



## Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

May 20, 2011

Daniel Odess, Ph.D.  
Departmental Consulting Archeologist  
National Park Service  
Archeology Program  
1849 C Street, NW (2275)  
Washington, DC 20240-0001

Dear Dr. Odess:

This letter is in response to your March 4, 2010, request for information on the Department of Energy's (DOE) archeological programs and projects for fiscal year (FY) 2010. 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 reporting DOE site 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 email [Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Andrew C. Lawrence".

Andrew C. Lawrence  
Director  
Office of Environmental Protection, Sustainability  
Support and Corporate Safety Analysis  
Office of Health, Safety and Security

Enclosures (as listed)

## **List of Enclosures**

- Enclosure 1 REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – FY 2010  
Quantitative Questionnaire on FY 2010 Activities
- Enclosure 2 REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – FY 2010  
DOE’s Response to Narrative Questionnaire on FY 2010 Activities
- Enclosure 3 DOE Site Specific Responses to the Federal Archeology Program Activities –  
FY 2010
- Enclosure 4 DOE Site Acronym List



Enclosure 1

REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES  
FY 2010

**Quantitative Questionnaire on FY 2010 Activities**



<b>REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES</b>		
<b>Quantitative Questionnaire on 2010 Activities</b>		
	<b>Agency Name: Department of Energy</b>	
	<b>Agency representative responsible for data submission (to be contacted in case of queries about data): Beverly Whitehead</b>	
	<b>Phone Number: (202) 586-6073</b>	
	<b>E-mail address: <a href="mailto:Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov">Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov</a></b>	
<b>Section A. Legislation, Policies, and Programmatic Actions</b>		
	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.	
<b>Section B. Participation, Education, and Outreach</b>		
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. ( <i>Do not include contracts.</i> )	13
B02.	Estimated total dollar value of contributions provided by partners (e.g. money, services, volunteers working directly for partners) during this reporting year.	\$1,270,263
B03.	Volunteer hours contributed directly to the agency for the benefit of archeological activities during this reporting year.	970
<b>Section C. Archeological Planning</b>		
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.	7
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. ( <i>Report all projects for which checks were done, even those that produced no information.</i> )	1,392

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.	67
<b>Section D. Archeological Identification and Evaluation</b>		
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.	336
D02.	Number of acres inventoried during this reporting year to identify and evaluate archeological sites.	67,339
D03.	Number of new archeological sites identified during this reporting year.	206
D04.	How many NHPA Section 106 actions involving archeological sites carried out, authorized, or required by your agency were completed during this reporting year?	224
D05.	Number of archeological sites that were stabilized, rehabilitated, or protected (e.g. anti-vandalism signs, fences, or road closures) during this reporting year.	7
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 ?	244
<b>For land managing agencies:</b>		
D9.	Cumulative number of acres inventoried to identify and evaluate archeological sites on agency-managed land. (Include this reporting year.)	438,114
How many of these cumulative survey areas are mapped using a GIS or CAD system?		
D10.A	GIS:	355,947
D10.B	CAD:	7,375

D11.	Cumulative number of archeological sites identified on agency-managed land. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	10,220
	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:	8,155
D12.B	CAD:	28
D13.	Number of archeological sites that were assessed for condition in the reporting year.	140
D14.	Number of known archeological sites revisited and re-evaluated during this reporting year.	79
<b>Section E. Archeological Data Recovery Projects</b>		
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 <b>projects</b> in progress during this reporting year.	26
E02.	Number of archeological <b>sites</b> on which data recovery was undertaken during this reporting year.	25
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.	2
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. <i>(Include the undertaking in the reporting year that the archeological site is discovered even if data recovery will not occur until the following year.)</i>	1
<b>Section F. National Register Activities</b>		
Reporting the numbers of <i>sites</i> 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.	80
F02.	Number of archeological sites that were listed in the National Register during this reporting year.	1
F03.	Number of archeological sites that were determined ineligible for listing in the National Register during this reporting year.	59
	<b>For land managing agencies:</b>	
F06.	Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency managed lands that were determined eligible for the National Register. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	1,701
F07.	Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency managed lands that were determined ineligible for the National Register. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	1,877
F08.	Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency managed lands that are listed in the National Register. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	51
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
	<b>For agencies who <b>only</b> maintain information about archeological districts on the National Register</b>	
F11.	Number of archeological districts on agency managed lands that were determined eligible for the National Register during this reporting year.	2
F12.	Cumulative number of archeological districts on agency managed lands that were determined eligible for the National Register by the Keeper. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	4
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. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	7
	<b>Section H. Archeological Collections Management</b>	
	<i>(Note: Section G is omitted to maintain consistency in the numbering of questions with prior years.)</i>	
H01.	Number of items/lots (artifacts, samples) curated in all repositories.	2,105,511
And/Or		
H02.	Number of cubic feet of material remains (artifacts, samples) curated in all repositories.	4,975
H03.	Are associated records included? (Yes)	11
H03.	Are associated records included? (No)	3
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.	968.2
And/Or		
H06.	Number of gigabytes of stored archeological records or studies.	282
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.	11
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?	51

	<b>Section I. Archeological Resource Management Program Funding</b>	
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.	\$5,142,409
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.	\$742,300
	<b>Section K. Permits for Archeological Investigations</b>	
	(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.	1
K02.	Number of permits issued by the agency or in effect during the reporting year.	2
	<b>Section L. Archeological Resource Law Enforcement</b>	
	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 statutes and regulations protecting archeological resources.	
L01.	Number of incidents affecting archeological resources documented during this reporting year.	0
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.	0

<b>ARPA (Archaeological Resources Protection Act) Violations</b>		
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 ( <i>not amount offered</i> ).	0
<b>Prosecutions for Looting and Vandalism of Archeological Resources Under Other Laws</b>		
L10.	Number of individuals convicted of a misdemeanor under authorities other than ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L11.	Number of individuals convicted of a felony under authorities other than ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L12.	Number of individuals found not guilty of charges under laws other than ARPA during this reporting year.	0
<b>Summary Information</b>		
L13.	Number of criminal and civil cases where individuals were found guilty or liable during this reporting year. (Include ARPA cases.)	0
L14.	Total sum of fines imposed or ordered during this reporting year.	\$0
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.	\$162,883
L22.	Number of collected LOOT forms. <i>(It is important to send completed LOOT forms to the Departmental Consulting Archeologist.)</i>	0



## REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES—2010

### Questionnaire on FY 2010 Activities

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

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Agency-Subunit</b>	<b>Museum/Repository</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Date last visited</b>
DOE	Bonneville Power Administration	Burke Museum of Natural History and Culture	WA	2010
DOE	Bonneville Power Administration	Museum of Natural and Cultural History	OR	2010
DOE	Bonneville Power Administration	Smithsonian Collection	DC	2010
DOE	Brookhaven National Laboratory	BNL Cultural Resource Management Collection	NY	Nov. 15, 2010
DOE	Brookhaven National Laboratory	Camp Upton Historical Collection	NY	Dec. 28, 2010
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	May 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	2010
DOE	Los Alamos National Laboratory/Los Alamos Site Office	Museum of New Mexico, Laboratory of Anthropology at Santa Fe	NM	Sept. 22, 2010
DOE	NNSA/Nevada	NNSA/NSO Curation Facility	NV	2010
DOE	Oak Ridge Operations Office	University of Tennessee McClung Museum	TN	Aug. 2005
DOE	Richland Operations	Columbia Exhibition for History, Science, and Technology	WA	Apr. 11, 2010
DOE	Richland Operations	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Sigma V Building	WA	Apr. 11, 2010
DOE	Richland Operations	Washington State University, Tri-Cities Campus, Rolling Storage, Richland	WA	Apr. 11, 2010
DOE	RMOTC	University of Wyoming	WY	2010
DOE	Savannah River Ops Office	On-site curation facility in US DOE building 760-11G	SC	SRARP on work days, DOE staff about once a month
DOE	Southwestern Power Administration	Arkansas Archeological Survey	AR	2010



Enclosure 2

REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES  
FY 2010

**DOE's Response to Narrative Questionnaire on FY 2010 Activities**



## QUESTIONNAIRE ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

### Instructions for 2010 Questionnaire And form for narrative questions in 2010 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](http://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](http://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 May 16, 2011. Questions about this survey should be directed to Karen Mudar, Archeology Program, 202-354-2103; Fax: 202-371-5102; [karen\\_mudar@nps.gov](mailto: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 the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, reported that they had no relevant information to provide for the narrative questions and their responses to the quantitative portion were all zero or not applicable.*

**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**

*The Bureau of Indian Affairs signed the Programmatic Agreement 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 in fiscal year (FY) 2010. Several stipulations of the Programmatic Agreement were implemented.*

**Golden Field Office**

*There were no regulatory, legislative, or programmatic developments during this reporting year that affected the program. The DOE Golden Field Office oversees the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) located in Golden, Colorado. Portions of the NREL South Table Mountain Complex property were formerly part of Camp George West, an Army National Guard facility constructed and operated in the early to middle 1900s. The Camp George West Historic District lies immediately to the south of the South Table Mountain Complex property.*

*There are two properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within NREL/DOE property: a Works Project Administration (WPA) amphitheatre and a stone ammunition igloo. There are existing policies and procedures to protect these resources. NREL/DOE has conducted various cultural and archeological inventory surveys as well as Section 106 consultations with the Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for Site-Wide Environmental Assessments and other National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents. No additional historic*

*structures or archeological resources are known to be located on NREL/DOE owned lands. However, NREL/DOE has protocols in place to respond to the discovery of any cultural resources during earth disturbing activities.*

### **Idaho Operations Office**

*The Idaho National Laboratory (INL), an 890 square mile nuclear research laboratory in southeastern Idaho is 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 among DOE-ID, the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Many INL programs benefit from the tailored approach to cultural resource compliance outlined in the Plan, which is implemented by the INL Cultural Resource Management (INL CRM) program and operated by DOE-ID's maintenance and operations contractor, Battelle Energy Alliance (BEA). The INL CRM office is responsible for day-to-day implementation of the Plan and provided support in FY 2010 to BEA and other federal contractors with responsibility for INL activities.*

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

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

### **Richland Operations Office**

*The 100-KR4 Pump and Treat update report was prepared to provide new information and incorporate the changes that have taken place since the document was prepared in the 1990s. The update included the archaeological work that has taken place since the document was prepared and also included the numerous wells and pumping facilities that have been added to the pump and treat system over the years. The Tribes and SHPO were consulted on the revision and concurred with the updated document.*

### **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 the technical expertise and guidance needed to help DOE manage archaeological resources at the Savannah River Site (SRS).*

*Research conducted by SRARP personnel was reported in eleven professional articles and reports published during FY 2010. The SRARP staff presented research results in 16 papers and posters at professional conferences. The SRARP archaeological research included 6 field survey and excavation programs. Three grants were acquired to support both on-site and off-site research, and employees served as consultants on 16 projects in off-site cultural resources management (CRM) and research activities. The SRARP staff held 35 offices and appointments to committees in various educational, avocational, and professional organizations.*

### **Western Area Power Administration**

*Western Area Power Administration continued to follow DOE policies, Federal Regulations, Executive Orders, and Federal laws including NHPA and 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.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

*In FY 2010 the INL CRM office staff mentored two summer interns: an undergraduate at the University of Montana and a Ph.D. candidate at Texas A&M. The latter intern assisted in the development of a National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 110 research design, and both interns supported associated fieldwork under the direct supervision of INL archaeologists.*

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

*The LLNL staff archaeologist regularly publishes articles highlighting the archaeology and historic preservation program at LLNL in the laboratory's periodical, Newsline. The quarterly articles include many photos of the resources on LLNL property.*

*In 2010, LLNL's staff archaeologist participated in the Expanding Your Horizon's Career Fair for Young Girls. Two posters of archaeological activities and sites were presented, 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**

*Cultural resource staff continued their long-standing outreach to the neighboring Tewa Pueblo of San Ildefonso. On June 16, 2010 cultural resource staff provided hands-on training in local ancestral Pueblo archaeology to students at the Pueblo Learning Center. This training included the chronological seriation of Tewa pottery dating between approximately AD 1250-1600 and the recognition of chipped and ground stone artifacts. In return, the cultural resource staff were invited on a tour of a large ancestral village on San Ildefonso land. On July 7, 2010 cultural resource staff hosted approximately 25 students (ages 6-14) from the Pueblo for a tour of the Mortandad Cave Kiva complex. This unique 13<sup>th</sup> - 14<sup>th</sup> century AD talus room pueblo is ancestral for the Pueblo of San Ildefonso.*

*The DOE Los Alamos Site Office, Los Alamos County, the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Pueblo of San Ildefonso signed a 2010 Memorandum of Agreement to preserve and protect several ancestral Pueblo traditional cultural properties located in Rendija Canyon within the boundaries of a parcel of land being conveyed to Los Alamos County as part of the Congressionally mandated Land Conveyance and Transfer Project (Public law 105-119).*

