

**REPORT ON THE
ALASKA HISTORIC ROADS STUDY GROUP WORKSHOP
SEPTEMBER 28–30, 2010
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA**

**Prepared for:
State of Alaska
Department of Transportation & Public Facilities**

**Prepared by:
The SRI Foundation
333 Rio Rancho Drive, Suite 103
Rio Rancho, NM 87124**

January 21, 2011

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) executed in February 2010 a Section 106 programmatic agreement (PA) entitled *Programmatic Agreement Regarding Alaska's Highway System Roads Affected by the Federal-Aid Highway Program*. The PA establishes the process whereby FHWA and DOT&PF comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in terms of project effects on National Register of Historic Places (National Register)-listed and -eligible historic roads in the State.

As noted in one of the whereas clauses, the objective of this Alaska Road PA is to allow DOT&PF “to efficiently proceed with needed transportation projects while, in cooperation with FHWA and SHPO, it develops an efficient, systematic approach to evaluating the [National Register] eligibility of roads receiving [Federal-Aid Highway Program] funding in Alaska...” The first step to achieving this objective is to organize and host a workshop to “develop shared goals and understandings for linear feature guidance and contexts on historic roads and highways. The workshop will be developed in cooperation with the SHPO and will also include a planning session that will outline future planning meetings, workshop goals, and responsibilities.” Workshop attendees are to include FHWA; DOT&PF statewide and regional staff; SHPO, along with other interested parties identified by FHWA, DOT&PF, and the SHPO; and a representative from the National Park Service (NPS).

Based on the results of the workshop, as stipulated in the PA, DOT&PF is to develop Interim Guidance. The Interim Guidance is to serve as a mechanism for addressing historic road eligibility and project effects until the completion of a statewide Historic Roads Historic Context, followed by the development of final guidance. As noted in Stipulation 5.C. of the PA, the Historic Roads Historic Context will “include methodology for identification and treatment of historic roads that identifies historic themes, property types, eligibility criteria, treatment approaches, and program recommendations.”

This report presents the results of the workshop stipulated in the PA. The workshop was entitled “The Alaska Historic Roads Study Group Workshop,” and was held in Anchorage on September 28–30, 2010. Workshop participants included representatives from FHWA’s Alaska Division Office, DOT&PF (including the statewide office and regional offices), SHPO, the Department of Natural Resources-Office of History and Archaeology (OHA), and NPS. FHWA’s Federal Preservation Officer also attended the workshop in addition to representatives from the Alaska offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, and US Forest Service (see Appendix A for list of workshop participants).

The SRI Foundation, under contract with DOT&PF, facilitated the workshop. Terry Klein, Executive Director of the Foundation, served as the facilitator. Prior to the

workshop, Foundation staff worked with the Alaska Historic Roads Study Group Core Project Team on the format and content of the workshop. The Core Project Team includes representatives from FHWA's Alaska Division Office, DOT&PF's statewide office, SHPO, OHA, and NPS. FHWA's Federal Preservation Officer and a representative from the staff of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Advisory Council) are also on the Core Project Team.

Also prior to the workshop, Foundation staff conducted research on historic road programs in other states. These included programs in Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Iowa, Montana, and Nebraska. This research examined the successes and challenges of developing and implementing historic road historic contexts and guidance.

Workshop participants were provided, prior to the workshop, summaries of each of the above state programs, in addition to URLs for accessing additional documentation on the programs:

- *Arizona DOT's Interim Procedures for the Treatment of Historic Roads* (November 15, 2002) [A PDF of the procedures was provided to workshop participants.]
- *Colorado State Roads and Highways: National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Submission* (2003). <http://www.coloradohistory-oahp.org/publications/pubs/645.pdf>
- *Georgia Linear Resource Guidance Paper, Georgia DOT*. [A PDF of the paper was provided to workshop participants.]
- *Iowa's Historic Automobile Roads: A National Register Study of Pre-1948 Arterial Highways* (<http://www.iowadot.gov/ole/documents/IowaHistoricRoads.pdf>)
- *Nebraska Historic Buildings Survey: Historic Highways in Nebraska* (2002) (http://www.nebraskahistory.org/histpres/historic_highway_book-web.pdf)
- Montana DOT's Programmatic Agreement on Historic Roads and Bridges, 2007. [A PDF of the agreement was provided to the workshop participants.]

The summaries of these programs are provided in Appendix B.

An additional "read-ahead" sent to the workshop participants prior to the workshop included *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Workshop participants were asked to review: "Section V. How to Evaluate a Property within its Historic Context;" "Section VI. How to Identify the Type of Significance of a Property;" and "Section VIII. How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property."

The workshop agenda is provided in Appendix C. It should be noted that only the Core Project Team participated in Day 3 of the workshop. On Day 3, the Core Team reviewed the Interim Guidance outline and the outline for the Historic Roads Historic Context scope of work developed during Days 1 and 2.

SECTION 2.0 DAYS 1 AND 2 OF THE WORKSHOP

2.1 Goals and Outcomes

FHWA and DOT&PF began the workshop with a discussion on the Alaska Road PA, the purpose of the workshop in the context of the PA, and the SRI Foundation's role in facilitating the workshop. After introductions of the workshop participants, Klein reviewed the workshop's two primary goals:

Goal 1: Identify the objectives and structure of the Interim Guidelines and develop a detailed outline for the guidance.

Goal 2: Identify the objectives and structure of the Historic Roads Historic Context and create a detailed outline of a scope of work for developing the historic context.

Next, Klein asked the workshop participants to identify the specific outcomes they would like to see after all of the stipulations of the Alaska Road PA are implemented. The identified outcomes are listed below:

- Have a framework for how to apply National Register criteria of significance to historic roads.
- Have predictability for maintenance and operations.
- Have a transparent process and a team approach.
- Digitize old records (e.g., photography, as-builts, etc.) and make all records accessible. Have a standardized process for evaluating the significance of roads until there is a "master list" of all significant roads in the State.
- Have a new, more informed PA.
- Have a common agreed-upon terminology on what is significant.
- Have guidelines for mitigation.
- Have an understanding of what makes a historic road significant so this information can be used in the early design stages of a project.
- Have a better understanding of the integrity of a road and its essential features to better assess project effects on the road.
- Have a process for updating information on the National Register eligibility of roads.
- Define the intangible aspects of significant roads, such as the "feeling" of driving along a historic road.
- Obtain local input on evaluating the significance of a historic road.
- Have a list that a DOT&PF project manager can use in order to identify which roads and road segments are National Register eligible and which are not. If a road or road segment is National Register eligible, this list would define whether or not a category the proposed type of project will have an adverse effect on the historic road, and if there is an adverse effect, provide an approach for resolving

the adverse effect. Further, if a historic road is not on this list, then there is nothing the project manager needs to do in terms of assessing project effects to the road itself [Note: Section 106 review involving identification and assessment of potential effects to other historic properties in the project's area of potential effects might still be necessary].

