



**Department of Energy**  
Washington, DC 20585

April 17, 2008

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

Dear Dr. McManamon:

This is in response to your December 2007 request for information on the Department of Energy's (DOE) archeological programs and projects for fiscal year 2007. The Department does not maintain centralized records at Headquarters of historical and archeological activities conducted at DOE sites nationwide. Our office forwarded the questionnaire you provided to these 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 Lois Thompson, of my staff, at (202) 586-9581 or email: lois.thompson@hq.doe.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Andrew C. Lawrence".

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

Enclosures (as listed)

## **List of Enclosures**

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Enclosure 1 | REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM<br>ACTIVITIES – 2007 Quantitative Questionnaire on 2007<br>Activities |
| Enclosure 2 | REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM<br>ACTIVITIES – 2007 Narrative Questionnaire on 2007<br>Activities    |
| Enclosure 3 | DOE Responses to the FY 2007 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY<br>PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – 2007 (site-specific information)   |
| Enclosure 4 | Acronym List   |

ENCLOSURE 1

REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – 2007

**Quantitative Questionnaire on 2007 Activities**



**REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM  
ACTIVITIES--2007  
Quantitative Questionnaire on 2007 Activities**

**Agency Name:** Department of Energy

---

**Section A. This is a narrative section for describing your agency's exemplary projects (For this section, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**

**Section B. Participation, Education, and Outreach**

- B1.** Number of partnership agreements (e.g. cooperative, cost-share, interagency, research) in the archeology program. *(Do not include contracts.)* 4
- B2.** Estimated total dollar value of contributions provided by partners (e.g. money, services, volunteers working directly for partners). \$768,000
- B3.** Volunteer hours contributed directly to the agency for the benefit of archeological activities. 301
- B4.** Describe exemplary partnership, education, or outreach program/product/activity projects conducted by your office in the reporting year.  
**(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**
- B5.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about participation, education, and outreach (B1- B3). **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**

**Section C. Archeological Overviews**

- C1.** 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.) during the reporting year. 12
- C2.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological overviews (C1).  
**(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**

## 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, 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. An archeological site is defined as the location of a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity.

- D1.** Number of undertakings or projects undertaken during the reporting year for which archeological database and file searches, literature reviews, or map checks were conducted. *(Report all projects for which checks were done.)*
- D2.** Number of field studies to identify and evaluate archeological sites carried out during the reporting year.
- D3.** Number of acres inventoried to identify and evaluate archeological sites during the reporting year.
- D4.** Number of new archeological sites identified during the reporting year.
- D5.** Number of historic properties that are individual archeological sites and were determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including administratively- or consensus-determined eligible, by the Keeper, or by the agency through documented consultation with the SHPO or THPO during this reporting year.
- D6.** Number of archeological sites that were assessed for condition, stabilized, rehabilitated, monitored, or protected (e.g. anti-vandalism signs, fences, or road closures) in the reporting year. *(Report each protected archeological site only once. Do not include sites avoided during a Section 106 undertaking.)*
- D7.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological identification and evaluation (D1-D12). **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**
- D8.** Number of historic properties that are individual archeological sites and were listed on the NRHP during this reporting year. *(Report the number of archeological districts listed on the NRHP in D12.)*

- D9.** Number of archeological sites contributing to NRHP districts that were listed on the NRHP during this reporting year.  
(Do not include sites reported in D8.) 0
- D10.** Number of archeological sites contributing to NRHP districts that were determined eligible for the NRHP, including administratively- or consensus-determined eligible, by the Keeper, or by the agency through documented consultation with the SHPO or THPO.  
(Do not include sites reported in D5.) 118
- D11.** Number of archeological sites that were determined ineligible for the NRHP by the Keeper, or by the agency through documented consultation with the SHPO or THPO during this reporting year. 93
- D12.** Number of historic properties that are archeological districts and were listed on the NRHP during this reporting year. 0
- D13.** Number of historic properties that are archeological districts and were determined eligible for the NRHP during this reporting year. 0

### 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 compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA or with ARPA or with an agency-specific statute, regulation, or policy.

- E1.** Number of archeological data recovery projects. 2
- E2.** Number of archeological sites on which data recovery was undertaken. 1
- E3.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological data recovery projects (E1-E2). **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**

### Section F. Unanticipated Archeological Discoveries during this reporting year

This section provides data on archeological sites that were discovered unexpectedly subsequent to agency completion of the NHPA Section 106 review for undertakings conducted on federal and non-federal land and performed or funded by agency or non-agency entities in the reporting year. Include unanticipated discoveries in the reporting year that the archeological site is discovered.

- F1.** Number of undertakings resulting in the discovery of unanticipated archeological sites. 0

**F2.** Number of undertakings resulting in discovery of unanticipated archeological sites that required data recovery. *(Include the undertaking in the reporting year that the property is discovered even if data recovery will not occur until the following year.)*

0

**F3.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about unanticipated archeological discoveries (F1-F2). **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**

### Section G. Archeological Information Management

**G1.** Describe how the agency is maintaining and improving the management of records for collections, permits, sites, and inventory.  
**(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**

If your agency's archeological information management systems include:

**G2.** automated archeological site records, what percentage of the agency's sites has been entered into this system?

**G3.** digitally mapped archeological site locations, what percentage of the agency's sites has been entered into this system?

**G4.** digitally mapped areas that were surveyed to identify archeological sites, what percentage of the data has been entered?

**G5.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological information management (G2-G4). **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**

### Section H. Archeological Collections Management

**H1A.** Number of items/lots (artifacts, samples) curated in all repositories

1,565,741

**Or**

**H1B.** Number of cubic feet of material remains (artifacts, samples) curated in all repositories.

5023.2

**H2.** Percentage of amount identified in H1A or H1B that has been processed for professional curation in accordance with 36 CFR 79.5.

98%

**H3.** Number of linear feet of associated records related to stored archeological materials, or records associated with any archeological studies.

1,137.50

- H4.** Number of federal museums/repositories curating agency collections. 3
- H5.** Number of non-federal museums/repositories curating agency collections. 9
- H6.** Does the agency have a policy for management and preservation of archeological collections? **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)** no
- H7.** List the names of the museums/repositories that are curating agency collections.  
**(Use Worksheet for H7- Museum Name List)**
- H8.** If needed, clarify responses to questions above about archeological collections management (H1-H7). **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**

### Section I. Archeological Resource Management Program Funding

- I1.** Estimated total amount of funding appropriated to the agency (directly from Congress or as a result of internal agency allocations) that is used for archeological activities. \$2,660,548
- I2.** Estimated total amount of funding allocated from other agency programs (e.g. timber, construction, wildland fire management, permits, licenses, grants) that are used for archeological activities. \$845,000
- I3.** Does the agency have information on economic benefits from archeology and heritage tourism? If so, describe. **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**
- I4.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about funding for archeological resource management programs (I1-I2). **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**

### Section J. Cumulative Archeological Resource Base on Federal and Indian Lands

These questions call for the most accurate counts or estimates possible for all prior years plus the reporting year.

- J1.** Cumulative number of acres inventoried to identify and evaluate archeological sites on agency-managed land. *(Include this reporting year.)* 370,292

- J2.** Cumulative number of archeological sites identified on agency-managed land.  
(Include this reporting year.) 9,649
- J3.** Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency-managed lands contributing to districts that are listed on the NRHP.  
(Include his reporting year; do not include sites reported in J7.) 113
- J4.** Cumulative number of historic properties that are individual archeological sites on agency-managed lands and have been determined eligible for the NRHP, including administratively- or consensus-determined eligible, by the Keeper, or by the agency through documented consultation with the SHPO or THPO. (Include this reporting year.) 1,981
- J5.** Cumulative number of individual archeological sites on agency-managed land that were determined ineligible for the NRHP by the Keeper, or by the agency through documented consultation with the SHPO or THPO.  
(Include this reporting year.) 1,668
- J6.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about the archeological resource (J1-10).  
**(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**
- J7.** Cumulative number of historic properties on agency-managed lands that are individual archeological sites and are listed on the NRHP.  
(Include this reporting year.) 1,125
- J8.** Cumulative number of archeological sites contributing to NRHP districts on agency-managed lands and that have been determined eligible for the NRHP, including administratively-determined or consensus-determined eligible, by the Keeper, or by the agency through documented consultation with the SHPO or THPO. (Include this reporting year; do not include sites reported in J4.) 155
- J9.** Number of historic properties that are archeological districts on agency-managed lands and have been determined eligible for the NRHP by the Keeper.(Include this reporting year.) 0
- J10.** Cumulative number of historic properties on agency-managed lands that are archeological districts and are listed on the NRHP.  
(Include this reporting year.) 46

### Section K. Permits for Archeological Investigations

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

- K1.** Number of permit applications received during the reporting year.
- K2.** Number of permits issued or in effect during the reporting year.
- K3.** Number of notifications to Indian Tribes of proposed work that might harm or destroy archeological sites having religious or cultural importance to the Tribes.
- K4.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological permitting (K1-3).  
(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)

### Section L. Archeological Cultural Resource Law Enforcement

Include information about archeological resources crimes in violation of ARPA, the Antiquities Act, Federal property protection laws, and other statues and regulations protecting archeological resources.

