on the design identified two constraints in the alignment on Pettigrew Street.

- The existing road profiles would prevent larger vehicles from crossing both sets of tracks;
- Analysis of gate operations revealed timing constraint at Blackwell Street and Dillard Street.
Blackwell Street Road Profile
What Does the Solution Need to Accomplish?

The solution to the Pettigrew Street issues needs to:

- Re-establish pedestrian and bicycle north/south connectivity in downtown Durham
  - DPAC
  - Durham Bulls Athletic Park
  - American Tobacco Campus
  - City Center
  - Businesses and retail

- Avoid Adverse Effects to the W.T. Blackwell & Co Building

- Align with the City of Durham SmART Initiative
  - Improve walkability and connectivity
  - Showcase Durham’s unique character
  - Increase spending in arts, hotels, shops, and restaurants
  - Encourage private developers to invest in public art and artscape
Current Pedestrian/Bicycle Access Options

Access options:
Main Street to DBAP, using Blackwell (yellow) = 1,470 feet

Main Street to DBAP, using Mangum (magenta) = 2,300 feet

Main Street to American Tobacco, using Blackwell (yellow)= 950 feet

Main Street to American Tobacco, using Mangum (magenta)= 1,785 feet
Alternatives Evaluated

- Aerial alignment along Pettigrew Street
- Not cost effective
- Visual aspect in proximity to the W.T. Blackwell & Co. Building

Closure of Blackwell Street with at-grade streets connections
- Vehicles re-routed to two-way Ramsey Street to alternative north/south roads
- Pedestrians could be re-routed to one-way southbound Mangum Street; however, volume is considered unsafe and no viable alternative for cyclists heading north.

Blackwell Street one-way southbound
- Signal timing issue
- Raising Pettigrew Street approx. 4' would result in 4-8 retaining walls outside W.T.

Blackwell & Co. Building
- Pedestrian/bicycle underpass
- Undesirable length or pedestrian safety
- Construction under the railroad
- Potential foundation issues for historic buildings

Pedestrian/bicycle bridge
- Visual aspect in proximity to the W.T. Blackwell & Co. Building
Blackwell Street One-way Southbound Alternative
Blackwell Street One-way Southbound Alternative
Pedestrian/Bicycle Underpass Alternative
Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Alternative
View from W.T. Blackwell & Co. Building

- Approximately 160 feet to edge of proposed Blackwell/Mangum Station
- Approximately 180 feet to proposed bridge
- Approximately 315 feet to DFAC
View from W.T. Blackwell & Co. Building

Approx. 180 feet to the proposed pedestrian/bicycle bridge

Approx. 315 feet to DPAC

Approx. 160 feet to edge of proposed Blackwell/Mangum Station
## Schedule Milestones 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge (0%)</td>
<td>Bridge (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Section 106 Consultation and Supplemental Environmental Assessment – October 2018 (0%)**
  - 3rd party Urban Designer/Planner to help establish base criteria and conceptual design direction
  - Charrette with stakeholders
  - **Publish Supplemental Environmental Assessment end of October**

- **Conceptual Design 1 – November 2018 (5%)**
  - 3rd party Architectural/Engineering team to lead conceptual designs
  - Establish up to 5 early bridge aesthetic options and materials
  - Charrette with stakeholders

- **Conceptual Design 2 – December 2018 (10%)**
  - 3rd party AE team – review concepts with stakeholders
  - Reduce number of bridge aesthetic options and materials
  - 1st Public Meeting to review bridge design
Schedule Milestones 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge (0%)</td>
<td>Bridge (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Mtg #1</td>
<td>Public Mtg #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Schematic Design – January 2019 (15%)**
  - 3rd party AE team to select 2 bridge aesthetic options and materials
  - Review with stakeholders

- **Final Effects Determination – February 2019**

- **Design Development – April 2019 (30%)**
  - Public Meeting #2 to review bridge aesthetic options and materials
  - 1 bridge presented
  - Review with stakeholders

- **Construction Documentation – August 2019 (60%)**
  - 1 bridge design
  - GEC to produce document package for submittal to FTA
  - Review with stakeholders
Proposed Process for Effects Determination Consultation

- GoTriangle met with SHPO on June 5, 2018 to review the revised APE and begin the consultation process for the Proposed Refinements along the corridor.

- The proposed Blackwell Street closure will be incorporated into the draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment and will evaluate the conceptual design for the proposed bridge for the draft effects determination.

- GoTriangle and the FTA request SHPO’s participation in the continued consultation and development of the design parameters.

- Potential review during the design process may include:
  - Process to develop bridge type and materials
  - Input on design aspects of safety additions (to prevent objects from being thrown off bridge)
GoTriangle presented an update on the status and scope of the proposed refinements to the previous design of the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-OLRT) Project. The purpose of this discussion was to review options for maintaining bicycle and pedestrian access between Ramseur and Pettigrew Streets that would be affected by the proposed Blackwell Street closure.

Meeting Discussion

1. Purpose of Proposed Refinement and Mitigation Option
   a. The profile change between the proposed light rail track and Pettigrew Street to the south creates a safety issue for trucks crossing the track on Blackwell Street; the gate closure timing that would be required for vehicles crossing the longer intersection creates additional safety concerns. To address these concerns, GoTriangle proposes closing Blackwell Street between Ramseur Street and Pettigrew Street.
   b. GoTriangle recognizes the importance of this north-south crossing to bicycle and pedestrian traffic and wants to maintain the access connection, especially given the parking decks on the north side of Ramseur Street that feed pedestrian traffic to the DPAC and American Tobacco District south of Pettigrew Street. In addition, the City of Durham wishes to increase north-south pedestrian connectivity in the downtown area.

2. Alternatives Evaluated
   a. At-Grade Crossing: Norfolk Southern (NS) has raised concerns about leaving a bicycle/pedestrian crossing on Blackwell Street, and NS has to sign off on any at-grade crossing that impacts its tracks. NS has control of an area 50 feet on either side of its tracks, and NCRR envisions up to four tracks in downtown Durham. There are similar safety concerns with re-routing bicycle and pedestrian traffic onto the one-way Mangum Street crossing.
   b. Pedestrian Bridge: Typically, NS requires 23 feet of vertical clearance over its tracks, but 24.3 feet is required between Raleigh and Charlotte due to anticipated future passenger rail needs
and freight concerns. GoTriangle estimates that the walking surface of pedestrian bridge (based on the required clearance) would be approximately 30 feet high (allowing for a 5-foot structure depth).

i. The Blackwell/Mangum Streets Station platform would not be directly accessible from the bridge; users would have to exit the south end of the bridge to reach the station.

ii. GoTriangle is reviewing ramp alternatives for ADA compliance; these would serve bicycles and ADA compliance. An elevator/stair combination hasn’t been ruled out, but GoTriangle is focusing on cost effective access options.

iii. SHPO requested information on what protection/fencing NS and NCRR would require on the bridge itself; on other projects, railroads have required chain-link fencing or other protection with smaller openings.

c. If Blackwell Street closed, Pettigrew can remain at its existing elevation, but would gradually increase moving east to Mangum Street; this would eliminate the need for retaining walls at the Old Bull Building. SHPO encouraged GoTriangle to note in the project documentation this minimization measure.

d. SHPO offered that a No Adverse Effect determination should be possible for the proposed pedestrian bridge concept, with the following notes:

i. SHPO will need to consider the revised view of the Old Bull Building from points east (view from Mangum shooting down Pettigrew); it is better to frame the building then to cut off the view at mid-height. Since Pettigrew will be one-way eastbound, the issue will be pedestrian experience rather than from vehicle.

ii. It was not recommended that the bridge shift any farther west (as compared to what is shown in the PowerPoint presentation).

iii. The southern pedestrian ramp connection to the bridge can extended diagonally southwest sloping down to Blackwell Street.