- Implement a systemic evaluation of the National Register eligibility of all historic roads in the State.
- Have a historic roads program that identifies significant/important roads in the state, and defines how to preserve, protect, and manage these roads.
- Have a process that screens out non-National Register-eligible roads.
- Have a historic context that describes how roads were developed in the State and identifies which roads are significant.

Klein noted that a goal of this workshop is to identify mechanisms and processes that will achieve most, if not all of these outcomes.

2.2 A Discussion on What Other States Have Done

Klein asked the workshop participants the following questions about the programs in other states, summarized in the “read-aheads”:

- What struck you about what other states have done?
- What did you like about what other states have done?
- What did you not like?

The workshop participants noted that the processes and methods used by the different states were quite variable, with a wide range of approaches. The participants also noted that a good approach was to identify a first tier of the most obviously significant historic roads in a state, and focus on the management of these roads as a first step in developing a statewide program.

The workshop participants had several comments on how states used historic contexts and evaluated National Register eligibility. They noted that using National Register Criterion D was not appropriate, and that steps and guidance for evaluating eligibility are often buried by the historical background and research discussions in a historic context document. In addition, these documents are often too unwieldy and bulky to use as an effective tool for evaluating eligibility. Finally, even with a completed historic context in place, state DOTs still needed to conduct project-by-project surveys to identify and then evaluate the eligibility of a historic road or road segment. The workshop participants noted that a goal for Alaska's program is to have a tool or approach that moves away from project-by-project evaluations.

Klein reported on his discussions with some of the cultural resource staff of the other state DOTs in terms of the successes and challenges of their respective programs. The following is a summary of these discussions:

- Lisa Schoch, Architectural Historian for Colorado DOT, noted that the registration requirements in their multiple property documentation forms are very helpful in identifying property types and the specific requirements for applying the National Register criteria. Schoch also had some interesting observations about the challenges associated with historic highways. These observations, which were in an email sent to the SRI Foundation, are quoted below:

As you know, the main problem with roads and highways is that they are unfortunately linear. For project work, we look at a small segment of a much larger highway, and as with most linear resources, we typically have to assume that the entire resource is significant (especially if it spans multiple counties) since we do not usually have the time to conduct enough research to evaluate the entire highway's significance. Further, we usually assume the entire highway has integrity since it is not usually in the project scope to field survey the entire resource. So, when we do consult with SHPO on highways, we often have to treat the entire highway as eligible and then evaluate whether the segment in the project area has integrity. We really need to complete an inventory of our state highways and determine which resources are significant and only consult on those. However, that is not likely to occur for awhile.

- Iowa DOT sent their National Register study to their consultants, but the DOT does not know if any of their consultants actually use the study in their work.
- Georgia DOT noted that the paper on linear resources has left its mark in several areas, especially in relation to dealing with effects and treatment of resources. The DOT considers the entire linear resource as National Register eligible, with contributing and noncontributing components, as opposed to evaluating small segments of the same resource for National Register eligibility. The linear resources are generally considered historic structures. The paper is used by some cultural resource staff at the DOT, but most of their newer staff did not know it existed.
- Montana DOT reported that their PA is working just fine. They have completed the identification and recordation of the initial 12 roads targeted for preservation work. None of these historic roads, however, have been programmed for reconstruction, rehabilitation or resurfacing work by the DOT.

The staff of the SRI Foundation is currently working with Arizona DOT on their historic roads program. Several years ago, the DOT attempted to develop a statewide historic context but the state DOT and SHPO could not come to a consensus on a process for evaluating eligibility based on the draft historic context prepared by the DOT's private sector consultant. ADOT's Interim Guidance (see Appendix B) was to be used as a stop-gap measure after the cessation of work on the draft historic context. The SRI Foundation

is currently working with the Arizona DOT to prepare a PA that will guide the development of a new statewide historic context and replace the DOT's existing Interim Guidance.

2.3 Historic Roads in Alaska

Rolfe Buzzell of the OHA provided a PowerPoint presentation to the workshop participants on the history of roads in the State. Buzzell discussed the reasons behind road construction prior to and after statehood, the types of roads that were built, and who built them. After this presentation, Buzzell, and Laurie Mulcahy and Kathy Price of DOT&PF's statewide office, discussed various transportation projects across the State that involved the identification, evaluation, and treatment of historic roads.

2.4 What Makes a Historic Road in Alaska Significant?

Klein divided the workshop participants into three small groups. Each group was tasked to address the following questions and note their responses to the questions on a flip chart pad. Workshop participants were asked to take into account the information provided by Buzzell, Mulcahy, and Price:

- What types of historic roads exist in the State (categories of roads and specific roads)?
- What makes a historic road significant and therefore eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? What significant historical themes are associated with these roads?
- What are the character defining features of these significant historic roads?
- What aspects of integrity must these character defining features retain in order to consider a road as National Register eligible?

After the small group discussions, Klein had each group report on their responses to the first two questions. The following is a summary of the small groups' responses:

Road Types:

- Gravel
- Asphalt
- Arterials
- Local
- Collector
- Chip seal
- Highways
- Village access roads
- Road remnants
- Scenic byways
- Abandoned roadways
- Recreational
- Forest roads

- City streets

The significant historic themes identified by the small groups included:

- World War II
- Cold War
- Mining access
- Mining activities/exploration (including oil and gas)
- Arctic engineering adaptation
- Fishing industry
- Transportation linkages with primary modes, such as waterways and railroads
- Railroads converted to roads
- Post-1964 earthquake road construction
- General resource development, such as for timber and agriculture
- National Parks
- Wagon roads and early settlement roads
- History of Alaska Road Commission, Territorial Board of Road Commissioners transition to DOT&PF
- Commerce
- Native Alaskans
- Community development
- Private industry and ventures
- Recreation and tourism

Next, each group reported on their discussions addressing the questions: “What are the character-defining features of these significant historic roads?” and “What aspects of integrity must these character-defining features retain in order to consider a road as significant?” The following is an example of the results of one of the small group discussions. This example looks at these questions in the context of the Denali Highway:

The significant historical themes associated with the Denali Highway, dating from the 1950s to 1971, include:

- Recreation/tourism
- Mining (e.g., Valdez Creek mining resource development)
- Military history
- Native Alaskan routes
- Hunting/fishing subsistence
- Community development
- Alaskan (Arctic) highway engineering
- Territory and State road administration

The character-defining features of the highway include:

- Gravel surface
- Narrow, windy roadway

- Scenic outlooks
- Rural, open setting with little or no development
- Low speed limit

The aspects of integrity these character-defining features must retain in order for the road to be considered significant (i.e., National Register eligible) are location, setting, materials, feeling, and association.

