Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

January 15, 2010

Francis P. McManamon, Ph.D.
Departmental Consulting Archeologist
National Park Service
Archeology Program
1849 C Street, N.W. (2275)
Washington, DC 20240-0001

Dear Dr. McManamon:

This letter is in response to your October 30, 2009, request for information on the Department of Energy's (DOE) archeological programs and projects for Fiscal Year 2009. The Department does not maintain centralized records at Headquarters of archeological activities conducted at DOE sites nationwide. Our office forwarded the questionnaire you provided to the sites for their input on site-specific activities. Enclosed is the composite response summarizing information collected from those DOE sites that completed the questionnaire. In the Narrative Response sections of the enclosed response, each of the reporting DOE sites is identified. Also provided is a chart delineating individual site responses.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of assistance and hope that the information provided will be helpful in preparation of the Secretary of Interior's Report to Congress on Federal Archeology. If you have any questions on the enclosed materials, please contact Beverly Whitehead, of my staff, at (202) 586-6073, or by email at Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov.

Sincerely,

Andrew C. Lawrence

Andrew C. Lawrence
Director
Office of Nuclear Safety, Quality Assurance
and Environment
Office of Health, Safety and Security

Enclosures (as listed)

Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

List of Enclosures

Enclosure 1 REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – FY 2009
Quantitative Questionnaire on FY 2009 Activities

Enclosure 2 REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – FY 2009
DOE's Response to Narrative Questionnaire on FY 2009 Activities

Enclosure 3 DOE Site Specific Responses to the Federal Archeology Program Activities – FY 2009

Enclosure 4 DOE Site Acronym List

Enclosure 1

REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
FY 2009

Quantitative Questionnaire on FY 2009 Activities

	REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	
	Quantitative Questionnaire on 2009 Activities	
	Agency Name: Department of Energy	
	Agency representative responsible for data submission (to be contacted in case of queries about data**): Beverly Whitehead**	
	Phone Number: (202) 586-6073	
	E-mail address: Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov	
	Section A. Legislation, Policies, and Programmatic Actions	
	This is a narrative section for describing your agency's programmatic, regulatory, and legislative activities that affect archeological activities within your agency. These descriptions will be compiled for the Secretary's Report to Congress on the Federal Archeology Program.	
	Section B. Participation, Education, and Outreach	
B01.	Number of partnership agreements (e.g. cooperative, cost-share, interagency, research) in place with the archeology program in your agency during this reporting year. (*Do not include contracts.*)	10
B02.	Estimated total dollar value of contributions provided by partners (e.g. money, services, volunteers working directly for partners) during this reporting year.	1,231,250
B03.	Volunteer hours contributed directly to the agency for the benefit of archeological activities during this reporting year.	600
	Section C. Archeological Planning	
C01.	Number of area-wide overviews and general management non-project plans completed or updated under ARPA and NHPA (e.g. Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans, forest overviews, preservation plans, historic context statements, archeological resource protection stewardship plans, etc.) by your agency during the reporting year.	5
C02.	Number of undertakings or projects undertaken during the reporting year for which archeological database and file searches, literature reviews, or map checks were conducted. (*Report all projects for which checks were done, even those that produced no information.*)	1,259

C03.	(*For land managing agencies*) Number of notifications to Indian Tribes of proposed work that might harm or destroy archeological sites having religious or cultural importance to the Tribes.	68
	Section D. Archeological Identification and Evaluation	
	Responses to questions in this section should include all and ARPA and NHPA Section 106 and Section 110 activities that are performed or funded by agency and non-agency entities (e.g. contractors, independent investigators, third parties) in the reporting year.	
D01.	Number of field studies carried out, authorized, or required by your agency during this reporting year to identify and evaluate archeological sites.	347
D02.	Number of acres inventoried during this reporting year to identify and evaluate archeological sites.	23,469
D03.	Number of new archeological sites identified during this reporting year.	415
D04.	How many NHPA Section 106 actions involving archeological sites carried out, authorized, or required by your agency were completed during this reporting year?	188
D05.	Number of archeological sites that were stabilized, rehabilitated, or protected (e.g. anti-vandalism signs, fences, or road closures) during this reporting year.	122
D08.	How many reports (grey literature, such as Section 106 compliance reports) about archeological resources either on private or public lands were completed for your agency during the reporting period ?	168
	For land managing agencies:	
D9.	Cumulative number of acres inventoried to identify and evaluate archeological sites on agency-managed land. (*Include this reporting year.)*	385,536
	How many of these cumulative survey areas are mapped using a GIS or CAD system?	
D10.A	GIS:	293,389
D10.B	CAD:	7,375

D11.	Cumulative number of archeological sites identified on agency-managed land. (*Include this reporting year*.)	10,170
	How many of the locations of the cumulative number of archeological sites discovered to date are mapped using a GIS or CAD system?	
D12.A	GIS:	7,883
D12.B	CAD:	28
D13.	Number of archeological sites that were assessed for condition in the reporting year.	164
D14.	Number of known archeological sites revisited and re-evaluated during this reporting year.	85
	Section E. Archeological Data Recovery Projects	
	Data recovery projects include archeological investigations, typically excavations, that are conducted to mitigate the effects of destruction or disturbance caused by Federal undertakings or to document sites for interpretation or management. Recovery projects may be related to scholarly research, compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA, ARPA, or an agency-specific statute, regulation, or policy.	
E01.	Number of archeological data recovery **projects** in progress during this reporting year.	12
E02.	Number of archeological **sites** on which data recovery was undertaken during this reporting year.	24
E03.	Number of undertakings resulting in the unexpected discovery of archeological sites subsequent to agency completion of the NHPA Section 106 review and compliance process during this reporting year.	1
E04.	Number of undertakings resulting in the unexpected discovery of archeological sites subsequent to agency completion of the NHPA Section 106 review and compliance process that required data recovery. *(Include the undertaking in the reporting year that the archeological site is discovered even if data recovery will not occur until the following year.)*	0
	Section F. National Register Activities	

	Reporting the numbers of *sites* is preferred. "Eligibility" includes administratively or consensus-determination of eligibility through documented consultation with the SHPO or THPO or through requesting an official determination of eligibility by the Keeper.	
F01.	Number of archeological sites that were determined eligible for the National Register during this reporting year.	105
F02.	Number of archeological sites that were listed in the National Register during this reporting year.	0
F03.	Number of archeological sites that were determined ineligible for listing in the National Register during this reporting year.	105
	For land managing agencies:	
F06.	Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency managed lands that were determined eligible for the National Register. *(Include this reporting year.)*	1,670
F07.	Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency managed lands that were determined ineligible for the National Register. *(Include this reporting year.)*	1,878
F08.	Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency managed lands that are listed in the National Register. (*Include this reporting year.*)	1,173
F09.	Number of archeological sites listed on the National Register that passed out of control of the reporting Federal agency during the reporting period.	0
	Number of archeological sites under Federal control that were formerly but are no longer listed on the National Register because of natural causes or human induced destruction.	
F10.A	Natural Destruction	0
F10.B	Human Induced Destruction	0
	For agencies who **only** maintain information about archeological districts on the National Register	
F11.	Number of archeological districts on agency managed lands that were determined eligible for the National Register during this reporting year.	0
F12.	Cumulative number of archeological districts on agency managed lands that were determined eligible for the National Register by the Keeper. *(Include this reporting year.)*	21

F13.	Number of archeological districts on agency managed lands that were listed on the National Register during this reporting year.	0
F14.	Cumulative number of archeological districts on agency-managed lands that are listed on the National Register. (*Include this reporting year.)*	8
	Section H. Archeological Collections Management	
	(Note: Section G is omitted to maintain consistency in the numbering of questions with prior years.)	
H01.	Number of items/lots (artifacts, samples) curated in all repositories.	2,008,640
And/Or		
H02.	Number of cubic feet of material remains (artifacts, samples) curated in all repositories.	5,171
H03.	Are associated records included? (Yes)	8
H03.	Are associated records included? (No)	6
H04.	Percentage of collection identified in H1 or H2 that has been processed for professional curation in accordance with 36 CFR 79.5	varies
H05.	Number of linear feet of associated paper records related to stored archeological materials, or records associated with any archeological studies.	1,172
And/Or		
H06.	Number of gigabytes of stored archeological records or studies.	193
H07.	Number of Federal museums/repositories, as defined in 36 CFR 79, curating agency collections.	7
H08.	Number of non-Federal museums/repositories, as defined in 36 CFR 79, curating agency collections.	10
H09.	Does your agency have a policy for management and preservation of archeological collections?	yes
H10.	List the names of the museums/repositories that are curating agency collections.	see separate sheet