3. Next Steps

a. GoTriangle will provide SHPO with the proposed pedestrian bridge design once available. As long as conditions discussed above are met, no further conditions should be needed.

b. The design submittal should include a visualization of how the bridge frames the building. SHPO should also be updated on the fencing/endlosure required by the railroad.

c. GoTriangle will schedule an effects meeting in the next 30 days for the entire project, with which draft effects report/letter will be provided. The effects determination is needed for final decision document.

Attachments

Meeting Agenda
PowerPoint
Good morning,

A hard copy and CD version of the revised Archaeological Resources Technical Report (September 2018) will be hand-delivered to Rosie Blewitt-Golsch's office today, September 21, 2018. Attached is a copy of the transmittal letter.

Thank you,
Kaitlin Hughes
Environmental Planner
GoTriangle
September 19, 2018

Rosie Blewitt-Golsch, Archaeologist
Office of State Archaeology
4619 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4619

RE: Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Duham and Orange Counties, ER 12-0378 –
Transmittal of Archaeological Resources Technical Report

Dear Ms. Blewitt-Golsch:

Enclosed please find a copy of the revised Archaeological Resources Technical Report (September 2018) for your review. In response to your letter dated July 24, 2018, GoTriangle updated the Archaeological Resources Technical Report (September 2018) to include:

- Relevant legislation and SHPO environmental review number;
- Project goals and objectives;
- Principal investigator, crew member names, and field survey time;
- Total acreage of the project area and a map of project boundaries;
- Types of current and historic land use and expected archaeological potential for the project area; and,

As a reminder from the June 5, 2018 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) Project Section 106 consultation meeting, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and GoTriangle are preparing a Supplemental Environmental Assessment to evaluate the potential effects of project refinements proposed along the 17.7 mile D-O LRT Project. The Archeological Resources Technical Report documents the results of the Phase I archaeological survey, which was conducted in support of the upcoming Supplemental Environmental Assessment. The report includes:

- an environmental and cultural contextual review;
- background research for previously recorded site locations located in the revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) (revised APE previously transmitted to you on May 31, 2018);
- Phase I archaeological survey for the three areas recommended for further analysis (i.e., Leigh Village Station, Gateway Station, and the Erwin Road/LaSalle Street area) and results of the investigations;
- supporting background research, photographs, maps, shovel test results, and tables; and,
- resumes for the Principal Investigators and the Lead Reviewer

A separate electronic submittal will be transmitted to all consulting parties for review. The electronic submittal will also include a redacted version of this revised Archaeological Resources Technical Report (redactions pursuant to N.C.G.S. 70-18). If there is any additional information that you may need to assist in your review, please contact me at:

Sincerely,

Kaitlin Hughes
Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Enclosures: One (1) Archaeological Resources Technical Report
Pearson, Jennifer

From: Kaitlin Hughes
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2018 11:30 AM
To: Meghan Makoid; wbs; Mitchell; Stanley; Walker; Julia (FTA); renee.gledhill-earle
Cc: DOLRT 0637B / 0615 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Durham and Orange Counties, ER 12-0378 – Transmittal of Supplemental Architectural Resources Memo

Good morning,
A hard copy and CD version of the supplemental memo to the Architectural Resources Technical Report (June 2018) will be hand-delivered to Renee Gledhill-Earley’s office today, September 21, 2018. Attached is a copy of the transmittal letter and an electronic copy of the supplemental memo.

Photographs of the interior of the Asbury Temple United Methodist Church (DH3964) are scheduled to be taken. The photographs and a separate memo will be transmitted under a separate cover.

Thank you,
Kaitlin Hughes
Environmental Planner
GoTriangle
September 19, 2018

Renee Gledhill-Earley, Environmental Review Coordinator
North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office
4617 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4617

RE: Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Durham and Orange Counties, ER 12-0378 –
Transmittal of Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report (Background and Eligibility Report)

Dear Ms. Gledhill-Earley:

Enclosed please find a copy of the historic architecture memo that supplements the previously transmitted Architectural Resources Technical Report (June 2018). In response to your letter dated July 24, 2018, GoTriangle prepared this supplemental memo to include additional information regarding the Glenwood-Woodstock Neighborhood. Based on your recommendations, details from the report titled Durham Documentation of African American Historic Sites Inventory and Preservation Plan 2009-2012 and additional photographs of the Glenwood-Woodstock Neighborhood are documented in this historic architecture memo.

As discussed during the June 5, 2018 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) Project Section 106 consultation meeting, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and GoTriangle are preparing a Supplemental Environmental Assessment to evaluate the potential effects of project refinements proposed along the 17.7 mile D-O LRT Project. The Architectural Resources Technical Report (June 2018) documents the results of the supplemental architectural resource survey, which was conducted in support of the upcoming Supplemental Environmental Assessment. The report includes:

- Phase I reconnaissance-level survey review of individual buildings and districts in the revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) for historic architecture;
- Phase II intensive evaluation to assess National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility for potentially eligible resources identified during the Phase I supplemental survey;
- Supporting background research, photographs, maps, and tables; and
- Resumes for the Principal Investigators and the Lead Reviewer

A separate electronic submittal will be transmitted by email to all consulting parties for review. The submittal will include a copy of this supplemental historic architecture memo.

If there is any additional information that you may need to assist in your review, please contact me at [redacted] or [redacted]

Sincerely,

Kaitlin Hughes
Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Enclosures: One (1) Historic Architectural Resources Supplemental Memo
Thanks, Meghan.
It sounds like a sound plan.
Renee

---

Renee Gledhill-Earley
Environmental Review Coordinator
State Historic Preservation Office

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Please Note: Requests for project review or responses to our review comments should be sent to our Environmental Review emailbox at [mailto:jordan@ncdcr.gov]
Otherwise, I will have to return your request and ask that you send it to the proper mailbox. This will cause delays in your project. Information on email project submittal is at: http://www.hpo.ncdcr.gov/er_email_submittal.html

From: Meghan Makoid [mailto:jordan@ncdcr.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 6:14 PM
To: Shearin, Renee; Gledhill-Earley, Renee
Cc: wbs; DCR - Environmental_Review; Kaitlin Hughes; 'Mitchel, Stanley'; Walker, Julia (FTA); Fletcher, Joshua

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to Report Spam.