As a result of these small group discussions, in addition to the lessons learned from historic road programs in other states, the workshop participants made the following observations about the steps that should be taken in developing a statewide historic roads historic context:

- The historic context should focus on specific roads as opposed to categories of roads.
- The historic context development should begin with a screening the State's historic roads into three classes: (1) those that are clearly significant based on the views of cultural resource professionals and the interested public in the State, (2) those whose significance is not clear and will require additional research in order to assess significance, and (3) those which fall below thresholds of significance (which the historic context would define), and which need no further consideration.
- A next step would be to conduct an initial inventory of the roads in these categories, to assist in identifying the character-defining features of these roads in the context of the themes identified during this workshop, in addition to other significant themes in Alaskan history to be identified through additional research.

The workshop participants noted that one approach is to choose a few historic roads (e.g., 10 to 12) and address the eligibility of these roads first, before conducting a comprehensive, statewide inventory. The selection of this initial group of roads would be based on local knowledge already available in the state. This effort could serve as a pilot project. The workshop participants also noted that it is important to establish the primary goal of the historic context in order to guide any screening of historic roads. If the goal is to evaluate every road in the State, the process for developing the historic context would be very different from developing a context based on the identification of key historic themes and screening roads based on these themes. Further, several of the historic preservation professionals in the workshop noted that the eligibility evaluation of roads within cities would be a lower priority than the evaluation of roads outside cities, as the latter would generally retain more historic integrity.

2.5 How Might Historic Roads Be Affected by DOT&PF Undertakings?

The small groups re-assembled to address the following questions:

- How might the State's significant historic roads be affected by transportation projects?

- How do you determine if a project will have no adverse effect on a National Register-listed or -eligible road, versus an adverse effect?
- What are some mechanisms for resolving adverse effects to National Register-listed or -eligible roads?

The following is an example of the results of the small group discussions, again applying these questions to the Denali Highway:

DOT&PF undertakings that would not adversely affect the character-defining features of the Denali Highway include:

- Adding a rest stop with bathrooms
- Re-grading
- Culvert replacement
- Construction of adjacent materials site
- Year-round maintenance and operation
- New signage
- Construction of new pullouts or improvements to existing pullouts

DOT&PF undertakings that would have an adverse effect on the highway's character-defining features include:

- Modifying the roadway through chip sealing or covering with asphalt
- Widening the roadway, adding one or more lanes
- Major roadway realignments
- Placement of new above-ground utilities
- Adding guard rails
- Expanding clear zones

Some possible mechanisms for resolving these types of adverse effects might include:

- For changing the roadway, (a) maintain an intact, original roadway segment so one could continue to experience driving along a historic segment of the highway, or (b) use a roadway surface that simulates driving on the original roadway surface, using, for example, large chips when chip-sealing the roadway.
- For widening segments of the highway, develop interpretive panels that showcase the original segment, or provide the public a CD or other type of electronic media containing information on the history and importance of the roadway.

A more comprehensive approach to resolving future adverse effects on a roadway such as the Denali Highway is to develop a management plan that lays out specific actions to be taken in response to an improvement or change to the roadway by DOT&PF. The plan pre-establishes the definition of adverse effects on the roadway

and those actions that would not be adverse, in addition to the procedures and specific actions for resolving any adverse effects to the roadway.

After addressing these questions about National Register eligibility and effects, the workshop participants were divided into two groups. One group focused on developing an outline for the Interim Guidance. The second group prepared an outline for a scope of work for developing the Historic Roads Historic Context. Below is a summary of both group's efforts.

2.6 Interim Guidance Outline

The Alaska Road PA includes a stipulation whereby FHWA and DOT&PF “will not need to comply with Section 106 with regard to the effects of an undertaking on roads within the scope of this Agreement when the DOT&PF [Professionally Qualified Individual (PQI)] determines that the undertaking falls within the thresholds established under Appendix A of this Agreement.” The undertaking thresholds listed in Appendix A include categories such as minor road widening; minor road realignment; surface material changes (e.g., chip seal applications to asphalt); and new construction involving actions such as improving existing pedestrian crossings for American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance, or installation of cross culverts in new locations within the road prism. As noted in the PA, FHWA and DOT&PF will still need to comply with Section 106 regarding the effects of an undertaking on other historic properties.

The Interim Guidance will replace Appendix A of the Alaska Road PA through an amendment to the PA. The workshop group developing the outline for the Interim Guidance recommended that the Guidance consist of three parts. The first is a list of historic roads that, for the purpose of the Interim Guidance, will be treated as if they were National Register eligible. During the life of the Interim Guidance (i.e., prior to the completion of the Final Guidance required by Stipulation 5 of the Alaska Road PA), only those historic roads on this list will be treated as National Register eligible and therefore subject to Section 106 review. All other roads in the State will be excluded from Section 106 consideration as historic properties during this period. The second component is an undertaking exemption list. The undertakings in this list will have no effect on National Register-eligible or -listed historic roads. The final component will detail the process for Section 106 findings of no adverse effect and adverse effect involving the roads listed in the Interim Guidance.

2.6.1 List of Historic Roads Treated as Eligible for Listing on the National Register for the Purpose of the Interim Guidance. The workshop participants created a preliminary list of these historic roads on Day 2. This list was reviewed and revised by the Core Project Team on Day 3 of the workshop. After the workshop, the Core Project Team consulted with other stakeholders within DOT&PF and OHA to revise the list and to define the termini of the roads included in the list. The revised list is provided in Appendix D.

To finalize this list of historic roads for inclusion in the Interim Guidance, DOT&PF will send out letters to potential consulting parties, including Tribes. The letters will discuss the Alaska Road PA and the function of the Interim Guidance. Letter recipients will be asked if they would like to become consulting parties in the preparation of the Interim Guidance in terms of identifying any locally significant historic roads for inclusion in the Interim Guidance. Responses from the consulting parties will be vetted by FHWA, DOT&PF, and the SHPO, and the list will be finalized for inclusion in the Interim Guidance. These locally significant roads, for the duration of the Interim Guidance, will be treated as if they are National Register eligible.

As noted above, only those historic roads on this final list will be treated as National Register eligible, and therefore subject to Section 106 review, for the purpose of the Interim Guidance. The Interim Guidance will, however, include a process whereby this list can be modified through consultation among FHWA, DOT&PF, the SHPO, and other consulting parties.

