

**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**Implementation of the Programmatic Agreement Regarding Alaska's Highway System  
Roads Affected by the Federal-Aid Highway Program in Alaska**

**October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2014**

**I. Background and Reporting Requirements**

The *Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities Regarding Alaska's Highway System Roads Affected by the Federal-Aid Highway Program in Alaska* (Alaska Road PA) went into effect on February 23, 2010. The Alaska Road PA provides for an efficient, systematic approach for evaluating the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) eligibility of roads through the development of historic context and guidance tools. Among these are a Historic Roads Context Study and Final Guidance (Methodology) for assessing National Register eligibility of roads.

The Alaska Road PA also directed DOT&PF to prepare Interim Guidance that would address historic road eligibility and project effects during the period before the statewide Historic Road Context and Methodology are completed, and the Methodology is implemented. The DOT&PF developed this Interim Guidance in consultation with National Park Service (NPS), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). As noted below, the Interim Guidance identified fifteen roads to be treated as eligible for the National Register (TE List Roads) and provided mechanisms for assessing project effects to these roads. The Interim Guidance went into effect through the Second Amendment to the Alaska Road PA on June 8, 2012. This PA amendment also updated reporting stipulations.

This report for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2014 documents the *Alaska Road PA Stipulation 4 Annual Reporting Requirements*. Most projects involving TE List Roads proceed through a standard Section 106 consultation, which documents the assessment of project effects to the TE List Road. These projects do not require any additional reporting. However, one provision of the Interim Guidance, Section 5.1, allows certain limited projects to proceed with an internal DOT&PF review by a DOT&PF professionally qualified individual (PQI) staff who meets the Secretary of the Interior Professional Qualifications Standards when no other historic properties are present in the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE). The DOT&PF is required to submit an annual report to the SHPO and the FHWA on these Section 5.1 projects for the federal fiscal year that has just concluded. For each such project, the report is to include its federal number, project name, indication of whether the DOT&PF has been assigned FHWA categorical exclusion approval authority under 23 U.S.C. 326 (6004 Program), the type of undertaking, definition of the APE, the identification and evaluation efforts undertaken, and the basis for determination under Section 5.1.

In addition to the stipulated reporting, this annual report also provides updates on the ongoing implementation of the Interim Guidance and on the progress of the Historic Road Context and Methodology.

## **II. Interim Guidance**

According to Interim Guidance Applicability Section 2.0, the Interim Guidance will be in effect until the statewide Historic Roads Context and Methodology stipulated in the Alaska Road PA are completed and implemented.

Interim Guidance key points:

1. TE List Roads Appendix 1: Fifteen roads within Alaska are being treated as National Register eligible (TE List Roads) through an up-front agreement among the Alaska Road PA Signatories. While the Interim Guidance is in effect, other roads in Alaska will not be considered Section 106 historic properties except roads that are listed or previously determined eligible for listing in the National Register and portions of roads located in historic districts or National Historic Landmarks.
2. The Interim Guidance provides two lists of project activities for internal DOT&PF screening and documentation that do not require further Section 106 consultation with SHPO on effects to the TE List Road (Appendices 3 and 4). Potential effects to other types of properties are addressed pursuant to 36 CFR 800.
3. In cases where no other historic properties are present in the APE, and all activities are covered under Appendices 3 and 4, the project can be processed under Interim Guidance Section 5.1 with no further consultation.
4. Projects that include other activities not covered by Appendices 3 and 4 follow Interim Guidance Section 6.0 for *Projects that may have an Adverse Effect on Roads Treated as National Register Eligible*. These projects require consultation with the SHPO and other interested consulting parties to identify if an action would have an adverse effect on TE List Roads. The consultation will result in a finding of no adverse effect or in a finding of adverse effect. Results of the consultation are documented in the findings letter for the project.

## **III. Summary of FFY2014 Project Reporting**

No projects were processed under Interim Guidance Section 5.1 during the current FFY2014 Alaska Road PA reporting period.

## **IV. Alaska Road PA Accomplishments**

1. Interim Guidance Refresher Training  
Refresher training on the Interim Guidance was provided to DOT&PF PQIs and the Alaska Office of History and Archaeology (OHA) Liaison in February 2014. Training focused on this group of practitioners, who are the central points of contact for project teams for Section 106 review.
2. Interim Guidance Screening Form  
The existing Interim Guidance Screening Form was updated with minor adjustments in February 2014 following discussions at the refresher training session. Revisions clarified the signature protocols and the section on project effects to the TE List road. A copy of the revised form is appended to this report.

### 3. Historic Roads Context Study and Methodology

According to Alaska Road PA Stipulations 5.C.1 and 5.B.2, the DOT&PF is to develop a Historic Roads Context Study and Methodology for assessing National Register eligibility of roads. The primary goal of the applied historic context is to address National Register eligibility of State and regionally significant roads. A secondary goal is to propose general recommendations to guide future eligibility determinations for locally significant roads. The general tasks of the study and methodology are to prepare: (1) Historic Overview, (2) Methodology for Assessing Eligibility, and (3) Application of Methodology to Specific Roads. Consultant Mead & Hunt, Inc. is under contract through December 31, 2014 for the study and methodology.