*During FY 2010, cultural resource staff partnered with community and national historic preservation groups in support of the National Park Service's Manhattan Project National Historical Park (MPNHP) special resource study, including attending meetings in Los Alamos and Washington, D.C., and reviewing the November 2009 MPNHP draft study report.*

*During FY 2010, cultural resource staff conducted at least 15 tours and public presentations related to LANL history and historic properties from the Homestead, Manhattan Project, and Cold War eras. Specifically, cultural resources staff worked with the Los Alamos Historical Society to help interpret the Romero Cabin, a local Homestead era property. This partnership included designing and producing interpretive panels about the history of the cabin and local homesteading, providing voiceover narration for a video regarding the restoration of the cabin, and speaking at the May 2010 public opening ceremony. During summer 2010, cultural resource staff also provided tours of historic buildings for the Atomic Heritage Foundation's teacher symposium (an educational program related to the history of the Manhattan Project), for participants in the International Women's Forum annual meeting, and for members of the Northern New Mexico and National Citizens' Advisory Boards.*

*In October 2009 and again in May 2010, cultural resource staff assisted the LANL Trails Working Group and the Volunteer Task Force in repairs and maintenance on the historic Duran Trail at LANL.*

*In August 2010, the cultural resource staff hosted the multiple agency East Jemez Resources Council cultural subcommittee on a tour of the Ancestral Pueblo Mortandad Cave Kiva complex at LANL.*

*Cultural resource staff presented an overview of Pajarito Plateau archaeology and cultural history to the DOE Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs in September 2010. A tour of Ancestral Pueblo Tsirege Village at LANL was also conducted for the SSAB.*

#### **Office of Legacy Management**

*On June 7 and 8, 2010, in Grand Junction, Colorado, DOE Office of Legacy Management (DOE-LM) organized and hosted cultural sensitivity training, led by Navajo and Hopi representatives, for its staff and contractor personnel. The two-day training course encompassed topics such as Navajo and Hopi governmental structures, laws, and environmental regulations; cultural history and issues; and recommended communication protocols with Navajo Nation and Hopi communities. The training course was well received by participants.*

#### **Pantex Site Office**

*A prehistoric and natural resource exhibit (focusing on the prehistory, bone fragments that were discovered on site and land management) has been developed and installed as educational outreach to those working on site and invited visitors.*

#### **Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant**

*DOE Portsmouth Site Office provides informative presentations concerning National Historic Preservation Act compliance and activities at the Portsmouth Site during Portsmouth EM Site Advisory Board's public meetings.*

#### **Savannah River Operations Office**

*The SRARP conducted a full schedule of classroom education, public outreach, and on-site tours in FY 2010. Forty-eight 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. In addition, the SRARP website, [www.srarp.org](http://www.srarp.org), has seen an increase in traffic this year. In FY2010, there were over 10,000 visits to the website. The website continues to improve and includes information on current research and outreach events at SRARP.*

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

### **Idaho Operations Office**

*The INL CRM program's outreach and education efforts are routinely directed toward the general public, INL employees, and important stakeholders such as the Idaho SHPO, and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. The means of communication with these groups include activity reports, presentations, newspaper articles and interviews, periodic tours, monthly meetings with Tribal representatives, and various INL-specific media outlets such as the INL Public Outreach Program, the INL external web page ([www.inl.gov](http://www.inl.gov)) and internal intranet, INL employee training, and iNotes, an email-based internal communication tool. Educational exhibits at the Experimental Breeder Reactor I Visitor's Center (a National Historic Landmark) and the public Big Lost River Rest Area near the INL's southwestern border are also important public outreach tools.*

*Direct communication is implemented through tours and periodic presentations to local schools, civic groups, and at professional conferences. In FY 2010 INL CRM staff members spoke on a wide variety of topics including regional prehistory and history, World War II, nuclear history, historic preservation, careers, cultural resource management, archaeological resource protection, cave resources, and Native American resources and sensitivities. Several FY 2010 tours provided crucial orientation and background for INL visitors, employees, and stakeholders and ranged in diversity from a tour for the DOE-ID Physical Security Officer to enhance protection of INL cultural resources to a lively hands-on experience for approximately 50 people in celebration of May's National and Idaho Archaeology and Historic Preservation Month.*

*Since the early 1990s, 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." Under this program, Tribal and INL CRM staff 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 evidence of human land use from at least 13,500 years ago to present. In FY 2010 INL CRM office staff developed a paper for presentation at the American Nuclear Society's International Decommissioning, Decontamination, and Reutilization meeting held in Idaho Falls, ID. The paper, entitled "Ghosts of Programs Past: Managing INL Historic Structures in the D&D Era," illustrated the challenges faced by archaeologists in preserving structures that have been, or that are planned to be, demolished.*

### **Sandia Site Office**

*The Sandia Site Office (SSO) maintains an agreement with Kirtland Air Force Base (KAFB) regarding archaeological surveys on land managed by Cibola National Forest and 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**

**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.

### **Bonneville Power Administration**

*The Federal Columbia Power System Cultural Resource Program (FCRPS) is an ongoing partnership between Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), and other federal and state 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 (BPA, the Corps, and Reclamation) in complying with Section 106 of NHPA at 14 federal hydropower projects in the Columbia Basin.*

*One preservation poster and one brochure were developed for public distribution. One DVD about the effects of Hungry Horse Dam and Reservoir on a Native American trail network through the Rocky Mountains was completed. Distribution of six existing public information brochures continued in FY 10.*

### **Idaho Operations Office**

*The INL is an active facility where thousands of work orders for projects ranging from lawn care to new facility construction are processed each year. Several internal INL procedures integrate cultural resource management with land use planning and other strategic, programmatic, and project objectives across INL. INL CRM office staff reviewed and provided input to two of the primary integrating procedures.*

### **Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant**

*The "Phase I Archaeological Survey for the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PORTS) in Scioto and Seal Townships, Pike County, Ohio" was submitted to the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) in CY 2003. The OHPO office commented on this survey, requesting that the thirteen farmsteads identified within the survey be evaluated further to determine, if collectively, these farmsteads are eligible for the NRHP. Two of the thirteen farmsteads (33Pk212 and 33Pk213) were evaluated in FY 2009 to support a potential undertaking (now on hold). As part of its Section 110 responsibilities, DOE planned, beginning in late CY 2009, to complete the balance of the farmstead surveys. In 2010 DOE surveyed five of the eleven remaining farmsteads and is planning to survey the remaining six farmsteads in CY 2011.*