2.6.2 Undertaking Exemption List. The group working on the Interim Guidance identified DOT&PF undertakings that will have no effect on National Register listed or eligible historic roads. As with the undertakings included in the current Appendix A, these exempted undertakings will not require a Section 106 review when the DOT&PF's PQI determines that the undertaking falls within the thresholds established under the Interim Guidance. The undertakings identified by the group include the following (which may be expanded upon and modified during the full development of the Interim Guidance):

1. Spot repair, crack sealing, filling potholes, surface rehabilitation
2. In-kind resurfacing, including adding chip seal to asphalt
3. Ditch cleaning and seeding
4. Brushing and mowing within the existing clear zone
5. In-kind culvert repair, extension, maintenance, and replacement (will need to develop a definition of "in-kind" for the Interim Guidance)
6. In-kind replacement of signs, lighting, signals, guardrails, poles, delineators, and appurtenances
7. Grading (will need to define in the Interim Guidance what is meant by "grading")
8. Installation of rumble strips and recessed pavement markings
9. Installation of subsurface utilities with no aboveground components, and surface access components that are low-lying and small-scale (will need to define latter)
10. ADA improvements to existing pedestrian crossings

The Interim Guidance will include a process whereby classes of undertakings can be added or deleted through consultation among FHWA, DOT&PF, the SHPO, and other consulting parties.

2.6.3 Findings of No Adverse Effect. For undertakings that are not on the revised exemption list but, as determined by a DOT&PF PQI, will have no adverse effect on a

historic road listed in the Interim Guidance, the FHWA (or DOT&PF for SAFETEA-LU Section 6004 projects) will send a letter to the SHPO presenting a finding of “no adverse effect.” The Interim Guidance will include examples of categories of undertakings that would have no adverse effect on the historic roads listed in the Guidance.

The letter to the SHPO will include:

- A description of the scope of the project
- A figure showing the project’s area of potential effects (APE)
- The basis for the finding of no adverse effect, along with appropriate support documentation.

The Interim Guidance will include the format for these letters to be sent to the SHPO. Submissions of no adverse effect findings to the SHPO may be integrated into existing Section 106 consultation templates used by FHWA and DOT&PF. These no adverse effect findings will be reviewed by the SHPO within 15 days. No adverse effect findings for undertakings involving other types of historic properties would follow existing Section 106 consultation templates used by FHWA and DOT&PF, with a SHPO review period of 30 days.

2.6.4 Adverse Effects Findings and Resolution of Adverse Effects. Documenting findings of adverse effect will follow the requirements of 36 CFR 800.11 with the exception that documentation will not be required on how a road was determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register. As noted above, all historic roads listed in the Interim Guidance are being treated as if they are National Register eligible. Consultation on resolving the adverse effect on the historic road will follow 36 CFR 800.6. Measures to resolve the adverse effect will be stipulated in a Memorandum of Agreement, or within a management plan for the historic road.

Measures for resolving adverse effects on historic roads listed in the Interim Guidance might include the use of standard treatments or preservation of roadway segments. The latter might involve a program to preserve in-place key segments of an historic road while allowing other segments to be modified or replaced as part of roadway improvements (a kind of mitigation-banking).

The group working on the Interim Guidance noted that preparation of a management plan is an efficient mechanism for dealing with a historic road that will be involved with multiple future undertakings that might result in an adverse effect on the road. The management plan would pre-establish the actions to be taken to resolve any adverse effects on the historic road.

The Dalton Highway is one of the historic roads identified for inclusion in the list of roads to be treated as National Register eligible. As this highway has been defined by DOT&PF as a high-priority corridor, workshop participants recommended the drafting of a programmatic agreement/road corridor management plan for the Dalton Highway subsequent to the workshop. This PA will serve as an initial management plan template for other road corridors.

[Note from the SRI Foundation: A historic road management plan might include requirements for the use of standard treatments or the preservation of roadway segments as measures for resolving adverse effects to the road. The plan might also include a listing of those specific undertakings that are not in the Interim Guidance’s exemption list, but would have no adverse effect on that particular road. These types of undertakings might involve FHWA and DOT&PF actions that are included as part of the proposed roadway improvements and which avoid adversely affecting the historic characteristics of the road. A management plan would be made operational by becoming part of the Alaska Road PA. The management plan replaces normal project-by-project Section 106 consultation and lays out the specific actions to be taken for all undertakings affecting the historic road. Another alternative is to prepare a separate PA for a historic road. This PA would stipulate how Section 106 consultation will be carried out for all future FHWA and DOT&PF undertakings associated with the road].

2.6.5 State-Funded Projects. Some workshop participants recommended that the Interim Guidance also address state-funded DOT&PF undertakings. DOT&PF, the SHPO, and FHWA will explore this recommendation further.

2.7 Outline for a Scope of Work for a Historic Roads Historic Context

The group working on the Historic Roads Historic Context recommended that the historic context include actual determinations of eligibility for specific historic roads in the state, in addition to a framework for evaluating the eligibility of various types of historic roads that may be affected by future DOT&PF undertakings. The group, therefore, referred to the historic context as an “Applied Historic Context.” [Note: it is assumed that a private sector consultant will prepare the historic context for DOT&PF.]

The group developed a broad three-part outline for the historic context, with each part being reviewed by a DOT&PF technical panel before work begins on subsequent sections of the historic context. The intention was to build on the knowledge developed in each section to guide subsequent decision points. Deliverables to be submitted for review at each stage are marked below in italics. Before work begins, a kickoff meeting will be held with the consultant developing the historic context.

The three sections of the historic context are as follows:

I. Historic Overview

This section would provide a historical background on Alaska roads and would also include:

- Definition of types of roads to be addressed in the historic context.
- Discussion of how associated features will be handled.
- Identification of areas of significance/summaries of significant themes.

Consultant submits detailed historic context outline.

Consultant submits draft narrative for Section I.

II. Methodology for Assessing Eligibility

This would include:

- Guidelines for applying National Register criteria to historic themes associated with the state's historic roads, resulting in thresholds for significance.
- Definition of character-defining features.
- Thresholds for determining integrity.

Consultant submits revised draft narrative for Section I in addition to a draft of Section II.

III. Application of Methodology to Specific Roads

- Identification of a set number of roads (number to be worked out in scope of work) for consensus determinations of eligibility, which can demonstrably meet the significance thresholds. This list of specific roads will be created in consultation with the technical panel. It is recommended that the highest priority be assigned to historic roads that may be affected by future projects listed in the State Improvement Plan (STIP).
- Conducting a pilot determination of eligibility of one road from the above list. The pilot might include some field work, if appropriate. Purpose of pilot is to test the proposed methods for evaluating National Register eligibility.

Consultant submits revised draft of Section II and proposes roads for consensus determinations of eligibility and pilot determination of eligibility.

Consultant conducts pilot determinations of eligibility and reviews results of pilot with technical team. Consultant proceeds with eligibility evaluation of remaining roads on list and submits draft of Section III for review. After addressing technical panel comments, consultant compiles entire historic context into a final document.