- L1.** Number of documented violations. (*Each incident is counted once.*)
- L2.** Number of documented violations where individuals were arrested.
- L3.** Number of individuals arrested.
- L4.** Number of individuals cited.
- L5.** Number of individuals prosecuted under ARPA.
- L6.** Number of individuals prosecuted under authorities other than ARPA.
- L7.** Number of individuals convicted of a misdemeanor under ARPA.
- L8.** Number of individuals convicted of a misdemeanor under authorities other than ARPA.
- L9.** Number of individuals convicted of a felony under ARPA.
- L10.** Number of individuals convicted of a felony under authorities other than ARPA.
- L11.** Number of individuals found liable for a civil penalty under ARPA.

- L12.** Number of criminal and civil cases where individuals were found guilty or liable.
- L13.** Number of criminal and civil cases where individuals were found not guilty or not liable.
- L14.** Amount of fines imposed or ordered.
- L15.** Amount of restitution imposed or ordered, including civil penalties.
- L16.** Cost of restoration and repair originally asked for in site damage assessments.
- L17.** Amount given in rewards (*not amount offered*).
- L18.** Commercial value of personal property and artifacts seized and either retained or sold.
- L19.** Estimated law enforcement cost for archeological resource protection.
- L20.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological law enforcement (L1-19). **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**
- L21.** Describe effective projects, methods, and techniques the agency has used to improve protection at archeological sites under its management control. **(For this question, use the SRC form for narrative answers.)**
- L22.** Number of enclosed LOOT forms. (*It is important to send LOOT forms with the questionnaire.*)

**REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES--2007****Questionnaire on 2007 Activities****H7. List the names of the museums/repositories that are curating agency collections.****Indicate which museums/repositories that were inspected/visited during this fiscal year**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Agency-Subunit</b>	<b>Museum/Repository</b>	<b>Date last visited</b>
DOE	Berkley Site Office	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Archives Center	
DOE	Brookhaven Site Office	Brookhaven Graphite Research Reactor Project Site	
DOE	Fermi Site Office	Illinois State Museum	
DOE	Idaho Operations Office	Idaho Museum of Natural History	2008
DOE	Los Alamos Site Office	Museum of New Mexico	2007
DOE	Nevada Site Office	National Nuclear Safety Administration/Nevada Site Office Curation Facility	2007
DOE	Oak Ridge Operation Office	University of Tennessee-Knoxville	
DOE	Office of Civilian and Radioactive Waste Management	Desert Research Institute	
DOE	Office of Legacy Management	Ohio Historical Society Archives/Library	
DOE	Richland Operations Office	Washington State University and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Respository	
DOE	Savannah River Site	Savannah River Site Archeological Program Facility	



ENCLOSURE 2

REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – 2007

**Narrative Questionnaire on 2007 Activities**



# REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES--2007

## Instructions for 2007 Questionnaire and Form for narrative questions in 2007 Questionnaire

The Report to Congress on the Federal Archeology Program is prepared for the Secretary of the Interior by the Departmental Consulting Archeologist, NPS. The report is 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. This report provides information about Federal archeological activities in order to offer assistance with professional methods for archeological preservation and for the administration of historic preservation programs.

The Departmental Consulting Archeologist appreciates your cooperation in reporting information about archeological activities undertaken by your agency or department. The compiled data contribute to the Secretary's Report to Congress on the Federal Archeology Program. Numerical information reported by each agency is available on the NPS Archeology Program website ([www.nps.gov/history/archeology/SRC/INDEX.HTM](http://www.nps.gov/history/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 all cultural resource management activities. It is understood that precise data are not always available and that in some cases knowledgeable estimates must be made. In the event that a department/agency takes the position that the entire questionnaire is not applicable, return the uncompleted questionnaire with a cover letter of explanation.

**Note:** The committee that will be reviewing the 2008 questionnaire is considering several new questions; agencies may wish to begin to collect the following information:

- Section H, the number of archeological reports (published and unpublished) completed during 2008.
- Section G, the number of people who have used Federal archeological collections during 2008.

**LOOT Clearinghouse Data.** The attached LOOT form (NPS Form 10-29) is an important source for information on cases of federal archeological resource crime. Submitting this form is voluntary, however, the information has been useful to law enforcement and attorneys in developing prosecution cases against looters. Please fill out a form or send copies of equivalent information from the case files for each citation; misdemeanor and felony conviction; and civil penalty completed in the reporting year.

**Due Dates and Assistance.** The headquarters office of each agency should send their response via e-mail to the Departmental Consulting Archeologist, NPS, Archeology Program, [dca@nps.gov](mailto:dca@nps.gov) by **December 31, 2007**. Questions about this questionnaire should be directed to Karen Mudar, Archeology Program, 202-354-2103; Fax: 202-371-5102; [karen\\_mudar@nps.gov](mailto:karen_mudar@nps.gov).

**For Agency Headquarters Use Only.** *We ask that the headquarters office of each agency or department compile an agency/department-wide response to the questionnaire, summarizing numerical information collected from regions, districts, divisions, etc. The 2007 questionnaire has been reformatted. Please use the attached Excel spreadsheets for your numerical answers. Submit narrative responses as Word documents using the "Form for Narrative Questions," or a similarly formatted RTF document. The questionnaire and answer sheets may be found on the NPS Archeology Program website at [www.nps.gov/archeology/SRC/INDEX.HTM](http://www.nps.gov/archeology/SRC/INDEX.HTM). Agencies may reformat the questionnaire to expedite the collection of information from their field offices; however, the numerical answer sheet must be submitted to us in its original form.*

**REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM  
ACTIVITIES--2007  
Narrative Questionnaire on 2007 Activities**

Agency Name Department of Energy

Date of Report March 24, 2008

**Section A. Agency Archeology Program Highlights**

A1. Please describe exemplary projects or programs conducted by your office in this reporting year, using the following categories in the title:

Public Education/Outreach	Information Management
Data Recovery	Resource Protection
Collections Management	Other
Archeological Overview/ Identification/Evaluation (including unanticipated discoveries)	

**Bonneville Power Administration**

**Information Management**

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) has been making a concerted effort over the past year to incorporate field data collection into a library and geographical information system (GIS) database that is easily retrievable.

BPA Cultural Resource (CR) Library and Database: The CR library consists of both a physical library and a project catalog database. The library consists of reports and archival documents detailing the CR project compliance record for BPA projects, including Fish & Wildlife (F&W) and transmission services (TS) projects. Library files and reports are securely filed in locked cabinets to which only the CR group has access.

The project catalog database links GIS data with project specific information and library materials. The database tracks project information, CR compliance activities, financial information, tribal consultation, contractor performance, etc. Files can be queried by state, county, TS line, township range section (TRS), CR project identification (ID) number, work order, etc. Brief project information can be viewed, or the project number can be used to retrieve a report from the library.

GIS Records: The GIS analyst for the BPA CR Program carries out a variety of functions that support the overall CR Program. This includes database development, data management, global positioning system (GPS) management, mapping, and spatial analysis.

CR survey data is collected for F&W mitigation projects and for TS projects to document BPA-related cultural resource work. Data collected by both BPA CR staff and outside contractors working on BPA projects is included in the BPA survey database. GIS CR survey data provide background information to assist in planning CR work for upcoming projects in a timely and cost effective manner, preventing unnecessary multiple surveys of any given area.

Historic property site data is also collected in a BPA GIS database. This electronic data is shared with appropriate state historic preservation officers (SHPOs) and used internally at BPA to document known CR sites in BPA project areas.

The CR Project Tracking database, survey database, and site database are all linked together via a BPA-assigned project number. This allows for the identification of reports so they can be quickly retrieved from the CR library.

The CR scope of work (SOW) template outlines specific CR survey and site requirements. Use of the CR SOW template ensures that contractor's GIS deliverables are received by BPA in a format that permits easy integration into BPA GIS databases.

## **Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL)**

### **Public Education/Outreach**

In fiscal year (FY) 2007 BNL conducted several presentations on Laboratory/site history and provided tours of the World War I Training Trenches. Audiences for these events included the American Nuclear Society – Long Island Chapter, a BNL Employee Lunchtime Tour, and other interested stakeholders.

An archaeological survey of the proposed site of National Synchrotron Light Source II (NSLS-II) was performed in December 2006. A total of 356 shovel test pits were dug over the 24-acre area. Based on the results of the survey, no further archaeological investigations were recommended.

No construction took place at Brookhaven National Laboratory during FY 2007 that would have impacted areas previously identified as potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, no construction activities were initiated other than in areas previously disturbed. All projects constructed or proposed for construction were reviewed for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. This review includes search of available information on historic or archaeologically significant items/area to ensure compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

## **Idaho Operations Office**

### **Resource Protection: Lava Tube Caves at the Idaho National Laboratory**

Idaho National Laboratory (INL) is a Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID) sponsored multi-purpose national laboratory encompassing nearly 890 square miles of high cold desert terrain in southeastern Idaho. Facilities at the Laboratory have been delivering excellence in science and technology in response to the nation's war time, energy, security, and scientific challenges for more than 50 years. Prior to development of the INL, this portion of the northeastern Snake River Plain was home to indigenous populations of Native Americans, who found ample resources to support a hunting and gathering lifestyle. Later immigrants also settled the high desert, seeking to convert the sagebrush grasslands to green pastures. Archaeological sites representing these varied activities and spanning at least 13,000 years of human use are numerous in the thousands of acres of undeveloped lands that surround INL facilities. Due to long-standing restrictions on public access, a majority remains virtually undisturbed by modern activities.

