



## Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

March 3, 2009

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 October 31, 2008, request for information on the Department of Energy's (DOE) archeological programs and projects for fiscal year 2008. The Department does not maintain centralized records at Headquarters of archeological activities conducted at DOE sites nationwide. Our office forwarded the questionnaire you provided to 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 Beverly Whitehead, of my staff, at (202) 586-6073 or email [Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov).

Sincerely,

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

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

Enclosures (as listed)



## **List of Enclosures**

- Enclosure 1 U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – FY 2008  
Quantitative Questionnaire on FY 2008 Activities
- Enclosure 2 U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES – FY 2008  
DOE’s Response to Narrative Questionnaire on FY 2008 Activities
- Enclosure 3 DOE Site Specific Responses to the Federal Archeology Program Activities – FY 2008
- Enclosure 4 DOE Site Acronym List



Enclosure 1

U. S. Department of Energy (DOE)

REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES  
FY 2008

**Quantitative Questionnaire on FY 2008 Activities**



<b>REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES</b>		
<b>Quantitative Questionnaire on 2008 Activities</b>		
	<b>Agency Name: Department of Energy</b>	
	<b>Agency representative responsible for data submission</b> (to be contacted in case of queries about data): <b>Beverly Whitehead</b>	
	<b>Phone Number: (202) 586-6073</b>	
	<b>E-mail address: Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov</b>	
<b>Section A. Legislation, Policies, and Programmatic Actions</b>		
	This is a narrative section for describing your agency's programmatic, regulatory, and legislative activities that affect archeological activities within your agency. These descriptions will be compiled for the Secretary's Report to Congress on the Federal Archeology Program.	
<b>Section B. Participation, Education, and Outreach</b>		
B01.	Number of partnership agreements (e.g. cooperative, cost-share, interagency, research) in place with the archeology program in your agency during this reporting year. ( <i>Do not include contracts.</i> )	10
B02.	Estimated total dollar value of contributions provided by partners (e.g. money, services, volunteers working directly for partners) during this reporting year.	\$1,426,000
B03.	Volunteer hours contributed directly to the agency for the benefit of archeological activities during this reporting year.	196
<b>Section C. Archeological Planning</b>		
C01.	Number of area-wide overviews and general management non-project plans completed or updated under ARPA and NHPA (e.g. Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans, forest overviews, preservation plans, historic context statements, archeological resource protection stewardship plans, etc.) by your agency during the reporting year.	14
C02.	Number of undertakings or projects undertaken during the reporting year for which archeological database and file searches, literature reviews, or map checks were conducted. ( <i>Report all projects for which checks were done, even those that produced no information.</i> )	1,162
C03.	( <i>For land managing agencies</i> ) Number of notifications to Indian Tribes of proposed work that might harm or destroy archeological sites having religious or cultural importance to the Tribes.	142

<b>Section D. Archeological Identification and Evaluation</b>		
	Responses to questions in this section should include all and ARPA and NHPA Section 106 and Section 110 activities that are performed or funded by agency and non-agency entities (e.g. contractors, independent investigators, third parties) in the reporting year.	
D01.	Number of field studies carried out, authorized, or required by your agency during this reporting year to identify and evaluate archeological sites.	271
D02.	Number of acres inventoried during this reporting year to identify and evaluate archeological sites.	20,360
D03	Number of new archeological sites identified during this reporting year.	470
D04.	How many NHPA Section 106 actions involving archeological sites carried out, authorized, or required by your agency were completed during this reporting year?	90
D05.	Number of archeological sites that were stabilized, rehabilitated, monitored, or protected (e.g. anti-vandalism signs, fences, or road closures) during this reporting year.	337
D08.	How many reports (grey literature, such as Section 106 compliance reports) about archeological resources either on private or public lands were completed for your agency during the reporting period ?	184
<b>For land managing agencies:</b>		
D9.	Cumulative number of acres inventoried to identify and evaluate archeological sites on agency-managed land. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	368,605
	How many of these cumulative survey areas are mapped using a GIS or CAD system?	300,973
D10.A	GIS:	293,598
D10.B	CAD:	7,375
D11.	Cumulative number of archeological sites identified on agency-managed land. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	9,932
	How many of the locations of the cumulative number of archeological sites discovered to date are mapped using a GIS or CAD system?	7,698
D12.A	GIS:	7,670
D12.B	CAD:	28
D13.	Number of archeological sites that were assessed for condition in the reporting year.	170
D14.	Number of known archeological sites revisited and re-evaluated during this reporting year.	106

<b>Section E. Archeological Data Recovery Projects</b>		
	Data recovery projects include archeological investigations, typically excavations, that are conducted to mitigate the effects of destruction or disturbance caused by Federal undertakings or to document sites for interpretation or management. Recovery projects may be related to scholarly research, compliance with Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPA, ARPA, or an agency-specific statute, regulation, or policy.	
E01.	Number of archeological data recovery <b>projects</b> in progress during this reporting year.	10
E02.	Number of archeological <b>sites</b> on which data recovery was undertaken during this reporting year.	9
E03.	Number of undertakings resulting in the unexpected discovery of archeological sites subsequent to agency completion of the NHPA Section 106 review and compliance process during this reporting year.	4
E04.	Number of undertakings resulting in the unexpected discovery of archeological sites subsequent to agency completion of the NHPA Section 106 review and compliance process that required data recovery. <i>(Include the undertaking in the reporting year that the archeological site is discovered even if data recovery will not occur until the following year.)</i>	3
<b>Section F. National Register Activities</b>		
	Reporting the numbers of <i>sites</i> is preferred. "Eligibility" includes administratively or consensus-determination of eligibility through documented consultation with the SHPO or THPO or through requesting an official determination of eligibility by the Keeper.	
F01.	Number of archeological sites that were determined eligible for the National Register during this reporting year.	53
F02.	Number of archeological sites that were listed in the National Register during this reporting year.	0
F03.	Number of archeological sites that were determined ineligible for listing in the National Register during this reporting year.	43
<b>For land managing agencies:</b>		
F06.	Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency managed lands that were determined eligible for the National Register. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	1,639
F07.	Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency managed lands that were determined ineligible for the National Register. <i>(Include this reporting year .)</i>	1,835