[Note from the SRI Foundation: A process will need to be established whereby the consultant's recommendations on the eligibility of specific roads included in the historic context are reviewed by FHWA, DOT&PF, and SHPO through the consensus eligibility determination process (36 CFR 800.4). The results of this consensus determination should be included in the final Applied Historic Context.]

In addition to the Historic Context, the consultant will be asked to prepare templates for both a PA and a management plan that could be applied to the State's historic roads. The technical panel will review the draft templates, and the consultant will finalize the templates after the panel's review.

The group working on the historic context scope of work also identified the desired qualifications of the consultant developing the historic context. These include:

- Knowledge of Alaska history
- Knowledge of the history of road development in the State and the United States in general
- Experience evaluating historic roads

The consultant's team should have regular access to relevant Alaskan archival sources. The group also recommended that the consultant's team might include a cultural

geographer who has a background in National Historic Preservation Act requirements, a highway/roadway engineer, a landscape architect, and a Secretary of the Interior-qualified historian and/or architectural historian. Specific requirements for the composition of a consultant's team will need to be defined for the historic context scope of work.

2.8 Wrap-up of Days 1 and 2

Klein asked the workshop participants to highlight some of the key findings, issues, and observations from Days 1 and 2 of the workshop. The workshop participants noted the following:

- It is important to consider the entire length of a historic road in terms of identification, evaluation, and treatment.
- It is important to define categories of undertakings that would have no effect and no adverse effect on historic roads.
- Management plans and road-specific PAs are excellent tools for handling the identification, evaluation, and treatment of historic roads, avoiding case-by-case and project-by-project Section 106 review.
- Preserving segments of historic road corridors, as a form of “mitigation banking,” is potentially a valuable and effective tool for addressing future impacts to historic roads.
- DOT&PF, OHA, and the Alaska Region NPS office have in-house expertise to evaluate the National Register eligibility of many historic roads in the State.

Klein also asked the workshop participants to review the outcomes they identified at the beginning of the workshop on Day 1 (see Section 2.1), and to note which outcomes were achieved during the workshop and which were not. This review demonstrated that almost all of the desired outcomes were either achieved during the workshop, or the groundwork for meeting the outcomes was established through the workshop participants' efforts.

SECTION 3.0
DAY 3 OF THE WORKSHOP
CORE PROEJCT TEAM

3.1 Action Items for Developing Interim Guidance

The Core Project Team reviewed the recommendations of the group that worked on the Interim Guidance outline, and then identified the following actions items for preparing the Guidance, in addition to the individuals who will be responsible for completing these action items. The Core Project Team also recommended that preliminary guidance developed during this workshop should be followed until the Interim Guidance was made fully operational:

- Set-up a process for finalizing the list of historic roads to be treated as National Register eligible for the Interim Guidance, in addition to a process for obtaining input from local communities, organizations, and individuals and tribes. [Doug Gasek, Laurie Mulcahy, and Kathy Price]
- Define and develop language for handling emergency situations. [Doug Gasek and Ben White (DOT&PF Statewide Environmental Manager)]
- Prepare a section of Interim Guidance listing caveats to implementing the procedures established by Guidance. [Terry Klein]
- Prepare language for the Interim Guidance on training DOT&PF and OHA staff in the use of the Guidance, in addition to follow-up to this training. [Terry Klein]
- Prepare language and a process for integrating the Interim Guidance with existing Section 106 templates used by FHWA, DOT&PF, and SHPO. [Tim Haugh, Laurie Mulcahy, and Kathy Price]
- Identify which local communities, organizations, individuals and tribes to contact in order to obtain input on locally significant historic roads, and then contact these communities, organizations, individuals and tribes in order to get their input. [Laurie Mulcahy and Kathy Price write letter to communities, organizations, tribes, and individuals. Doug Gasek and Tim Haugh review draft of letter]
- Inform the Advisory Council about development of the Interim Guidance and amending the PA to include the Guidance. [Tim Haugh and MaryAnn Naber]
- Define and refine the list of exempted undertakings, and include examples. [Janet Brown, Doug Gasek, and Laurie Mulcahy]. Involve DOT&PF maintenance and operation personnel in review of the list. [Janet Brown]
- Prepare language on a process for modifying the list of exempted actions included in the Guidance. [Terry Klein]
- Identify standard treatments to be included in the Guidance as measures to resolve adverse effects, in addition to templates and/or processes for preparing PAs for specific historic road corridors. [Doug Gasek, Tim Haugh, Laurie Mulcahy, and Kathy Price]

3.2 Action Items for Developing Scope of Work for Applied Historic Context

The Core Project Team also reviewed the recommendations of the group that worked on the Historic Context scope of work outline, and then identified the following actions items for preparing the scope of work. The team to guide the development of the scope of work will include Jo Antonson, Janet Brown, Janet Clemens, Laurie Mulcahy, and Kathy Price.

- Collect example scopes of work from other state DOTs for developing historic contexts. States to be contacted include California, Colorado, Georgia, and Minnesota. Also obtain a copy of the scope of work for the National Cooperative Highway Research Program's national historic context for post-World War II housing.
- Pre-identify the historic roads to be formally assessed for eligibility for listing in the National Register through the preparation of the historic context. Select one of these roads as a "pilot" effort for the consultant. The scope of work will note which road was selected for the pilot.
- Define other types of roads to be included in the historic context (i.e., categories of roads for which the historic context will establish a process for making eligibility determinations)
- For specific local roads to be evaluated for National Register eligibility, give highest priority to those local roads slated for improvements as shown in the STIP.

3.3 Next Steps

The top post-workshop priorities are to finalize the list of historic roads to be treated as National Register eligible for the Interim Guidance, and to obtain input from local communities, organizations, and individuals and tribes in order to identify locally significant roads. The development of the Interim Guidance is another priority. The SRI Foundation is under contract with DOT&PF to develop the Guidance, working with the individuals noted in Section 3.1.

In terms of additional next steps, the SRI Foundation recommends that FHWA, DOT&PF, and SHPO share with their peers nationwide, information on Alaska's program for the identification, evaluation, and management of historic roads. No other state has implemented a similar, comprehensive statewide program that includes both guidance for decision-making and a statewide historic context on historic roads. With the exception of Montana DOT's program, no other state has in place a comprehensive approach to historic roads that moves away from costly and time-consuming case-by-case and project-by-project Section 106 compliance. Alaska's historic roads program will continue to result in increased efficiencies and predictability in the Section 106 compliance process; reduce administrative burdens within FHWA, DOT&PF, and OHA; save time and money in transportation project delivery; and preserve the State's most significant historic roads for the benefit of Alaskans and visitors to the State.