Renee,

Thank you for your response on the historic resources report.

For the Asbury Temple United Methodist Church (DH3964) - our team will contact the church to gain access to the interior and take photos of the church's interior.
For the Glenwood-Woodstock Neighborhoods (DH3965) – our team will take additional photographs of the area and its houses. Our team will also contact Preservation Durham to obtain access to the Johnson report. Since Ms. Johnson was just appointed the new executive director of Preservation Durham, we will also reach out to Ms. Johnson to specifically ask about the Glenwood-Woodstock neighborhood, and extend the invitation to participate in any future project consultation meetings.

We will follow up with you once these efforts are complete to provide the photos and additional requested information.

Thanks,

Meghan

Phone: 

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the NC. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

---

From: DCR - Environmental_Review [mailto]
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2018 12:28 PM
To: Meghan Makoid


Our response is attached. Thank you.

Renee Shearin
Environmental Review Technician, State Historic Preservation Office
North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Please submit all Environmental Review projects to [removed]. Only one project per email. Allow at least 30 days for our review. We try hard to complete the reviews in fewer days, but under state and federal regulations we have a mandatory 30 days.

See [removed] for guidelines on submitting projects for environmental review.

Do not send .zip, .tif files, downloads, or links to websites as we are not able to process these types of items. The message size, including all attachments, should be no larger than 20 megabytes.

---

From: Meghan Makoid [mailto]
Sent: Monday, Jul 02, 2018 7:24 PM
To: DCR - Environmental_Review
Cc: wbs; Gledhill-earley, Renee


Attached please find a copy of the transmittal letter for the Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report that was hand delivered to the Renee Gledhill-Earley’s office on June 29, 2018.

An electronic copy of the report may be accessed using the GoTriangle FTP at the link below. The electronic report will be transmitted to all consulting parties along with a copy of the June 5, 2018 Section 106 consultation meeting materials.

http://ftp.ridetta.org

Please use the following username and password:
Username: [Redacted]
Password: [Redacted]
(Please note: the letters [Redacted] are uppercase letters)

The report is located in the “Section 106 – Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report” folder.

Should you require any additional information to assist in your review, please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,
Meghan

Meghan A. Makoid, AICP
Senior Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.
This page intentionally left blank.
Thank you, Renee.

We will address the corrections outlined in your response in our final report.

Thanks,
Meghan

---

From: DCR - Environmental_Review [mailto:DCR-Environmental_Review@ncdcr.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2018 3:48 PM
To: Meghan Makoid

Our response is attached. Thank you.

---

Renee Shearin
Environmental Review Technician, State Historic Preservation Office
North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources

109 East Jones Street  |  4603 Mail Service Center  |  Raleigh, North Carolina 27699

---

Please submit all Environmental Review projects to [mailto:DCR-Environmental_Review@ncdcr.gov]. Only one project per email.

Allow at least 30 days for our review. We try hard to complete the reviews in fewer days, but under state and federal regulations we have a mandatory 30 days.

See [http://www.hpo.ncdcr.gov/er/er_email_submittal.html](http://www.hpo.ncdcr.gov/er/er_email_submittal.html) for guidelines on submitting projects for environmental review.

*Do not send .zip, .tif files, downloads, or links to websites as we are not able to process these types of items. The message size, including all attachments, should be no larger than 20 megabytes.*
Attached please find a copy of the transmittal letter for the Historic Archaeological Resources Technical Report that was hand delivered to the Rosie Blewitt-Godsch’s office on June 29, 2018.

An electronic copy of the full Archaeological Resources Technical Report may be accessed using the following secure Dropbox link:

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/q0qoqasvo9ahr1/AABg0oOCYL5n4_fOJoP62JN6a?dl=0

As a courtesy, an electronic copy of the redacted report (reductions pursuant to N.C.G.S. 70-18), may be accessed using the GoTriangle FTP at the link below. The redacted electronic report will be transmitted to all consulting parties along with a copy of the June 5, 2018 Section 106 meeting materials.

http://ftp.rideetta.org

Please use the following username and password:

Username: [Redacted]
Password: [Redacted]

(Please note: the letters "[Redacted]" are uppercase letters)

The redacted report is located in the “Section 106 – Archaeological Resources Technical Report” folder.

Should you require any additional information to assist in your review, please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,
Meghan

Meghan A. Makoid, AICP
Senior Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.
Our response is attached. Thank you.

Renee Shearin  
Environmental Review Technician, State Historic Preservation Office  
North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources

Please submit all Environmental Review projects to: [email removed]. Only one project per email. Allow at least 30 days for our review. We try hard to complete the reviews in fewer days, but under state and federal regulations we have a mandatory 30 days.

See http://www.hpo.ncdcr.gov/er/er_email_submittal.html for guidelines on submitting projects for environmental review.

Do not send .zip, .tif files, downloads, or links to websites as we are not able to process these types of items. The message size, including all attachments, should be no larger than 20 megabytes.

Attached please find a copy of the transmittal letter for the Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report that was hand delivered to the Renee Gledhill-Earley's office on June 29, 2018.

An electronic copy of the report may be accessed using the GoTriangle FTP at the link below. The electronic report will be transmitted to all consulting parties along with a copy of the June 5, 2018 Section 106 consultation meeting materials.

http://ftp.ridetta.org

Please use the following username and password:

Username: [email removed]  
Password: [email removed]  
(Please note: the letters [removed] are uppercase letters)
The report is located in the “Section 106 – Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report” folder.

Should you require any additional information to assist in your review, please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,
Meghan

Meghan A. Makoid, AICP
Senior Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.
July 24, 2018

Meghan A. Makoid
Go Triangle

Re: Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report, Durham-Orange Light Rail, Durham and Orange Counties, ER 12-0738

Dear Ms. Makoid:

Thank you for your June 29, 2018, letter transmitting the above-referenced report undertaken in support of an upcoming Supplemental Environmental Assessment for the proposed light rail project. We have reviewed the report and offer the following comments.

If, as the report claims, the Asbury Temple United Methodist Church (DH3964) is the only remaining resource connected to the important Royal Ice Cream Company sit-in, it would meet the significance criteria. While the exterior appears to be substantially intact, without information on the interior, we cannot concur that it meets the integrity criteria and is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Thus, we urge the author to make a concerted effort to contact the church and gain access to the interior so that the question of eligibility can be fully assessed.