F08.	Cumulative number of archeological sites on agency managed lands that are listed in the National Register. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	51
F09.	Number of archeological sites listed on the National Register that passed out of control of the reporting Federal agency during the reporting period.	0
F10.A	Number of archeological sites under Federal control that were formerly but are no longer listed on the National Register because of natural causes or human induced destruction. Natural Destruction Human Induced Destruction	0
F10.B		
	For agencies who <b>only</b> maintain information about archeological districts on the National Register	
F11.	Number of archeological districts on agency managed lands that were determined eligible for the National Register during this reporting year.	0
F12.	Cumulative number of archeological districts on agency managed lands that were determined eligible for the National Register by the Keeper. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	0
F13.	Number of archeological districts on agency managed lands that were listed on the National Register during this reporting year.	0
F14.	Cumulative number of archeological districts on agency-managed lands that are listed on the National Register. <i>(Include this reporting year.)</i>	6
<b>Section H. Archeological Collections Management</b>		
<i>(Note: Section G is omitted to maintain consistency in the numbering of questions with prior years.)</i>		
H01.	Number of items/lots (artifacts, samples) curated in all repositories.	1,999,703
H02.	Number of cubic feet of material remains (artifacts, samples) curated in all repositories.	5,171
H03.	Are associated records included? (Y/N)	yes = 9 no = 3
H04.	Percentage of collection identified in H1 or H2 that has been processed for professional curation in accordance with 36 CFR 79.5	99%
H05.	Number of linear feet of associated paper records related to stored archeological materials, or records associated with any archeological studies.	1,159

H06.	Number of gigabytes of stored archeological records or studies.	170
H07.	Number of Federal museums/repositories, as defined in 36 CFR 79, curating agency collections.	5
H08.	Number of non-Federal museums/repositories, as defined in 36 CFR 79, curating agency collections.	8
H09.	Does your agency have a policy for management and preservation of archeological collections?	yes
H10.	List the names of the museums/repositories that are curating agency collections (use separate worksheet in this database).	see separate sheet
H11.	How many times were collections held by your agency utilized for research or for exhibits during the reporting period?	52
<b>Section I. Archeological Resource Management Program Funding</b>		
I01.	Estimated total amount of funding appropriated to the agency (directly from Congress or as a result of internal agency allocations) that was used for archeological activities during this reporting year.	\$6,933,972
I02.	Estimated total amount of funding allocated from other agency programs (e.g. timber, construction, wildland fire management, permits, licenses, grants) that was used for archeological activities during this reporting year.	\$1,521,900
<b>Section K. Permits for Archeological Investigations</b>		
(Note: Section J is omitted to maintain consistency in the numbering of questions with prior years.)		
Include all permits issued pursuant to Federal agency policies and procedures for archeological activities authorized by the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, the Antiquities Act or agency-specific statutes.		
K01.	Number of permit applications received by the agency during the reporting year.	2
K02.	Number of permits issued by the agency or in effect during the reporting year.	2
<b>Section L. Archeological Resource Law Enforcement</b>		
Include information about archeological resources crimes in violation of ARPA; the Antiquities Act; Federal property protection laws, such as Theft of Government Property and Destruction of Government Property, or agency-specific statutes and regulations protecting archeological resources.		

L01.	Number of incidents affecting archeological resources documented during this reporting year.	4
L02.	Number of documented incidents affecting archeological resources in which individuals were arrested during this reporting year.	0
L03.	Number of individuals arrested for all documented incidents affecting archeological resources during this reporting year.	0
L04.	Number of individuals issued citations for violations of Federal laws and regulations involving archeological resources during this reporting year.	0
	<b>ARPA (Archaeological Resources Protection Act) Violations</b>	
L05.	Number of individuals convicted of a misdemeanor under ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L06.	Number of individuals convicted of a felony under ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L07.	Number of individuals found liable for a civil penalty under ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L08.	Number of individuals charged but found not guilty or not liable of ARPA violations during this reporting year.	0
L09.	Total sum of amounts given in rewards under ARPA ( <i>not amount offered</i> ).	0
	<b>Prosecutions for Looting and Vandalism of Archeological Resources Under Other Laws</b>	
L10.	Number of individuals convicted of a misdemeanor under authorities other than ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L11.	Number of individuals convicted of a felony under authorities other than ARPA during this reporting year.	0
L12.	Number of individuals found not guilty of charges under laws other than ARPA during this reporting year.	0
	<b>Summary Information</b>	
L13.	Number of criminal and civil cases where individuals were found guilty or liable during this reporting year. (Include ARPA cases.)	0
L14.	Total sum of fines imposed or ordered during this reporting year.	0

L15.	Total amount of restitution imposed or ordered, including civil penalties, during this reporting year.	0
L16.	Total summed estimated costs of restoration and repair in site damage assessments during this reporting year.	0
L17.	Total commercial value of personal property and artifacts seized and either retained or sold during this reporting year.	0
L18.	Law enforcement costs to agency for archeological resource protection during this reporting year.	\$321,000
L22.	Number of collected LOOT forms. <i>(It is important to send completed LOOT forms to the Departmental Consulting Archeologist.)</i>	1

**REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES--2008**

**Questionnaire on 2008 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>State</b>	<b>Date last visited</b>
DOE	Argonne Site Office	Illinois State Museum, Springfield, IL	IL	2005
DOE	Brookhaven Site Office	Brookhaven Graphite Research Reactor Project Site	NY	
DOE	SC-Fermi Site Office	Illinois State Museum, Springfield, IL	IL	not visited
DOE	Idaho Operations Office	Idaho Museum of Natural History/Earl H. Swanson Archaeological Repository	ID	10/22/2007
DOE	Office of Legacy Management	Ohio Historical Society Archives/Library	OH	summer 2008
DOE	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	Laboratory Archives and Research Center	CA	
DOE	Los Alamos National Laboratory	Museum of New Mexico, Laboratory of Anthropology at Santa Fe	NM	
DOE	NNSA/Nevada	NNSA/NSO Curation	NV	2008
DOE	Oak Ridge Operations Office	University of Tennessee McClung Museum	TN	
DOE	Richland	Columbia Rvr. Exhibition of Hist., Sci., and Tech.	WA	9/18/2008
DOE	Richland	Sigma V	WA	Mar-08
DOE	Richland	Consolidated Information Center	WA	Mar-08
DOE	Richland	4704N	WA	Dec-08
DOE	Richland	Energy Northwest Warehouse	WA	Dec-08
DOE	Richland	Federal Building Room 570B	WA	Dec-08
DOE	Savannah River Site	Savannah River Site Archeological Program Facility	SC	

Enclosure 2

U. S. Department of Energy (DOE)

REPORT ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES  
FY 2008

**DOE's Response to Narrative Questionnaire on FY 2008 Activities**



**Instructions for 2008 Questionnaire  
and  
Form for narrative questions in 2008 Questionnaire**

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

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

We ask that the headquarters office of each agency or department compile a service-wide response to the questionnaire, summarizing numerical information collected from regions, districts, divisions, etc.