**APPENDIX A
WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS**

Name	Affiliation
Antonson, Jo	OHA
Biddle, Greg	NPS, Wrangell-St. Ellis National Park
Bittner, Judy	State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) [Note: Bittner participated in Day 3]
Brown, Janet*	DOT&PF, Northern Region
Buzzell, Rolfe	OHA
Clemens, Janet*	NPS, Alaska Region
Elliott, Brian	DOT&PF Central Region
Gasek, Doug*	OHA
Haugh, Tim*	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Alaska Division
Hays, Kimberly	DOT&PF, Statewide, Materials
Hoff, Ricky	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Karchut, Jeremy	US Forest Service
Klein, Terry	SRI Foundation
Krauthoefer, Tracie	OHA
Lochart, Emily	OHA
Mulcahy, Laurie*	DOT&PF, Statewide
Mushovic, Dave	Bureau of Land Management
Naber, MaryAnn*	FHWA Headquarters
Price, Kathy*	DOT&PF, Statewide
Rickman, Summer	OHA
Russell, Amy	DOT&PF, Northern Region
Welsh, Gerry	DOT&PF, Central Region
Winters, Victor	DOT&PF, Southeast Region
Yost, Reuben	DOT&PF, Southeast Region

* Core Project Team Member

APPENDIX B SUMMARIES OF OTHER STATE PROGRAMS

Arizona DOT's Interim Procedures for the Treatment of Historic Roads (November 15, 2002)

Through the Interim Procedures, Arizona DOT, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred on the National Register eligibility of historic highways in the state, and defined treatment measures for historic highways affected by a transportation project. The Interim Procedures stipulate that the state's historic highways are to be considered as a system and a single historic property.

The following is a summary of how National Register eligibility and project effects to the highway system are handled under the Interim Procedures.

National Register Eligibility of In-Use and Abandoned Highway Segments

Arizona's Historic State Highway System (HSHS) is a network of roadways developed between 1912 and 1955, and includes in-use and abandoned roadway segments. The HSHS does not pertain to Interstates or bridges. For Federally funded projects, the HSHS is considered eligible for listing in the National Register under criterion D, for information potential.

No Adverse Effects

- If a proposed project does not impact either the *location* or *function/design* of a roadway in the system, there would be no adverse impact to the HSHS, and a finding of no adverse effect would be made.
- If a proposed project would modify any historic roadway *features* identified as "considered worthy of recording," then the features would be documented. Documentation would be supplied with the consultation letter to the SHPO documenting a no adverse effect finding. This documentation would include a report and photographic recordation.

Adverse Effects

- *Location*: If the proposed project would impact the *location* of a roadway within the system, then there would be an impact to the HSHS, resulting in an adverse effect.
- *Function/Design*: If a proposed project would significantly impact the *function/design* of a roadway in the system, then there would be an impact to the HSHS, resulting in an adverse effect.

If a proposed project results in an adverse effect, then the FHWA would notify the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation that there would be an adverse effect on a significant historic property and invite their participation in the preparation of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or a Programmatic Agreement (PA).

Colorado State Roads and Highways National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Submission. Robert Autobee and Deborah Dobson-Brown, Associated Cultural Resource Experts, 2003. Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Colorado Historical Society. <http://www.coloradohistory-oahp.org/publications/pubs/645.pdf>

In April 2001, Colorado DOT contracted with Associated Cultural Resource Experts (ACRE) to prepare an historic automobile road and highway historic context (i.e., National Register multiple property submission). The context does not include roadside architecture (either commercial or residential) or bridges. The study also does not address roads and highways built and maintained

by county and local governments. The historic context provides a basis for evaluating the National Register eligibility of individual highways or highway segments throughout Colorado.

To develop this historic context, ACRE's study addressed five major questions/information requirements:

1. What is the current state of knowledge concerning historic roads and highways in the state? What information sources are available?
2. Can the history of roads and highways be understood in terms of specific geographic contexts within Colorado? If so, how are those contexts spatially and thematically defined?
3. What are the themes and sub-themes of highway development in Colorado? How are those themes and sub-themes reflected in physical resources?
4. In light of the particular history of Colorado highways, what registration criteria (significance and integrity) are appropriate?
5. Which highways in the state highway system may be eligible for the National Register, and what data gaps remain to determine eligibility?

ACRE also identified the following principles to guide their development of the historic context:

- Highways are significant for their facilitation of many human activities, transportation being only the most obvious. From transportation grows economic enterprises, community development, and social interaction.
- The act of highway construction itself represents private initiatives, community activism, and government funding and regulation.
- The construction of roads and highways often involves significant engineering achievements.
- Roads and highways are extremely common structure types, though they vary significantly in materials, design and general appearance because of age, use and location.
- Highways are exceptionally vulnerable to alteration over time because of maintenance and modernization. A highway cannot be expected to retain all of its original materials and design elements for more than a few years after initial construction.
- Highways are often defined as much by their settings as by their physical nature. Settings can change dramatically over time, however, so that the original purpose and effect of a highway is no longer evident.
- Highways are among the largest human-made structures.
- The historical significance of a highway, like that of a railroad, trail, or canal, may be associated with the whole length of the resource or a discrete segment.
- Historic highways usually have significance because they allowed other human activities to occur that are considered important in our past.

Based on background research to address these questions/information requirements, and taking into account the above principles, ACRE selected 10 Colorado highway segments and conducted surveys of each segment. The highway segments were selected based on their potential historic integrity, and social and economic importance. Selected highway segments ranged from 18 to 162 miles.

Next, ACRE identified (a) periods of significance, (b) property types for the historic context, (c) National Register criteria for evaluation that can be applied to the state's historic roads and highways, and (d) the required level of integrity these properties should exhibit in order to be National Register eligible.

Period of Significance

- A highway can be assigned to one or more of the four principal historic periods of automobile highway construction in the state.
- The focal period for historical significance of most highways is the period in which they were constructed and first used.
- For highways that are significant primarily for their engineering and construction features, the period of significance may appropriately end with the completion of the highway or a particular segment of the highway.
- The ending point of a period of significance is more problematic.

Property Types. ACRE lists three property types—cultural routes, engineered routes, and aesthetic routes—and provides definitions, discussions of significance, and registration requirements for each, specific to Colorado.

Criteria for Evaluation. ACRE notes that highways are most likely to be eligible for nomination to the National Register under criterion A or C. Highways are rarely eligible under criterion B because this criterion requires that a highway be directly associated with a person important in history, and that this association must be directly linked to the events or work for which the person is important. ACRE notes that an association with a designer or builder is addressed under criterion C. They also note that highways are extremely unlikely to be eligible under criterion D. ACRE states that

Automobile highways are relatively recent phenomena, and the technology of highway construction is well understood and documented. Study of a physical highway is therefore unlikely to yield information important in expanding our understanding of history. Study and documentation of physical features of a highway are more likely to be applicable to Criterion C considerations. (Section F, Page 2).