Glenwood-Woodstock Neighborhood (DH3965): Without a context on other subdivisions developed for African Americans during the 1950s and 1960s and the comparing and contrasting of Glenwood-Woodstock to the others, we cannot assess this subdivision’s eligibility. There are numerous other African American subdivisions of the period, several of which were surveyed by April Johnson several years ago for Preservation Durham. We enclose a copy of the cover of her report and recommend that the authors contact Preservation Durham to obtain access to it. They should also provide additional photographs of the area and its houses to better determine the significance and integrity of this neighborhood to the development and history of Durham’s African-American subdivisions.

The above comments are made pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s Regulations for Compliance with Section 106 codified at 36 CFR Part 800.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration. If you have questions concerning the above comment, contact Renee Gledhill-Earley, environmental review coordinator, at [redacted] or [redacted]. In all future communication concerning this project, please cite the above referenced tracking number.

Sincerely,

Ramona M. Bartos

Enclosure
DURHAM
DOCUMENTATION OF
AFRICAN AMERICAN
HISTORIC SITES

Inventory and Preservation Plan

DURHAM, NC
2009-2013

P.O. BOX 25411, DURHAM, NC 27707-5411
Our response is attached. Thank you.

Renee Shearin
Environmental Review Technician, State Historic Preservation Office
North Carolina Department of Natural and Cultural Resources

109 East Jones Street | 4603 Mail Service Center | Raleigh, North Carolina 27699

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Please submit all Environmental Review projects to [REDACTED]. Only one project per email. Allow at least 30 days for our review. We try hard to complete the reviews in fewer days, but under state and federal regulations we have a mandatory 30 days.

See [REDACTED] for guidelines on submitting projects for environmental review.

Do not send .zip, .tif files, downloads, or links to websites as we are not able to process these types of items. The message size, including all attachments, should be no larger than 20 megabytes.

From: Meghan Makoid [mailto:REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2018 7:24 PM
To: DCR - Environmental Review
Cc: wbs; Blewitt, Rosemarie; Gledhill-earley, Renee; Shearin, Renee; 'Mitchell, Stanley'; Kaitlin Hughes

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to Report Spam.

Attached please find a copy of the transmittal letter for the Historic Archaeological Resources Technical Report that was hand delivered to the Rosie Blewitt-Golsch’s office on June 29, 2018.

An electronic copy of the full Archaeological Resources Technical Report may be accessed using the following secure dropbox link: [REDACTED]

As a courtesy, an electronic copy of the redacted report (redactions pursuant to N.C.G.S. 70-18), may be accessed using the GoTriangle FTP at the link below. The redacted electronic report will be transmitted to all consulting parties along with a copy of the June 6, 2018 Section 106 meeting materials.

[REDACTED]
Please use the following username and password:

Username: [REDACTED]
Password: [REDACTED]

(Please note: the letters [REDACTED] are uppercase letters)

The redacted report is located in the “Section 106 – Archaeological Resources Technical Report” folder.

Should you require any additional information to assist in your review, please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,
Meghan

Meghan A. Makoid, AICP
Senior Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.
July 24, 2018

Meghan A. Makoid
GoTriangle

Re: Supplemental Environmental Assessment Archaeological Resources Technical Report, Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Durham and Orange Counties, ER 12-0738

Dear Ms. Makoid:

Thank you for your June 20, 2018, letter transmitting the draft report for the above-referenced undertaking. We have reviewed the report and offer the following comments.

No archaeological sites were identified as a result of fieldwork activities, and New South Associates recommends no further archaeological work is needed for the project area. Based on the information provided, this office concurs with their recommendation, and finds that the proposed project will have no effect on any archaeological resources eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Attached for your use are items that need to be corrected in the final report.

The above comments are made pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's Regulations for Compliance with Section 106 codified at 36 CFR Part 800.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration. If you have questions concerning the above comment, contact Renee Gledhill-Earley, environmental review coordinator, at [redacted] or [redacted] In all future communication concerning this project, please cite the above referenced tracking number.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ramona M. Bartos

Attachment — corrections

cc: Shawn Patch, New South Associates, [redacted]
Please add the information listed below to the final report, described in the guidelines for Phase I Identification Survey Reports, pages 21-27

a. Management Summary
   2. Relevant legislation and SHPO environmental review number
   3. A brief statement of project goals and objectives

b. Introduction
   3. SHPO environmental review number
   7. Principal investigator and crew member names

c. Environmental Setting
   1. Total acreage of the project area
   2. Map of project boundaries showing recent aerial imagery at a scale of 1:24,000 or less
   3. Types of current and historic land use within the project area, including estimates of the acreage within each current land use type

d. Archaeological and Cultural Background
   3. Expected archaeological potential for the project area, including expected site types and settings

f. Results
   1. Field survey time, specifically how many person-days in the field were necessary to cover the project area using the techniques described
Dear Consulting Party,

The FTA and GoTriangle are preparing a Supplemental Environmental Assessment (Supplemental EA) to evaluate the potential effects of proposed refinements to the design of the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) Project. Since the D-O LRT Project would use federal funds and is administered by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the project meets the definition of a federal undertaking per 36 C.F.R. Part 800. As you may recall, your organization was invited to participate in a consultation meeting on the project, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 36 C.F.R. Part 800a Section 106.

On June 5, 2018, GoTriangle and the FTA held a consultation meeting pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. During this meeting, GoTriangle provided an update about the D-O LRT Project and an overview of the proposed refinements currently under study. The principal investigators for the project discussed the proposed revisions to the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for historic and archaeological resources. In addition, the investigators reviewed the background research and preliminary survey findings for the listed resources and potentially eligible resources for listing on the National Register of Historic Places located within the revised APEs.

Below, please find an FTP link to access the materials from the June 5, 2018 Section 106 Consultation meeting. In addition, copies of the historic and archaeological resources technical reports are included for your reference.

http://ftp.ridetta.org

Please use the following username and password to login:
Username: [REDACTED]
Password: [REDACTED]
(Please note: the letters [REDACTED] are uppercase letters)

On behalf of FTA, GoTriangle is seeking the input of your organization on the materials linked above, and will consider such input when evaluating the potentially eligible resources within the APE.

GoTriangle and FTA will host a subsequent consultation meeting, which will focus on the potential effects of the proposed project refinements on historic, cultural, and archaeological resources located within the APE. This meeting and any subsequent consultation will help inform the upcoming Supplemental EA, Section 106 evaluation and draft determination, and Section 4(f) evaluation and draft determination, which the FTA and GoTriangle plan to publish later this fall. A follow up meeting invitation will be sent to all of the consulting parties once the date of the meeting is confirmed with the FTA and the State Historic Preservation Office.
Should you have questions, please contact me directly at [redacted] or [redacted].