The LOOT Clearinghouse is an important source of information on cases of Federal archeological resource crime. Submitting LOOT forms (NPS Form 10-29) is voluntary, however, the information has been useful to law enforcement and government attorneys in developing prosecution cases against looters. LOOT forms are available on the NPS Archeology Program website at [www.nps.gov/archeology/SRC/forms/05LOOTForm.doc](http://www.nps.gov/archeology/SRC/forms/05LOOTForm.doc)

Please submit completed LOOT forms, or mail or fax copies of equivalent information from the case files, for each citation, misdemeanor, and felony conviction, and civil penalty pertaining to archeological resources in your agency that was completed in the reporting year.

**Due Dates and Assistance.** The headquarters office of each agency should complete the survey by December 31, 2008.

Questions about this survey should be directed to Karen Mudar, Archeology Program, 202-354-2103; Fax: 202-371-5102; [karen\\_mudar@nps.gov](mailto:karen_mudar@nps.gov).

**Terms Used in this Questionnaire**

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

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

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

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGY PROGRAM  
ACTIVITIES**

**Narrative Questions about 2008 Archeological Activities**

Agency Department of Energy

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

E-mail Address [Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Beverly.Whitehead@hq.doe.gov)

Phone Number 202-586-6073

**Section A. Legislation, Policies, Exemplary Activities**

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

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

**Argonne Site Office**

Amendment of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO): The Department of Energy's Argonne Site Office (DOE-ASO) entered into a MOA with the Illinois State Historic Preservation Agency in 1999 for the mitigation of adverse effects resulting from the planned demolition of the historically significant Building 301, the Physics and Metallurgy Hot Laboratory located on the Argonne Site. A stipulation contained in the agreement stated that two sets of master-slave manipulators from the building would be kept by the laboratory. It was determined that the manipulators found in Building 301 were contaminated and could not be retained, so an alternative set of uncontaminated manipulators were found as a replacement. In order to allow the replacement set of manipulators to be retained, the original MOA was amended. DOE-ASO received SHPO concurrence on the amendment in February 2008.

**Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

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

**Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management**

In August 2008, the SHPO, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Advisory Council), and DOE's Office of Civilian and Radioactive Waste Management entered into formal consultation to develop a PA for the licensing and development of a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, NV. The PA was prepared to fulfill DOE's statutory responsibilities under Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and related obligations under the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA).

**Savannah River Operations Office**

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

Research conducted by SRARP personnel was reported in three professional articles and reports published during FY 2008. SRARP staff presented research results in 20 papers and posters at professional conferences. SRARP archaeological research included 11 field survey and excavation programs. Three grants were acquired to support both on-site and off-site research, and employees served as consultants on 22 projects in off-site cultural resources management (CRM) and research activities. SRARP staff held 34 offices and appointments to committees in various educational, avocational, and professional organizations.

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

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

### **Brookhaven Site Office**

The Brookhaven National Laboratory Management and Operations contractor, DOE-Brookhaven Site Office (DOE-BHSO), and the Brookhaven Veterans Association participated in the “Casing of the Colors” Ceremony on September 8, 2008, which effectively deactivated the 77<sup>th</sup> Division Regional Readiness Command. The 77<sup>th</sup> Division was activated on August 25, 1917, at Camp Upton, which is now the site of Brookhaven National Laboratory. The ceremony was planned and carried out in cooperation with the 77<sup>th</sup> Regional Readiness Command Commandant Major General Terpeluk and his staff. The ceremony took place near Buildings 30 and 50 that served as the Officers’ Club and Camp Headquarters, respectively, in WW II. Attendees included several of the past commanding generals of the 77<sup>th</sup> Division, and the keynote speaker was Robert Laplander, author of “Finding the Lost Battalion.” Information concerning the ceremony and the 77<sup>th</sup> Division can be found on the Longwood School District’s history web site:

<http://www.longwood.k12.ny.us/history/index.htm>.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) is a Department of Energy-Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID) sponsored multi-purpose national laboratory. During FY 2008, the INL Cultural Resource Management (CRM) Office continued its long-standing commitment to enhanced K-12 education through participation in local “Career Days” events, informational presentations to school groups, and occasional field tours. One highlight of FY 2008 involved ongoing INL CRM Office participation in the “Rocky Mountain Summer Science Adventure,” a productive partnership with the Museum of Idaho and the INL Environmental Surveillance, Education, and Research program, coordinated by S. M. Stoller Corp. For the third year in a row, this innovative field-oriented experience delivered hands-on science education to middle and high school students and teachers in outdoor “classrooms” at the INL and throughout southeastern Idaho’s cold desert. A second highlight involved participation in INL’s “Science and Engineering Expo,” which draws thousands of students in grades 6-8, parents, and teachers with the intent to stimulate interest in science. Informational booths and displays provide interactive opportunities in virtually all scientific disciplines and expose participants to a wide and diverse range of potential careers in science, math, engineering, and technology. In FY 2008, INL CRM staff exhibited posters and artifact displays, along with interactive training in Native American technologies and a large wall panel that provided hands-on experience in creating and appreciating “rock art.”

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

In March 2008, LLNL's staff archaeologist participated in the *Expanding Your Horizon's Career Fair for Young Girls*. It presented two poster-boards of archaeological activities and sites and a hands-on artifact display. The attending archaeologist answered many questions and provided a handout of websites for more information on careers in archaeology including college and university programs.

In March 2008, LLNL's staff archaeologist participated in a Career Day for 8th graders at a local middle school. A PowerPoint slideshow was presented along with questions and answers, and representative artifacts were passed around for examination by the students.