ACRE also notes that different segments of the same highway may be historically significant (and eligible) for different reasons. A segment's length is not a determinant of historical significance or National Register eligibility, as long as the segment can convey its significance and retains integrity.

Integrity. ACRE notes highways are very susceptible to change over time. As a result, the existence of a “pristine” historical highway is very unlikely.

- *Location.* The principal considerations are (1) the extent to which a highway corresponds to the general route followed during the period in which the highway attained its historical significance, and (2) the relative importance of the route as an element of the significance of the historic highway.
- *Setting.* The principal consideration is the extent that the general environment and any particular elements of the environment that affected location, design, construction, and use of the highway remain intact from the highway's period of significance. The extent of the effective setting of a highway varies according to all of the elements that form the setting. The effective setting is usually the view shed from a highway. Regardless of the extent of the view shed/setting, the key consideration is the retention of salient features from the period of significance of the highway.
- *Design.* The principal consideration is the extent to which the highway retains the features that defined the physical nature of the highway during the period of its significance.

- *Materials*. The principal integrity consideration for materials is the extent to which the highway retains the same general types of materials that were present during the highway's period of significance. Materials are the aspect of highways most likely to have been changed during and after the period of significance, particularly the materials in the driving surface.
- *Workmanship*. The principal integrity consideration for workmanship is the extent of retention of distinctive artistry from the highway's period of significance. Workmanship is rarely a primary integrity consideration in the evaluation of highways.
- *Feeling*. ACRE notes that this aspect of integrity is more subjective than other aspects, and is expressed when the other aspects of integrity are present.
- *Association*. Distinctive physical features that exist as part of the highway and clearly demonstrate the connection to the past event or person.

Georgia Linear Resource Guidance Paper, Georgia Department of Transportation

- Roads and railroads are defined as *linear resources*.
- Roads and railroads are historically significant in Georgia, having made contributions in the areas of transportation, engineering, economy and commerce.
- Linear resources are *linear districts*, not features; they include all features (e.g., buildings, structures, and objects) associated with the linear resource.
- Linear resources that are 50+ years old generally should be treated as *historic structures* and not as archaeological sites or resources.
- Archaeological methods may be used to gather significant historical information on linear resources.
- A linear resource's associated features may be treated as archaeological sites.
- Linear resources are usually considered eligible under criteria A and C, and rarely under criterion D. Linear resources are considered archaeological resources when criterion D is the primary or sole area of significance for the resource.
- National Register boundaries for linear resources generally include the road or rail bed, all components that make up the bed, and associated features/structures adjacent to the corridor and rights-of-way.
- Eligibility usually refers to the entire resource, including the resource termini, not just the segment under project consideration.
- Disturbed segments of the corridor may be defined as "non-contributing" sections.
- Original materials need not be present for the retention of integrity, although this should be a consideration. The general characteristics of the horizontal and vertical dimensions of the corridor and design should be reasonably intact.
- Realignment or the addition/removal of contributing elements could result in a breach in integrity.
- Effects to the resource are not adverse if the project does not impact alignment, design, or transportation use, especially for active linear resources. If a segment has lost integrity and is non-contributing, then impacting this segment would not result in an adverse effect to the overall resource.
- Effects to the resource are adverse when the project results in changes to the significant characteristics of the resource or its contributing elements.
- Unlike *active* linear resources, *abandoned* resources no longer function as transportation facilities. The "transportation use" element of abandoned resources is relatively less important, or moot, and the "corridor" and "design" elements are relatively more important.

- Changes to an abandoned linear resource affect the static structure, and do not relate to on-going maintenance or replacement.
- Projects causing any impacts to the resource within National Register boundaries could adversely affect the resource.

Iowa's Historic Automobile Roads: A National Register Study of Pre-1948 Arterial Highways. Marlin R. Ingalls, 2009. Highway Archaeology Program, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

This study examines historic cut-off arterial highway segments in the context of technology and engineering, materials, and construction. The study provides guidance on evaluating National Register eligibility of these highways, dating between 1900 and 1948.

The University of Iowa's Highway Archaeological Program conducted research on the history of road construction in the state, examining historical themes such as political and technological trends associated with arterial highway construction. Examples of these themes include The Pre-Concrete Era, Formative Time Strong on Local Issues and Boosterism, Pre-Iowa Highway Commission, Good Roads Era and Prior to the Iowa State Highway Commission, and Road Drag and Minor Equipment.

The University also conducted a statewide reconnaissance of 7,334 miles of roadways, and then focused on two cut-off highway corridors of multi-county length identified through this reconnaissance. Their study focused on the rights-of-way associated with these two highways. The study did not include features outside of the rights-of-way or roadside architecture. The study's criteria for evaluation focused on engineering elements such as design, material acquisition, and construction methods.

Research on the two selected cut-off highways included:

- local and regional in-depth archival research,
- oral histories and interviews,
- mapping of the highway routes,
- GPS locations of all significant features and structures (culverts, bridges, etc. within the rights-of-way), and
- photo-documentation and completion of site forms.

Both of these highways were made up of multiple cut-off segments, and each individual segment was evaluated in terms of National Register eligibility. As an example, the following is a list of some of the character-defining features of one these segments:

- Segment related to the Register Highway Era, mid-Iowa State Highway Commission Era, and Federal-Aid Era.
- Segment exhibits 2 and-a-half miles of 18 foot-wide concrete pavement with integral lip-curbs.
- Has unique eligible signature culvert stock crossing.
- Paving has not been overlain with asphalt.
- Segment exhibits elements of ca. 1910–1930 construction methods and materials.
- Presence of handwork on structures.
- Interpretive value of segment only fair due to short length and a segment with higher integrity to the north. It does serve as a contributing element.

- Construction elements, features, and materials of pavement fairly typical of similar period roads.

This segment was recommended as eligible under criteria A and C. The report states

It is eligible under Criterion C for its importance as a type section of 1920s construction methods and materials. It has interpretive value as erosion has exposed long sections of the pavement and road bed for close examination. It is also eligible under Criterion A for its 1922 association with the largest auto stranding in Iowa up to that time, and for its interpretive value in containing an important signature culvert stock crossing possibly representing the area's Czech heritage (page 219).

The study concluded that information about Iowa's road building past can be quantified by understanding three primary elements: design, materials, and construction. Road laws, engineering and design, state and federal politics, and construction equipment and materials serve as the foundation for a historic context for the state's roads and cut-off segments.