Sincerely,

Meghan A. Makoid, AICP
Senior Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.
June 29, 2018

Rosie Blewitt-Golsch, Archaeologist
Office of State Archeology
4619 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4619

RE: Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Durham and Orange Counties, ER 12-0378 – Transmittal of Archaeological Resources Technical Report

Dear Ms. Blewitt-Golsch:

Enclosed please find a copy of the Archaeological Resources Technical Report (June 2018) for your review. As discussed during the June 5, 2018 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) Project Section 106 consultation meeting, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and GoTriangle are preparing a Supplemental Environmental Assessment to evaluate the potential effects of project refinements proposed along the 17.7 mile D-O LRT Project.

The Archeological Resources Technical Report (June 2018) documents the results of the Phase I archaeological survey, which was conducted in support of the upcoming Supplemental Environmental Assessment. The report includes:

- an environmental and cultural contextual review;
- background research for previously recorded site locations located in the revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) (revised APE previously transmitted to you on May 31, 2018);
- Phase I archaeological survey for the three areas recommended for further analysis (i.e., Leigh Village Station, Gateway Station, and the Erwin Road/LaSalle Street area);
- results of the investigations;
- supporting background research, photographs, maps, shovel test results, and tables; and,
- resumes for the Principal Investigators (Shawn Patch and John Kannaday with New South Associates, Inc.) and the Lead Reviewer (Josh Fletcher with HDR, Inc.)

A separate electronic submittal will be transmitted to all consulting parties for review. The electronic submittal will include a redacted version of this Archaeological Resources Technical Report (redactions pursuant to N.C.G.S. 70-18), as well as copies of the June 5, 2018 Section 106 consultation meeting agenda, sign-in sheet, related correspondence, presentation, and meeting summary.

If there is any additional information that you may need to assist in your review, please contact me at [redacted] or [redacted]

Sincerely,

Meghan A. Makoid, AICP
Senior Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Enclosures: One (1) Archaeological Resources Technical Report
June 29, 2018

Renee Gledhill-Earley, Environmental Review Coordinator
North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office
4617 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4617

RE: Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Durham and Orange Counties, ER 12-0378 – Transmittal of Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report (Background and Eligibility Report)

Dear Ms. Gledhill-Earley:

Enclosed please find a copy of the Architectural Resources Technical Report (June 2018). As discussed during the June 5, 2018 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) Project Section 106 consultation meeting, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and GoTriangle are preparing a Supplemental Environmental Assessment to evaluate the potential effects of project refinements proposed along the 17.7 mile D-O LRT Project.

The Architectural Resources Technical Report (June 2018) documents the results of the supplemental architectural resource survey, which was conducted in support of the upcoming Supplemental Environmental Assessment. The report includes:

- Phase I reconnaissance-level survey review of individual buildings and districts located in the revised Area of Potential Effects (APE) for historic architecture (revised APE previously transmitted to you on May 31, 2018);
- Phase II intensive evaluation to assess National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility for potentially eligible resources identified during the Phase I supplemental survey;
- supporting background research, photographs, maps, and tables; and,
- resumes for the Principal Investigators (Mary Bath Reed, Ellen Turco, and Scott Morris with New South Associates, Inc.) and the Lead Reviewer (Josh Fletcher with HDR, Inc.)

For your reference, the report appendix includes the materials shared during the June 5, 2018 consultation meeting, including: revised APE maps, photographs of the newly surveyed resources in the revised APE, maps of the previously identified NRHP-eligible Resources in the Revised APE, as well as photographs, renderings, and conceptual designs illustrating the proposed refinements in proximity to the previously identified NRHP-eligible resources.

A separate electronic submittal will be transmitted by email to all consulting parties for review. The submittal will include a copy of this Historic Architectural Resources Technical report, as well as copies of the June 5, 2018 Section 106 consultation meeting agenda, sign-in sheet, correspondence, presentation, and meeting summary.

If there is any additional information that you may need to assist in your review, please contact me at [redacted].

Sincerely,

Meghan A. Makoid, AICP
Senior Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Enclosures: One (1) Historic Architectural Resources Technical Report

PO Box 13787
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
P: 919.485.7510 | F: 919.485.7547

www.gotriangle.org
MEETING AGENDA

Date: June 5, 2018, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject: D O LRT Project Section 106 / Section 1(f) Consultation Meeting
Location: GoTriangle D-O LRT Project Office, Suite 100, NC Mutual Building
411 W. Chapel Hill Street, Durham, NC 27701
Magnolia Conference Room
Conference Call (866) 583-7984, code 1068493

Goals:
- Provide an update on the D-O LRT project and overview of Proposed Project Refinements
- Provide an update on Archaeological and Historic Architectural Resources Surveys

Agenda:
1. Introductions and Meeting Goals (5 minutes)
2. Overview of Section 106 (5 minutes)
3. Project Update (10 minutes)
4. Proposed Project Refinements (10 minutes)
5. Proposed APE Revisions (20 minutes)
6. Archaeological Survey update (15 minutes)
7. Historic Architecture Survey update and eligibility discussion (20 minutes)
8. Next Steps (5 minutes)
9. Discussion/Questions (30 minutes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jordan McNeely</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashleigh Booth</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Tyson</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacia Mitchelt</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F Heckel</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe F Reed</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Menden</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosanna Brockhill</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart Evans</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roomie Kirkland-Cottingham</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Eickes</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Smythe</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Peters</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggan Maxwell</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Hughes</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Pearson</td>
<td>6030 West End Blvd, 5th Floor, 6th St, Durham, NC 27703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project**

Meeting Date: 6/5/2018

Meeting Location: GotRandalone-D0 LRT Project Office

Meeting Subject: Section 106 Consultation Meeting on Proposed Project Refinements
Agenda

• Welcome and Introductions – GoTriangle
• Goals of the Meeting – GoTriangle
• Overview of Section 106 – HDR
• Project Update – GoTriangle
• Proposed Project Refinements – HDR
• Proposed APE Revisions – New South
• Archaeological Survey and Findings – New South
• Architectural Survey and Findings – New South
• Next Steps – HDR
• Discussion and Questions - All
Goals of the Meeting

- **Overview** of Section 106
- **Review** proposed revisions to Area of Potential Effects (APE)
- **Review** newly identified resources (listed or eligible) in proposed revised APE
Overview of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act – Just the Basics

- Section 106 of National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to:
  - Determine resources in a project’s Area of Potential Effects (APE) that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)
  - Determine how listed and eligible Historic Resources might be affected by the project
  - Explore measures to avoid or reduce (mitigate) harm to any affected Historic Resources, and
  - Consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on measures to resolve any Adverse Effects

- Locally designated properties are not part of Section 106, but are considered in assessing Section 4(f) resources
Section 106 Process

Codified in 36 C.F.R. § 800

1. INITIATE the process
   - Determine undertaking
   - Coordination with other reviews (NEPA)
   - Notify SHPO/THPO
   - Identify Tribes and other Consulting Parties
   - Plan to involve the public
   - Undertaking with potential to cause effects?