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

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

During FY 2008, the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) cultural resources team continued to support various external organizations that have an interest in the preservation of Manhattan Project properties, including Los Alamos County, the Los Alamos Historical Society, the Atomic Heritage Foundation (AHF), and the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA). Outreach activities included continued dialogue with the National Park Service (NPS) regarding the Manhattan Project National Historical Park study. In June 2008, LANL cultural resources staff gave two presentations in Oak Ridge, TN, about the status of Manhattan Project preservation activities. One presentation was part of an ECA peer exchange meeting, and the other presentation was at a public lecture sponsored by the AHF as part of the Oak Ridge Secret City Festival.

Additionally, LANL staff completed an update to DOE's assessment of historic properties and preservation activities in response to requirements of President George W. Bush's Executive Order 13287, *Preserve America*. This information was requested by DOE's Office of History and Heritage Resources in FY 2008 and included a summary of LANL's prehistoric and historic archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures that are potential heritage tourism assets.

### **Pacific Northwest Site Office**

During FY 2008, the DOE's Pacific Northwest Site Office completed a cultural resources management plan in consultation with area Tribes and the SHPO.

### **Richland Operations Office**

In FY 2008, DOE's Richland Operations Office (Richland) continued to develop management plans for traditional cultural properties and associated archeological sites in collaboration with multiple tribes.

### **Savannah River Operations Office**

In the area of heritage education, SRARP continued its activities in FY 2008 with a full schedule of classroom education, public outreach, and on-site tours. Fifty-seven presentations, displays, and tours were provided for schools, civic groups, and environmental and historical awareness day celebrations. SRARP staff also taught six 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 2008, 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.

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

### **Bonneville Power Administration**

Project-specific activities carried out in FY 2008 are described below. The two partnerships are reported separately, the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)-Corps of Engineers (Corps) and BPA-Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation).

#### **BPA-Corps Program**

BPA continued its ongoing partnership with the Corps for Section 106 compliance at 12 Corps projects in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana. Other stakeholders involved include the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) (Kootenai National Forest, Mt. Hood National Forest, and the Idaho Panhandle National Forest), the

Confederated Colville Tribes (CCT), the Nez Perce Tribe, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWSRO), Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation (Yakama), Coeur d'Alene Tribe, Kalispel Tribe of Indians, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes (CSKT). Work is conducted on lands managed by the Corps, USFS, and various Tribes.

Program stakeholders, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) and SHPO staff from Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, participated in planning activities for the Section 106 compliance program through five Cooperating Groups (Wannapa Kootkoot, Payos, Albeni Falls, Chief Joseph, and Libby). The USFS, tribal contractors, and private contractors perform program compliance activities under contracts awarded by the Corps. The Corps appropriated about \$500,000, and BPA provided about \$2.5 million for the following jointly funded project activities in FY 2008:

#### Albeni Falls Project

- Finalized Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP)
- Completed stabilization of a National Register of Historic Sites (NRHP) eligible site
- Initiated Coeur D'Alene Tribe Traditional Cultural Properties Identification Project
- Conducted ongoing inventory of Clark Fork Delta
- Completed cultural review and initiated National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review for a site stabilization project
- On-going USFS agreement and Kalispel Tribe services contract

#### Chief Joseph Project

- Finalized HPMP
- Drafted project PA
- Initiated planning for stabilization of site
- Initiated traditional cultural properties study on Chief Joseph Dam fishery
- Conducted annual shoreline monitoring and site inspections

#### Libby Project

- CSKT evaluated site for NRHP eligibility
- USFS assessed condition of 30 sites and surveyed selected reservoir cut banks
- Drafted project PA
- Signed geographic information system (GIS) data sharing agreement between Corps/BPA/USFS

#### McNary, Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, Lower Granite, and Dworshak Projects: Payos Kuus Cuukwe (“Snake River knowledge and learning”)

- Corps re-established working relationship with Cooperating Group members
- Awarded IDIQ contracts to Nez Perce, CTUIR, and Yakama for traditional cultural properties management
- Awarded Public Awareness Task Order for traditional cultural properties work
- Finalized research on Dworshak monitoring
- Developed a Treatment Plan and initiated the Design, Specifications, and NEPA documentation for a site stabilization project
- Initiated development of a Monitoring Plan

#### Bonneville, The Dalles, and John Day Projects: Wanna Pa Koot Koot (“People working along the river”)

- Monitoring and law enforcement activities
- Treatment of vandalized and eroded areas at a site
- Celilo Oral History contract with Warm Springs, Yakama, and Nez Perce Tribes
- Revised and distributed Wana Tumuma public information brochure

### BPA-Reclamation Program

BPA continued its ongoing partnership with Reclamation for Section 106 compliance at Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake (Lake Roosevelt) behind Grand Coulee Dam in eastern Washington and at Hungry Horse Reservoir in western Montana. Also involved were the USFS (Flathead National Forest), the NPS, Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area (NPS-LRNRA), the Confederated Colville Tribes (CCT), the Spokane Tribe of Indians (STI), and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes (CSKT). Work is conducted mainly on lands managed by the NPS and on CCT and STI reservation lands.

Project stakeholders, as well as THPOs and SHPO staff from Washington State and Montana, participated in planning activities for the Section 106 compliance program at these reservoirs through three Cooperating Groups (Hungry Horse, Lake Roosevelt Spokane Arm, and Lake Roosevelt Mainstem). The USFS, NPS-LRNRA, and the three affected Tribes perform program compliance activities under contracts awarded by BPA. Reclamation funded approximately \$150,000, and BPA provided about \$1.1 million for the following jointly funded project activities in FY 2008:

#### Hungry Horse

- Prepared Multiple Properties NRHP Determination of Eligibility of Indigenous Transportation Networks
- Conducted oral history interviews and elder site visits
- Initiated development of an interpretive DVD on transportation networks
- Ongoing development of interactive CRM database
- Continuation of survey, erosion, and site condition monitoring and public education by Salish and Kootenai Tribe and Flathead National Forest
- Drafted project PA

