George Washington Memorial Parkway Routing Slip

Title of Attached Document: PERCO Dump - Compliance Docs
Sent by: R. Mucko
Date: 2/14/19
GWMP Routing ID # GWMP-18-0025

Action Required

- [X] Signature
- [ ] Surname/ Initial
- [ ] Return to R. Mucko
- [ ] Comment
- [ ] FYI / to be filed

Reply Due Date: 2/21/19

If your name is checked, initial and date on the line, then forward to the next person.

Please route to all levels of approval prior to the Superintendent, she will be the last to initial off on this.

Leadership Team

- [X] Superintendent _____
- [ ] Deputy Superintendent _____
- [X] Administrative Officer _____
- [ ] Safety Officer _____
- [ ] Chief of Maintenance _____
- [X] Chief of Resource Management MAV ACTING 2/19/19
- [ ] Chief of Visitor Services _____
- [ ] Chief of Lands, Planning, and Design _____

Division of Administration

- [ ] Budget Analyst _____
- [ ] Contracting Specialist _____
- [ ] IT Specialist _____
- [ ] Admin. Prog Specialist _____
- [ ] Concessions Specialist _____
- [ ] Procurement Tech Contr. _____

Division of Lands, Planning, and Design

- [ ] Landscape Architect _____
- [ ] Civil Engineer _____
- [ ] Architect _____
- [ ] Historic Architect _____

Division of Maintenance

- [ ] Deputy Chief _____
- [ ] Supv Fac Mgmt Specialist _____

Division of Resource Management

- [X] Enviro Protection Spec. KJM 2/14
- [ ] Natural Resource Mgr. _____
- [ ] Natural Resource Spec. _____
- [X] Cultural Resource Mgr. MAV 2/14/19
- [X] Cultural Resource Spec. BK 2/13
- [ ] Museum Curator _____
- [ ] Museum Technician _____
- [ ] Horticulturalist _____
- [ ] ROW Permits Coord. _____
- [ ] GIS/Lands Specialist _____

Division of Visitor Services _____

- [ ] Supv Park Ranger (North) _____
- [ ] Supv. Park Ranger (South) _____
- [ ] Supv. Visitor Use Assistant _____
- [ ] Education Specialist _____
- [ ] Special Use Permits _____

Other

- [ ] _____
- [ ] _____
- [ ] _____

Notes:

Memorandum

To: Superintendent, George Washington Memorial Parkway

Through: Chief of Resource Management, George Washington Memorial Parkway ACTING 2/19/19

From: Section 106 Coordinator, George Washington Memorial Parkway

Subject: Final Approval of Assessment of Effect (AOE) Form

Ref: AOE GWMP No. 19-002 Pepco Potomac River Oil Spill Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (DARP)

The proposed work described in the attached referenced document conforms to NPS Management Policies and D.O.-28. Therefore, I recommend approval, in accordance with the stipulations or conditions noted in Section C of the AOE Form(s).

Please return the AOE package to me when signed, after a copy is made for GWMP files.

Additionally, if appropriate, please attach a copy of the signed AOE package to the Categorical Exclusion Form completed for this project.

Matthew R. Virta

Matthew R. Virta

2/19/19

Date

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES, GWMP #19-002

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: George Washington Memorial Parkway

2. Project Description:

Project Name: Pepco Potomac River Substation Oil Spill Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (DARP)

PEPC Project Number: 79591

Locations:
County, State: Arlington, VA

Describe project:
A Draft Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (DARP) for the January 2011 Pepco Potomac River Substation Oil Spill (Pepco Potomac Spill) in Arlington County, Virginia, is being prepared by the natural resource trustees affected by the Pepco Potomac Spill. The Draft DARP is intended to inform the public about the natural resource injuries caused by the Pepco Potomac Spill and restoration projects that could compensate for those injuries. Proposed restoration projects are PEPC ID 73678, Vegetative Restoration of Boundary Channel Shorelines in Virginia and Washington D.C, and PEPC ID 62437, Installation and Maintenance of a Stream Trash Interceptor (extend maintenance by three years).

Area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR 800.16[d])
The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this project consists of the Potomac River from Arlington to Alexandria, Virginia, adjacent to the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) Historic District.

3. Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify historic properties?

___ No
_X_ Yes

Source or reference: George Washington Memorial Parkway NRHP Nomination, 95000605 (1995)
George Washington Memorial Parkway, Vegetation Cultural Landscape Report (2009)
Mount Vernon Memorial Highway Cultural Landscape Report (1986)
Mount Vernon Memorial Highway NRHP Nomination, 81000079 (1981)
Parkways of the NCR NRHP Nomination, 64500086 (1991)

4. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

Archeological Resources Affected: No
Archeological Resources Notes: The proposed project consists of the completion and issuance of a DARP for the Pepco Potomac Spill. While a variety of both prehistoric and archeological sites are located within the GWMP Historic District, none of them would be impacted by the completion and issuance of this plan. Any action items

resulting from the issuance of the DARP would require separate compliance review. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause effects to archeological resources.

Historical Structures/Resources Affected: No
Historical Structures/Resources Notes: The proposed project consists of the completion and issuance of a DARP for the Pepco Potomac Spill. While a variety of historic resources and structures are located within the GWMP Historic District, none of them would be impacted by the completion and issuance of this plan. Any action items resulting from the issuance of the DARP would require separate compliance review. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause effects to archeological resources.

Cultural Landscapes Affected: No
Cultural Landscapes Notes: The proposed project consists of the completion and issuance of a DARP for the Pepco Potomac Spill. While a variety of cultural landscapes are located within the GWMP Historic District, none of them would be impacted by the completion and issuance of this plan. Any action items resulting from the issuance of the DARP would require separate compliance review. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause effects to archeological resources.

Ethnographic Resources Affected: No
Ethnographic Resources Notes: The proposed project consists of the completion and issuance of a DARP for the Pepco Potomac Spill. Currently, there are no known ethnographic resources within the GWMP Historic District. Additionally, any action items resulting from the issuance of the DARP would require separate compliance review. Therefore, the proposed project will not cause effects to ethnographic resources.

5. The proposed action will: (check as many as apply)

No Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
No Replace historic features/elements in kind
No Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure
No Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
No Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape
No Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible
No Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible>
No Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources
No Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources
No Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)
X Other (please specify): - Completion and issuance of a Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (DARP); does not include an actionable item or undertaking.

6. Supporting Study Data:
(Attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and project or page number.)

B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS

The park 106 coordinator requested review by the park's cultural resource specialist/advisors as indicated by check-off boxes or as follows:

[X] 106 Advisor
Name: Sam Tamburro

Date: 02/04/2019
Comments: No potential to cause effect. This compliance review is only for the completion and issuance of the DARP. If the NPS decides to move forward with any actionable item or restoration component, then a separate Section 106 compliance review will be necessary.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance **[ ]**
Assessment of Effect: _X_No Potential to Cause Effect __No Historic Properties Affected __No Adverse Effect __Adverse Effect __Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

[X] 106 Advisor
Name: Matthew Virta
Date: 02/01/2019
Comments: The proposed project consists of the completion and issuance of the DARP for the Pepco Potomac River Substation oil spill incident from 2011. While the spill itself had impacts to the natural resources of the GWMP Historic District, the proposed project relates to the subsequent damage assessment and transmittal of that information to the public. The compliance review and commentary is for the administrative exercise of issuing the planning document. As such, there is no actionable item or undertaking being proposed that will impact or otherwise affect the environment, cultural resources, or historic properties. Therefore, this project is not anticipated to adversely affect the historic characteristics of the GWMP Historic District that make it eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance **[X]**
Assessment of Effect: _X_No Potential to Cause Effect __No Historic Properties Affected __No Adverse Effect __Adverse Effect __Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: This compliance review is only for the completion and issuance of the DARP. If the NPS decides to move forward with any actionable item or restoration component, then a separate Section 106 compliance review will be necessary.