The basaltic landscape of the INL was formed by lava extruded from low shield volcanoes during the Pleistocene epoch. Over time the flows have accumulated, layer upon layer, with periods of quiescence marked by inter-bedded deposits of aeolian, lacustrine, and alluvial sediments. The basalt flows often contain lava tube systems, with entrances created by partial roof collapse. In some cases, the collapses have formed simple shelter caves with little subsurface extent, but long underground caverns are also common. Entrances range from high vertical drops to easy surface walk-in approaches. As of FY 2007 27 caves have been inventoried within the boundaries of the INL. Geologically, biologically, and culturally, each of these resources is unique. Though all were formed from the same basic set of geological forces, the formational and erosional history of each is different, resulting in a different physical setting in each case. These differing settings support diverse biological communities. Rattlesnakes, bats, packrats and other small mammals, carnivores, and raptors all find suitable homes in INL caves, and some caves contain deep paleontological and/or pollen records documenting change in biological communities through time.

Over time, humans have been drawn to INL caves seeking shelter, work areas, and unique opportunities for caching food and valuables. Some caves have also served unique roles in hunting, spirituality, religion, communication, and education. Sensitive archaeological materials (e.g. perishable artifacts, fragile deposits underfoot) and cultural features (e.g. pictographs, rock features, hearths) remain inside caves today as a fragile record of these many uses. These materials exhibit remarkable potential for providing information of value in understanding the past and as a result, the caves that contain them are eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Caves also retain enduring cultural significance to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and are a seemingly endless source of fascination to the general public. Scientific interest is also high, with ongoing research on the caves themselves, as well as their resident plant and animal populations.

The INL Cultural Resource Management (CRM) Office maintains an active program of management to protect these unique resources, according to a plan originally developed in 1994. In past years detailed documentation on individual INL caves has been assembled in support of a future Multiple Property Nomination to the National Register. In FY 2007 an information package for Aviators Cave was drafted and submitted to DOE-ID. Monitoring is also an important component of cave management, and each year a number of particularly sensitive caves are visited. In FY 2007 this included five caves (Prickly Cave, Aviators Cave, Middle Butte Cave, Moonshiners Cave, and Rattlesnake Cave). A sixth cave, Southeast Boundary Cave, originally documented more than 20 years ago, generated some excitement when it was re-discovered in a landscape ravaged by a late summer wildfire. In FY 2008 steps will be taken to identify other INL caves reported to occur in this burned area and initiate additional monitoring to determine if they have been harmed by the effects of fire or if they are in danger of adverse impacts from unauthorized visitation and vandalism. Finally, in FY 2007 a cave visitation protocol with appropriate protections for cultural resources was formalized for scientific researchers seeking access to INL's caves.

## **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

### **Public Education/Outreach**

In October 2007 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) staff archaeologist participated in *the Expanding Your Horizon's Career Fair for Young Girls*. We presented 2 poster-boards of archaeological activities and sites and a hands-on artifact display. The attending archaeologist answered many questions and provided a handout of websites for more information on careers in archaeology including college and university programs.

## **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

### **Resource Protection**

During this FY 2007, extensive repairs were made to two wire fences that serve to protect eight Ancestral Pueblo Traditional Cultural Properties in the Rendija Canyon Tract of the DOE Land Conveyance and Transfer Project. These fences had been damaged by Ponderosa Pine snags produced by the May 2000 Cerro Grande Fire and snags subsequently resulting from drought-related bark beetle activity. The fences will serve to protect these non-development areas when the Rendija tract is transferred in FY 2008 to the County of Los Alamos for potential economic development. In addition, more than a dozen large snags were cut and used for erosion control at three historic homesteads that are part of a proposed Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) National Register Historic District.

## **Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management**

### **Archeological Overview/ Identification/Evaluation**

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) prepared archeological overviews and historic context reports and conducted sample inventory surveys for two proposed rail alignments in Nevada, each approximately 300 miles long. These reports and surveys were prepared to support the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) evaluations for both the Yucca Mountain Nevada Rail and Repository Programs.

## **Richland Operations Office**

### **Evaluation**

The U.S. Department of Energy Richland Office undertook an extensive study in collaboration with the Yakama Nation to document and evaluate a National Register-eligible traditional cultural property. Over 100 archaeological sites were determined to be contributing to this property.

### **Resource Protection**

The U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office continued to develop management plans for traditional cultural properties and associated archaeological sites in collaboration with multiple tribes.

## **Sandia Site Office (SSO)**

### **Archeological Overview/Identification/Evaluation**

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

## **Savannah River Site**

### **Collections Management**

Through a cooperative agreement between the U.S. Department of Energy (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 manage archaeological resources at the Savannah River Site (SRS).

Research conducted by SRARP personnel was reported in nine professional articles and reports published during FY 2007. The SRARP staff presented research results in 23 papers and posters at professional conferences. The SRARP archaeological research included 15 field survey and excavation programs. Five grants were acquired to support both on-site and off-site research, and employees served as consultants on 18 projects in off-site cultural resources management (CRM) and research activities. The SRARP staff held 40 offices and appointments to committees in various educational, avocational, and professional organizations.

### **Southwestern Power Administration**

#### **Archeological Overview/ Identification/Evaluation (including unanticipated discoveries)**

Southwestern Power Administration (Southwestern) completed updates to its Class I Cultural Resource Inventory during 2007. One-hundred and thirty-seven sites and properties listed or eligible for National Register of Historic Places, within one-half mile of Southwestern's transmission line corridor and facilities, were identified on the updated Class I Inventory.

### **Section B. Participation, Education, and Outreach in the Agency Archeology Program**

**B4.** Describe exemplary partnership, education, or outreach program/product/activity projects conducted by your office in the reporting year, using the following categories in the titles:

- |                                 |                   |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Partnership                     | Volunteer Program |
| Interpretation/Visitor Activity | Publication       |
| Web Site Development            | Exhibit           |
| Outreach                        | Other             |

### **Idaho Operations Office**

#### **Partnership: Rocky Mountain Summer Science Adventure**

During FY 2007 the INL CRM Office continued its long-standing commitment to enhanced K-12 education through participation in local "Career Days" events, informational presentations to school groups, support to the INL Science and Engineering Expo, and occasional field tours. One highlight of FY 2007 involved ongoing INL CRM participation in a productive partnership with the Museum of Idaho and INL's Environmental Surveillance, Education and Research program, coordinated by S. M. Stoller Corp. For the second year in a row, these groups have cooperated in supporting the "Rocky Mountain Summer Science Adventure." This innovative field-oriented experience is designed to bring hands-on science education to middle and high school students and teachers. INL provides a perfect outdoor classroom for learning about southeastern Idaho's cold desert. During day-long field tours and on-site lectures on regional geology, paleontology, archaeology, and history, participants in the FY 2007 event were challenged to learn about and experience archaeological resources along with the natural environment in which they are found.

### **Interpretation: Rest area signs**

Public access to the INL is limited, and facilities like the Visitors Center at Experimental Breeder Reactor I (EBR-I ) (open seasonally from Memorial Day to Labor Day) and the Big Lost River rest area on U.S. Highway 20/26 (open year-round) provide important interfaces for education and information exchange. Records indicate that on average nearly 14,000 people visit the interpretive exhibits at EBR-I every year and the number of visitors to the nearby rest area may be even higher. In FY 2007 the INL CRM Office was instrumental in a multi-disciplinary partnership to install new interpretive signs during rehabilitation of the rest area. Participants included several INL organizations (e.g. Communications, Roads and Grounds, Cultural Resources), S. M. Stoller Corp., DOE-ID, Idaho Transportation Department, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The visually striking and informative signs developed by this partnership showcase INL's natural environment, long history of Native American occupation, historic endeavors related to homesteading and agricultural development, participation in activities during World War II, significant contributions to the history of nuclear science and technology, and current missions. Occupying a prominent position in the design of the new facilities, these signs are sure to attract the attention of many thousands of visitors, piquing interest and appreciation for the Laboratory and its cultural history.

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL)**

#### **Publication**

In November 2007 the LLNL employee publication *Newsline* debuted a new series of articles highlighting the archaeology and historic preservation program at LLNL. The quarterly articles are written by the staff archaeologist and include many photos of the resources to be found on LLNL property.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)**

#### **Interpretation/Visitor Activity**

Public tours were conducted for six hours on Friday and Saturday May 18-19, 2007, at the Mortandad Cave Kiva Complex in LANL Technical Area 5. This site complex, which is one of four elements of a proposed Ancestral Pueblo National Historic Landmark at LANL, represents a series of more than 40 cavate rooms excavated into the volcanic tuff cliff face and an equal number of associated talus slope rooms that were constructed and occupied around AD 1300 by the ancestors of the Pueblo of San Ildefonso. Approximately 1,000 members of the general public took advantage of the tours, which were conducted as part of formal participation by LANL in New Mexico Heritage Month sponsored by the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Division.

### **Richland Operations Office**

#### **Partnership**

The 100-K-R-4 archaeological excavation task was a multi-agency, multi-Tribal effort that brought representatives of the U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office and their contractors including Fluor Hanford Incorporated, Washington Closure Hanford, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Nez Perce Tribe, the Wanapum and the Yakama Nation together in the field to excavate 6 locations within the 100-KR-4 Pump and Treat Project boundary.