H11.	How many times were collections held by your agency utilized for research or for exhibits during the reporting period?	70

	Section I. Archeological Resource Management Program Funding	
I01.	Estimated total amount of funding appropriated to the agency (directly from Congress or as a result of internal agency allocations) that was used for archeological activities during this reporting year.	$4,633,917
I02.	Estimated total amount of funding allocated from other agency programs (e.g. timber, construction, wildland fire management, permits, licenses, grants) that was used for archeological activities during this reporting year.	$6,159,537
	Section K. Permits for Archeological Investigations	
	(Note: Section J is omitted to maintain consistency in the numbering of questions with prior years.) Include all permits issued pursuant to Federal agency policies and procedures for archeological activities authorized by the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, the Antiquities Act or agency-specific statutes.	
K01.	Number of permit applications received by the agency during the reporting year.	3
K02.	Number of permits issued by the agency or in effect during the reporting year.	4
	Section L. Archeological Resource Law Enforcement	
	Include information about archeological resources crimes in violation of ARPA; the Antiquities Act; Federal property protection laws, such as Theft of Government Property and Destruction of Government Property, or agency-specific statues and regulations protecting archeological resources.	
L01.	Number of incidents affecting archeological resources documented during this reporting year.	15
L02.	Number of documented incidents affecting archeological resources in which individuals were arrested during this reporting year.	0

L03.	Number of individuals arrested for all documented incidents affecting archeological resources during this reporting year.	0
L04.	Number of individuals issued citations for violations of Federal laws and regulations involving archeological resources during this reporting year.	3
	ARPA (Archaeological Resources Protection Act) Violations	
L05.	Number of individuals convicted of a misdemeanor under ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L06.	Number of individuals convicted of a felony under ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L07.	Number of individuals found liable for a civil penalty under ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L08.	Number of individuals charged but found not guilty or not liable of ARPA violations during this reporting year.	0
L09.	Total sum of amounts given in rewards under ARPA *(not amount offered)*.	0
	Prosecutions for Looting and Vandalism of Archeological Resources Under Other Laws	
L10.	Number of individuals convicted of a misdemeanor under authorities other than ARPA during this reporting year.	3
L11.	Number of individuals convicted of a felony under authorities other than ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L12.	Number of individals found not guilty of charges under laws other than ARPA during this reporting year.	0
	Summary Information	
L13.	Number of criminal and civil cases where individuals were found guilty or liable during this reporting year. (Include ARPA cases.)	1
L14.	Total sum of fines imposed or ordered during this reporting year.	$375

L15.	Total amount of restitution imposed or ordered, including civil penalties, during this reporting year.	0
L16.	Total summed estimated costs of restoration and repair in site damage assessments during this reporting year.	0
L17.	Total commercial value of personal property and artifacts seized and either retained or sold during this reporting year.	0
L18.	Law enforcement costs to agency for archeological resource protection during this reporting year.	$266,917
L22.	Number of collected LOOT forms. *(It is important to send completed LOOT forms to the Departmental Consulting Archeologist.)*	0

REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES--2009

Questionnaire on FY 2009 Activities

H10. List the names of the museums/repositories that are curating agency collections. Indicate which museums\repositories that were inspected\visited during this fiscal year

Agency	Agency-Subunit	Museum/Repository	State	Date last visited
DOE	Bonneville Power Administration	Burke Museum of Natural History and Culture	WA	2009
DOE	Bonneville Power Administration	The People's Center*	MT	2009
DOE	Brookhaven National Laboratory	BNL Cultural Resource Management Collection	NY	10/13/2009
DOE	Brookhaven National Laboratory	Camp Upton Historical Collection	NY	6/9/2009
DOE	SC-Fermi Site Office	Illinois State Museum, Springfield	IL	2005
DOE	Idaho Operations Office	Idaho Museum of Natural History/Earl H. Swanson Archaeological Repository	ID	5/15/2009
DOE	Office of Legacy Management	Ohio Historical Society Archives/Library	OH	summer 2008
DOE	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	Laboratory Archives and Research Center	CA	FY 2009
DOE	Los Alamos National Laboratory	Museum of New Mexico, Laboratory of Anthropology at Santa Fe	NM	summer 2009
DOE	NNSA/Nevada	NNSA/NSO Curation	NV	2009
DOE	Oak Ridge Operations Office	University of Tennessee McClung Museum	TN	Aug-05
DOE	OCRWM - Yucca Mountain	Desert Research Institute	NV	
DOE	Richland Operations	Columbia Exhibition for History, Science, and Technology	WA	9/18/2008
DOE	Richland Operations	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Sigma V Building	WA	Mar-08
DOE	Richland Operations	Washington State University, Tri-Cities Campus, Rolling Storage, Richland	WA	
DOE	RMOTC	University of Wyoming	WY	never
DOE	Savannah River Ops Office	On-site curation facility in US DOE building	SC	all work days

* Collection owned by Flathead National Forest. BPA funds curation in part.

Enclosure 2

REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
FY 2009

DOE's Response to Narrative Questionnaire on FY 2009 Activities

QUESTIONNAIRE ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Instructions for 2009 Questionnaire
And form for narrative questions in 2009 Questionnaire

The Departmental Consulting Archeologist, NPS, prepares the Report to Congress on the Federal Archeology Program for the Secretary of the Interior as required by Section 13 of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA; 16 USC 470aa-470mm) and by Section 7.19 of the Uniform ARPA Regulations (43 CFR 7). The statute directs the Secretary to report on the scope and effectiveness of Federal archeological activities and to provide information about such activities and programs to Congress. The Secretary's Report provides information about Federal archeological activities. Information about the Secretary's Report to Congress is available on the NPS Archeology Program website at www.nps.gov/archeology/SRC/index.htm

The questions in this questionnaire specifically apply to archeological investigation, protection, management, recovery, education, and collections management activities carried out under Federal authority, and do not pertain to other cultural resources. It is understood that precise data are not always available and that in some cases knowledgeable estimates must be made.

The LOOT Clearinghouse is an important source of information on cases of Federal archeological resource crime. Submitting LOOT forms (NPS Form 10-29) is voluntary, however, the information has been useful to law enforcement and government attorneys in developing prosecution cases against looters. LOOT forms are available on the NPS Archeology Program website at www.nps.gov/archeology/SRC/forms/05LOOTForm.doc. Please submit completed LOOT forms, or mail or fax copies of equivalent information from the case files, for each citation, misdemeanor, and felony conviction, and civil penalty pertaining to archeological resources in your agency that was completed in the reporting year.

Due Dates and Assistance. The headquarters office of each agency or department should compile a service-wide response to the questionnaire, summarizing numerical information collected from regions, districts, divisions, etc. by December 31, 2009. Questions about this survey should be directed to Karen Mudar, Archeology Program, 202-354-2103; Fax: 202-371-5102; karen_mudar@nps.gov.

Terms Used in this Questionnaire
Definitions are adapted from "Guidelines for Completing National Register of Historical Places Forms, Part A-How to Complete the National Register Registration Form, Appendix IV-Glossary." (U.S. Department of Interior, NPS, National Register of Historic Places, 1997.)

Archeological Site: location of a significant event, a pre or post-contact occupation or activity, or a building, or a structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses archeological value.

Archeological District: possesses significant concentrations, linkages or continuity of sites united historically or aesthetically by plan or by physical development.

Cumulative: refers to combined data from all years to the present.

Annual: refers to data pertaining to the reporting year.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
Narrative Questions about 2009 Archeological Activities

Agency: Department of Energy (DOE)

Representative responsible for data submission (to be contacted in case of queries about data): Beverly Whitehead

E-mail Address: Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov

Phone Number: ***(202) 586-6073***

Two U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) facilities, Ames Laboratory and Kansas City Plant, reported that they had no relevant information to provide for the narrative questions and their responses to the quantitative portion were all zero.

Section A. Legislation, Policies, Exemplary Activities

This is a narrative section for describing your region's programmatic, regulatory, and legislative activities that affect archeological activities. These descriptions will be compiled for the Secretary's Report to Congress on the Federal Archeology Program.

A1. Describe any regulatory, legislative, or programmatic developments during this reporting year that affect the way that archeology is conducted in your park or program.

Bonneville Power Administration

On October 6, 2009, a Systemwide Programmatic Agreement (PA) for the Management of Historic Properties Affected by the Multipurpose Operations of Fourteen Projects of the Federal Columbia River Power System for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) went into effect. Signatory parties to the PA include the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; Bonneville Power Administration (BPA); the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); the Bureau of Reclamation (BR); Oregon, Montana, and Idaho State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs); the Kalispel Tribe of Indians; the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon; the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Nation; Regions 1 and 6 of the US Forest Service; and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The PA streamlines the section 106 process at affected Projects; identifies future work priorities and prioritization factors; sets schedules and reporting requirements; and clarifies how BPA, the USACE, and the BR will work with tribes and consulting parties in the region.