#### Lake Roosevelt

- Erosion and site condition monitoring by NPS, CCT, and STI
- Continued inventory and evaluation of Spokane Arm sites by STI
- Ongoing law enforcement monitoring of sites and public education of local community by CCT and STI
- Developed prioritization strategies to identify sites for evaluation and treatment, including stabilization
- Tested 2 sites to collect information for NRHP evaluation
- CCT conducted traditional cultural properties research, collecting oral histories and elder site visits
- Developed and distributed interpretive products for public education
- Developed 3 draft and 2 final NRHP Determinations of Eligibility and continued Kettle River Archeological District Determination of Eligibility for finalization in FY 2009

### Idaho Operations Office

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

Direct communication is implemented through annual tours and periodic presentations to local schools and civic groups and at professional conferences. In FY 2008, INL CRM staff members spoke on a wide variety of topics including regional prehistory and history, World War II, nuclear history, historic preservation,

careers, CRM, archaeological resource protection, cave resources, and Native American resources and sensitivities. Several tours provided lively hands-on experiences for several hundred people to celebrate Idaho Archaeology and Historic Preservation Month; to enhance a summer science camp experience and science expo (highlighted in response to Question **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 (e.g., 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, Bureau of Land Management Resource Advisory Council) have also benefitted from the energies, expertise, and voluntary efforts of INL CRM Office staff.

In FY 2008, the INL CRM Office furthered three significant and multi-faceted cooperative efforts in addition to the ongoing tasks discussed above. The first, highlighted in response to Question **B4** above, involved hands-on educational opportunities for K-12 students from throughout the region.

The second significant cooperative effort fostered in FY 2008 was part of an ongoing program and relationship based on a written “Agreement in Principle” between DOE-ID and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. Tribal and INL personnel under this program jointly conduct many general and project-specific activities including archaeological surveys and evaluations, recommendations for site protection and/or mitigation, educational outreach, tribal access to and use of significant areas and resources on the INL, and general planning and feedback on local decision-making. Most of these activities are coordinated through the INL “Cultural Resources Working Group,” with representatives from 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 views into land and cultural resource management decisions.

The third cooperative activity is ongoing and focuses on engaging local and regional universities in research collaborations. In FY 2008, INL CRM staff joined with Idaho State University researchers to identify and deploy a field-portable x-ray fluorescence unit capable of conducting reliable obsidian source analyses. Approximately 400 temporally diagnostic INL artifacts were analyzed with this versatile equipment during the year, and these data were incorporated into the University’s growing obsidian source chemistry database. INL CRM staff also collaborated on other efforts to develop the obsidian sourcing capability, including assistance in obtaining geologic samples from obsidian sources not represented in the University’s sample library.

### **Sandia Site Office/NNSA**

In FY 2008, Sandia Site Office (SSO) coordinated with and provided information to the U.S. Navy for its Hawaii Range Complex Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) (May 2008) covering programmatic activities in Hawaii. SSO’s participation addressed the Sandia National Laboratories-operated Kauai Test Facility.

## **Section C. Archeological Planning**

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

### **Bonneville Power Administration**

In FY 2008, BPA initiated consultations on three separate system-wide PAs.

The three lead federal agencies for the Federal Columbia Power System Cultural Resource Program worked with regional stakeholders on a draft Federal Columbia Power System system-wide PA. This PA defines the roles and responsibilities of various Program participants and explains how compliance will be achieved.

BPA initiated consultation with the SHPOs of four states, THPOs, and interested Tribes on a system-wide PA to streamline Section 106 consultations for projects and activities funded through the Fish and Wildlife Mitigation program. It is seeking to identify activities with little or no impact to be excluded and to streamline consultation processes when no cultural resources are found during field surveys.

BPA also initiated consultation with the SHPOs of four states, THPOs, and Tribes on a PA to streamline Section 106 consultations for repetitive projects and activities carried out as part of transmission system operations and maintenance, asset management, and land use programs. It is seeking to identify activities with little or no impact to be excluded and to streamline consultation processes when no cultural resources are found during field surveys.

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

During 2008, a summary was prepared of historic property inventory surveys and consultations with culturally affiliated tribes regarding properties of religious and cultural significance that have been conducted to date for the Yucca Mountain Repository Project since its inception. At the request of the SHPO and the Advisory Council, this summary is included as Appendix C of the PA for the licensing and development of a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain (currently in formal consultation).

#### **Richland Operations Office**

During FY 2008, Richland conducted four workshops with representatives of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Washington State Department of Ecology, and four regional Tribes to develop a strategy for identifying and protecting sites of religious or cultural significance that might be impacted by soil and sediment sampling needed to support a Remedial Investigation along 150 miles of the Columbia River, both on and off the Hanford Site. This collaborative planning effort resulted in a sampling design that was protective of cultural resources and responsive to project needs.

#### **Strategic Petroleum Reserve**

As a result of the Record of Decision for the Site Selection for the Expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve EIS, in FY 2008, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve authorized and funded archeological field studies at the Richton, MS, location. Actual field studies and reports will be performed and prepared in FY 2009.

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

#### **Bonneville Power Administration**

BPA completed a Cultural Resource Compliance Guide and distributed it throughout the agency in FY 2008. BPA archeology staff have been providing training to a variety of project managers and other BPA staff on consultation processes to build understanding and support for the cultural resource program.

BPA owns and manages the Caples site (on the NRHP), where damage occurred when a nearby landowner (who thought he owned the property) dumped debris on the site. BPA consulted with five Tribes on the proposed mitigation.

#### **Idaho Operations Office**

Every year INL CRM staff prepare two routine reports with archaeological content: one summarizing programmatic activities conducted throughout the year (INL/EXT-08-14071) and another documenting the results of cultural resource monitoring (INL/EXT-07-13446). Both are available online at [www.inl.gov](http://www.inl.gov). Yearly reviews are also completed for the "INL Cultural Resource Management Plan" (DOE/ID-10997)

based on feedback from DOE-ID, the Idaho SHPO, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, and stakeholders and in response to changes to existing requirements or enactment of new requirements. In FY 2008, no changes were made to the Plan.

The INL is an active facility where thousands of work orders for projects ranging from lawn care to new facility construction are processed each year. The comprehensive “INL Cultural Resource Management Plan” outlines a tailored process of assessing and, when necessary, mitigating adverse impacts to archaeological resources as a consequence of all activities, large or small. Under INL procedures a cultural resource review is prompted whenever ground disturbance or major structural or landscape modifications are proposed. In FY 2008, 38 project reviews were completed for potential impacts to archaeological resources.