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

### **Golden Field Office**

*As indicated in Section A, cultural resource inventory efforts for the NREL South Table Mountain Complex have not identified additional cultural resources. In March 2010 during preplanning for construction activities for the Vehicle Modification Facility and Vehicle Test Pad (near the amphitheatre), a potentially historic rock alignment was found near the middle arroyo that runs through the NREL property. A qualified cultural resource consultant conducted field reconnaissance and a records review. The consultant determined that the rock alignment was not a contributing feature of the amphitheatre or the Camp George West Historic District and was not eligible for listing on the NRHP.*

*In 2010, NREL/DOE began evaluating the feasibility of installing a new access road to the South Table Mountain Complex. In June 2010, a qualified cultural resource consultant conducted a Class III Cultural Resource Survey of the affected lands which indentified one previously recorded cultural resource (Camp George West Firing Lines, a contributing feature of the Camp George West Historic District) and one previous undocumented feature (a man-made linear drainage ditch), which was determined to not be a contributing feature of Camp George West and not eligible for listing on the NRHP).*

## **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.

**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.

### **Bonneville Power Administration**

*A plan for complying with Section 106 of NHPA at the 14 FCRPS hydroelectric projects was developed for the fiscal year 2012-2017 time period. The plan contains measurable goals that are tied to NHPA Section 106 procedural requirements.*

*Historic Property Management Plans (HPMP) for 13 FCRPS hydroelectric projects were reviewed for consistency with the terms of the FCRPS Systemwide Programmatic Agreement, and a HPMP revision schedule was created.*

### **Idaho Operations Office**

*During prehistoric and historic times, the INL lava tube caves provided unique resources for Native Americans and early ethnoEuropean 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.*

*INL (then Idaho National Engineering Laboratory or INEL) Airborne Security Program personnel rediscovered Aviator's Cave in the mid-1980s during a routine winter surveillance flight and notified the INL CRM office staff of the cave's existence and location. The cave is located in a remote part of the INL; its exact location remains confidential. Subsequent archaeological investigations revealed that the cave was used from approximately 1300 to 150 years ago and that it held, and continues to hold, great importance to the Shoshone-Bannock people. To protect the cave and to meet DOE's compliance responsibilities, the INL CRM office staff drafted a NRHP nomination package for Aviator's Cave. The cave was nominated under criterion D, for its potential to yield important information in history and prehistory. In FY 2010 Aviator's Cave was formally listed on the NRHP, making it the second INL property to be listed. The first, Experimental Breeder Reactor I National Historic Landmark, was listed in 1966.*

### **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. When possible, artifacts photographed in 2009 were photographed again in 2010. Once the proposed Programmatic Agreement is approved this pre- and post-burn activity will become an annual requirement.*

### **Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plan**

*A Phase II Archaeological Survey of five of the thirteen PORTS farmsteads (identified in the Phase I Survey referenced above) warranting Phase II Surveys was conducted in 2010. The farmsteads are on land that was purchased as part of the original tract for the Portsmouth site by the Atomic Energy commission, a DOE predecessor agency, in the early 1950s. The survey began in September 2010. The survey concluded that individually these five sites (33Pk184, 33Pk193, 33Pk 194, 33Pk195 and 33Pk197) were not eligible for the NRHP; however, they will be evaluated with the other six PORTS farmsteads to determine their collective eligibility. DOE is currently performing the Phase II Archaeological Survey of these remaining six PORTS farmsteads.*

*A Phase I Archaeological Study was performed for the X-605 well field and the X-230 M raw water supply line from the X-605 well field to the facility property boundary. The X-605 well field and water line are not on DOE owned property, but on land where DOE has an easement from a private landowner. The 2010 Phase I Archaeological Survey of the well field and the raw water supply line identified the need for a more in-depth Phase II Archaeological survey of a portion of the well field area. This in-depth survey is to be performed in CY 2011.*

*A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the X-608 well field and the X-230 F raw water supply line was initiated in CY 2010 to further PORTS Section 110 efforts and in anticipation of potential future transfer requests for this facility. The X-608 well field and X-230F water line are not located on DOE owned property, but they are on land where DOE has an easement from a number of private landowners. The X-608 pump house (where water is drawn from the Scioto River) is on land owned by DOE. This study is in progress and is planned for completion in CY 2011.*

### **Richland Operations Office**

*The recordation and evaluation of two historic districts on the Hanford Site were completed during FY 2010: the Town of Hanford and the Hanford Construction Camp Historic District and the White Bluffs Historic District. Contributing sites/components to each of these districts were identified and evaluated for inclusion within their associated districts. Documents detailing the history of each of the districts, including descriptions of the contributing and non-contributing components, was completed. Both of the districts have been recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP.*

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

### **Golden Site Office**

*As a result of the 2010 proposed access road project (discussed in Section C) and associated Class III Cultural Resource Survey of the affected lands, DOE initiated Section 106 consultation with the Colorado SHPO and determined the proposed action would have an adverse effect on the Camp George West Firing Lines. The Colorado SHPO concurred with the adverse effect finding as well as the proposed mitigation consisting of an interpretative feature. DOE, SHPO and other consulting parties are currently drafting a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for this action. The two studies*

referenced above involved approximately five acres (3.3 acres on non-NREL/DOE land and 1.5 acres on NREL/DOE property).

### **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 one-fourth of the 55,072 cumulative acres that have been inventoried at INL were examined using these less intensive methods. As of FY 2010, 2,699 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 for long term land use planning at the INL indicates that thousands more resources are present in unsurveyed areas. INL's unique "data management system" integrates geographic information system data sets, relational databases, and web-based server technologies to easily access, update, analyze, and manage this inventory. Approximately 80% of identified resources (2,159 resources) and 75% of cumulative survey areas (41,304 acres) are currently mapped in this system. Work is ongoing to incorporate remaining data.

In FY 2010 17 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 test project was initiated. With the addition of these surveys, the total number of acres surveyed for archaeological resources on INL increased to 55,072, and the total number of resources identified rose to 2,699.

In 9 of the 27 FY 2010 project reviews, archival information indicated that no archaeological resources would be affected by the proposed activities. In one case information on archaeological sensitivity was provided for the pre-project planning and initial facility siting analysis. In the remaining 17 cases, field investigations ranging from 0.5 - 379 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 1,432 acres were intensively examined during these project surveys; 59 new archaeological sites and several historic canals 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 according to 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 three FY 2010 reports, Cultural Resource Investigations for the MFC Wastewater System Upgrade at the INL (INL/EXT-10-18950, May 2010); Cultural Resource Investigations for the Remote Handled Low Level Waste Facility at the INL (INL/EXT-10-19116, June 2010); and Cultural Resource Investigations for a Multipurpose Haul Road on the INL (INL/EXT-10-19370, July 2010).