This project is a good example of the co-operative, collaborative working relationship sought by DOE on the national and local level as a matter of both policy and “on the ground” practice. It is “partnering” in the best sense of the word.

### **Savannah River Site**

#### **Heritage Education**

In the area of heritage education the SRARP continued its activities in FY 2007 with a full schedule of classroom education, public outreach, and on-site tours. Seventy-six presentations, displays, and tours were provided for schools, civic groups, and environmental and historical awareness day celebrations. The SRARP staff also taught eight anthropology courses at Augusta State University and the University of South Carolina, Columbia. In addition, the SRARP website, [www.srarp.org](http://www.srarp.org), has seen an increase in traffic this year. In FY 2007, there were over 10,000 visits to the website. The website continues to undergo improvements including information on current research and outreach events at SRARP.

### **Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management**

#### **Outreach**

OCRWM conducted several public meetings, including specially convened meetings for Native American tribes and organizations, to solicit comments and facilitate outreach regarding the Yucca Mountain Nevada Rail and Repository Programs. These meetings were held to encourage public participation in both the scoping process for the proposed NEPA evaluations and for the public review and comment of the draft environmental impact statements. Cultural resource management along the proposed rail alignments and within the repository area was highlighted in these meetings.

**B5.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about participation, education, and outreach (B1- B3).

### **Idaho Operations Office**

Outreach and education are very important elements in the INL CRM program, and efforts are oriented toward the general public, INL employees, and important stakeholders such as the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. Tools that facilitate communication with all of these groups include yearly stakeholder outreach meetings, annual activity reports, presentations, newspaper articles and interviews, periodic tours, monthly meetings with Tribal representatives, and various INL-specific media outlets such as the INL Speakers Bureau, the INL external web page ([www.inl.gov](http://www.inl.gov)) and internal intranet, INL site access training, and iNotes, an email-based communication tool. Informative exhibits at the Experimental Breeder Reactor I Visitors Center and Big Lost River rest area are also important public outreach tools.

Direct communication is implemented through the annual stakeholder meetings, tours, and periodic presentations to local schools and civic groups and at professional conferences. These efforts are especially effective, educational, and entertaining for all. In FY 2007 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, INL rock structures, and Native American resources and sensitivities. Several tours provided lively hands-on experiences for several hundred people in celebration of Idaho Archaeology and Historic Preservation Month, to enhance a summer science camp experience (see B4, above), and to provide crucial orientation and background for INL visitors, employees, and stakeholders. For many years local community organizations, educational institutions, the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, and a variety of professional organizations such as the Idaho Professional Archaeological Council, Idaho Archaeological Society, Idaho Historic Sites Review Board, Bonneville County Historical Society, Museum of Idaho, Yellowstone Business Partnership, Idaho Falls Historic Preservation Commission, Preservation Action Board, Idaho State University, and the Bureau of Land Management Resource Advisory Council have also benefitted from the energies and expertise of INL CRM Office staff.

One significant partnership is highlighted in B4 above. The second significant cooperative effort fostered in FY 2007 was part of an ongoing program based on an “Agreement in Principle” between DOE-ID and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. Tribal and INL CRM personnel under this program jointly conduct many general and project-specific activities (e.g. 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, general planning and feedback on INL project implementation). In FY 2007 INL CRM staff also assisted in the identification and structural evaluation of historic buildings located at the Fort Hall Reservation and helped tribal partners identify grant opportunities to restore and reuse a select few of them. All of the joint efforts under the Agreement in Principle are coordinated through the INL “Cultural Resources Working Group,” a partnership between DOE-ID, the INL CRM Office, and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. The high level of interaction encouraged by this group fosters an atmosphere of mutual respect that is conducive to open communication and helps to incorporate tribal concerns into land and cultural resource management decisions.

### **Section C. Archeological Overviews**

C2. If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological overviews (C1).

#### **Idaho Operations Office**

Every year the INL CRM Office reviews and, when necessary, updates the “INL Cultural Resource Management Plan” (DOE/ID-10997) based on feedback from DOE-ID, the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, and stakeholders. In FY 2007 Revision 2 of this document was completed.

#### **Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management**

During 2007 OCRWM prepared archeological overviews and historic context reports and conducted sample inventory surveys necessary to develop the environmental impact statements for both the Yucca Mountain Nevada Rail and the Yucca Mountain Repository programs.

### **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, 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. An archeological site is defined as the location of a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity.

**D7.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological identification and evaluation (D1-D9).

### **Brookhaven National Laboratory**

An archaeological survey of the proposed site of National Synchrotron Light Source II (NSLS-II) was performed in December 2006. A total of 356 shovel test pits were dug over the 24-acre area. Based on the results of the survey, no further archaeological investigations were recommended.

In FY 2007, the Department of Energy funded/sponsored actions which were undertaken/initiated at Brookhaven National Laboratory. Approximately 91 of these actions were evaluated in accordance with NEPA. One component of the NEPA review process is to assess an action's potential to impact resources protected under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), and Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). This assessment was completed for all actions under consideration.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

The INL is an active facility where thousands of work orders for projects ranging from lawn mowing to new facility construction are processed each year. A comprehensive "INL Cultural Resource Management Plan" outlines a tailored process of assessing and mitigating adverse impacts to archaeological resources as a consequence of all activities, large or small. A programmatic agreement with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and an Agreement in Principle with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes form the basic foundation for this plan. As of FY 2007, approximately 9% of the 890-square mile area of INL has been surveyed, and just over 2,400 archaeological resources have been documented. Although none of these resources have been nominated to the National Register, many are certainly eligible. To date, only one INL property, the Experimental Breeder Reactor I National Historic Landmark, has been listed on the National Register. However, the INL CRM Office maintains an active program to collect information that will support future nominations. In FY 2007 Aviators Cave was the focus of these efforts.

The totals reported in this section are derived from two types of survey: those related to specific INL projects (Section 106: 33 projects) and those related to INL CRM Office research interests (Section 110: 4 projects). The results of each type of survey are highlighted separately in the discussions to follow.

In FY 2007 33 INL projects were screened for potential impacts to archaeological resources. In most of these cases archival information indicated that no properties would be affected by the activities proposed. In 13 cases field investigations ranging from 1 – 400 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 561 acres were intensively examined during these surveys, and a wide variety of National Register-eligible cultural

resources were identified or re-identified and recommended for avoidance or other protective measures during project implementation. None of these resources were impacted by the proposed activities.

The largest project-related field survey of FY 2007 was completed in a relatively remote, undeveloped area to assess the potential impacts of a proposed training range for unmanned ground vehicles. Numerous archaeological sites (16 total) were identified in this 400-acre project area, including several turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century homesteads and a variety of other resources representing Native American hunting and gathering. The INL CRM Office continues to work with project managers to ensure that these sensitive sites are not adversely impacted by the proposed off-road activities of the robots. Unrelenting drought conditions in eastern Idaho may have contributed to the severity of a large 9,500 acre range fire on the INL in FY 2007. In a second sizeable survey project, approximately 60 acres of fire-breaks were surveyed within and around the burned area, and ten sensitive archaeological sites were identified. Work to complete this assessment of the impacts of fire-fighting efforts and protect the identified resources during future rehabilitation and revegetation will continue into FY 2008. Several smaller project surveys less than 28 acres in size also contribute to the totals reported in this section. Proposed activities included road improvements, cellular towers, various test pads, parking lot expansions, and miscellaneous cleanup activities. No sensitive archaeological resources were threatened by these smaller undertakings.

Significant survey efforts were also conducted in FY 2007 to further DOE-ID obligations under Section 110 of the NHPA to develop a broad understanding of all INL archaeological resources, not only those located in active project areas. The FY 2007 Section 110 surveys were focused on historic trails, late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century snow fences, historic residential sites, and previously unsurveyed lands along the Big Lost River. In keeping with INL CRM Office goals under outreach and education, many of these efforts involved students and/or University researchers in the recording of 52 historic and prehistoric archaeological resources. Shoshone-Bannock tribal involvement was also high.

The INL now occupies what was certainly a well-traveled, if not strategic, location between burgeoning towns along the Snake River to the south and mining boom towns in the mountains to the north during the period of late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century settlement. The Big Lost River on and near the INL also served as a critical source of water for thirsty stages, freighters, and settlers, human and animal alike. Many of the trails created during this period are still identifiable on INL lands. One important trail, Goodale's Cutoff, which is a northern spur of the Oregon Trail, has been nominated to the National Register by a neighboring federal agency (Bureau of Land Management). Others like the "Lost River Road" and "Old Road" may also be eligible. As part of an ongoing evaluation of the significance and integrity of INL historic trails, in FY 2007 INL CRM staff traveled approximately 105 miles of eight historic INL trails, recording five new historic archaeological sites and documenting features of the trails themselves (e.g., swales, ruts, rock scrapes, visible artifacts, impacts, overall conditions).

Section 110 research and survey was also focused on four historic snow fences located on the INL in FY 2007. These unique rock structures assume a typical form: locally available basalt rocks, sometimes shaped, are dry laid in multiple courses up to a height of nearly two meters. Wooden lathe fencing appears to have been stretched between tall wooden posts extending from the top of the rock walls, making them even taller. The snow fences were constructed in natural

low-lying areas that were often deepened through artificial means and oriented perpendicular to prevailing winds. They were effective in trapping snow that melted in the springtime to serve as a source of water for local ranchers, effectively extending the grazing season in this naturally dry cold desert. Although results are preliminary, it appears that many of these unique rock features were designed and constructed in the 1930s by Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) workers based at a camp in Midway, now known as Atomic City. Studies are ongoing to assemble more information on these and other CCC efforts in the region.