Montana—Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Montana Department of Transportation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Montana State Historic Preservation Office Regarding Historic Roads and Bridges Affected by Montana Department of Transportation Undertakings in Montana

This programmatic agreement, executed in January 2007, includes stipulations on how Montana DOT will manage the state's historic roads when affected by DOT projects. The PA applies to road built after 1859. The DOT is to "compile a list of a minimum of 12 (twelve) historic road segments in Montana that are especially significant for their historic associations and/or engineering and associated features (i.e., bridges, roadside architecture, proximity to abandoned segments of historic road, etc.) for inclusion in a Montana Historic Highway Program."

The Montana DOT is to identify this list of segments in consultation with the Montana State Historic Preservation Office. If a road segment on this list is not already evaluated in terms of National Register eligibility, then the DOT is to evaluate the eligibility of the segment in consultation with the SHPO.

The PA then stipulates that in terms of these 12 road segments, the DOT "will seek whenever prudent and feasible to preserve or incorporate into the design of all proposed undertakings as many of the historic features associated with the designated roadway as it possible based on current American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards." The DOT is to use design exceptions "as necessary and allowable to minimize impacts to historic highway features that may be located within the right-of-way (ROW) or clear zone." The PA also establishes a process for assessing impacts to the historic roads in the Montana Historic Highway Program, and for resolving any adverse effects to these roads.

Nebraska Historic Highway Survey. Prepared by Mead & Hunt, Inc., and Heritage Research, Ltd. 2002.

The scope of work for the Nebraska Historic Highway Survey Project, which was conducted for the Nebraska State Historical Society and the Nebraska Department of Roads, had the following components:

6. Develop a statewide historic context addressing the history of road and highway development in Nebraska.

1. Devise a methodology and conduct a field reconnaissance-level survey of five historic highways.
2. Prepare a National Register Multiple Property Document form for each of the five surveyed highways

The five surveyed highways encompassed approximately 3,500 miles and were associated with 921 newly identified or previously known road-related properties (e.g., bridges, roads, motels, gas stations, waysides, restaurants).

The project team developed an overall historic context to guide the study, specifically looking at the history of road development during the turn-of-the-20th century through the post-WW II era. The context examined state and federal road legislation and funding, and statewide trends in road improvements. The five selected highways were representatives of well known, early automobile routes, established from ca. 1911 to 1925. Each had multiple alignments. A specific alignment of each highway was chosen for the field reconnaissance survey.

The survey focused on identifying historic roads, bridges, and road-related property types. Associated properties (or complexes of properties) were surveyed when integrity did not appear to be severely lost or diminished. Site-specific historical research was limited on individual properties. As a result, the analysis of the historic associations of these properties is not complete.

The project team notes in their survey report that “[r]oad segments are the key element of a historic highway. To meet National Register criteria the road segment should largely remain in vehicular use and be long enough to provide the experience of a historic road. Road segments need to retain enough characteristic features of the road from the historic period to convey a sense of time and place as an early highway route.”

As noted above, a component of this project was to prepare a National Register Multiple Property Document form for each of the five surveyed highways. The forms were to outline the historic context for each highway, identify associated road-related property types, and outline the evaluation methods and registration requirements for individual resources. The survey report lists the variety of property types, including the highways themselves, to be included in the Multiple Property Document forms. The report also provides a listing of individual resources identified and evaluated during the reconnaissance survey, with recommendations on which resources may be candidates for National Register listing within the context of the Multiple Property Document forms. It should be noted, however, that the Multiple Property Document forms were never advanced beyond initial drafts reviewed and accepted by the Nebraska State Historical Society/Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office.

**APPENDIX C
AGENDA
ALASKA HISTORIC ROADS STUDY GROUP WORKSHOP
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
SEPTEMBER 28–30, 2010**

Day 1 (8:30 AM–4:30 PM)—All Participants

8:30–9:00 AM. Welcome and introductions

9:00–9:30 AM. Historic roads programmatic agreement and background on workshop

9:30–10:00 AM. Workshop goals

- Identify objectives and structure of Interim Guidance and develop outline for guidance
- Identify objectives and structure of Historic Context and develop draft scope of work for historic context

Break: 10:00–10:15 AM

10:15–10:45 AM. What have they done in other states? Lessons learned.

- Historic contexts for evaluating National Register eligibility—what is out there, how were they developed, and are they working
- Guidance and protocols for assessing effects and resolving adverse effects

10:45–11:15 AM. Historic roads in Alaska

- What is the status of current knowledge about the state’s historic roads?

Lunch: 11:15–12:15 AM.

12:15–4:30 PM. What makes a road historic?—Small and large group discussions

- What makes a historic road significant (and then potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places)?
- Types of roads in the state
- Character defining features of significant roads
- Integrity of character defining features of significant roads
- What type of information/research is needed to evaluate the significance of a historic road in the state?

Day 2 (8:30 AM–4:30 PM)—All Participants

8:30–10:00 AM. How might historic roads be affected by DOT&PF undertakings?—
Small and large group discussions

- How might the state’s historic roads be affected by transportation projects?
- How do you determine if a project will have no adverse effect on a listed and National Register eligible historic road, versus an adverse effect?
- What are some mechanisms for resolving adverse effects on National Register listed and eligible roads?

Break: 10:00–10:15 AM.

10:15 AM–4:30 PM. (with Lunch at 11:30 AM–12:30 PM.) Interim guidance and historic context—Small and large group discussions

- Objectives and structure of Interim Guidance. Outline for guidance
- Objectives and structure of Historic Context. Draft scope of work for historic context

Day 3 (8:30 AM–4:30 PM)—Core Project Team

8:30–9:30 AM. Review of Days 1 and 2

9:30 AM–1:30 PM. (with break at 10:00–10:15 AM and lunch at 11:30 AM–12:30 PM.)
Agreement on outline for interim guidance and on process for developing guidance

1:30–4:00 PM. Agreement on draft scope of work for historic roads historic context.

4:00–4:30 PM. Next steps

APPENDIX D
LIST OF HISTORIC ROADS TREATED AS ELIGIBLE FOR LISTING ON THE
NATIONAL REGISTER FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERIM GUIDANCE.

Dalton Highway
Williamsport–Pile Bay Road
Denali Highway
McCarthy Road (also designated as Edgerton/McCarthy Road)
Basin Road
Palmer–Fishhook Road (Palmer to Hatcher Pass)
Willow–Fishhook Road (Hatcher Pass to Willow)
Old Glenn Highway Segment–Glenn Highway Junction to Palmer
Nabesna Road
Richardson Highway Segment–Gulkana Junction to Delta Junction city
limits
South Tongass Highway
Thane Road
Nome–Council Road
Taylor Highway
Steese Highway Segment–U.S. Creek Road to Circle

FHWA, DOT&PF, and OHA are currently identifying the segments (beginning and ending mileposts) of each of these roads that will be treated as National Register eligible for the purpose of the Interim Guidance.