The third report, Cultural Resource Investigations for a Multipurpose Haul Road on the INL, was based on one of the larger surveys completed in FY 2010. The project involved examination of a new route for a proposed multipurpose haul road to transport materials between the Materials and Fuels Complex (MFC) and other INL site facilities. Approximately 341 acres were surveyed in FY 2010 to support the new alignment (located south of an existing powerline) and 24 previously recorded and newly recorded cultural resources were identified within the area potentially affected by construction. In FY 2011 a series of test excavations will be completed at select archaeological resources and other protective measures will be implemented to prevent any adverse impacts to the identified resources.

*INL CRM staff members also provided input to NEPA environmental assessments for the Remote Handled Low Level Waste Facility, the Multipurpose Haul Road, the Standoff Experiment (SOX) Test Range, and the Radiological Response Test Range.*

*INL CRM office survey and research efforts in FY 2010 were also conducted to further DOE-ID obligations under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act to understand all INL's archaeological resources, not only those located in active project areas. In addition to the Aviator's Cave NRHP listing (highlighted in Question D6), a significant Section 110 excavation project was initiated in FY 2010 (detailed in Question E5). 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 2010 information was provided on all 27 of the INL projects reviewed by the INL CRM office. Several tribal tours were coordinated, including two for tribal Business Council members and tribal elders to sensitive INL caves. Tribal partners were also important team members during the Section 110 test excavation project and annual monitoring of INL archaeological resources. This tribal involvement incorporated into INL CRM activities provides outstanding examples of DOE-ID's proactive efforts to establish a meaningful working relationship with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.*

*The INL CRM office has a yearly program of cultural resource monitoring that includes many archaeological resources. In FY 2010 33 archaeological localities were revisited including two locations with Native American human remains (one of which is a cave), two other caves, twenty-six prehistoric archaeological sites, two late nineteenth-century stage stations, and the Experimental Breeder Reactor I National Historic Landmark. Representatives from the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes are important partners in these efforts. The results of FY 2010 INL cultural resource monitoring are documented in external INL report numbered INL/EXT-10-20270.*

*Two wildfires swept through INL lands in FY 2010, including the largest such fire in INL history and another that burned near INL's southern boundary. Related fire suppression activities created the potential for impacts to sensitive cultural resources. Surveys to assess the damage to known INL cultural resources began in FY 2010 and will continue and be reported on in FY 2011.*

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

*(Question D1) One new field study was conducted this year (FY 2010) at LANL, and one new historic building survey was conducted this fiscal year. However, 44 actual projects were worked on that used or required some field verification of previous survey information (archaeological and historic building resources).*

*(Question D4) LANL reviewed 743 undertakings that had the potential to impact archaeological or historic building resources. Section 106 reports were completed for 11 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 2010, 73 undertakings were summarized in the NP/NE report.*

*(Question D8) LANL produced 12 reports, including one notification to the New Mexico SHPO that LANL was invoking LANL's standard documentation measures for a historic building scheduled for decommissioning and decontamination (D&D) and eventual demolition. Ten of the twelve reports*

covered projects potentially affecting archaeological sites, and one was the final submittal of historical documentation of buildings scheduled for D&D and demolition per terms of a Memorandum of Agreement.

(Question D9) One tract of land was conveyed to Los Alamos County during FY 2010. Therefore, the total acres surveyed this fiscal year, using the new DOE boundary, the new acres surveyed, and corrections made to the survey coverage in the database is 23,090 acres.

(Question D12A) FY 2009's number included an error of three sites that were not mapped using a GIS system. Therefore, taking into account this error and the addition of three new sites this year (FY 2010) the number stays the same – 1432 sites that have been mapped using a GIS system.

### **National Energy Technology Laboratory**

NETL has evaluated the possibility of archeological sites as part of the NEPA process for projects that receive financial assistance from DOE. It appears that at least 20 projects had these evaluations during FY 2010; some evaluations for projects requiring environmental impact statements may span several years. Projects may be located on federal, state, tribal, municipal or private property. In many cases recipients of financial assistance from DOE under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act carried out Section 106 surveys looking for possible archaeological sites and reported the results to DOE. There were no positive determinations of archeological sites by DOE or its financial assistance recipients in FY 2010.

### **Office of Legacy Management**

(Question D1) The three field studies conducted during FY 2010 were Class III cultural resource inventories.

(Question D4) DOE-LM consulted with State or Tribal Historic Preservation Officers on 11 occasions during FY 2010; however, only one of those consultations involved potential effects to archaeological sites. (During the other 10 consultations, DOE requested concurrence in findings of “No Historic Properties Affected.”)

### **Sandia Site Office**

Some SSO managed activities take place on State lands and 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 map and records checks ensure that no resources are located in the area of potential effect. This screening is generally coordinated through NEPA review of proposed actions. There are no archaeological sites located on DOE-fee-owned lands; there are NHPA-eligible structures and buildings located on these lands.

### **Western Area Power Administration**

WAPA conducted over 40 surveys for Section 106 activities (no section 110 or Archeological Resources Protection Act [ARPA] due to very limited land management). WAPA also made initial determination of eligibility for 99 properties located during these surveys.

## **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 3,821 artifact remnants were recovered during the Phase I Archaeological Surveys of the five farmsteads and the X-605 well field and X-230M raw water supply line. The majority of the artifact remnants for the farmsteads were metal fence wire or wire fragments, nails or nail fragments and bottle glass. Although numerous, the artifacts provided little new or significant information concerning life during the first half of the twentieth century in northern Appalachia (Ohio). There were 159 artifacts recovered from the X-605 well field and raw water supply lines; all were fire cracked rock.*

### **Western Area Power Administration**

*Eight 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.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

*Two archaeological data recovery projects were initiated at the INL in FY 2010: one to comply with Section 106 and the other to comply with Section 110.*

### **Western Area Power Administration**

*Eight total data recovery projects associated with Section 106 were conducted.*

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

### **Idaho Operations Office**

*Planning began in FY 2010 for a series of small Section 106 test excavations within the area of potential effects from construction of a new multipurpose haul road; fieldwork is scheduled to begin early in FY 2011. The results of this work will be reported in FY 2011.*