Idaho Operations Office

DOE has long recognized a stewardship responsibility for the rich and irreplaceable archaeological resources that fall under its jurisdiction. In 2001 a written policy that confirms this commitment and integrates cultural resource management into overall Agency missions was formalized. At the Idaho National Laboratory (INL), an 890-square mile nuclear research laboratory in southeastern Idaho overseen by DOE's Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID), a comprehensive "Cultural Resource Management Plan" guides cultural resource compliance and preservation activities in both the long and short term. The programmatic cornerstones of the Plan are signed Agreements between DOE-ID and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and between DOE-ID, the Idaho SHPO, and the Advisory Council

on Historic Preservation. Many INL programs benefit from the tailored approach to cultural resource compliance outlined in the Plan with the help of the INL Cultural Resource Management (INL CRM) program, operated by DOE-ID's maintenance and operations contractor, Battelle Energy Alliance. The INL CRM office is responsible for day-to-day implementation of the Plan and in FY 2009 completed minor revisions to ensure that it continues to fill these important functions.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) continues to wait for the SHPO to approve and sign a Programmatic Agreement and Archaeological Resources Treatment Plan authored in 2006-2007.

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management

In late FY 2009, owing to programmatic and fiscal reorientation resulting in a substantial reduction of site activities, DOE's archeological program was limited to monitoring, planning, and comment response efforts.

Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant

From a programmatic level DOE took additional measures in April 2009 to contact 13 Native American tribes to determine any tribal interest in becoming consulting parties at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (Portsmouth Site) and to request any further information regarding prehistoric or historic districts, sites, buildings, structures, or objects within the Portsmouth Site. Although there are no federally recognized tribes in Ohio, there are Native American federally recognized tribal authorities historically associated with the state of Ohio, and DOE obtained their contact information through the Native American Consultation Database. In addition, DOE issued a public notice and postcard notifications seeking to obtain any additional information from the public on historic sites or properties on or near the Portsmouth Site. Two tribes responded back to DOE, requesting to be contacted should any Native American burial sites be discovered. No additional information was provided by tribal authorities or the public.

Savannah River Operations Office

Through a cooperative agreement between DOE and the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA), the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program (SRARP) provides DOE with the technical expertise and guidance needed to manage archaeological resources at the Savannah River Site (SRS).

Research conducted by SRARP personnel were reported in five professional articles and reports published during FY 2009. The SRARP staff presented research results in 24 papers and posters at professional conferences. The SRARP archaeological research included eight field survey and excavation programs. Four grants were acquired to support both on-site and off-site research, and employees served as consultants on 16 projects in off-site CRM and research activities. The SRARP staff held 37 offices and appointments to committees in various educational, avocational, and professional organizations.

Western Area Power Administration

Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) continued to follow DOE policy, federal regulations, Executive orders, and federal laws including the National Historic Preservation Act, especially Section 106, as amended for all undertakings within its service area.

Section B. Public Participation, Education, and Outreach

B4. If desired, describe exemplary partnership, education, or outreach programs, products, or activities conducted by your parks or programs during this reporting year, for potential inclusion in the Secretary's Report to Congress.

Bonneville Power Administration

The Federal Columbia Power System Cultural Resource Program (Program) is an ongoing partnership between BPA, the USACE, the BR, and other federal agencies and Native American tribes throughout the Pacific Northwest region. This unique partnership ensures the interests of program participants are addressed by the joint-lead federal agencies (i.e., BPA, the USACE, and BR) in complying with section 106 at 14 federal hydropower Projects in the Columbia Basin.

The Bear Paw Rock Art Documentation Project recorded a cluster of over 40 petroglyphs at risk of being impacted by operation of the John Day hydroproject and recreational use on the bank of the Columbia River. Work was accomplished through a partnership between the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, Central Washington University, Earthwatch, BPA, and the USACE. Twelve high school students from across the U.S. gained insight into the importance of rock images to members of the Yakama Nation, learned about scientific documentation methods used to document archaeological sites, and gained a better understanding of federal land management.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

The LLNL staff archaeologist regularly publishes in the Lab's periodical, Newsline, articles highlighting the archaeology and historic preservation program at LLNL. The quarterly articles include many photos of the resources to be found on LLNL property. In February 2009 LLNL's staff archaeologist participated in the Expanding Your Horizon's Career Fair for Young Girls, presenting two poster-boards of archaeological activities and sites and a hands-on artifact display. The attending archaeologist answered many questions and provided a handout of websites for more information on careers in archaeology including college and university programs.

Los Alamos National Laboratory

In September 2009 the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) Cultural Resources Team (CRT) partnered with the LANL Trails Assessment Working Group and the Volunteer Task Force (VTF) to reroute publicly used social trails around a large (4-acre) late Archaic Period (ca. 1000 BC to 600 AD) archaeological site of chipped stone scatter (and possible campsite) through which several hiking/horseback riding trails had been established since the 1960s from the adjacent community of White Rock. The long-used trails through the site had created erosion issues as well as having exposed possible hearth features. The VTF is a non-profit organization established to help service and maintain social trails in and around Los Alamos County. The VTF has entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with Los Alamos Nuclear Security, LLC, the Contractor who operates LANL for DOE, to assist with social trails at LANL that are accessible by the general public. Nine individuals, including two Eagle Scouts, donated four hours of time each to cut a new bypass trail about 900 m long outside the site boundaries. Hand tools such as pulaskis, shovels, rakes, and saws were used to create the new bypass trail. Once the new trail was completed, snags and fallen juniper and pinyon pine trees were slashed and spread along previously existing trails in the site in order to prevent their continued use.

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management
In FY 2009 DOE reprinted a popular volume on Yucca Mountain prehistory entitled "Reading the Stones: The Archaeology of Yucca Mountain" at the request of the SHPO for use in public outreach.

Pantex
A prehistoric and natural resource exhibit (focusing on prehistory, bone fragments that were discovered on site, and land management) has been developed and is in the installation phases for educational outreach purposes for those working at the site and invited visitors.

A Prehistory Presentation to the Texas Archeological Society was conducted, discussing archeological Pantex activities.

Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant
As educational outreach to the public, DOE provided a presentation on NHPA compliance and activities at the Portsmouth Site during the Portsmouth Environmental Management (EM) Site Specific Advisory Board's public meeting on April 2, 2009.

Savannah River Operations Office
In the area of heritage education the SRARP continued its activities in FY 2009 with a full schedule of classroom education, public outreach, and on-site tours. Fifty-nine presentations, displays, and tours were provided for schools, civic groups, and environmental and historical awareness day celebrations. The SRARP staff also taught four anthropology courses at Augusta State University and the University of South Carolina, Columbia. In addition, the SRARP website, www.srarp.org has seen an increase in traffic this year. In FY 2009 there were over 10,000 visits to the website. The website continues to undergo improvements including information on current research and outreach events at SRARP.

Western Area Power Administration
This would be covered under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) program as WAPA has little land to manage and limited, to no, Section 110 responsibilities.

B5. If needed, clarify responses to questions about public participation, education, and outreach.

Idaho Operations Office
Outreach and education are important elements in the INL CRM program and efforts are routinely oriented toward the general public, INL employees, and important stakeholders such as the Idaho SHPO and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. Tools that facilitate communication with all of these groups include annual activity reports, presentations, newspaper articles and interviews, periodic tours, monthly meetings with Tribal representatives, and various INL-specific media outlets such as the INL Speakers Bureau, the INL external web page (www.inl.gov) and internal intranet, INL employee training, and iNotes, an email-based communication tool. Informative exhibits at the Experimental Breeder Reactor I Visitor's Center (a National Historic Landmark) and the Big Lost River Rest Area are also important public outreach tools.

Direct communication is implemented through annual tours and periodic presentations to local schools, civic groups, and at professional conferences. In FY 2009 INL CRM staff members spoke on a wide variety of topics including regional prehistory and history, World War II, nuclear history, historic preservation, careers, CRM, archaeological resource protection, cave resources, and Native American resources and sensitivities. Several FY 2009 tours provided crucial orientation and

background for INL visitors, employees, and stakeholders as well as a lively hands-on experience for approximately 50 people in celebration of Idaho Archaeology and Historic Preservation Month.