Archival and field investigation of INL's historic archaeological sites (e.g. homesteads, campsites, trash dumps and scatters) also continued in the reporting year. Among the early records and scattered artifacts, INL CRM staff collected information that fills gaps in our understanding of the lives of some of INL's earliest historic residents. Throughout the year, 15 previously recorded sites were re-visited, and four new resources were recorded. This ongoing effort is refining the classification of these resources, leading ultimately to more reliable National Register evaluations.

A significant portion of INL CRM Office Section 110 effort is dedicated to a multi-year project exploring and documenting human lacustrine and riverine adaptations on the Eastern Snake River Plain. In FY 2007 field surveys were focused on a 12 km stretch of the Big Lost River where a large number of prehistoric and historic archaeological resources (38 total) spanning some 12,500 years were recorded. In FY 2009 the results of this long-term project will be compiled into a final report.

The INL CRM Office implements a yearly program of cultural resource monitoring that includes many archaeological resources. In FY 2007 35 archaeological localities were revisited including two locations of heightened Shoshone-Bannock tribal sensitivity, four caves, three butte/craters, twelve prehistoric sites, two historic stage stations, nine historic homesteads, a portion of Goodale's Cutoff of the Oregon Trail, a portion of historic trail T-16, and one World War II dump. Historic architectural properties, including buildings from World War II and the Experimental Breeder Reactor-I National Historic Landmark, and several active INL project areas were also monitored in FY 2007.

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

#### **Archaeological Sites Assessed for Condition**

The Carnegie Town Site (CA-SJO-173H) at Site 300 was observed for post-Annual Prescribed Burn condition. As no pre-burn assessment had been done, documentation was limited to photos of particular artifacts to establish a baseline. Once the proposed Programmatic Agreement is approved, this pre- and post-burn activity will become an annual requirement.

### **Office of Legacy Management (LM)**

In September 2007 a DOE-subcontracted archaeologist monitored road maintenance work at DOE's Salmon, Mississippi, site in an area where the road intersected cultural resource Site 22LM584. No archaeological resources were identified during maintenance operations.

## **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

(D2) The number of new field studies conducted this year (FY 2007) at LANL was one. Additionally, six new building surveys were conducted this fiscal year. However, 32 actual projects were worked on that utilized or required some field verification of previous survey information (archaeological and historic building). One new field study was conducted by LANL on Santo Domingo Pueblo land during this fiscal year.

(D3) The number of new acres on LANL land inventoried during FY 2007 was 4. However, 35.7 acres were surveyed outside the boundaries of LANL on Santo Domingo Pueblo land.

(D4) Four new archaeological sites were identified during FY 2007. No new historic buildings were identified this year.

(D5) Fifteen archaeological sites and zero historic buildings were determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in concurrence with the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer.

(D6) Condition assessments were conducted at 37 sites. Fences at eight of these sites were repaired.

(D11) Two archaeological sites were determined ineligible for the NRHP in concurrence with the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer.

## **Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office**

(D1) The Department of Energy's Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office received concurrence from the Ohio Historic Preservation Office in June 2007 on the South Groundwater Extraction and Monitoring Wells Project at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, stating that no historic properties would be affected by the project.

## **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 checking maps and records to ensure that no resources are located in the area of potential effect. Generally, this screening is coordinated through NEPA review of proposed actions. There are no archaeological sites located on DOE-fee owned lands; there are NHPA-eligible structures and buildings located on these lands.

## **Section E. Archeological Data Recovery Projects**

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

**E3.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological data recovery projects (E1-E2).

### **Idaho Operations Office**

Under INL-wide Stop Work Authorities INL employees are authorized to stop work at all DOE-ID, contractor, and/or subcontractor operations if they believe the work poses an imminent danger to human health and safety, or the environment, including irreplaceable cultural resources. Procedures are in place to make immediate notifications to appropriate parties (INL CRM Office, 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 cultural materials were unexpectedly encountered at the INL in FY 2007.

### **Section F. Unanticipated Archeological Discoveries**

This section provides data on archeological sites that were discovered unexpectedly subsequent to agency completion of the NHPA Section 106 review for undertakings conducted on federal and non-federal land and performed or funded by agency or non-agency entities in the reporting year. Include unanticipated discoveries in the reporting year that the archeological site is discovered.

**F3.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about unanticipated archeological discoveries (F1-F2).

Nothing to report.

### **Section G. Archeological Information Management**

**G1.** Describe how the agency is maintaining and improving the management of records for collections, permits, sites, and inventory. Include a description of any data-sharing efforts between your office and other organizations. If there is no change from previous years, indicate no change.

### **Bonneville Power Administration**

The BPA currently has an agreement with the Washington State Historic Preservation Office for sharing site and survey data from Washington State. See response in Section A1 for discussion of digital information storage.

### **Brookhaven National Laboratory**

The document *Cultural Resources Management Methods and Procedures for BNL*, which defines program protocol and standards, was developed in 2003. Establishing a formal collections management/preservation policy is identified as a goal in the BNL Cultural Resources Management Plan.

All of the Camp Upton World War I Training Trenches have been surveyed and mapped. The Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates corresponding to the boundaries encompassing each trench unit

have been input into the BNL digital map system. The GPS coordinates corresponding to the boundaries of the two archeological sites have also been input into the BNL digital map system

### **Fermi Site Office**

No change.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

No change.

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

#### **Information Management**

During 2007 over 300 site and survey records, collected during record searches performed for previous year identification and evaluation efforts, were scanned to portable digital file (PDF) format and uploaded to a secure, digital database. The records are searchable by site number and survey report title, among other options, and the site is password restricted to individuals with authorization to view the files.

#### **Digital Mapping**

Both the main lab site and the remote explosives test site (Site 300) have been mapped in a geographic information system (GIS) to show NRHP-eligible site locations, known – but ineligible – site locations, and sensitivity depths.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

During FY 2007 LANL's archaeological site spatial and tabular databases have been joined. This merger greatly improves the accessibility and maintenance characteristics of the site information database. However, this combined database is still in the verification stage.

### **Nevada Site Office**

No change.

### **Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management**

No change

### **Office of Legacy Management**

No change.

### **Pacific Northwest Site Office**

The Pacific Northwest Site Office utilizes ArcGIS and ACCESS to manage digital and electronic data associated with archeological sites located on agency lands. All paper records are maintained in a secure manner.

### **Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant**

No change.

### **Pantex Site Office**

No change.

### **Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant**

No change.

### **Richland Operation Office**

No change.

### **Sandia Site Office**

No change. Records are managed by submittal to the State and also through the records management of Prime Management and Operations Contractors, such as Lockheed Martin/Sandia Corporation records management for the Sandia National Laboratories. Information is shared with other agencies as needed for management of properties on State lands, and Federal lands owned or managed by the USDA National Forest (Cibola), the United States Air Force, or the United States Navy. Approximately 80% of the archeological resources site locations have been digitally mapped.

### **Savannah River Site**

The Savannah River Archaeological Research Program (SRARP) continues to develop and maintain electronic data bases to capture site location, artifacts collected, and file information for each of the 1,889 identified SRS archaeological sites and 35 SRS cemetery locations. The SRARP also reviews all SRS Site-Use permits to ensure that all planned ground disturbing activities meet archaeological regulatory requirements.

### **Southwestern Power Administration**

Southwestern is maintaining and improving the management of records by implementing the practices mandated in DOE O 243.1, *Records Management Program*, and DOE O 243.2, *Vital Records*, and by following protocol defined in the agency's Environmental Management System.

### **Western Area Power Administration**

No change.

**G5.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological information management (G2-G4).

Information provided below is from the individual DOE sites that provided a response. Paducah and Portsmouth indicated in the numerical response that no sites (including digitally mapped sites) have been entered into an automated system.

### **Bonneville Power Administration**

Because BPA is not a land managing agency it does not generally own sites. Therefore, not applicable (N.A.) was entered for questions G2 and G3. However, BPA is developing a GIS database of the sites recorded during the course of complying with section 106.

On question G4 all of the surveys that were conducted in house and some of the contracted surveys have been entered into GIS. However, there are some contracted surveys conducted in 2007 that have not been entered into GIS yet. Out of 78 surveys conducted, 58 have been entered into GIS.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

The INL CRM Office serves as the secure repository for all cultural resource information gathered from the INL. Up-to-date, accurate data on the distribution, nature, and condition of all known INL cultural resources and cultural resource surveys are critical to effective management.

Whenever ground-disturbing projects or building modifications are proposed at the INL, these archives are consulted. In FY 2007 the INL CRM Office continued to utilize the INL "Data Management Tool," a fully integrated automatic system for accessing and archiving information on INL cultural resources. This system takes advantage of existing electronic data (Intermountain Antiquities Computer System site forms, Idaho Historic Sites forms, predictive modeling database) and spatial information (Geographical Information System coverages, digitized site locations, global positioning system coordinates), integrating all into a single user interface using Microsoft Access software. Approximately 60 % of the total inventory of INL cultural resources and archaeological surveys is accessible through this integrated system, and additional information is added every year.