[X] Archeologist
Name: Bradley Krueger
Date: 02/01/2019
Comments: The proposed project, as designed, consists of completing a Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan for the Pepco Potomac River Substation oil spill. Completion of the plan itself does not include any ground disturbing component that would adversely affect archeological resources. Should the park decide to move forward with the restoration component, a separate compliance review would be required for that work. Therefore, this project is not anticipated to adversely impact archeological resources.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance **[X]**
Assessment of Effect: _X_No Potential to Cause Effect __No Historic Properties Affected __No Adverse Effect __Adverse Effect __Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: Compliance review will be required for any DARP component that moves forward for implementation.

No Reviews From: Curator, Historical Architect, Historian, Other Advisor, Anthropologist, Historical Landscape Architect

---

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

X No Potential to Cause Effects
_____ No Historic Properties Affected
_____ No Adverse Effect
_____ Adverse Effect

2. Documentation Method:

[ ] A. Standard 36 CFR Part 800 Consultation
Further consultation under 36 CFR Part 800 is needed.

[ ] B. Streamlined Review Under the 2008 Servicewide Programmatic Agreement (PA)
The above action meets all conditions for a streamlined review under section III of the 2008 Servicewide PA for Section 106 compliance.

Applicable Streamlined Review Criteria
(Specify 1-16 of the list of streamlined review criteria.)

[ ] C. Undertaking Related to Park Specific or Another Agreement
The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a park, region or statewide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR 800.7 or 36 CFR 800.14.

[ ] D. Combined NEPA/NHPA Process
Process and documentation required for the preparation of an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD to comply with Section 106 is in accord with 36 CFR 800.8.c.

[X] E. Memo to Project File

3. Consultation Information

SHPO Required: No
THPO Required: No
SHPO/THPO Notes:

Advisory Council Participating: No
Advisory Council Notes:

N/A

4. Stipulations and Conditions:

Please see "Conditions and Stipulations" in Section B and "Mitigations/Treatment Measures" in Section C.5 of the Assessment of Effect form.

5. Mitigations/Treatment Measures: Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties: (Remember that setting, location, and use may be relevant.)

No Assessment of Effect mitigations identified.

6. Assessment of Effect Notes:

The federal action for this project is the completion of a Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (DARP). The DARP focuses on an oil spill in the Potomac River from the Pepco Potomac River Substation (January 23, 2011) and provides details to the public regarding the related natural resource damages. While actionable items and undertakings are proposed in the DARP as part of the restoration efforts, those actions would require their own individual Section 106 review.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Compliance Specialist:

NHPA Specialist
Matthew Virta Matthew N Virta **Date:** 2/14/19

E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL

The proposed work conforms to the NPS *Management Policies* and *Cultural Resource Management Guideline*, and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section C of this form.

Signature

Superintendent: Charles Cuvelier **Date:** 2/27/19

Charles Cuvelier

Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: Pepco Potomac River Substation Oil Spill Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (DARP)
PEPC Project Number: 79591
Description of Action (Project Description):

A Draft Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (DARP) for the January 2011 Pepco Potomac River Substation Oil Spill (Pepco Potomac Spill) in Arlington County, Virginia, is being prepared by the natural resource trustees affected by the Pepco Potomac Spill. The Draft DARP is intended to inform the public about the natural resource injuries caused by the Pepco Potomac Spill and restoration projects that could compensate for those injuries. Proposed restoration projects are PEPC ID 73678, Vegetative Restoration of Boundary Channel Shorelines in Virginia and Washington D.C, and PEPC ID 62437, Installation and Maintenance of a Stream Trash Interceptor (extend maintenance by three years).

Project Locations:

Location

County: Arlington **State:** VA

Mitigation(s):

- No mitigations identified.

CE Citation: CEs for Which No Formal Documentation is Necessary
3.3 code = R, Adoption or approval of surveys, studies, reports, plans and similar documents which will result in recommendations or proposed actions which would cause no or only minimal environmental impact.

CE Justification:

Decision: I find that the action fits within the categorical exclusion above. Therefore, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No extraordinary circumstances apply.

Signature

Superintendent: Charles J. Cuvelier **Date:** 2-27-19

Charles Cuvelier

Extraordinary Circumstances:

If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Notes
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?	No	
B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?	No	
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?	No	
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	No	
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?	No	
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?	No	
I. Violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898)?	No	
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?	No	
L. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?	No	