Shoshone-Bannock tribal members have been important partners in CRM at the INL for many 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 2008, information was provided on all 38 of the INL projects submitted for cultural review. The designated tribal point of contact also receives regular 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.

#### **Section D. Archeological Identification and Evaluation During the Reporting Year**

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

##### **Argonne Site Office**

Two Section 106 reviews were undertaken in FY 2008. The first Section 106 review conducted was for installation of a fiber optic communications line. The project required 10 acres of new archaeological survey. No historic properties were affected by the project. A second Section 106 review was conducted for the installation of a transmission line. The review required archaeological investigation of 7 acres. No historic properties were affected by the project.

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

##### **Argonne Site Office**

All four historically significant archaeological sites at Argonne were monitored in FY 2008.

##### **Berkeley Site Office**

- Developed administrative draft Cultural Resources Management Plan for Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
- Completed Historic American Engineering Record activities for Building 71 seismic project

### **Idaho Operations Office**

The Powell Stage Station is one of only two historic stage stations known to have existed within the INL boundary. Because of its central location on the Snake River plain between central Idaho mining camps and eastern Idaho railroad depots, it played a key role in late 19th century transportation and economic development. Surface structures and features at the stage station today show only a small footprint of what would have been a major stop over and resting place for stagecoach customers and freighters. Additionally, early photographs from the 1890s suggest that there might have been more buildings at the site than the foundations exposed on the surface today illustrate. In an attempt to identify unknown subsurface features, INL CRM staff employed geophysical equipment at the site in FY 2008. So far, the cart-mounted ground penetrating radar used to survey the site has revealed a hidden road and an additional foundation. Data used from this activity will improve resource protection and management and guide future investigations.

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

The Carnegie Town Site (CA-5JO-173H) at Site 300 was observed for pre- and post-Annual Prescribed Burn condition. Documentation was limited to photos of particular artifacts to record pre- and post-burn conditions. If possible, artifacts photographed in 2007 were photographed again in 2008. Once the proposed PA is approved, this pre- and post-burn activity will become an annual requirement.

### **Pacific Northwest Site Office**

During FY 2008, the Pacific Northwest Site Office made a concerted effort to protect culturally sensitive areas that include archaeological sites by posting additional signage, securing fencing, and controlling access.

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

In FY 2008, representatives from Native American Tribes affiliated with the Yucca Mountain area visited archaeological sites at Yucca Mountain to assess their current condition and prepared a report entitled, "Yucca Mountain Project American Indian Monitoring Report, May 27-30, 2008." A letter of appreciation was sent from the Tribes to the DOE Director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management commending the DOE Yucca Mountain Project for its support of tribal interactions and site monitoring and emphasizing the positive step the site visit made towards maintaining government-to-government relations.

### **Richland Operations Office**

During FY 2008, Richland made a concerted effort to protect culturally sensitive areas that include archaeological sites that had been looted in the past as well as two highly significant traditional cultural properties that contain multiple significant archaeological sites. Protection efforts include signage, access control, and cultural resource sensitivity and awareness training for agency and contractor staff.

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

### **Bonneville Power Administration**

BPA does not have a GIS data layer of its fee-owned lands to compile this information. However, this data may be available for FY 2009.

The one known site that is being managed on BPA fee-owned land is the Caples site.

### **Idaho Operations Office**

Since 1984, archaeological surveys on the INL have been conducted with intervals between surveyors that do not exceed 20 meters. Prior to 1984, reconnaissance level surveys were common with survey intervals up to 100 meters. Approximately one-quarter of the 52,177 cumulative acres that have been inventoried at INL were examined using these less intensive methods. As of FY 2008, 2,537 archaeological resources have been

documented during these surveys that comprise more than 9% of the 890-square mile laboratory. A simple predictive model developed to facilitate long term land use planning at the INL indicates that thousands more are present in unsurveyed areas.

INL's unique "data management system" integrates GIS data sets, relational databases, and web-based server technologies to create a user-friendly portal to easily access, update, analyze, and manage this inventory. Approximately 80% of identified resources (2,050 resources) and 75% of cumulative survey areas (39,800 acres) are currently mapped and accessible through this system.

The totals reported in this section for FY 2008 are derived from two types of surveys: those related to specific INL projects (Section 106: 38 projects) and those related to INL CRM Office research interests (Section 110: 1 survey project, 1 mapping project, 1 archival investigation). The results of each type of survey are separated in the discussions to follow. All activities are also summarized in an external technical report that is prepared every year (INL/EXT-08-14071) and is available online at [www.inl.gov](http://www.inl.gov).

In FY 2008, 38 INL projects were screened for potential impacts to archaeological resources. In many of these cases archival information indicated that no archaeological resources would be affected by the activities proposed. In 23 cases INL CRM staff provided feedback on archaeological sensitivity for large scale siting studies or worked directly with project managers in the field to protect 113 archaeological sites (70 newly recorded in FY 2008, 43 previously recorded) that were potentially threatened by proposed project activities in specific areas. In 20 cases field investigations ranging from 1 – 80 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 436 acres were intensively examined during these project surveys, and 70 new archaeological sites were identified and recommended for avoidance or other protective measures during project implementation.

The largest project-related field surveys of FY 2008 were completed in relatively remote, undeveloped areas to assess the potential impacts of the expansion of safety fans associated with three INL gun and explosives test ranges. Numerous archaeological sites were identified around the perimeters of the new safety fans, and all were avoided during installation of new signage. The INL CRM Office continues to work with project managers to ensure that these sensitive sites are not adversely impacted by yearly maintenance of the signs. Avoidance was also accomplished for significant archaeological sites located in an 80-acre project area near the Big Lost River where INL and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration researchers proposed to conduct a series of atmospheric dispersion tests. After a decade of drought conditions in eastern Idaho, it is not surprising that INL firefighters were called to respond to another range fire in FY 2008. In a third sizeable FY 2008 project survey, approximately 80 acres of fire-breaks were surveyed within and around a newly burned area, and three sensitive archaeological sites were identified. Work to protect the identified resources during future rehabilitation and revegetation will continue into FY 2009. Several smaller project surveys less than 32 acres in size also contribute to the totals reported in this section. Proposed activities included road improvements, powerline testing, cellular towers, temporary wind towers, ecological sampling, wells, various test pads, and miscellaneous cleanup activities. INL project managers and CRM staff cooperated to ensure that no sensitive archaeological resources were threatened by these smaller undertakings.