Since the early 1990's, DOE-ID and the INL CRM program have participated in an important partnership with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes based on successive written "Agreements-in-Principle." Tribal and INL CRM staff under this program jointly conduct many general and project-specific activities including archaeological surveys and evaluations, recommendations for site protection and/or mitigation, educational outreach, tribal access to and use of significant areas and resources on the INL, and general planning and feedback on INL activities. Regular, face-to-face meetings of the INL "Cultural Resources Working Group," with representatives from DOE-ID, the INL CRM program, the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, and INL program and project managers, as appropriate, have built a long-term relationship of trust and cooperation. The high level of interaction encouraged by this group fosters an atmosphere of mutual respect that is conducive to open communication and effective consideration of tribal views in decisions regarding INL cultural resources and overall land management.

The INL area holds a myriad of historic trails, including a portion of a northern cutoff of the Oregon Trail; various stage and freight roads; and roads to, from, and between homesteads. In FY 2009 INL CRM staff developed a poster for the annual National Trust for Historic Preservation conference held in Tulsa, OK. The poster, entitled "To Use or Not to Use, That is the Question: A Roads and Trails Case Study," illustrated via photographs and words the dilemma faced by archaeologists who are tasked with protecting these historic resource types.

Sandia Site Office

Sandia Site Office maintains an agreement with Kirtland Air Force Base (KAFB) regarding archaeological surveys on land managed by Cibola National Forest land withdrawn for DOE use. KAFB previously conducted archaeological surveys in the area and included DOE land; KAFB shares the resulting information.

.

Section C. Archeological Planning

Richland Operations Office

DOE's Richland Operations Office conducted several workshops with four regional Tribes to develop strategies for minimizing and reducing impacts to a traditional cultural property (TCP) located on the Hanford Site. This collaborative planning effort resulted in development of a site-wide cultural sensitivity training module for working on TCPs at Hanford. Workshops were also held with the four regional Tribes to develop a Memorandum of Agreement for Historic-Archaeological Data Recovery at 45BN1437 (Hanford Construction Camp Burn Pits) and 45BN1536 (Hanford Trailer Camp Landfill).

Western Area Power Administration

WAPA's main focus is compliance with Section 106 and follows that process. WAPA has limited to no land management, which restricts planning.

C4. If desired for potential inclusion in the Secretary's Report to Congress, describe any notable planning activities that took place during this reporting year.

Idaho Operations Office
INL is an active facility where thousands of work orders for projects ranging from lawn care to new facility construction are processed each year. The comprehensive "INL Cultural Resource Management Plan" outlines a tailored process of assessing and, when necessary, mitigating adverse impacts to archaeological resources as a consequence of all activities, large or small. The Plan was updated in FY 2009 with minor changes to ensure its continued relevance.

Pantex
The Cultural Resource Management Plan is referenced in other plans that are implemented throughout the Plant. The Integrated Plan for Playa Management at Pantex Plant and the Ten-Year Site Plan are reviewed annually for continued protection of the archeological sites. The Work Instruction, "Protecting Cultural Resources," was revised to provide a step-by-step procedure to follow if artifacts are discovered during Plant activities.

Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant
DOE received a request in 2008 for transfer of a parcel of land for economic development purposes by the DOE-recognized Community Reuse Organization, the Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative. As part of the evaluation process, DOE planned in 2009 to perform an archaeological study on two historic farmstead sites, 33PK212 and 33PK213, located on the subject parcel in the northeastern portion of the Portsmouth Site. The two sites had been recommended for further investigation under a Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Portsmouth Site. In addition, DOE provided funding for a geophysical survey to be performed at a historical cemetery located on the same land parcel.

Strategic Petroleum Reserve
The DOE Strategic Petroleum Reserve contracted through its Management and Operating contractor to have the proposed expansion site in Richton (Perry County), Mississippi, assessed for the presence of prehistoric, historic, or isolated finds that could be considered for inclusion into the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). The Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment noted the identification of 15 prehistoric sites, six historic sites, and six isolated finds. The final two-part report (March 2009), along with concurrence letters from the Mississippi Department of Archives and History (October 14, 2008, and January 23, 2009) revealed that the approximate 800-acre site did not have any sites or finds that could be considered eligible for the National Register.

C5. If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological planning.

Berkeley Site Office
Further progress was made on a draft Cultural Resources Management Plan, which will be completed in 2010.

Section D. Archeological Identification and Evaluation During the Reporting Year

Responses to questions in this section should include all NHPA Section 106 and Section 110 activities and ARPA activities that are performed or funded by agency or non-agency entities (e.g. contractors, independent investigators, third parties) in the reporting year.

Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant
A Phase II Archaeological Study of two farmstead sites was conducted in late April 2009 by a subcontractor to DOE. The farmsteads had been purchased as part of the original tract for the Portsmouth Site by the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), a DOE predecessor agency, in the early 1950s. The resultant report was entitled "Phase II Site Evaluations of 33PK212 and 33PK213 for the

Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Facility, Seal Township, Pike County, Ohio" and dated August 21, 2009. As individual resources, the study concluded the archaeological evidence of both sites lacked sufficient data to provide new or significant information regarding Ohio's past and, as such, both were recommended not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

A geophysical survey of the Holt Cemetery, located on DOE property at the Portsmouth Site, was completed in May 2009 to help identify grave site locations and boundary extent of the cemetery. The survey was performed as part of the evaluation process for a request to transfer a parcel of land from DOE to the Community Reuse Organization. The geophysical survey report is entitled "Geophysical Survey at the Holt Cemetery, Pike County, Ohio" and dated June 23, 2009.

Western Area Power Administration

WAPA conducted over 50 surveys for Section 106 activities (no section 110 or Archaeological Resources Protection Act [ARPA] due to very limited land management). WAPA also made initial determinations of eligibility for 111 properties located during these surveys.

D6. If desired, describe any exemplary identification, evaluation, stabilization, rehabilitation, monitoring, or protection projects that parks in your region were involved in during this reporting year for potential inclusion in the Secretary's Report to Congress.

Idaho Operations Office

During prehistoric and historic times the INL lava tube caves provided unique resources for Native Americans and early ethno-european settlers. Today, not only do these caves provide valuable archaeological and paleontological information, they are considered by Shoshone-Bannock tribal members to be of particular importance. At least 30 caves are known within INL boundaries. Not all of the caves have, however, been formally surveyed. Surveys for many caves were conducted long ago, those survey forms are outdated, and location information for many caves is suspect.

As a result, during FY 2009 a project was initiated to inventory, survey, and map caves located on the INL This work is intended as a partial fulfillment of requirements established in Section 110 of NHPA and to shed light on when, how, and why INL caves were used in prehistoric and historic times. In FY 2009 seven known but previously unrecorded caves were visited and recorded. One cave that was originally recorded in the late 1960s was re-recorded, and two previously unknown caves were found and recorded.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

The Carnegie Town Site (CA-SJO-173H) at Site 300 was observed for pre- and post-annual prescribed burn conditions. Documentation was limited to photos and geographic positioning system (GPS) point recording of particular artifacts to log pre- and post-burn conditions and locations. If possible, artifacts photographed in 2008 were photographed again in 2009. Once the proposed Programmatic Agreement is approved, this pre- and post-burn activity will become an annual requirement. Site CA-SJO-184, a prehistoric rock shelter at Site 300, was revisited and assessed for potential damage following a small wildfire. Updated site records were submitted to the California Historical Resources Information System.

Pantex

Signs were installed for further protection of the archeological site.

D7. If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological identification and evaluation.

Brookhaven Site Office

In FY 2009 the following two field studies were conducted to evaluate the proposed PB Solar Array Project site; Section 106 project reports were subsequently submitted to the SHPO.

1. An archaeological survey was performed on 33 acres formerly occupied by the World War I Camp Upton Remount Facility in order to assess the overall potential of the area for the presence of cultural resources, including both a surface inspection and subsurface testing. The surface inspection entailed a walkover of the entire project area. Subsurface testing involved the excavation of small shovel test pits on a closely spaced grid system, in accordance with NY State guidelines.

2. An architectural and archeological data recovery/assessment of the standing Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC)- era privy was conducted on a half-acre site in accordance with Section 106 of NHPA. The architectural documentation was designed to meet the standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS). The archeological survey included excavation of the outhouse pit to document the potential presence of artifacts and required removal of the privy structure from its rotted sill.

Idaho Operations Office

Since 1984, archaeological surveys on the INL have been conducted with intervals between surveyors that do not exceed 20 meters. Prior to 1984, reconnaissance level surveys were common with survey intervals up to 100 meters. Approximately ¼ of the 53,640 cumulative acres that have been inventoried at INL were examined using these less intensive methods. As of FY 2009, 2,640 archaeological resources have been documented during reconnaissance-level and intensive surveys that have covered more than 10 % of the 890-square mile laboratory. A simple predictive model developed to facilitate long term land use planning at the INL indicates that thousands more are present in unsurveyed areas. INL's unique data management system integrates geographic information system(GIS) data sets, relational databases, and web-based server technologies to easily access, update, analyze, and manage this inventory. Approximately 80 % of identified resources (2,126 resources) and 75 % of cumulative survey areas (41,182 acres) are currently mapped in this system. Work is ongoing to incorporate the remaining data.