2. IDENTIFY historic properties
   - Determine APE
   - Identify historic properties
   - Consult with SHPO/THPO, Tribes, and other Consulting Parties
   - Involve the public
   - Historic properties present and affected?

3. ASSESS adverse effects
   - Apply criteria of adverse effect
   - Consult with SHPO/THPO, Tribes, and other Consulting Parties
   - Involve the public
   - Historic properties adversely affected?

4. RESOLVE adverse effects
   - Avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects
   - Notify ACHP
   - Consult with SHPO/THPO, Tribes, and other Consulting Parties
   - Involve the public
   - Agreement (MOA/PA) or Council Comment

PROCESS COMPLETE

Source:
NEPA and NHPA
A Handbook for Integrating NEPA and Section 106 (CEQ and ACHP, March 2011)
National Register Criteria

NRHP Criteria for Evaluation

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. That are associated with the lives of significant persons in or past; or
C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

**To be eligible, properties have to retain integrity AND be significant.
Your Role in the Meeting

• Role of Consulting Parties in Section 106 Process:
  - Provide your organization’s special knowledge of, concern for, or mandated regulatory role that pertains to the historic resources
    - Input will be considered by FTA for determination of eligibility
Project Update

- Project changes have been made based on the following:
  - Advancements in design since the Amended ROD;
  - Responses to public comments and stakeholder feedback on the previous NEPA documentation;
  - Recommendations from the Transit Oriented Development grant study to optimize platform locations for future development; and
  - Recommendations from the updated Durham County and Orange County transit plans.
Proposed Project Refinements

- Proposed Project Refinements were made as a result of project design or project commitments.
  - Shortened station platform lengths;
  - Adjusted station platforms and corresponding track alignments;
  - Modified planned park-and-ride lots;
  - Added bicycle and pedestrian facilities;
  - Reconfigured Rail Operation Maintenance Facility (ROMF) & yard;
  - Elevation of the alignment on Erwin Road;
  - Inclusion of drainage and grading throughout; and
  - Added a new station at Blackwell/Mangum Streets.

- APE’s expanded for additional areas and resources that could be affected by the Proposed Project Refinements.
- Please see the handout packet of revised APE maps.
- GoTriangle completed archaeological and architectural surveys of revised APE’s.
Archaeological Survey and Findings

- Three areas in the revised APE recommended for survey due to larger size and having moderate to high archaeological probability
  - Leigh Village Station
  - Gateway Station
  - A small section on Duke U. campus near LaSalle Street
  - No cultural materials were recovered from these three areas
- A fourth area for a proposed waterline relocation along US 15/501
  - Previously reviewed by HPO, assigned ER Number 14-1904.
  - Recommendation of no cultural resources analysis. OSA confirmed that no archaeological investigations were necessary in this area for the analysis.

- The following figure presents an overview of areas with proposed APE revisions
- Subsequent figures present these areas in more detail
Archaeological Draft Effects Updates

- The archaeological resources identified in the APE for the Previous Design are the same as those that could be affected by the Proposed Project Refinements.
- The Proposed Project Refinements will have either no effect or no adverse effect on archaeological sites within the APE.
D-O LRT Project

Historic Architecture
Revised Historic Architectural APE

• The following figure presents an overview of areas of proposed APE revisions.
• Subsequent figures present these four areas in more detail.
New Historic Architectural Resources

- The Phase I reconnaissance-level survey of the revised APE documented five newly identified historic resources:
  - Oakwood Park Neighborhood,
  - Eastwood Park Neighborhood,
  - 5606 Wendell Road,
  - Asbury Temple United Methodist Church (DH 3964), and
  - Glenview/Woodstock Neighborhood (DH 3965).
- Oakwood Park Neighborhood, Eastwood Park Neighborhood, and 5606 Wendell Road are recommended not eligible for the NRHP and no further work is recommended for these resources.
- The following slides present the locations of the resources recommended not eligible for the NRHP.
Oakwood Park Neighborhood

From Oakwood Drive, looking west (recent infill construction).

From Oakwood Drive, looking west (typical Historic Minimal Traditional house).
Eastwood Park Neighborhood

From Celeste Circle, looking south (typical Ranch house).

From Nelson Highway, looking north (typical Ranch house).
Architectural Survey and Findings

- **Asbury Temple United Methodist Church** and the **Glenview/Woodstock Neighborhood** underwent a Phase II intensive evaluation to assess NRHP eligibility. Both are recommended eligible for the NRHP.
- The Proposed Project Refinements are not anticipated to affect the recommended NRHP-eligible resources.
- The following slides present the locations and representative photos of the resources recommended eligible for the NRHP.
Asbury Temple United Methodist Church

View from East Lawson Street, looking south.

View from Wabash Street, looking southwest.
Glenview/Woodstock Neighborhood

West Side of Rosewood Street from Dayton Street.

East Side of Rosewood Street North of Lawson Street.
Next Steps

- Agreement on APE revisions
- Finalize the Archaeological Resources Technical Report and Historic Architecture Technical Report and submit to SHPO for review
- Agreement on eligibility of newly identified historic resources
- Discuss effects to historic resources and provide information to FTA to inform determination
Next Steps (cont.)

Continued consultation with SHPO would include:

Project effects for:
- Newly identified historic resources
- Previously identified resources
  - D-O LRT Project (documented in DEIS and Combined FEIS/ROD)
    - No Effect on 13 of 25 historic resources
    - No Adverse Effect on 12 historic resources

Mitigation Measures
- Will provide landscape visual buffer for historic resources in non-urban settings.
- Any prior commitments that would be modified due to Proposed Project Refinements will be discussed in this meeting.

Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)
- MOA between FTA, SHPO and GoTriangle
- Documents procedures for ensuring effective protection of historic and/or archaeological resources during implementation and construction of the proposed D-O LRT project.
MEETING SUMMARY

Date: June 5, 2018, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject: D-O LRT Project Section 106 / Section 4(f) Consultation Meeting
Location: GoTriangle D-O LRT Project Office, Magnolia Conference Room/ Conference Call

Attendees:

SHPO
Renee Gledhill-Earley
OSA
Rosemarie Blewitt
FTA
Stan Mitchell

GoTriangle
Meghan Makoid
Kaitlin Hughes
Katharine Eggleston
Hart Evans

PMC
Greg Munden
Beth Smyre
Ashley Booth

GEC
Jennifer Pearson
Josh Fletcher
Doug Jackson
John Jamison
Jordan Myers
Shawn Patch
Jackie Tyson

GoTriangle presented an update on the status and scope of proposed refinements to the previous design of the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) Project. The previous design was presented in the December 2016 Amended Record of Decision. GoTriangle is evaluating the impacts of proposed design refinements and plans to issue a Supplemental Environmental Assessment in Summer 2018, as directed by FTA. The purpose of this discussion is to provide an update on the D-O LRT project, an overview of the Proposed Project Refinements, and an update on Archaeological and Historic Architectural Resources surveys conducted for the Proposed Project Refinements. This meeting was held to re-initiate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

Major items discussed include the following:

1. GoTriangle has contacted the consulting parties to the Secton 106 Memorandum of Agreement associated with this project. The Town of Chapel Hill and NCRR responded, but could not attend the scheduled meeting. GoTriangle will continue attempts to contact Preservation Durham, Preservation Chapel Hill, and Preservation North Carolina. A summary of this meeting, along with meeting materials, will be provided to all parties.