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

Sixty percent of the archeological sites identified have been entered into an automated system, including digitally mapped sites and digitally mapped site locations.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

All of the archeological sites identified have been entered into an automated system, including digitally mapped sites and digitally mapped site locations.

(G2) 100 percent of LANL's data is in a digital database; however, site forms are not automatically generated from this database.

(G3) 100 percent of LANL's archaeological sites have been mapped into the spatial database. However, 83 percent of the sites have Global Positioning System locations, whereas the remaining 17 percent have locations digitized from United States Geological Survey (USGS) and other paper maps.

### **Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management**

All of the archeological sites identified have been entered into an automated system, including digitally mapped sites and digitally mapped site locations.

### **Pacific Northwest Site Office**

Regarding archeological information management, all of the archeological sites have been entered into an automated system, including digitally mapped sites and digitally mapped site locations.

### **Richland Operation Office**

All of the archeological sites identified have been entered into an automated system, including digitally mapped sites and digitally mapped site locations.

### **Sandia Site Office**

Sandia National Laboratories maintains a mapping application for sites in or near areas the lab uses; the application includes sites on the Cibola National Forest land withdrawn for DOE use in New Mexico. Approximately 80% of archeological information site location has been digitally mapped.

### **Savannah River Site**

Fifty per cent of the archeological sites have been entered into an automated system. Thirty per cent of the digitally mapped sites have been entered. One hundred percent of the digitally mapped site locations have been entered.

## **Section H. Archeological Collections Management**

**H6.** Does the agency have a policy for management and preservation of archeological collections? What is the administrative or guideline citation for this policy? When was the policy last revised?

### **Brookhaven National Laboratory**

No. Establishing a formal collections management/preservation policy is identified as a goal in the BNL Cultural Resources Management Plan.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

U.S. Department of Energy Policy 141.1, approved May 2, 2001, outlines broad responsibilities for cultural resource management, including 36 CFR Part 79: Curation of Federally Owned and Administered Archeological Collections. The INL Cultural Resource Management Plan (DOE/ID-10997) outlines policies specific to DOE-ID. A 2003 Memorandum of Understanding between DOE-ID and the Idaho Museum of Natural History provides specific guidance for collections management.

## **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

The LLNL archaeologist is responsible for maintaining the collections.

## **Office of Legacy Management**

DOE adheres to the regulations codified at 36 CFR part 79.

## **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

In accordance with 36 CFR part 79, LANL archaeological collections are curated at an approved repository (the Museum of New Mexico, Laboratory of Anthropology at Santa Fe). A formal curation agreement between DOE's Los Alamos Site Office (LASO) and the Museum of New Mexico is in progress.

## **Nevada Site Office**

Policies for the management and preservation of the National Nuclear Security Administration/Nevada Test Site (NNSA/NSO) collections have been in place since 1980 and are revised periodically. During 2001 the policies were updated to include a Safety Plan for the NNSA/NSO curation facility. In 2003 the NNSA/NSO collections were moved to a new curation facility requiring new policies and procedures to be implemented. In FY 2003 new curation procedures were written. The document outlines appropriate procedures for the accession and deaccession, processing, inventorying, and care of the archaeological collections and associated records from the NTS and off-site areas which are under the federal jurisdiction of the NNSA/NSO. In FY 2004 the curation procedures were updated providing general guidelines to follow in order to comply with 36 CFR Part 79. These revisions included a new form for loaning artifacts from the NNSA/NSO collections. In FY 2006 the focus of work will be the on-going process of organizing the records and artifact materials. This will include moving the project files into the new fireproof cabinets purchased during 2004 and organizing the artifact material on the shelving units according to site provenience. In FY 2007 most of the cardboard boxes holding the artifacts have been replaced with plastic archival boxes. These type of boxes are more protective of the artifact collection in regards to accidents, such as water damage, and are less likely to deteriorate as quickly from handling and age. About 900 of the cardboard boxes, representing approximately 90 percent of the collection, have been replaced.

Also, during this fiscal year most of the artifact collection was reorganized on the shelving by site. Previously they were grouped according to artifact types. Artifacts given to the NNSA/NSO from the Yucca Mountain program were inventoried. These artifacts are from sites that fall outside the proposed final boundary for the Yucca Mountain area and on the NTS. These artifacts are to be incorporated into the NNSA/NSO collection. Another objective for this fiscal year was to move project files to fire proof cabinets in the archival records room. The task was completed, and the files have been sequentially ordered according to project number. In the process of transferring the files to the cabinets they were inspected for out-of-date documents, non-project documents, or duplicate documents. These documents were removed from the files and discarded.

Correspondence and other miscellaneous documents were also reviewed, and those pertaining to

projects were incorporated into the project files. Original copies of technical reports in the records room have also been transferred to the fire proof cabinets.

Photographs and negatives, as well as the photo log records, from various projects were organized into three-ring binders. Scanning of individual site records, numbering 2,000, to pdf format was also implemented. About 15 percent of the site files have been scanned.

### **Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management**

Management and preservation of archeological collections are clarified in Section H8, below.

### **Pacific Northwest Site Office**

This site does not have any collections; a policy has been developed which is outlined in the newly drafted cultural resources management plan for the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory site.

### **Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office**

Site-specific procedure, National Historic Preservation Act Program Description, Rev. 1, was last updated April 2006. The procedure references requirements under NHPA and 36 CFR part 79. A site-wide Cultural Resources Management Plan has not yet been completed.

### **Richland Operations Office**

The policy was established in 1987 to maintain collections onsite. Formal curation plans were integrated into the 2003 Hanford Cultural Resources Management Plan.

### **Sandia Site Office**

No policy currently in place.

### **Savannah River Site**

Yes. At the Savannah River Site DOE uses the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program Guide to Curation Procedures, 1991.

**H7.** A spreadsheet is attached for listing the museums/repositories that are curating agency collections. Indicate which museums/repositories were inspected/visited during this reporting year.

### **Brookhaven National Laboratory**

The Brookhaven Graphite Research Reactor (BGRR) records are presently stored at the BGRR Project site. Upon completion of the BGRR decommissioning project these records will be transferred to the National Archives.

The Department of Energy contracted operator of Brookhaven National Laboratory maintains a Camp Upton Historical Collection that primarily includes a variety of items donated to the collection, along

with materials found on site (2,121 items). This collection provides insight and interpretive information regarding the history of the property during its operation as WWI and WWII Camp Upton.

The DOE contractor also maintains a collection of artifacts recovered from two archeological evaluations of 19<sup>th</sup> century house sites in 2004 (8,811 items) and equipment artifacts associated with the BGRR.

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

LLNL's archaeological collections, 90% of which are labeled and catalogued in accordance with 36 CFR part 79, have been moved to LLNL's on-site Laboratory Archives and Research Center (ARC) for long-term storage.

### **Office of Legacy Management**

The Ohio Historical Society Archives/Library curates the artifacts collected from the Fernald, Ohio, processing site. DOE did not inspect the archives during FY 2007.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

Museum of New Mexico, Laboratory of Anthropology at Santa Fe, New Mexico is the one non-federal museum/repository curating collections from LANL. This museum was visited during FY 2007.

**H8.** If needed, clarify responses to questions above about archeological collections management (H1-H5).

### **Bonneville Power Administration**

Our cultural resource staff is currently working to identify collections where BPA has ownership or a responsibility to curate collections. These collections are located in at least three repositories in Washington and Oregon. The number of items/lots or cubic feet that BPA has curated is currently unknown.

### **Nevada Site Office**

The artifacts stored in the NNSA/NSO artifact repository are stored in plastic archival boxes that hold 1.5 ft<sup>3</sup> of materials. To obtain the total cubic feet, the number of boxes was counted and then multiplied by 1.5. The cubic footage of groundstone located on open shelving was estimated by estimating that two large pieces of groundstone could fit into each of the previously defined boxes.

### **Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management**

In 2007 OCRWM tasked the Desert Research Institute (DRI), Nevada System of Higher Education, to manage and preserve its collections, as they have since ca. 1980. Collections are maintained in a

curation facility at the DRI, in accordance with standards and practices set forth in 36 CFR Part 79. These practices include acid-free packaging; indelible labeling of all materials; and a dedicated, climate-controlled and secure storage facility.

### **Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office**

(H1B and H3) The Portsmouth site has photographs and only minimal artifact fragments in storage on-site, collected during the site's Phase I Archaeological Survey conducted in 1996-1997. Total number of records is less than one linear feet.

### **Savannah River Site**

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 is on display at local/regional museums.

## **Section I. Funding of Archeological Resource Management Programs**

**I3.** Does the agency have information on economic benefits from archeology and heritage tourism? If so, describe.

### **Brookhaven National Laboratory**

Approximately 20 visitors and 45 employees toured the Camp Upton trenches as part of small group visits and Employee Lunchtime Tours.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

Public access to the INL is restricted due to the classified nature of much of the research conducted there. As a result, heritage tourism is presently not a viable concept. Recreational use is only authorized for special activities such as Oregon Trail reenactments and Idaho Archaeology and Historic Preservation Month events or within specified areas such as the Experimental Breeder Reactor I Visitors Center and at the Big Lost River rest area. In spite of security restrictions, interest in INL cultural resources remains high. Approximately 14,000 people visit the EBR-I facility between Memorial Day and Labor Day every year, and the annual public archaeology tours remain extremely popular. In FY 2007 over 400 people expressed interest in a tour that was limited to 50 participants. In recognition of this interest, a second tour was conducted. In addition, educational opportunities for the public have been enhanced by the installation of new interpretive signs, including cultural resource information, at the public rest area located on the banks of the Big Lost River along U.S. Highway 20/26 within the INL. The INL CRM Office continues to explore additional ways of encouraging public interest in INL cultural resources while staying within established security parameters.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

No. However, in response to a recent DOE Headquarters request, LASO has developed a list of heritage tourism assets at LANL, including significant archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures.