The results of project-specific INL CRM surveys and other activities are documented in a number of ways per the guidelines of the INL "Cultural Resource Management Plan." Recommendations tailored to specific projects and any archaeological resources that may require consideration are delivered in official e-mail notes that become part of the project's NEPA-driven Environmental Checklist and permanent record. In FY 2008, 38 of these recommendations were issued. For larger projects external technical reports are often prepared to synthesize archaeological information and recommendations, but none of these more detailed documents were required in FY 2008. However, INL CRM staff feedback on archaeological sensitivity did appear in a number of technical reports such as INL/EXT-08-14052: "Site Selection Study for the High

Temperature Gas-Cooled Reactor Component Test Facility.” It is also incorporated into Environmental Assessments and EISs prepared to support NEPA. In FY 2008, feedback was provided for three such documents prepared by external, non-INL entities.

Significant survey and research efforts in FY 2008 were also conducted to further DOE-ID obligations under Section 110 of NHPA to develop a broad understanding of all INL archaeological resources, not only those located in active project areas. 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 2008, field surveys were focused on 600 acres along the Big Lost River and playa margins where 65 archaeological resources spanning some 12,500 years were recorded. In FY 2009, the results of this long-term project will be compiled into a final report.

Section 110 archival and field investigation of INL’s historic archaeological sites also continued in the reporting year. In one significant effort, highlighted in response to Question **D6**, above, state-of-the-art geophysical tools were employed in an ongoing investigation of an important stage station from the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Results of this investigation will be published in conference proceedings in FY 2009. Regional archival holdings (Big Lost River Irrigation Company records and General Land Office Tract records) were also visited to support an ongoing investigation of late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century homesteading activities on what is now the INL. Among the early records, INL CRM staff identified 56 homestead claims that can be added to the INL inventory. In the future these claims will be investigated in the field to determine if any archaeological materials are present.

The INL CRM Office implements a yearly program of cultural resource monitoring that includes many archaeological resources. In FY 2008, 43 archaeological localities were revisited including two sites of heightened Shoshone-Bannock tribal sensitivity, four lava tube caves, 31 prehistoric archaeological sites, two historic stage stations, two historic homesteads, a portion of Goodale’s Cutoff of the Oregon Trail, and a portion of historic trail T-2. Although no significant impacts were observed during the annual monitoring, investigations were completed for incidents including new graffiti, evidence of surface artifact collection, and bioturbation at three lava tube caves. The Experimental Breeder Reactor-I National Historic Landmark and several active INL project areas were also monitored in FY 2008. The results of INL cultural resource monitoring are documented in INL external technical reports such as INL/EXT-07-13446, available online at [www.inl.gov](http://www.inl.gov).

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

(D1) Three new building surveys but no new field studies were conducted in FY 2008 at LANL.. However, 38 actual projects were worked on that utilized or required some field verification of previous survey information (archaeological and historic building resources). Two new field studies were conducted by LANL on San Ildefonso and Santo Domingo Pueblo lands during this fiscal year.

(D4) There were 744 undertakings reviewed in FY 2008 that had the potential to impact archaeological or historic building resources. Section 106 reports were completed for 11 of these undertakings. However, under the terms of LANL’s CRMP not all Section 106 actions require formal individual reports. “No Property and No Effect” (NP/NE) actions are summarized after the end of each fiscal year in a single report. For FY 2008, 51 undertakings were summarized in the NP/NE report.

(D8) Ten reports plus one MOA regarding historic buildings were completed this year. One of the ten reports was an historic building restoration plan, and one was a nomination form for the inclusion of eight sites in the New Mexico State Register of Cultural Properties (State Register). Of the remaining eight reports, six covered projects potentially affecting archaeological sites, and two covered the assessment of historic buildings.

(D9) One tract of land was transferred to Los Alamos County during FY 2008. Therefore, the total acres surveyed using the new DOE boundary is 23,130.

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

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

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

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

One site (CA-SJO-181 H) that had previously been considered destroyed was rediscovered. Plans are being prepared to re-record the site in 2009. No artifact collection is anticipated.

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

(E2) One Early Archaic Period archaeological site (radiocarbon dates 3485-3375 BC) was tested to determine site eligibility status.

#### **Richland Operations Office**

Richland conducted two archaeological data recovery projects on the Hanford Site during FY 2008. Each project involved participation by EPA, Department of Ecology, and Tribal staff. Each resulted in the production of a report that documented field activities and provided an interpretive section that advanced understanding of local terrace formations along the Columbia River and archaeological chronology. Report titles are: (1) "Archaeological Activity Report: Excavation of Four Well Pads for the 100-HR-3 Groundwater Characterization Project" and (2) "Archaeological Activity Report: Excavation of Five Power Pole Locations and Monitoring of Infrastructure Improvements for the 2007 100-KR-4 Pump and Treat Expansion Project."

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

#### **Bonneville Power Administration**

One archaeological site was identified subsequent to BPA concluding the Section 106 process. The site was discovered on private property as a result of a non-federal undertaking. BPA is currently in the process of assessing damages to the site due to its own construction activity on an easement crossing the private property and consulting with affected Indian tribes and the Washington SHPO. Once the damage assessment is complete, a MOA will likely be drafted with the SHPO and tribes to resolve adverse effects. Resolution of adverse effects will likely necessitate data recovery.

### **Section F. National Register Activities**

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

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

#### **Idaho Operations Office**

The 890-square mile INL contains thousands of prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, but none of these sites has been formally nominated to the NRHP. 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 SHPO and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, to be ineligible for nomination. To date, only one INL property, the Experimental Breeder Reactor-I National Historic Landmark, has been listed on the NRHP. However, the INL CRM Office maintains an active program to collect information that will support future nominations.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

(F1) One archaeological site and eight historic buildings were determined eligible for the NRHP in concurrence with the New Mexico SHPO during FY 2008.