In FY 2009 20 INL project areas were surveyed to ensure that no impacts to archaeological sites would occur as a result of proposed activities, and one research-related cave survey was initiated. Cumulatively, the total number of acres surveyed for archaeological resources on INL increased to 53,640 with the addition of these surveys, and the total number of resources identified rose to 2,640.

In nearly half of the 37 FY 2009 project reviews, archival information indicated that no archaeological resources would be affected by the activities proposed. In three cases feedback was provided on archaeological sensitivity for large scale siting studies or NEPA analyses. In 20 cases field investigations ranging from 1 - 650 acres in size were conducted on lands that had never been archaeologically surveyed or in areas where previous surveys were completed more than a decade ago. Approximately 1,460 acres were intensively examined during these project surveys, and 89 new archaeological sites were identified and recommended for avoidance or other protective measures. The results of project-specific INL CRM surveys are documented in a number of ways per the guidelines of the INL "Cultural Resource Management Plan." Recommendations tailored to specific projects and any archaeological resources that may require consideration are delivered in official e-mail notes that become part of the project's NEPA-driven Environmental Checklist and permanent record. For larger projects external technical reports are often prepared to synthesize archaeological

information and recommendations, including one FY 2009 report, "Archaeological Investigation of the East Loop Power Line Road (T-25) Upgrade on the INL," INL/EXT-08-15039.

INL CRM office survey and research efforts in FY 2009 were also conducted to further DOE-ID obligations under Section 110 of NHPA to develop a broad understanding of all INL archaeological resources, not only those located in active project areas. One significant cave survey project (highlighted in Question D6, above) was initiated in FY 2009. During this survey one previously recorded cave was revisited and re-evaluated, nine caves were recorded for the first time, and five additional archaeological resources were identified and recorded in surveys of approximately three acres surrounding the caves. These important efforts will continue into the future. In addition, INL CRM staff produced two technical reports on previous years' Section 110 efforts in FY 2009, including "Report on Trace Element Analysis of INL Obsidian Artifacts," INL/EXT-09-15783, and "Geophysical Investigations of the Archaeological Resources at the Powell Stage Station," INL/CON-09-15269.

INL CRM staff traveled to the Idaho State Archive in Boise in FY 2009. Through days of research they were able to identify approximately 50 INL homesteaders from the late 1800s and early 1900s. These data were used to put names to previously recorded archaeological homestead sites, thus opening the door to further research on immigration patterns to and from southeastern Idaho.

Shoshone-Bannock tribal members have been important partners in cultural resource management at the INL for many years, and their interests in INL archaeological resources and their preservation are officially recognized in DOE-ID's "Agreement-in-Principle" and the INL "Cultural Resource Management Plan." Under these guidelines information is provided to a designated tribal point of contact on all new and ongoing INL projects submitted for cultural resource review, and tribal input is actively solicited. In FY 2009 information was provided on all 37 of the INL projects reviewed by the INL CRM office, and several tribal tours were coordinated. Tribal partners were also important team members during cave inventory efforts and annual monitoring of INL archaeological resources. The holistic view of cultural resources and active tribal involvement incorporated into INL CRM activities are outstanding examples of DOE-ID's proactive efforts to establish a meaningful working relationship with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.

The INL CRM office implements a yearly program of cultural resource monitoring that includes many archaeological resources. In FY 2009 36 archaeological localities were revisited including two locations with Native American human remains (one of which is a cave), two additional caves, 22 prehistoric archaeological sites, six historic homesteads, two historic stage stations, and two historic trails. One previously recorded lava tube cave was also revisited and re-evaluated during the year. Representatives from the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes are important partners in these efforts. The results of FY 2009 INL cultural resource monitoring are documented in INL/EXT-09-17202.

<u>Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory</u>

(D10A and B) *In FY 2008 identified cumulative survey areas mapped using a GIS or CAD system were mistakenly reported as 7,375 acres in GIS and 7,375 acres in CAD. Subsequently, it was determined that the cumulative survey areas are only mapped in CAD, not GIS. FY 2009 data reflect this correction.*

(D12A and B) *In FY 2008 identified cumulative number of archaeological sites mapped using a GIS or CAD system were mistakenly reported as 28 sites in GIS and 28 sites in CAD. Subsequently, it was determined that the archaeological sites were only mapped in CAD. As of FY 2009, archaeological sites are being mapped in GIS, as needed. FY 2009 data reflect this correction.*

Legacy Management (LM)

(D09 and D11) *DOE conducted archaeological investigations on 35 acres of its uranium lease tracts. The lease tracts are public lands that were withdrawn from mineral entry between 1948 and 1957 by the AEC. Today DOE manages the minerals, and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) manages the surface of these lands. Hence, BLM is the lead agency for cultural resource compliance activities. DOE documented 35 cultural resource sites during its FY 2009 archaeological investigations. Because BLM is the lead agency, DOE is not reporting the inventoried acreage in item D09, nor is DOE reporting the 35 sites in item D11. As the lease tracts occur within three BLM resource management areas, three BLM offices—the Grand Junction Field Office, Uncompahgre Field Office, and Dolores Public Lands Office—will report the inventoried acreage and sites.*

Los Alamos National Laboratory

(D1) *Three new field studies conducted in FY 2009 at LANL. No new building surveys were conducted this fiscal year. However, 40 actual projects were worked on that utilized or required some field verification of previous survey information (archaeological and historic building resources).*

(D4) *LANL reviewed 701 undertakings that had the potential to impact archaeological or historic building resources. Of these, Section 106 reports were completed for eight of these undertakings. However, under the terms of LANL's CRMP, not all Section 106 actions require formal individual reports. "No Property and No Effect" (NP/NE) actions are summarized after the end of each fiscal year in a single report. For FY 2009, 59 undertakings were summarized in the NP/NE report.*

(D8) *Six reports plus two Memoranda of Agreement regarding historic buildings were completed this year. Four of the six reports covered projects potentially affecting archaeological sites, and two covered the assessments of historic buildings.*

(D9) *Two tracts of land were transferred to Los Alamos County during FY 2009. Therefore, the total acres surveyed using the new DOE boundary plus the new acres surveyed this fiscal year is 23,046 acres.*

Sandia Site Office

Some Sandia Site Office-managed activities take place on state lands and some on federal lands owned or managed by the USDA National Forest (Cibola), the United States Air Force, or the United States Navy. Planning for proposed activities on or near these lands includes screening for the potential to affect cultural resources and checking maps and records to ensure that no resources are located in the area of potential effect. Generally, this screening is coordinated through NEPA review of proposed actions. There are no archaeological sites located on DOE-fee owned lands; there are, however, NHPA-eligible structures and buildings located on these lands.

Section E. Archeological Data Recovery Projects

Data recovery projects include archeological investigations, typically excavations, that are conducted to mitigate the effects of destruction or disturbance caused by Federal undertakings or to document sites for interpretation or management. Recovery projects may be related to scholarly research, compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA, ARPA, or an agency-specific statute, regulation, or policy.

Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant
A total of 1,961 artifact remnants were recovered, the majority being glass fragments recovered from single surface midden/bottle dumps, as part of the Phase II Archaeological Study of two historic farmsteads (noted in Section D above) to further document these two sites. Although numerous, the artifacts provided little new or significant information regarding life during the first half of the twentieth century in northern Appalachia (Ohio).

Western Area Power Administration
Five total data recovery projects associated with Section 106 were completed.

E5. If desired, describe any exemplary data recovery projects that took place during this reporting year in which parks in your region were involved, for potential inclusion in the Secretary's Report to Congress.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Site CA-SJO-181H, which had previously been considered destroyed and no longer extant, was relocated in 2008. GPS data points were collected for the site boundary during the summer of 2009. Plans are being prepared to finish re-recording the site in 2010. No artifact collection is anticipated.

E6. If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological data recovery projects.

Bonneville Power Administration
Question E01 was interpreted to mean any data recovery projects still in progress. BPA has no projects in progress because all were completed within the year.

Brookhaven Site Office
The architectural and archeological data recovery/assessment of the standing CCC-era privy, identified in item D7 above, is also included as an archeological investigation.