2. Archaeological APE and Survey: Based on the surveys conducted, the Proposed Project Refinements are expected to have No Effect to archaeological resources. OSA had no questions on the proposed findings, but requested a copy of the technical report to finalize this recommendation. It was noted that, under advice from OSA, a full technical report has been prepared for this effort.

3. Historic Architecture APE, Survey update and eligibility discussion: The group reviewed the proposed refinements in the vicinity of the surveyed sites. The primary changes in these areas are due to construction of new sidewalks or other bicycle/pedestrian facilities or due to changes in roadway configurations. Based on the initial discussion, the Asbury Temple United Methodist Church will likely be eligible for the National Register, but additional information is needed regarding the Glenview/Woodstock Neighborhood. The final determination will be made following review of the Historic Architectural Technical Report.

4. Project Refinements within the Existing Corridor: GoTriangle summarized the proposed project refinements that are in proximity to previously identified eligible sites. A detailed presentation of effects will be held during a subsequent meeting.

Action Items:

PO Box 13787
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
P: 919.485.7510 | F: 919.485.7547

www.gotriangle.org
a. HDR, on behalf of GoTriangle, will submit Archaeological and Historic Architectural Resources Technical Reports to SHPO and OSA for review within two weeks.
b. Copies of this meeting summary and all meeting materials will be provided to the Section 106 consulting parties.
c. GoTriangle will develop renderings of potential wall treatment options at Duke Memorial United Methodist Church. GoTriangle will also develop renderings for the railroad protection gate design in front of the W.T. Blackwell Building and the consolidated mast arm proposed on the southeast corner of Blackwell Street and Pettigrew Street.
Good Morning Meghan,

I was out of the office when this request was initially sent – thanks for your patience. I have conflicting meetings during this time and it’s unlikely I’ll be able to call in. Will meeting minutes or any other summary of changes be distributed?

Thanks,
Aaron
of, concern for, or mandated regulatory role that pertains to historic resources within the Area of Potential Effects.

On behalf of FTA, GoTriangle requests your consultation to discuss the proposed project refinements as related to the existing Section 106 determination of effects for historic, archaeological, and cultural resources. The FTA is seeking the input of your organization and will consider such input when evaluating the potential effects of the proposed project refinements on historic resources within the Area of Potential Effects.

The FTA and GoTriangle will hold a consultation meeting:
**June 5, 2018 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.**

The meeting will be held at the GoTriangle D-O LRT Project Office:

[Address redacted]

You may participate in person or by phone/Skype. Additional details regarding building access and alternative skype/phone participation are provided in the attached calendar invite.

Please respond to the attached calendar invite by **June 1, 2018**.

Should you have questions, if you cannot attend, or your organization is not interested in participating as a consulting party, please contact me directly at [Contact information redacted] or [Contact information redacted].

Sincerely,

Meghan A. Makoid, AICP
Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

Footer: Information is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.
Thanks Renee!

John Jamison, PWS
D 919.232.6625 M 919.801.8471
hdrinc.com/follow-us

From: Gledhill-earley, Renee [mailto:]
Sent: Friday, June 01, 2018 4:42 PM
To: Jamison, John R.
Subject: RE: [External] DOLRT 0637B Durham-Orange Light Rail Section 106 Consultation

Thanks, I got them.
Rosie Blewett in OSA will be on this project with me. So, we have the materials for review to prepare for the meeting. See you then.
R

--
Renee Gledhill-Earley
Environmental Review Coordinator
State Historic Preservation Office

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Please Note: Requests for project review or responses to our review comments should be sent to our Environmental Review emailbox at Jamison@hdrinc.com. Otherwise, I will have to return your request and ask that you send it to the proper mailbox. This will cause delays in your project. Information on email project submittal is at:
http://www.hpo.ncdcr.gov/er/er_email_submittal.html

From: Jamison, John R. [mailto:]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2018 8:02 PM
To: Gledhill-earley, Renee [mailto:]
Cc: Meghan Makoid [mailto:]; Alia, Eanas [mailto:]; Fletcher, Joshua [mailto:]; Pearson, Jennifer [mailto:]; Ellen Turcotte [mailto:]; wb [mailto:]


Hey Renee! I hope all is well with you. We just wanted to let you know that we dropped off a paper copy of the revised APE mapping (for both historic architecture and archaeology) for the Durham-Orange Light Rail project this afternoon at your office. It should be in your inbox.

Please email Meghan with any followup questions. Thank you!

John Jamison, PWS
Senior Environmental Scientist

hdrinc.com/follow-us
May 31, 2018

MEMORANDUM TO:  Renee Gledhill-Tarley, Environmental Review Coordinator  
                  NC DCR- Environmental Review Branch

FROM:            Jennifer Pearson, Deputy Environmental Project Manager  
                  HDR

CC:              Meghan Makoid, Environmental Planner  
                  GoTriangle

SUBJECT:         Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project  
                  Durham and Orange Counties

GoTriangle is proposing to refine the design of the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) Project, located in Durham and Orange Counties, North Carolina. A Supplemental Environmental Assessment (Supplemental EA) is currently being prepare to evaluate changes in the proposed D-O LRT Project Refinements subsequent to the issuance of the Amended Record of Decision (Amended ROD) in December 2016.

On behalf of GoTriangle, HDR Engineering, Inc. of the Carolinas (HDR) and New South Associates are providing mapping of proposed revisions to the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for both Archaeological Surveys and Architectural History Surveys for the above-referenced project for your review.

Included in this documentation are a brief project status and description of proposed Project Refinements associated with the project. A Supplemental Environmental Assessment for these changes is currently under development to address these refinements.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact either me  
[Contact Information]

or Meghan Makoid at [Contact Information]

Thank you for your time, and we look forward to meeting with you next week.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jennifer Pearson
May 29, 2018

Attention: Stan Mitchell
U.S. DOT Federal Transit Administration
230 Peachtree Street, N.W., Suite 1400
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Re: THPO # TCNS # Project Description
2018-852-1 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project – Proposed Project Refinements

Dear Mr. Mitchell,

The Catawba have no immediate concerns with regard to traditional cultural properties, sacred sites or Native American archaeological sites within the boundaries of the proposed project areas. **However, the Catawba are to be notified if Native American artifacts and/or human remains are located during the ground disturbance phase of this project.**

If you have questions please contact Caitlin Rogers at [contact information redacted], or e-mail [contact information redacted].