**I4.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about funding for archeological resource management programs (I1-I2).

### **Idaho Operations Office**

The totals listed above do not reflect the entire range of historic preservation activities at the INL. Missing from the totals are significant recent efforts 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. The amount listed in I1 is limited to funds that supported the general archaeological activities reported in this questionnaire (i.e., archive maintenance, reporting, Section 110 activities, tribal interactions). Funding associated with the 33 individual project reviews and associated field surveys completed in FY 2007 is reported in I2.

**THE REMAINDER OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE (Sections J-L) IS TO BE COMPLETED BY AGENCIES THAT MANAGE FEDERAL OR INDIAN LAND.**

### **Section J. Archeological Resource Base on Federal and Indian Lands**

These questions call for the most accurate counts or estimates possible for all prior years, plus the reporting year.

**J6.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about the archeological resource on Federal or Indian land (J1-10).

### **Brookhaven National Laboratory**

In the 1970s archeological surveys were conducted on approximately 500 acres of BNL property. In 2001 approximately 69 acres were surveyed, and in FY 2002, approximately 2,400 acres in the non-developed portion of the site were inventoried as part of the World War I features assessment project. In 2003 an archeological survey was performed on 6 acres of a designated project site. In 2004 archeological evaluations of two sites, preliminarily identified in 2002/2003, were conducted on a total of approximately 3 acres.

Approximately 1,250 acres in the developed portion of the BNL site were inventoried as part of completing the *Architectural Inventory of the Brookhaven National Laboratory* in FY 2001. To date the total acreage surveyed/inventoried approximately 4,249 acres out of 5,300 acres of total BNL property. To date, the total number of recorded archeological sites (identified below) is five:

1. World War I Camp Upton Training Trenches (Determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places)
2. Brookhaven Graphite Research Reactor Complex (Determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places)

3. High Flux Beam Reactor Complex (Determined to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places)
4. W. J. Weeks House site
5. Weeks–Campbell House Site

A total of 153 buildings were evaluated using the NHPA Section 106 review process and determined not to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, and that proposed demolition would have no effect on historic resources. The New York State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) was included in the Section 106 processes for the affected buildings.

### **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 13,425 of the acres reported in J1 were examined using these less intensive methods. Within the area surveyed on the INL (approximately 9 % of the total area), 2,402 historic and prehistoric archaeological sites have been identified to date. A simple predictive model developed to facilitate long term land use planning at the INL indicates that thousands more are present in unsurveyed areas.

The 890-square mile Idaho National Laboratory contains thousands of prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, but none of these sites have been formally nominated to the National Register. However, many are certainly eligible and until proven otherwise through intensive data collection, all are treated as if they are eligible. In past years four potentially eligible prehistoric archaeological sites located within the direct impact zones for proposed INL projects have been tested and formally determined, through documented consultation with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, to be ineligible for nomination. As part of an ongoing approach to cave management, the INL CRM Office has begun to assemble documentation packages to support a future Multiple Property Nomination. In FY 2007 Aviators Cave, a lava tube with extensive late Holocene archaeological deposits and contemporary tribal significance, was the focus of these efforts.

### **Office of Legacy Management**

(J1-10). In previous years, DOE-LM has reported one archaeological site (the Grand Junction Office Historic District) on agency-managed land that contributed to a district eligible for listing on the NRHP. This agency-managed land was transferred to several private entities between 1999 and 2001 and is no longer managed by DOE-LM.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

(J1) Four new acres were surveyed during FY 2007 on DOE managed land at LANL. The total acreage surveyed for cultural resources was recalculated and corrected due to a correction in the areas-surveyed data and changes in the DOE boundary. One tract of land was transferred to Los Alamos County during FY 2007. Therefore, the total acres surveyed using the new DOE boundary and updated areas surveyed data is 23,134, less than reported for FY 2006.

(J4) 450 archaeological sites and 152 historic buildings have been determined eligible for the NRHP.

(J5) 74 archaeological sites and 157 historic buildings have been determined ineligible for the NRHP.

(J7) LANL does not have any archaeological sites listed on the NRHP; however, LANL has 32 archaeological sites listed on the New Mexico State Register of Cultural Properties. In addition, one building is also listed on the State Register.

### **Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office**

(J5) 38 sites were surveyed. One site, identified under the Phase I Archaeological Survey (1997) and further studied in the Phase II Archaeological Testing at Site 33PK210 (July 2003), extended beyond the Federal property. The Ohio Historic Preservation Office could not concur that sufficient testing had been performed on the private property to conclude that the entire site did not meet criteria for National Register eligibility.

### **Sandia Site Office**

Approximately 2,841 acres of DOE-owned lands are used by Sandia National Laboratories in the State of New Mexico. This property has been 100% inventoried for the presence of archaeological sites. There are no known archaeological sites on this property.

## **Section K. Permits for Archeological Investigations**

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

**K4.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological permitting (K1-3).

### **Idaho Operations Office**

Most archaeological investigations on the INL are 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 Identification and Evaluation (48 Federal Register 190) for all work. Investigations by outsiders are rare and always coordinated through the INL CRM Office. A simple permitting system has been established to track work of this nature and ensure that it meets legal requirements. In FY 2007 no permits were issued to outside subcontractors for archaeological work on the INL and no permits remained outstanding.

Shoshone-Bannock tribal members have been important partners in cultural resource management at the INL for more than 14 years, and their interests in INL archaeological resources and cultural resource 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 2007 information was provided on all

33 of the INL projects submitted for cultural review. The designated tribal point of contact also receives quarterly reports on INL CRM Office activities, is informed of upcoming field projects, and coordinates tribal participation in monthly working group meetings and monitoring of sensitive cultural areas. Invitations to comment on, visit, observe, and/or assist in any of the described activities are implicit in all communications, and tribal members often provide critical assistance in the field. If necessary under law or if requested by the Tribes, formal consultation may follow at any time. The holistic view of cultural resources and active tribal involvement incorporated into INL CRM activities are outstanding examples of DOE-ID's proactive efforts to establish a meaningful working relationship with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

(K3) Four archaeological survey reports were completed and sent to Native American Indian Tribes for consultation. One report concerning historic buildings was also completed during FY 2007.

### **Savannah River Site**

In FY 2007 all archaeological activities at SRS were conducted by SRARP personnel under provisions of the existing DOE/SCIAA cooperative agreement that also incorporates SRS permitting guidance.

## **Section L. Archeological Cultural Resource Law Enforcement**

Include information about archeological resources crimes in violation of ARPA, the Antiquities Act, Federal property protection laws, and other statues and regulations protecting archeological resources. This section should be completed with the help of law enforcement. Use the attached LOOT form or send copies of equivalent information from the case files for each citation; misdemeanor and felony conviction; and civil penalty completed in the reporting year.

**L20.** If needed, clarify responses to questions about archeological law enforcement (L1-19).

### **Idaho Operations Office**

An active security force monitors the INL through ground patrols and security surveillance of public points of access. Trespassers are removed immediately and, when appropriate, prosecuted. Largely as a result of these restrictions, many archaeological sites on the INL display remarkable integrity and are virtually undisturbed. No violations were prosecuted in FY 2007.

### **Pacific Northwest Site Office**

Due to close proximity of the Hanford Site to the newly created Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) Site, the archeological resources located on lands managed by the Pacific Northwest Site Office receive law enforcement support and protection from the Hanford Patrol and PNNL security. Additionally, signs, fences, and vehicle barriers are in place to deter unauthorized access to archeological resources.

### **Richland Operations Office**

During routine site monitoring the U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Officer observed looting impacts to 45BN157. A damage assessment was completed. Legal action was not taken because the looting was documented after the incident had occurred and no perpetrators were identified.

### **Savannah River Site**

SRS is not open to the general public. Access to SRS is controlled by on-site security personnel. Access is generally restricted to SRS employees and contractor personnel. Visitors to the site are allowed under certain circumstances, but visitors are generally badged and escorted by SRS personnel. The SRS boundary is also fenced or posted to limit inadvertent trespassing. DOE and SRARP personnel actively work with on-site security forces and adjacent landowners to monitor unauthorized access activities and report/respond to any instances of archaeological looting.

**L21.** Describe effective projects, methods, and techniques the agency has used to improve archeological protection at archeological sites under its management control. Examples include development of incident reporting systems, the use of remote sensing equipment for site monitoring, and interagency cooperation by law enforcement, justice, and cultural resources staff.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

Efforts to enhance cultural resource protection at the INL are ongoing and are primarily focused on training and education. All INL employees (> 5,000 in FY 2007) are reminded of prohibitions on unauthorized disturbance of archaeological sites during yearly, on-line refresher courses covering Laboratory access and security. Additionally, more intensive cultural resource awareness training is targeted to certain INL employee populations every year (e.g. security, emergency response, environmental, fieldworkers, summer interns). Tours of archaeological and historic architectural sites also include an educational component intended to increase visitors' knowledge of and appreciation for the physical context of cultural resource sites and to heighten their sense of ownership of, and pride in, such sites.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

DOE provides funding to Bandelier National Monument [National Park Service (NPS)] to patrol outlying areas of LANL for ARPA violations.