Idaho Operations Office
Under INL-wide Stop Work Authorities, INL employees are authorized to stop work at all DOE-ID, contractor, and/or subcontractor operations if they believe the work poses an imminent danger to human health and safety or the environment, including irreplaceable cultural resources. Procedures are in place to make immediate notifications to appropriate parties (e.g., INL CRM, DOE-ID, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, State of Idaho, local law enforcement) in the event of any discoveries of this nature. Additionally, areas that have previously revealed unanticipated discoveries of sensitive cultural materials are routinely monitored for new finds. No archaeological materials were unexpectedly encountered at the INL in FY 2009.

Los Alamos National Laboratory
(E1) *Zero archaeological data recovery projects were in progress during this reporting year. However, three building data recovery projects were ongoing during FY 2009. The final documentation reports for these projects were worked on this fiscal year. All data recovery/documentation for these three projects was conducted during several prior fiscal years.*

(E2) *One Classic Period (AD 1325 to AD1600) rock shelter site was tested to determine site eligibility status.*

Section F. National Register Activities

"Eligibility" includes administratively or consensus-determination of eligibility through documented consultation with the SHPO or THPO or through requesting an official determination of eligibility by the Keeper.

Western Area Power Administration

WAPA made initial determination of eligibility for 111 properties located during surveys, none to or through the Keeper.

F4. If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological site and district National Register status.

Idaho Operations Office

The 890-square mile INL contains thousands of prehistoric and historic archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for nomination to the National Register. Until proven otherwise through intensive data collection, all are treated as if they are eligible. In past years four potentially eligible prehistoric archaeological sites located within the direct impact zones for proposed INL projects have been tested and formally determined, through documented consultation with the Idaho SHPO and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, to be ineligible for nomination. The INL CRM office maintains an active program to collect information that will support future nominations and in FY 2007 prepared a package to support a nomination for Aviators Cave. In FY 2009 DOE-ID received informal verbal notification from the Keeper of the Register that INL's nomination package for Aviators Cave had been accepted and that the Cave would be listed.

Legacy Management (LM)

(F06 and F07). *DOE conducted archaeological investigations on 35 acres of its uranium lease tracts and documented 35 new cultural sites. Because three BLM offices—the Grand Junction Field Office, Uncompahgre Field Office, and Dolores Public Lands Office— manage the surface of these lands (see narrative under D7), DOE will not report the 35 newly documented sites in items F06 and F07; BLM will report these.*

Los Alamos National Laboratory

(F1) *Zero archaeological sites but five historic buildings were determined eligible for the National Register in concurrence with the New Mexico SHPO during FY 2009.*

(F2) *LANL does not have any archaeological sites listed on the National Register; however LANL has 42 archaeological sites listed in the New Mexico State Register of Cultural Properties. In addition, one building is also listed in the State Register.*

(F3) *Zero archaeological sites and 2 buildings were determined not eligible for the National Register in concurrence with the New Mexico SHPO during FY 2009.*

F5. If desired, describe a National Register activity related to an archeological resource, for potential inclusion in the Secretary's Report to Congress on the Federal Archeology Program.

Idaho Operations Office

Geologically, biologically, and culturally, each INL cave is unique. Though all were formed from the same basic set of geological forces, each exhibits a different physical setting due to erosion, mineralogy, and other environmental factors. These differing settings support a wide variety of

contemporary biological communities (e.g., insects, reptiles, rodents, carnivores, birds, plants), and in some cases a long term record of biological and climatic change is preserved in ancient paleontological and/or pollen deposits. From a cultural standpoint humans have long been drawn to INL caves seeking shelter; work and storage areas; and unique settings for important cultural, educational, spiritual, and sacred activities. Many caves are eligible for nomination to the National Register as a result.

Aviators Cave (10-BT-1582) is a large INL lava tube with extensive evidence of prehistoric use and contemporary significance to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. Substantial archaeological deposits in and around the surface of the lava tube preserve a unique, detailed record of seasonal Native American occupation from approximately 1,300 – 150 years ago. Shoshone-Bannock tribal representatives place great value on Aviators Cave as an important part of their cultural and spiritual heritage. In FY 2007 these important characteristics of Aviators Cave were summarized in an information package to nominate the Cave for listing in the National Register. In FY 2009 the nomination was informally accepted by the Keeper of the Register, and formal listing should follow in FY 2010. It is possible that additional nomination packages will be developed as INL CRM staff continue efforts initiated in FY 2009 to revisit and assess all known INL caves.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
(See D6 above.) *The Carnegie Town Site (CA-SJO-173H) and CA-SJO-184 are National Register-eligible archaeological resources.*

Los Alamos National Laboratory
(F6) *441 archaeological sites and 158 historic buildings have been determined eligible for the National Register.*

(F7) *84 archaeological sites and 171 historic buildings have been determined not eligible for the National Register.*

(*Note: Section G is omitted to maintain consistency in the numbering of questions with prior years.)*

Section H. Archeological Collections Management

H12. If needed, clarify responses to questions above about archeological collections management.

Idaho Operations Office
Only one federal repository maintains INL archaeological collections for DOE-ID: the Earl H. Swanson Archaeological Repository in the Idaho Museum of Natural History in Pocatello, Idaho. A Memorandum of Understanding between DOE-ID and the Idaho Museum of Natural History provides specific guidance for management of the permanent collections according to the requirements of 36 CFR part 79. DOE-ID and INL CRM staff members conduct yearly inspections of the Repository and visited the facilities in May 2009.

Some recent collections of nonperishable artifacts are also held in secure, temporary storage in INL CRM offices in Idaho Falls, Idaho, where they await transfer to the permanent collections. In FY 2009, a project was initiated to address a portion of these materials and begin the transfer to permanent collections. This year 1,037 artifacts and approximately 1 linear foot of associated records held in interim storage were transferred to the Repository and accepted for permanent curation alongside other permanent DOE-ID collections from the INL. It is anticipated that additional artifact collections in temporary storage will be processed for permanent curation in FY 2010.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
LLNL's archaeological collections, 90% of which are labeled and catalogued in accordance with 36 CFR part 79, are curated at LLNL's on-site Laboratory Archives and Research Center (ARC).

Legacy Management (LM)
(H9) *DOE-LM adheres to the regulations codified at 36 CFR part 79.*

(H10) *The Ohio Historical Society Archives/Library.*

Los Alamos National Laboratory
(H3) *No. The records are listed in question H5.*

(H4) *The records submitted during FY 2009 have not been processed yet.*

(H10) *The Museum of New Mexico, Laboratory of Anthropology at Santa Fe, New Mexico is the one non-federal museum/repository curating collections from LANL***.**

Savannah River Operations Office
All SRS archaeological artifacts are managed at DOE's on-site curation facility by SRARP personnel. A portion of the SRS archaeological collections is on display at local and regional museums.

H13. If desired, describe an activity, such as an exhibit or cataloging project, related to archeological collections, for potential inclusion in the Secretary's Report to Congress on the Federal Archeology Program.

Brookhaven Site Office
A small portion of the Camp Upton Historical Collection was displayed in BNL's Berkner Hall as part of the Summer Sundays 'open house" program.

Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant
Through discussions with the Ohio SHPO and consulting parties at the Portsmouth Site, DOE has begun a process to evaluate structures being proposed for demolition at the former gaseous diffusion uranium enrichment plant and identify, log, and retain artifacts in storage for future preservation consideration (e.g., for potential future use in a local museum, visitors' center.).

Section I. Archeological Resources Management Program Funding

I3. If desired, describe the economic benefits to the agency or local communities from archeology and heritage tourism, for potential inclusion in the Secretary's Report to Congress.

Idaho Operations Office
Public access to the INL is restricted due to the classified nature of much of the research conducted at the active scientific facilities located there. As a result, heritage tourism is presently not a viable option. Recreational use is only authorized for special activities such as Idaho Archaeology and Historic Preservation Month events or within specified areas such as the Experimental Breeder Reactor I (EBR-1) Visitors' Center and at the public rest area located on the banks of the Big Lost River along U.S. Highway 20/26 within the INL.

In spite of security restrictions, interest in INL cultural resources remains high. Despite its relatively isolated location, thousands of people visit the EBR-I National Historic Landmark between Memorial Day and Labor Day every year, and the annual public archaeology tour offered by the INL CRM office remains extremely popular. Information signs installed at the Big Lost River rest area also provide cultural resource information to many people passing through the region. The INL CRM program continues to explore additional ways of encouraging public interest in INL cultural resources while staying within established security parameters.

Pantex

A multi-themed exhibit has been developed focusing on natural resources and prehistory and will include some of the Pantex archeological discoveries such as bison bones and arrow heads. The bison bones and other artifacts will be located in the alcove area directly outside the new visitor center. The display will discuss the importance of history, preservation, and the archeological techniques used when excavating. This exhibit can be used to explain the history of Pantex without impacting plant activities.