Sincerely,

Caitlin Rogers

Wenonah G. Haire
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Dear Consulting Party,

The Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project (D-O LRT Project) has progressed to the Engineering Phase in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Capital Investment Grant Program. Engineering and design plans have advanced to a more-detailed level since FTA issued the Combined Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Record of Decision (FEIS/ROD) and subsequent Supplemental Environmental Assessment (Supplemental EA) and Amended Record of Decision. As a result of this engineering work, GoTriangle is proposing project design refinements along the 17.7 mile project corridor.

The FTA and GoTriangle are preparing a Supplemental Environmental Assessment to evaluate the potential effects of the proposed project refinements. Since the project would use federal funds and is administered by the FTA, the project meets the definition of a federal undertaking per 36 C.F.R. Part 800. You are being contacted because your organization previously participated in consultation on the project, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 36 C.F.R. Part 800 and your organization has special knowledge of, concern for, or mandated regulatory role that pertains to historic resources within the Area of Potential Effects.

On behalf of FTA, GoTriangle requests your consultation to discuss the proposed project refinements as related to the existing Section 106 determination of effects for historic, archaeological, and cultural resources. The FTA is seeking the input of your organization and will consider such input when evaluating the potential effects of the proposed project refinements on historic resources within the Area of Potential Effects.

The FTA and GoTriangle will hold a consultation meeting:
June 5, 2018 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

The meeting will be held at the GoTriangle D-O LRT Project Office:

You may participate in person or by phone/Skype. Additional details regarding building access and alternative skype/phone participation are provided in the attached calendar invite.

Please respond to the attached calendar invite by June 1, 2018.
Should you have questions, if you cannot attend, or your organization is not interested in participating as a consulting party, please contact me directly at [redacted] or [redacted]

Sincerely,

Meghan A. Makoid, AICP
Environmental Planner
GoTriangle

*Email correspondence is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.*
From: Gledhill-earley, Renee <renee.gledhill-earley@ncdeq.nc.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 12:34 PM
To: Meghan Makoid
Subject: FW: design refinements for Dorham-Orange Light Rail

Sorry, got the wrong address.
R

--
Renee Gledhill-Earley
Environmental Review Coordinator
State Historic Preservation Office

[Image of NC Department of Natural and Cultural Resources]

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Please Note: Requests for project review or responses to our review comments should be sent to our Environmental Review mailbox at [mailbox]. Otherwise, I will have to return your request and ask that you send it to the proper mailbox. This will cause delays in your project. Information on email project submittal is at:
http://www.hpo.ncdcr.gov/er/er_email_submittal.html

From: Gledhill-earley, Renee
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 11:57 AM
To: 'mmakoid@
Cc: 'stanley.a.mitchell@ncdeq.nc.gov
Subject: design refinements for Dorham-Orange Light Rail

Dear Ms. Makoid:
This is to respond to Yvette G. Taylor’s letter of April 25, 2018, notifying us of design refinements for the above-referenced project and asking us to coordinate with you.

I look forward to learning about the refinements to the project. My possible dates for a meeting are May 29 in the afternoon or the 30th before 2PM and the 31st also June 4, 5, 7, and 8th. If none of these dates work, perhaps, a Doodle poll would be good.

Thank you.

--
Renee Gledhill-Earley
Environmental Review Coordinator
State Historic Preservation Office
Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Please Note: Requests for project review or responses to our review comments should be sent to our Environmental Review mailbox at [REDACTED]. Otherwise, I will have to return your request and ask that you send it to the proper mailbox. This will cause delays in your project. Information on email project submittal is at: http://www.nhp.ncdcr.gov/er/er_email_submittal.html
April 25, 2018

Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians
Attn: Mr. Russell Townsend
Qualla Boundary Reservation

RE: Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Proposed Project Refinements, Durham and Orange Counties, North Carolina

Dear Mr. Townsend:

The Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project (project), with the cooperation of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), has progressed to the Engineering Phase of this proposed major transit investment in the Chapel Hill-Durham, NC area. The project meets the definition of a federal undertaking per 36 CFR Par 800 and FTA is the lead federal agency. FTA is requesting your consultation for the project per Executive Order 13084, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR Part 800.

Attached please find a proposed Area of Potential Effect (APE) map package that contains a project description and background report. We would be pleased to discuss the project details with you, as well as any confidential concerns you may identify.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with the proposed project. Please contact Mr. Stan Mitchell at [redacted] or [redacted] of my staff should you have any questions or concerns. Your timely response will greatly help us incorporate your concerns into project development.

Sincerely,

Yvette G. Taylor, Ph.D.
Regional Administrator

Attachment: Project Map Package
April 25, 2018

Catawba Indian Nation
Attn: Wenonah G. Haire, THPO

RE: Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Proposed Project Refinements, Durham and Orange Counties, North Carolina

Dear Ms. Haire:

The Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project (project), with the cooperation of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), has progressed to the Engineering Phase of this proposed major transit investment in the Chapel Hill-Durham, NC area. The project meets the definition of a federal undertaking per 36 CFR Par 800 and FTA is the lead federal agency. FTA is requesting your consultation for the project per Executive Order 13084, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR Part 800.

Attached please find a proposed Area of Potential Effect (APE) map package that contains a project description and background report. We would be pleased to discuss the project details with you, as well as any confidential concerns you may identify.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with the proposed project. Please contact Mr. Stan Mitchell at [redacted] of my staff should you have any questions or concerns. Your timely response will greatly help us incorporate your concerns into project development.

Sincerely,

Yvette G. Taylor, Ph.D.
Regional Administrator

Attachment: Project Map Package
April 25, 2018

Ms. Renee Gledhill-Earley
State Historic Preservation Office

RE:  ER 12-0378 Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit Project, Durham and Orange Counties, North Carolina Proposed Design Refinements

Dear Ms. Gledhill-Earley:

Our Grantee, GoTriangle, has progressed to the Engineering Phase in the FTA Capital Investment Grant program for the above referenced project. Engineering and design plans have advanced to a more-detailed level since FTA issued the Combined Final Environmental Impact Statement/Record of Decision (FEIS/ROD) and subsequent Supplemental Environmental Assessment/Amended Record of Decision (Supplemental EA/Amended ROD). As a result of this engineering work, GoTriangle is proposing project design refinements along the 17.7-mile project corridor.

The FTA and GoTriangle are preparing a Supplemental Environmental Assessment to evaluate the potential effects of the proposed project refinements. FTA requests your consultation to discuss the proposed project refinements as related to the existing Section 106 determination of effects for historic, archaeological, and cultural resources.

Please contact Meghan Makoid at [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] to set up a meeting date and time at your convenience. Should you have any questions, please contact Mr. Stan Mitchell of my staff at [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

Yvette G. Taylor, Ph.D.
Regional Administrator