*A Section 110 data recovery project was initiated at select INL locations in FY 2010 selected on a science-based research design. Although it has long been known that humans have been present on the northeastern Snake River plain (including the lands now occupied by INL) for over 13,500 years, little is known about the human ecology and adaptive responses to climate changes over time in this region. Despite its high-desert landscape and arid appearance, the INL likely had a relative abundance of surface water since the end of the last ice age. Places where water was available provided valuable plant and animal resource patches for early humans and have the potential to provide important insights into human adaptations to desert landscapes. The natural sensitivity of desert streams and water catchments to climate change also will lead to better understanding of human response to fluctuating climates. However, a clearer understanding of the paleohydrology and paleoecology of the streams, shallow lakes and marshlands that once occupied much of the northern reaches of the INL is needed.*

*Past studies of human use of stream and wetland environments on the INL have been limited to analysis of surface archaeological sites. This has produced important information on site distribution and, to some extent, data on site age, based on morphological characteristics of surface artifacts (what locations were being used and roughly when). However, these data did not address the critical questions of precisely when and why sites were used. The FY 2010 Section 110 interdisciplinary project was undertaken at select riverine and marshland (playa-edge) environments to gather data to answer these questions. In FY 2010 geophysical investigations were conducted and identified anomalies at two archaeological sites located adjacent to the Big Lost River. Excavations were undertaken by INL archaeologists, geophysicists, and a Texas A&M geoarchaeology Ph.D. candidate. A total of eight one by one meter test units were excavated at the two locations and preliminary results were presented at the October, 2010 Great Basin meetings. Additional test units at other locations are planned for the 2011 field season and artifact analysis is underway.*

*In addition to the Section 106 and 110 activities described above, 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 (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 2010.*

#### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

*(Question E1) One archaeological data recovery project was in progress during this reporting year. In addition four building data recovery projects were ongoing during FY 2010. All data recovery/documentation for these projects was conducted during several prior fiscal years. The final documentation reports for these projects were worked on during this fiscal year and one was completed.*

*(Question E2) Two Historic Period (1890-1942) artifact scatters were completely recorded and 100% of the artifacts were documented.*

#### **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.

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

#### **Idaho National Laboratory**

*INL's 890 square miles contain thousands of prehistoric and historic archaeological resources that are potentially eligible for nomination to the National Register. All are treated as if they are eligible until proven otherwise through intensive data collection. 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 State Historic*

Preservation Office 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. In FY 2007 the office prepared a package to support a nomination for Aviators Cave. In FY 2010 DOE-ID received notification from the Keeper of the Register that INL's Aviators Cave had been accepted and listed (detailed in Section D6).

#### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

See D6 above. The Carnegie Town Site (CA-SJO-173H) and CA-SJO-184 are NRHP-eligible archaeological resources.

#### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

(Question F1) 51 archaeological sites and 13 historic buildings were determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in concurrence with the New Mexico SHPO during FY 2010.

(Question F2) LANL does not have any archaeological sites listed on the NRHP, 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.

(Question F3) Six archaeological sites and six historic buildings were determined not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in concurrence with the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer during FY 2010.

#### **Western Area Power Administration**

WAPA made initial determination of eligibility for 99 properties located during surveys, none to or through the Keeper.

**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.

#### **Golden Field Office**

No new eligible structures or features for the NRHP were documented in the reporting year. The two studies referenced in Sections C and D identified three features of which two (the rock alignment and the man-made linear drainage ditch) were determined not to be eligible for listing and one (Camp George West Firing Lines), which is already listed in NRHP as a contributing feature of Camp George West Historical District.

#### **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. Consequently, many caves are eligible for nomination to the NRHP.

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 to 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 NRHP. In FY 2010 the nomination was formally accepted by the Keeper of the Register, and Aviators Cave was listed.*

**Los Alamos National Laboratory**

*(Question F6) 494 archaeological sites and 160 historic buildings have been determined eligible for the NRHP.*

*(Question F7) 90 archaeological sites and 165 historic buildings have been determined not eligible for the NRHP.*

*(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.

**Bonneville Power Administration**

*Research was begun to determine ownership of collections recovered from the Caples Site (45SA5), which are housed at the Burke Museum in Washington state. Collections were previously thought to belong solely to the Army Corps of Engineers, but ownership is actually split between the two agencies.*

**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.*

**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 January of FY 2010. The focus of the inspection in FY 2010 was paleontological specimens.*

*Some recent collections of nonperishable artifacts are also held in secure, temporary storage in INL CRM offices in Idaho Falls, Idaho, awaiting 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 effort was ongoing in FY 2010.*

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

*LLNL's archaeological collections, 90% of which are labeled and catalogued in accordance with 36CFR79, are curated at LLNL's on-site Archives and Research Center (ARC).*

### **Legacy Management (LM)**

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

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

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

*(Question H2) There are approximately 398 cubic feet of material remains (artifacts, samples) curated in all repositories. In addition to this number there are 14 individually catalogued artifacts.*

*(Question H3) The records are listed in question H5.*

*(Question H4) The records submitted during FY 2010 have not been processed yet.*

*(Question 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 through a curation agreement. An audit of the curation facility was conducted in September 2010.*

### **Savannah River Operations Office**

*All Savannah River Site (SRS) archaeological artifacts are managed at DOE's on-site curation facility by Savannah River Archaeological Research Program personnel. A portion of the SRS archaeological collections are on display at local/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**

*DOE PORTS is engaged in the decontamination and demolition of the former gaseous diffusion plant under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation Liability Act (CERCLA). As a part of the evaluation of the alternatives to address the contaminated facilities, DOE has included mitigation measures that often include preservation of certain items from the PORTS properties*

## **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 only viable at the Experimental Breeder Reactor I Visitors Center, the public rest area located on the banks of the Big Lost River along U.S. Highway 20/26 within the INL, and during certain times of the year, such as in May, for Idaho Archaeology and Historic Preservation Month.*

*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. Signs installed at the Big Lost River Rest Area also provide cultural resource information to many people passing through the region as do local newspaper articles. The INL CRM program continues to explore additional ways of encouraging public interest in INL cultural resources while staying within established security parameters.*

### **Pantex Site Office**

*A multi-themed exhibit that focuses on the Natural Resources and Prehistory of the Panhandle of Texas has been installed. The exhibit could provide an economic benefit for the agency because it could divert visitors who might otherwise require use of plant resources while visiting more sensitive sites at Pantex.*

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

### **Golden Field Office**

*During the reporting year, NREL/DOE undertook the two cultural resource efforts documented in Sections B and C above, resulting in associated costs of \$13,143. In future years, additional funding will be required for the designing, fabrication, and placement of an interpretative feature, which will be required to mitigate the impact of the new full-service southern access to the Camp George West Firing Lines.*

### **Idaho Operations Office**

*The majority of funding for the INL CRM program is provided through DOE-ID's Office of Nuclear Energy via its contractor, BEA. This funding does 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.*

### **Office of Legacy Management**

*During FY 2010, DOE-LM appropriated approximately \$48,000 to obtain project-specific cultural resource clearances and approximately \$80,000 to organize, host, and attend the Cultural Sensitivity Training described in Item B4 of this questionnaire.*

*(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.