During this reporting year, all of these tasks moved forward. The Historic Roads Context Study portion of the work was completed and posted in February 2014 as a stand-alone *Alaska Roads Historic Overview* report on the DOT&PF historic properties website.

The Historic Context Review Team (the FHWA, the DOT&PF, the SHPO, and the NPS) also reviewed and commented on several draft versions of the *Alaska Roads Methodology for Assessing National Register of Historic Places Eligibility* (Methodology). The Methodology was essentially completed in June 2014, but is expected to undergo minor revisions resulting from the application task.

The application of the Methodology during the current reporting year included three components in various stages of completion, all reviewed by the Historic Context Review Team.

**Methodology Screening:** The first was a test of the Methodology's initial screening component to a list of 42 roads, completed in May 2014. The test indicated the screening component was working as expected. The project consultant, Mead & Hunt, presented the Alaska historic roads screening protocol to the *Preserving the Historic Road* national conference, in September 2014.

**Statements of Significance and Alaska Heritage Resources Survey (AHRS) cards:** The second component is the development of Statements of Significance and AHRS cards on 12 priority roads that had passed the initial screening review, to assess which ones may be historically significant enough under the Methodology parameters to warrant additional consideration for Determinations of Eligibility (DOEs). This component advanced to second draft stage during the reporting period.

**Pilot DOE:** The third applied component is a full pilot DOE on one road. Originally a DOE was planned for the Taylor Highway; however, this choice was revised after preliminary research, and the Elliott Highway was selected as the pilot DOE candidate. The first draft of the Elliott Highway DOE was received during the FFY2014 reporting year. The results of all the application tasks will be

included in the final project deliverable, anticipated in late December 2014 (FFY2015).

#### 4. Interagency Partnership

As noted in previous annual reports, the ongoing development and processing of the Alaska Road PA deliverables, which involves extensive consultation among Historic Context Review Team members, continues to strengthen the working relationship amongst the FHWA, the SHPO, and the DOT&PF. This interagency partnership is fostering good faith efforts to resolve historic road eligibility issues, provide guidance and assistance to assess project effects on historic properties, and promote the successful and expedited delivery of the State's transportation projects.

### V. Alaska Road PA Forthcoming Tasks

#### Historic Roads Context Study and Methodology Future Deliverables

As previously noted, task deliverables under the current contract for the coming year include the following, scheduled for completion in December 2014 (FFY2015):

- Final versions of AHRS cards and statements of significance for the priority roads
- Completed DOE for the Elliott Highway
- Revisions to the Methodology and submission of final report with all components

In 2015, after the contract deliverables have been received and accepted by the Alaska Road PA Signatories, protocol will be developed and agreed upon through consultation among the FHWA, the SHPO, and the DOT&PF to implement the Methodology.

As Alaska roads are evaluated for their National Register eligibility using the Methodology, the DOT&PF will work with the FHWA, the SHPO, and other interested consulting parties to develop Alaska Historic Road Management Plan(s) for those roads that are determined eligible for the National Register. It may be determined that historic road management can be accomplished through a single statewide plan or separate plans.

### VI. Conclusion

The Alaska Road PA has been in effect since the end of February of 2010. The objectives, benefits, and efficiencies of the Alaska Road PA and the Interim Guidance are now being realized as the DOT&PF Administration and regional staff have begun to understand the program's merits and the streamlining opportunities that have been built into the program. The DOT&PF Statewide Environmental Office looks forward to the continued development and receipt of the Alaska Road PA forthcoming deliverables, the strong working partnership that is being fostered among the parties of Alaska Road PA, and the successful implementation of the Methodology.

## **Appendix**

### **Revised Interim Guidance Screening Form**

# Interim Guidance (IG) Screening

for projects with a Treated as Eligible (TE) Road in the APE

**Form version:**  
2-11-14

**Project Name:**

**State Project #:**

**Federal Project #:**

**6004 Assignable:**  Yes  No

**Description of APE** (attach figures as needed):

Project Activities (please list individually; continue on next page if needed)	Indicate which, if any, appendix list items apply	Consultation required on effects to TE List Road?	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

**Do any project activities have potential to affect other historic properties ?**  Yes  No

*If project may affect other historic properties, and does not qualify for review under Section 5.1, address remaining effects under 36 CFR 800. Only Region PQI signature is required in these cases.*

**Does the project qualify for review under IG Section 5.1?**  Yes  No

*If yes, attach documentation of the identification efforts that support this decision and include Statewide PQI signature below. If a Section 5.1 FHWA finding is required, also include appropriate FHWA signature.*

**Effect to TE List Road** (not necessarily the finding for the entire project) :

- No Historic Properties Affected (all activities are included in Appendix 3)
- No Adverse Effect (all activities are included in Appendix 4, or a combination of Appendices 3 & 4)
- Effect determination will be addressed through consultation. (See completed project Sec 106 file for documentation.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
DOT&PF Region PQI (printed name and signature) Date:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Statewide Office PQI (If a finding is being made under IG Section 5.1) Date:

\_\_\_\_\_  
FHWA representative (If an FHWA finding is being made under IG Section 5.1) Date:

# Continuation Sheet- Interim Guidance (IG) Screening

Project Activities-Continuation	Indicate which, if any, appendix list items apply	Consultation required on effects to TE List Road?	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

**Additional comment space:**