I4. If needed, clarify responses to questions about funding for archeological resource management activities.

Bonneville Power Administration

(I1) *The funding level represents dedicated federal and contract staff funding. BPA has 9 full time equivalent employees in its archaeological programs.*

(I2) *The question was interpreted as, and the answer represents, funding that BPA provided to other parties to carry out archaeological investigations or other activities.*

Idaho Operations Office

Funding totals provided in this section do not reflect the entire range of historic preservation activities at the INL. Significant efforts and funding to identify, evaluate, and mitigate adverse effects to historic architectural properties, industrial archaeological sites, and other elements of the built INL environment that are associated with World War II as well as INL's significant scientific contributions to U.S. nuclear science and technology are not included at this time.

(*Note: Section J is omitted to maintain consistency in the numbering of questions with prior years.)*

Section K. Permits for Archeological Investigations

Include all permits issued pursuant to Federal policies and procedures for archeological activities authorized by the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, the Antiquities Act, or agency-specific statutes.

K3. If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological permitting.

Bonneville Power Administration

BPA received one request for an ARPA permit in FY 2008. The permit was issued on March 4, 2009; it was for the state of Washington, which wanted to put a trail across an agency right-of-way.

Brookhaven Site Office

A Federal Archaeological Permit was issued to the Institute for Long Island Archaeology, associated with the Research Foundation of State University of New York. The permit covered the two archaeological studies identified in item D7, for the period June 18 to July 15, 2009.

Idaho Operations Office

Archaeological investigations on the INL are typically conducted in-house through the INL CRM office, which is staffed with professionals who meet the qualification standards and follow the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for all work. Investigations by outsiders are rare and coordinated through the INL CRM program and DOE-ID through a formal permitting system. In FY 2009 no permits were issued to outside subcontractors for archaeological work on the INL, and no permits remained outstanding.

Savannah River Operations Office

In FY 2009 all archaeological activities at SRS were conducted by SRARP personnel under provisions of the existing DOE/South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology cooperative agreement, which also incorporates SRS permitting guidance.

Section L. Archeological Resource Law Enforcement

Include information about archeological resources crimes in violation of ARPA; the Antiquities Act; Federal property protection laws, such as Theft of Government Property and Destruction of Government Property, or agency-specific statues and regulations protecting archeological resources.

L19. If desired for potential inclusion in the Secretary's Report to Congress, describe notable prosecutions, or effective projects, methods, and techniques the agency has used to improve protection at archeological sites under its management control.

L20. If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological law enforcement.

Idaho Operations Office

Efforts to improve protection of archaeological sites at the INL are ongoing. An active security force monitors INL lands through ground patrols and security surveillance of public points of access. Trespassers are removed immediately upon detection and, when appropriate, prosecuted. Yearly on-line training modules remind INL employees of prohibitions on disturbing archaeological sites, and targeted training is also conducted by INL CRM staff for INL employees likely to encounter archaeological sites in their work. Largely as a result of these restrictions, many archaeological sites on the INL display remarkable integrity and are virtually undisturbed.

In FY 2009 three trespassers (two adults and one minor) were apprehended by INL security officers during an unauthorized visit to INL's Middle Butte Cave. Formal charges were pressed by DOE-ID in Bingham County. The two adults were cited with misdemeanor trespassing violations and assessed fines of $187.50 each, and one individual was sentenced to one year in jail (suspended). Fortunately, the Cave and its sensitive tribal interests, rock art, and archaeological deposits sustained no damage as a result of this unauthorized visitation.

In an effort to curtail a recurring pattern of unauthorized visitation to INL caves by members of the public as well as INL employees, INL CRM staff took steps in FY 2009 to initiate a new productive working relationship with U.S. federal agents experienced in enforcing ARPA and successfully prosecuting individuals who have violated the law. To initiate a dialog in FY 2009, two Special Agents with the Department of the Interior's U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Law Enforcement and a DOE-ID Security Specialist were escorted to several key archaeological sites on the INL that are particularly sensitive and that also receive occasional or regular unauthorized visitation from site employees and/or the public. Discussions between the agents and INL CRM staff resulted in the following ideas to pursue for prevention/mitigation:

- *Internal notifications from DOE as a reminder to employees in regard to ARPA and other preservation laws,*
- *INL procedural disciplinary actions, and*
- *Installation of remote surveillance equipment to document unauthorized visitors and activities.*

It is anticipated that interaction and cooperation between the federal agents, DOE-ID security personnel, and the INL CRM program staff will be ongoing through FY 2010 and beyond, leading to more effective protections for sensitive INL cultural resources.

Los Alamos National Laboratory

(L18) *DOE provides funding to Bandelier National Monument, part of the National Park Service, to patrol outlying areas of LANL for ARPA violations.*

Savannah River Operations Office

The SRS is not open to the general public. Access to SRS is controlled by on-site security personnel. Access is generally restricted to SRS employees and contractor personnel. Visitors to the site are allowed under certain circumstances, but visitors are generally badged and escorted by SRS personnel. The SRS boundary is also fenced or posted to limit inadvertent trespassing. DOE and SRARP personnel actively work with on-site security forces and adjacent landowners to monitor unauthorized access activities and report or respond to any instances of archaeological looting. In FY 2009 looting activity was reported at three SRS archaeological sites located along the Lower Three Runs stream corridor. SRARP staff is working with other SRS organizations, including security personnel, to enhance protection of archaeological sites in this portion of the SRS.

Enclosure 3

DOE Site Specific Responses to the Federal Archeology Program Activities

FY 2009

DOE RESPONSES TO FY 2009 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

SITES **	ASO	BPA	BNL	Fermi	Idaho	LBNL	LLNL	LM	LANL	Nevada	ORO	OCRWM	PGDP	Pantex	PNSO	Ports	Richland	RMOTC	Sandia	SPR	SRS	SWPA	WAPA	TOTAL
B1 (number of partnerships)	0	2	nd	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	n/a	0	1	n/a	1	3	0	10
B2 $ (value of partners' contributions)	0	$450,000	nd	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	$781,250	0	0	$1,231,250
B3 (number of volunteer hours)	0	0	nd	0	0	n/a	0	0	100	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	500	0	0	600
C1 (number of area-wide ARPA and NHPA overview or general non-project plans)	0	2	nd	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	5
C2 (number of projects for which reviews, etc. were done)	0	183	2	0	37	0	1	5	701	48	1	0	0	1	0	2	150	0	20	1	51	6	50	1,259
C3 (Number of notifications to Indian Tribes of potential harm)	0	5	nd	0	37	0	0	0	3	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	68
D1 (number of field studies)	0	149	2	0	21	0	1	4	3	12	1	0	0	12	0	2	23	0	0	1	65	1	50	347
D2 (number of acres inventoried)	0	10,672	33.5	0	1,463	0	0	35	52	121	72	0	0	0	0	<2	3,663	0	0	800	2,024	33.62	4,500	23,469
D3 (number of new archeological sites identified)	0	72	1	0	103	0	0	35	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	21	38	4	111	415
D4 (number of Section 106 actions involving archeological sites completed)	0	57	2	0	37	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	0	0	1	0	6	50	188
D5 (number of archeological sites stabilized, rehabilitated, protected)	0	103	nd	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0		122
D8 (number of reports [grey literature, e.g, Section 106 compliance reports] about archeological resources completed)	0	58	2	0	4	0	0	3	8	16	0	2	0	0	0	2	23	0	0	0	0	0	50	168
*D9 (cumulative total number of acres inventoried on DOE land)	489	unknown	4,299	6,800	53,640	0	7,375	2,810	23,046	37,178	29,390	n/a	0	3	300	2,068	122,635	9,600	2,481	n/a	83,422	n/a	n/a	385,536
D10A (number of cumulative survey areas mapped using GIS)	489	0	4,299	0	41,182	n/a	0	unknown	23,046	33,460	0	n/a	0	1	300	2,068	122,635	0	2,481	n/a	63,428	n/a	n/a	293,389
D10B (number of cumulative survey areas mapped using CAD)		0		0		n/a	7,375	unknown	n/a		0	n/a	0		0		0	0		n/a		n/a	n/a	7,375
*D11 (cumulative total number of archeological sites on DOE land)	46	4	6	46	2,640	0	28	197	1,887	2,179	47	n/a	1	69	16	38	1,043	63	0	n/a	1,860	n/a	n/a	10,170
D12A (number of cumulative total of archeological sites mapped using a GIS)	46	2	6	0	2,126	n/a	2	unknown	1,432	1,961	0	n/a	1	1	16	38	1,043	0		n/a	1,209	n/a	n/a	7,883
D12B (number of cumulative total of archeological sites mapped using a CAD)		0		0		n/a	28	unknown	n/a		0	n/a	0		0		0	0		n/a		n/a	n/a	28
D13 (number of archeological sites assessed for condition)	0	1	6	0	36	0	2	0	39	1	0	n/a	0	2	0	0	39	0	0	n/a	38	n/a	n/a	164
D14 (number of known archeological sites revisited and re-evaluated)	0	1	nd	0	1	0	3	6	3	1	0	n/a	0	2	0	2	47	0	0	n/a	19	n/a	n/a	85
E1 (number of archeological data recovery projects in progress)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	12
E2 (number of archeological sites on which data recovered)	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	24
E3 (number of undertakings with unexpected discoveries)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
E4 (number of undertakings with unexpected discoveries requiring data recovery)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
F1 (number archeological sites determined NRHP-eligible)	0	31	nd	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	67	105
F2 (number archeological sites listed on NRHP)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F3 (Number of archeological sites determined ineligible for NRHP)	0	2	nd	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	21	0	0	44	105
*F6 (cumulative total number of archeological sites oon DOE land determined NRHP-eligible)	4	4	3	1	1	0	5	20	441	1,121	15	n/a	0	0	1	0	34	20	0	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	1,670
*F7 (cumulative number of archeological sites on DOE land determined not NRHP-eligible)	21	0	153	17	4	0	23	177	84	1,056	32	n/a	0	67	8	38	161	37	0	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	1,878
*F8 (cumulative total number of NRHP-listed archeological sites on DOE land)	0	2	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,121	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	49	1	0	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	1,173
F9 (number of NRHP-listed archeological sites that passed out of DOE control)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0
F10A (number of archeological sites under DOE control that were formerly but are not now NRHP-listed due to natural causes)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0