### **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 2010 two permits were issued to outside subcontractors for archaeological work on the INL; no permits remain outstanding.*

### **Savannah River Operations Office**

*In FY 2010 all archaeological activities at the Savannah River Site (SRS) were conducted by SRARP personnel under provisions of the existing DOE/SCIAA 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 statutes 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. As a result of these restrictions, many archaeological sites on the INL display remarkable integrity and are virtually undisturbed.*

*An unauthorized hunting camp was discovered on INL lands between Middle Butte and East Butte. However, a check of a nearby cave and known archaeological sites indicated that no cultural resources were disturbed during this trespassing incident.*

**Los Alamos National Laboratory**

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

**Savannah River Operations Office**

*The DOE SRS is not open to the general public. Access to SRS is controlled by on-site security personnel and 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/respond to any instances of archaeological looting.*





Enclosure 3

**DOE Site Specific Responses to the Federal Archeology Program Activities**

FY 2010



Enclosure 4

**DOE Site Acronym List and Other Acronyms**



## DOE SITE ACRONYM LIST – FY 2010

Ames	Ames Laboratory, Ames, IA
Argonne	Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL
ASO	Argonne Site Office, Argonne, IL
BEA	Battelle Energy Alliance (operates Idaho National Laboratory for DOE)
BNL	Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR
Chicago	Chicago Operations Office
Fermi	Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL
Golden	Golden Field Office, Golden, CO
ID	Idaho Operations Office, Idaho Falls, ID
INL	Idaho National Laboratory
LANL	Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM
LBNL	Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA
LLNL	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA
LM	Office of Legacy Management, Grand Junction, CO
Nevada	Nevada National Security Site, Mercury, NV
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory
NSO	Nevada Site Office
ORO	Oak Ridge Office, Oak Ridge, TN
Pantex	Pantex Plant, 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 National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM
SPR	Strategic Petroleum Reserve Office, New Orleans, LA
SRS	Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC
SSO	Sandia Site Office, Albuquerque, NM
SWPA	Southwestern Power Administration, Tulsa, OK
WAPA	Western Area Power Administration, Denver, CO

## OTHER ACRONYM LIST – FY 2010

ARPA	Archeological Resource Protection Act
Corps	Army Corps of Engineers
CRM	Cultural Resources Management
CEMP	Cultural Resources Management Plan
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation Liability Act
CY	Calendar year
D&D	Decommissioning and decontamination
DVD	Digital video disc

EBR	Experimental Breeder Reactor
EM	Environmental Management
FCRPS	Federal Columbia River Power Systems
FY	Fiscal year
GIS	Geographical information system
HPMP	Historic Property Management Plan
KAFB	Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, NM
MFC	Materials and Fuels Complex (Idaho)
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MPNHP	Manhattan Project National Historical Park
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NP/NE	No Property and No Effect
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OHPO	Ohio Historic Preservation Office
Reclamation	Department of Reclamation
SCIAA	South Carolina Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
SHPO	State Historical Preservation Office
SRARP	Savannah River Archeological Research Program
SSAB	Site Specific Advisory Board
WPA	Works Progress Administration

## DOE RESPONSES TO FY 2010 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

SITES **	Argonne	Berkeley	BPA	BNL	Chicago	Fermi	Golden	Idaho	LLNL	LM	LANL	NSO	ORO	PGDP	Pantex	PNSO	PORTS	Richland	RMOTC	Sandia	SRS	SWPA	WAPA	TOTAL	
B1 (number of partnerships)	0	0	7	nd	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	1	3	0	13	
B2 \$ (value of partners' contributions)	\$0	n/a	\$480,263	nd	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a	\$0	\$0	\$790,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,270,263
B3 (number of volunteer hours)	0	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	900	0	0	970
C1 (number of area-wide ARPA and NHPA overview or general non-project plans)	0	0	1	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	7	
C2 (number of projects for which reviews, etc. were done)	0	1	185	nd	1	0	2	27	0	14	743	40	1	4	0	2	7	273	0	14	30	8	40	1,392	
C3 (Number of notifications to Indian Tribes of potential harm)	0	n/a	n/a	nd	0	0	n/a	27	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	32	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	67	
D1 (number of field studies)	0	1	169	nd	0	0	2	17	0	3	1	16	1	0	12	0	7	17	5	0	41	4	40	336	
D2 (number of acres inventoried)	11.9	2.25	6,541	nd	0	0	5	1,432	0	74.2	17.8	741	58	0	0	0	46	56,707	12	0	1,627	63.81	nd	67,339.0	
D3 (number of new archeological sites identified)	0.0	0	90	nd	0	0	0	59	0	0	3	18	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	8	0	nd	206	
D4 (number of Section 106 actions involving archeological sites completed)	0.0	1	99	nd	1	0	2	27	0	1	11	12	0	0	0	0	7	16	0	0	0	7	40	224	
D5 (number of archeological sites stabilized, rehabilitated, protected)	0.0	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	nd	7	
D8 (number of reports [grey literature, e.g. Section 106 compliance reports] about archeological resources completed)	0.0	0	137	nd	0	0	2	3	0	4	12	6	0	0	0	0	6	33	0	0	0	1	40	244	
D9 (cumulative total number of acres inventoried on DOE land)	500.9	n/a	unknown	4299	n/a	6800	n/a	55072	7375	2884.2	23090.6	37919	29448	1437	3	300	2113	179342	n/a	2481	85049	n/a	n/a	438113.7	
D10A (number of cumulative survey areas mapped using GIS)	500.9	n/a	unknown	4,299	n/a	0	n/a	41,304	0	unknown	23090.6	36,023	0	1,437	1	300	2,113	179,342	n/a	2,481	65,055	n/a	n/a	355,947	
D10B (number of cumulative survey areas mapped using CAD)		n/a	unknown	0	n/a	0	n/a		7,375	unknown	0		0	0		0	0	0	n/a	0		n/a	n/a	7,375	
D11 (cumulative total number of archeological sites on DOE land)	46	n/a	1	6	n/a	46	n/a	2,699	28	197	1,890	2,188	47	1	69	16	44	1,071	n/a		1,871	n/a	n/a	10,220	
D12A (number of cumulative total of archeological sites mapped using a GIS)	46	n/a	0	6	n/a	0	n/a	2,185	2	unknown	1,432	2,079	0	1	1	16	44	1,071	n/a		1,272	n/a	n/a	8,155	
D12B (number of cumulative total of archeological sites mapped using a CAD)	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	0	n/a		28	unknown	n/a		0	0		0	0	0	n/a			n/a	n/a	28	
D13 (number of archeological sites assessed for condition)	0	n/a	1	0	n/a	0	n/a	33	1	0	25	15	0	0	2	3	7	12	n/a	0	41	n/a	n/a	140	
D14 (number of known archeological sites revisited and re-evaluated)	0	n/a	1	0	n/a	0	n/a	5	1	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	5	51	n/a	0	11	n/a	n/a	79	
E1 (number of archeological data recovery projects in progress)	0	0	2	nd	1	0	0	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	8	26	
E2 (number of archeological sites on which data recovered)	0	0	2	nd	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	8	25	
E3 (number of undertakings with unexpected discoveries)	0	0	1	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
E4 (number of undertakings with unexpected discoveries requiring data recovery)	0	0	1	nd		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	nd	1	
F1 (number archeological sites determined NRHP-eligible)	0	0	21	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	nd	80	
F2 (number archeological sites listed on NRHP)	0	0	0	nd	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
F3 (Number of archeological sites determined ineligible for NRHP)	0	2	27	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5	0	0	0	nd	59	
F6 (cumulative total number of archeological sites on DOE land determined NRHP-eligible)	3	n/a	0	3	n/a	1	n/a	0	5	20	494	1,121	15	0	0	1	0	38	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	1,701	
F7 (cumulative number of archeological sites on DOE land determined not NRHP-eligible)	21	n/a	0	153	n/a	17	n/a	0	23	177	90	1,065	32	0	67	8	44	180	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	1,877	
F8 (cumulative total number of NRHP-listed archeological sites on DOE land)	0	n/a	1	nd	n/a	0	n/a	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	51	
F9 (number of NRHP-listed archeological sites that passed out of DOE control)	0	n/a	0	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	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	n/a	0	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	
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	n/a	0	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	
F11 (number archeological districts on DOE land determined NRHP-eligible)	0	n/a	0	nd	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0		0	n/a	2	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	2	
F12 (cumulative number archeological districts on DOE land determined NRHP-eligible by the Keeper)	0	n/a	1	nd	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0		0	n/a	3	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	4	