### **Richland Operations Office**

The U. S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office conducts annual monitoring of archaeological sites known to be threatened by looters and/or recreationalists. Additionally in FY 07, the agency increased the number of "No Trespassing" signs and closed off a road to protect a heavily looted area.



ENCLOSURE 3

DOE Responses to the  
FY 2007 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – 2007

**Site-specific information**



**DOE RESPONSES TO FY 2007 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE**

SITES	BPA	BNL	Fermi	Idaho	LLNL	LM	LANL	Nevada	ORO	OCRWM	PNSO	PGDP	Pantex	PORTS	Richland	Sandia	SRS	SWPA	WAPA	TOTAL
B1 (number of partnerships)	0	ND	0	2	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	1	1	0	0	4
B2 \$ (value of partners' contributions)	0	ND	0	ND	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	\$768,000	0	0	\$768,000
B3 (number of volunteer hours)	0	ND	0	60	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	241	0	0	301
C1 (number of area-wide ARPA and NHPA overview or non-project plans)	0	ND	0	1	0	NA	0	0	ND	2	1	0	3	0	3	0	1	1	0	12
D1 (number of projects documented)	104	1	0	37	0	ND	750	5	1	5	3	0	1	1	152	14	40	16	60	1,190
D2 (number of field studies)	78	1	0	17	0	ND	1	1	1	2	0	0	8	0	4	0	31	10	45	199
D3 (number of acres inventoried)	4,440	24	0	861	0	ND	4	6	41	2,838	0	0	3	0	1,128	0	495	218	3,887	13,945
D4 (number of archeological sites identified)	72	0	0	78	0	ND	4	0	1	103	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	137	135	549
D5 (number of archeological sites NRHP-eligible)	16	ND	0	0	0	ND	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	45	80
D6 (number of archeological sites stabilized, rehabilitated, protected)	0	ND	0	35	1	ND	37	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	37	0	0	0	7	129
D8 (number of historic properties are individual sites and listed NRHP)	0	ND	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D9 (number of archeological sites contributing to NRHP districts)	0	ND	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D10 (number of archeological sites contributing to NRHP districts were determined NRHP eligible)	0	ND	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	0	0	0	0	118
D11 (Number of archeological sites determined eligible by the Keeper, SHPO or THPO)	0	ND	0	0	0	ND	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	93
D12 (number of historic properties in archeological districts and listed on NRHP)	0	ND	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D13 (number of historic properties in archeological districts and eligible for the NRHP)	0	ND	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
E1 (number of archeological data recovery projects)	1	ND	0	0	0	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
E2 (number of archeological sites on which data recovered)	1	ND	0	0	0	ND	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
F1 (number of undertakings with discoveries)	0	ND	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F2 (number of undertakings with unanticipated discoveries)	0	ND	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**DOE RESPONSES TO FY 2007 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE**

SITES	BPA	BNL	Fermi	Idaho	LLNL	LM	LANL	Nevada	ORO	OCRWM	PNSO	PGDP	Pantex	PORTS	Richland	Sandia	SRS	SWPA	WAPA	TOTAL
G2 (% of sites entered in automated system)	NA	ND	NA	60%	0	NA	100%	5%	NA	100%	100%	NA	0	0	100%		50%	NA	NA	
G3 (% of sites digitally mapped entered)	NA	100%	NA	60%	100%	NA	100%	90%	NA	100%	100%	100%	0	0	100%		30%	NA	NA	
G4 (% of digitally mapped site locations entered)	74%	ND	NA	60%	100%	NA	100%	90%	NA	100%	100%	100%	0	0	100%	80%	100%	NA	NA	
H1A (Items curated)	ND	10,962		10,100		NA			0	0	0	0	0	0		0	1,544,679	0	NA	1,565,741
H1B (cubic feet curated)	ND		12.0		1.2	NA	339.0	3448.0	0	300.0	0	0	717.0	9.0	197.0	0		0	NA	5023.2
H2 % (portion of H1 accessioned/catalogued)	ND	100%	100%	98%	90%	NA	100%	100%	0	100%	0	0	100%	0	100%		100%	NA	NA	98%
H3 (linear feet of archeological records)	ND	9.0	1.0	4.0	2.5	NA	11.0	370.0	0	220.0	0	0	2.0	1.0	2.0	0	515.0	NA	NA	1137.5
H4 (number of federal museums/repositories curating collections)	ND	1	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	NA	3
H5 (number of non-federal museums/repositories curating collections)	ND	ND	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	NA	9
I1 \$ (CRM dollars allocated for archeology)	0	ND	0	\$160,000	0	NA	\$400,000	\$650,000	0	\$330,000	\$15,000	0	0	0	\$600,000	0	\$416,000	\$89,548	0	2660548
I2 \$ (non-CRM dollars allocated for archeology)	ND	ND	0	\$40,000	0	NA	\$420,000	\$25,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$360,000	0	0	\$845,000
J1 (acres inventoried on DOE land)	NA	4,229	6,800	51,141	7,375	0	23,134	37,035	29,207	NA	300	1,358	7,113	2,066	117,334	2,481	79,781	NA	938	370,292
J2 (total archeological sites on DOE land)	NA	5	46	2,402	28	0	1,855	2,178	47	NA	16	38	69	38	1,020	0	1,889	NA	18	9,649
J3 (total NRHP-listed archeological sites on DOE land)	NA	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	45	0	68	NA	0	113
J4 (total archeological sites determined NRHP-eligible)	NA	3	1	0	5	0	450	1,121	15	NA	1	0	2	0	11	0	370	NA	2	1,981
J5 (total archeological sites determined not NRHP-eligible)	NA	153	17	4	23	0	74	1,055	32	NA	8	38	67	38	156	0	0	NA	3	1,668
J7 (cumulative number of historic properties that are archeological sites and listed on the NRHP)	NA	ND	0	0	0	0	0	1,121	0	NA	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	NA	0	1,125
J8 (cumulative number of archeological sites contributing to NRHP districts and determined eligible for the NRHP)	NA	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	155	0	0	NA	0	155
J9 (number of historic properties that are archeological districts and determined eligible by the Keeper, SHPO or THPO)	NA	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	0	0
J10 (cumulative number of historic properties that are archeological districts and NRHP listed)		ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	NA	0	0	0	0	45	0	0	NA	0	46

**DOE RESPONSES TO FY 2007 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE**

SITES	BPA	BNL	Fermi	Idaho	LLNL	LM	LANL	Nevada	ORO	OCRWM	PNSO	PGDP	Pantex	PORTS	Richland	Sandia	SRS	SWPA	WAPA	TOTAL
K1 (archeological permits received)	NA	ND	0	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	NA	0	1
K2 (archeological permits issued)	NA	ND	0	0	0	NA	0	1	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	NA	0	2
K3 (notifications to Indian tribes under ARPA)	NA	ND	0	33	0	NA	4	1	NA	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	53
L1 (number of violations)	1	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
L2 (number of violations with arrests)	0			0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
L3 (number of individuals arrested)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L4 (number of individuals cited)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L5 (number individuals prosecuted under ARPA)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L6 (number individuals prosecuted under other laws)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L7 (number convicted of misdemeanor under ARPA)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L8 (number convicted of misdemeanor under other laws)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L9 (number convicted of felony under ARPA)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L10 (number convicted of felony under other laws)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L11 (number individuals found liable [civil penalty])	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L12 (number of cases with individuals found guilty or liable)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L13 (number of cases with individuals found not guilty or not liable)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L14 \$ (value of fines imposed)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L15 \$ (value of restitution, including civil penalties)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L16 \$ (value of restoration and repair originally sought)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,500	0	0	0	0	6,500
L17 \$ (amount given [not offered] in rewards)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
L18 \$ (value of property seized)	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0	35,300	0	0	0	0	35,300
L19 \$ (cost of law enforcement for archeology)	NA	ND	0	0	0	0	\$121,000	ND	0	0	NA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121,000



ENCLOSURE 4

**Acronym List**



## DOE SITE ACRONYM LIST

BNL	Brookhaven Area Office, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR
Fermi	Fermi Site Office, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, IL
Idaho	Idaho Operations Office, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID
LLNL	Livermore Site Office, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA
LM	Office of Legacy Management, Grand Junction, CO
LANL	Los Alamos Site Office, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM
Nevada	Nevada Site Office, Las Vegas, NV
ORO	Oak Ridge Operation Office, Oak Ridge, TN
OCRWM	Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Las Vegas, NV
Pantex	Pantex Site Office, Amarillo, TX
PGDP	Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, KY
PNSO	Pacific Northwest Site Office, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA
PORTS	Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Portsmouth, OH
Richland	Richland Operations Office, Richland, WA
Sandia	Sandia Site Office, Sandia National Laboratory, Sandia, NM
SRS	Savannah River Site Office, Aiken, SC
SWAPA	Southwestern Power Administration, Tulsa, OK
WAPA	Western Area Power Administration, Denver, CO