Prepared by Beverly Whitehead for FY 2009

DOE RESPONSES TO FY 2009 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

SITES **	ASO	BPA	BNL	Fermi	Idaho	LBNL	LLNL	LM	LANL	Nevada	ORO	OCRWM	PGDP	Pantex	PNSO	Ports	Richland	RMOTC	Sandia	SPR	SRS	SWPA	WAPA	TOTAL
F10B (Number archeological sites under DOE control that were formerly but are not now listed on the National Register due to human induced destruction)	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0
F11 (number archeological districts on DOE land determined NRHP-eligible)	0	0	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	n/a	0		0	n/a	0	0		n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0
*F12 (cumulative number archeological districts on DOE land determined NRHP-eligible by the Keeper)	0	1	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	n/a	0		0	n/a	0	20		n/a	0	n/a	n/a	21
F13 (number archeological districts listed on NRHP)	0	0	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	n/a	0		0	n/a	0	0		n/a	0	n/a	n/a	0
*F14 (cumulative number NRHP-listed archeological districts on DOE land)	0	1	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	n/a	0		0	n/a	6	1		n/a	0	n/a	n/a	8
H1 (number of items/lots curated)	63	unknown	11,860	n/a	11,937	n/a		15,516	n/a	414,682	0		0	0	0		n/a	1 lot	0	n/a	1,554,582	0	0	2,008,640
H2 (cubic feet curated)	68.4	unknown		12	n/a	n/a	2.0	n/a	416	3,448	0	300	0	717	n/a	11	197	0	0	n/a		0	0	5,171
H3 (associated records included? yes)	1	unknown	1	1	n/a	n/a	1	1		1			n/a	1	n/a	1		unknown		n/a		n/a		8
H3 (associated records included? no)		unknown			n/a	n/a			1		1	1			n/a		1			n/a	1	n/a	1	6
H4 (% of H1 and H2 processed for curation)	100%	unknown	100%	100%	90%	n/a	90%	100%	96%	100%		100%	n/a	100%	n/a	0%	100%	100%		n/a	100%	n/a	0%	varies
H5 (linear feet of paper archeological records)	3	unknown	9	1	6	n/a	2.5	unknown	19	370	0	220	n/a	2	n/a	<1	2	unknown		n/a	527	10	0	1,171.5
H6 (gigabytes of stored archeological records or studies)	0	unknown		n/a	0.3	n/a	<1	n/a	180.7	0.15	0		n/a	0.02	n/a	<1	n/a	<1		n/a		11.5	0	193
H7 (number of federal museums/repositories curating DOE collections)	0	0	1	0	1	n/a	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	n/a	1	n/a	0	7
H8 (number of non-federal museums/repositories curating DOE collections)	0	2	1	1	0	n/a	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	10
H9 (policy for managing and preserving archeological collections - yes)	1		nd	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1			n/a	1	1		15
H9 (policy for managing and preserving archeological collections - no)		1					1						1					1	1	n/a			1	6
H11 (number of times DOE collections utilized for research or exhibits)	0	unknown	1	0	0	n/a	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		0		n/a	67	n/a	0	70
I1 $ (appropriated dollars used for archeology)	$5,000	$1,085,708	nd	$0	$300,000	$0	$101,565	$61,000	$591,900	$960,613	$0	$235,000	$0	$0	$15,000	$70,000	$725,000	$0	$0	$8,600	$421,250	$53,281	$0	4,633,917
I2 $ (non-appropriated dollars used for archeology)	$0	$5,317,619	nd	$0	$160,000	$0	$0	$0	$150,200	$171,718	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$360,000	$0	$0	6,159,537
K1 (archeological permit applications received)	0	1	1	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
K2 (archeological permits issued or in effect)	0	1	1	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
L1 (number of incidents document)	0	12	nd	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	15
L2 (number of incidents with arrests)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L3 (number of individuals arrested)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L4 (number of individuals cited)	0	unknown	nd	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	3
L5 (number of individuals convicted of misdemeanor under ARPA)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L6 (number of individuals convicted of felony under ARPA)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L7 (number of individuals found liable for civil penalty under ARPA)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L8 (number of individuals found not guilty or not liable under ARPA)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L9 $ (amount given [not offered] in rewards)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L10 (number of individuals convicted of misdemeanor under other laws)	0	0	nd	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	3
L11 (number of individuals convicted of felony under other laws)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L12 (number of individuals found not guilty under other laws)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L13 (total number of cases where individuals were found guilty or liable [include ARPA])	0	0	nd	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	1
L14 $ (total value of fines imposed or ordered)	0	0	nd	0	$375	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	375

DOE RESPONSES TO FY 2009 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

SITES **	ASO	BPA	BNL	Fermi	Idaho	LBNL	LLNL	LM	LANL	Nevada	ORO	OCRWM	PGDP	Pantex	PNSO	Ports	Richland	RMOTC	Sandia	SPR	SRS	SWPA	WAPA	TOTAL
L15 $ (total value of restitution, including civil penalties)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L16 $ (estimated costs of restoration and repair in site damage assessments)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L17 $ (value of property seized)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L18 $ (cost of law enforcement to DOE for archeology)	0	$113,000	nd	0	unknown	0	0	0	$153,917	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	266,917
L22 (number of collected LOOT forms)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
* = cumulative values that include FY 2009																								
** all values are for FY 2009 only, except for those marked with one * that are cumulative totals.																								
n/a = not applicable																								
nd = no data																								

Prepared by Beverly Whitehead for FY 2009

Enclosure 4

DOE Site Acronym List

DOE SITE ACRONYM LIST – FY 2009

Ames	Ames Laboratory, Ames, IA
ASO	Argonne Site Office, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL
BNL	Brookhaven Site Office, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR - Extension
Fermi	Fermi Site Office, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL
Idaho	Idaho Operations Office, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID
KCP	Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO
LANL	Los Alamos Site Office, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM - Extension
LBNL	Berkeley Site Office, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA
LLNL	Livermore Site Office, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA
LM	Office of Legacy Management, Grand Junction, CO
Nevada	Nevada Site Office, Las Vegas, NV
OCRWM	Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Las Vegas, NV
ORO	Oak Ridge Office, Oak Ridge, TN
Pantex	Pantex Site Office, Amarillo, TX
PGDP	Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Site, Paducah, KY
PNSO	Pacific Northwest Site Office, Richland, WA
Ports	Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Portsmouth, OH
Richland	Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA
RMOTC	Rocky Mountain Oil Field Testing Center, Casper, WY
Sandia	Sandia Site Office, Sandia National Laboratory, Sandia, NM
SPR	Strategic Petroleum Reserve Office, New Orleans, LA
SRS	Savannah River Operations Office, Aiken, SC
SWPA	Southwestern Power Administration, Tulsa, OK
WAPA	Western Area Power Administration, Denver, CO