## DOE RESPONSES TO FY 2010 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

SITES **	Argonne	Berkeley	BPA	BNL	Chicago	Fermi	Golden	Idaho	LLNL	LM	LANL	NSO	ORO	PGDP	Pantex	PNSO	PORTS	Richland	RMOTC	Sandia	SRS	SWPA	WAPA	TOTAL	
F13 (number archeological districts listed on NRHP)	0	n/a	0	nd	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	
*F14 (cumulative number NRHP-listed archeological districts on DOE land)	0	n/a	1	nd	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	6	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	7	
H1 (number of items/lots curated)	63	n/a	75,591	11,860	n/a	n/a	0	11,937		15,516	n/a	414,682	0	0	0	0		n/a	unknown	0	1,575,861	1	nd	2,105,511	
H2 (cubic feet curated)	68.4	n/a	119		n/a	12	0	n/a	2.0	n/a	398.0	3,448	0	0	717	n/a	13	197	unknown	0		1	nd	4,975	
H3 (associated records included? yes)	1	n/a	1	1	n/a	1		n/a	1	1		1	1	n/a	1	n/a	1		unknown		1	1	nd	11	
H3 (associated records included? no)		n/a			n/a			n/a			1		1	n/a		n/a		1	unknown					nd	3
H4 (% of H1 and H2 processed for curation)	100%	n/a	40%	100%	n/a	100%	0%	92%	90%	100%	1.0	100%	0%	n/a	100%	n/a	0%	100%	unknown		100%	100%	nd	varies	
H5 (linear feet of paper archeological records)	3	n/a	3	9	n/a	1	0	6	2.5	unknown	27.7	370	0	n/a	2	n/a	1.0	2	unknown		530	11	nd	968.2	
H6 (gigabytes of stored archeological records or studies)	0	n/a	unknown	6	n/a	0	0	0.3	1	n/a	240.8	0.15	0	1	19.64	n/a	1	n/a	unknown				12	nd	281.89
H7 (number of federal museums/repositories curating DOE collections)	0	n/a	1	1	n/a	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	n/a	0	1	0	0	7	
H8 (number of non-federal museums/repositories curating DOE collections)	1	n/a	2	nd	n/a	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	11	
H9 (policy for managing and preserving archeological collections - yes)	1	n/a		nd	n/a	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Comply with WY SHPO requirements		1	1		14	
H9 (policy for managing and preserving archeological collections - no)		n/a	1	nd	n/a		0							1						1			1	4	
H11 (number of times DOE collections utilized for research or exhibits)	0	n/a	0	1	n/a	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a		48	0	0	51	
I1 \$ (appropriated dollars used for archeology)	\$15,000	\$0	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,143	\$400,000	\$101,565	\$128,000	\$589,700	\$550,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$265,000	\$1,965,000	\$0	\$0	\$430,000	\$75,001	\$0	\$5,142,409	
I2 \$ (non-appropriated dollars used for archeology)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$180,000	\$0	\$0	\$152,300	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$360,000	\$0	\$0	\$742,300	
K1 (archeological permit applications received)	0	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
K2 (archeological permits issued or in effect)	0	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
L1 (number of incidents document)	0	n/a	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L2 (number of incidents with arrests)	0	n/a	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	n/a	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	n/a	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L5 (number of individuals convicted of misdemeanor under ARPA)	0	n/a	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	n/a	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	n/a	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	n/a	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	n/a	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	n/a	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L11 (number of individuals convicted of felony under other laws)	0	n/a	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	n/a	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	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	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0
L14 \$ (total value of fines imposed or ordered)	\$0	\$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
L15 \$ (total value of restitution, including civil penalties)	\$0	n/a	\$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	n/a	\$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	n/a		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	n/a	\$0	nd	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$162,883	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a	\$162,883
L22 (number of collected LOOT forms)	0	n/a	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 2010

\*\* all values are for FY 2010 only, except for those marked with one \* that are cumulative totals.

n/a = not applicable, nd = no data