(F2) LANL does not have any archaeological sites listed on the NRHP; however, LANL has 40 archaeological sites listed in the New Mexico State Register (eight of which were newly listed this fiscal year). In addition, one building is also listed in the State Register.

(F3) One archaeological site and 19 historic buildings were determined not eligible for the NRHP in concurrence with the New Mexico SHPO during FY 2008.

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

### **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**

See D6 above. The Carnegie Town Site is a NRHP-eligible archaeological resource.

### **Los Alamos National Laboratory**

Even though no LANL sites are listed in the NRHP, eight traditional cultural properties were listed in the New Mexico State Register.

(F6) 439 archaeological sites and 158 historic buildings have been determined eligible for the NRHP.

(F7) 84 archaeological sites and 172 historic buildings have been determined not eligible for the NRHP.

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

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

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

### **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, and the INL "Cultural Resource Management Plan" outlines policies specific to DOE-ID. A Memorandum of Understanding between DOE-ID and the Idaho Museum of Natural History provides specific guidance for management of collections permanently curated in the Earl H. Swanson Archaeological Repository in Pocatello, ID. Recent collections of nonperishable artifacts may also be held in secure, temporary storage in the INL CRM Office, Idaho Falls, ID, where they await transfer to the permanent collections. In FY 2008, approximately 400 temporally sensitive obsidian artifacts in the INL collections were accessed and subject to non-destructive x-ray fluorescence analysis as part of an ongoing cooperative research project with Idaho State University.

Important historic archives are also maintained at INL. This includes a photographic collection with over 1 million negatives; an engineering and architectural drawing collection; and several collections of technical reports, maps, and other documents. In FY 2008, INL CRM staff led efforts to develop and implement a program to guide the retention and accessibility of these important resources in the short term along with a

strategy for their long term future preservation. In another ongoing effort activities are also underway to identify historic artifacts associated with World War II and the nuclear era. These artifacts often present unique challenges for curation (size, materials, contamination), so part of this ongoing effort is directed to the identification of a suitable repository for permanent long term curation. Efforts in these areas are ongoing.

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

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

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

(H09) DOE-LM adheres to the regulations codified at 36 CFR Part 79.

(H10) DOE-LM uses the Ohio Historical Society Archives/Library to curate its collections.

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Bonneville Power Administration**

The cultural resource staff is 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.

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

Ninety-six boxes of artifacts and 18 pieces of ground stone were submitted to LANL's official curation facility - the Museum of New Mexico, Laboratory of Anthropology at Santa Fe, NM.

### **Section I. Archeological Resources Management Program Funding**

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

#### **Idaho Operations Office**

Public access to INL is restricted due to the classified nature of much of the research conducted at the active scientific facilities located there. As a result, heritage tourism is presently not a viable 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 Visitor's Center and at the Big Lost River Rest Area. In spite of security restrictions, interest in INL cultural resources remains high. In FY 2008, as in past years, approximately 14,000 people visit the EBR-I National Historic Landmark between Memorial Day and Labor Day, and the annual public archaeology tours offered by the INL CRM Office remain extremely popular. 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 INL. The INL CRM Office continues to explore additional ways of encouraging public interest in INL cultural resources while staying within established security parameters.

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

**Bonneville Power Administration**

Approximately \$4,000,000 was spent in support of the Federal Columbia Power System Cultural Resource program. Approximately \$320,000 was spent on BPA staff salaries for Section 106 consultations and coordination. Approximately \$167,000 was spent on contract staff salaries for Section 106 consultations and coordination. Approximately \$376,500 was spent on contracting for archaeological work.

All of this money is derived from rates paid by BPA's customers for public power.

**Idaho Operations Office**

Funding totals provided in this section do not reflect the entire range of historic preservation activities at the INL. Significant efforts and funding to identify, evaluate, and mitigate adverse effects to historic architectural properties, industrial archaeological sites, and other elements of the built INL environment that are associated with World War II as well as INL's significant scientific contributions to U.S. nuclear science and technology are not included at this time. In FY 2008, 80 historic architectural properties were assessed, and 35 properties that are eligible to the NRHP for their association with important pioneering research on nuclear energy and associated science were identified. In future years the INL CRM Office will expand this report to include these important efforts under a heading of INL industrial archaeology.

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

**Section K. Permits for Archeological Investigations**

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

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

**Bonneville Power Administration**

BPA received its first request for an ARPA permit late this year. Examples of permits were sought from within DOE and other agencies, and a process to provide ARPA permits is being developed. The first one is to be awarded soon.

**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 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 2008, no permits were issued to outside subcontractors for archaeological work on the INL, and no permits remained outstanding.

**Savannah River Operations Office**

In FY 2008, all archaeological activities at the SRS were conducted by SRARP personnel under provisions of the existing DOE/SCIAA cooperative agreement that also incorporates SRS permitting guidance.

**Section L. Archeological Resource Law Enforcement**

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

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

**Richland Operations Office**

During FY 2008, Richland made a concerted effort to protect culturally sensitive areas that include archaeological sites that had been looted in the past as well as two highly significant traditional cultural properties that contain multiple significant archaeological sites. Protection efforts include signage, access control, and cultural resources sensitivity and awareness training for agency and contractor staff.

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

**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. In FY 2008, INL CRM staff observed new graffiti on the walls of an INL lava tube cave noted for Native American pictographs. INL security officers investigated the incident, identified the teenaged perpetrators, and coordinated cleanup of the area. None of the sensitive rock art panels located at the site were damaged by this incident, and no formal charges were filed.

Efforts to enhance cultural resource protection at INL are ongoing and are primarily focused on training and education. All INL employees (more than 5,000 in FY 2008) are reminded of prohibitions on unauthorized disturbance of archaeological sites during yearly, on-line training modules that address INL access and security. Additionally, in FY 2008, as in past years, more intensive cultural resource awareness training is targeted to certain INL employee populations (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**

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

**Savannah River Operations Office**

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



Enclosure 3

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

FY 2008



## DOE SITE RESPONSES TO FY 2008 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

SITES *	ASO	BPA	BNL	Fermi	Idaho	LM	LLNL	LANL	Nevada	ORO	OCRWM	PNSO	PGDP	Pantex	PORTS	Richland	Sandia	SRS	SWPA	SPR	WAPA	TOTAL
B1 (number of partnerships)	n/a	2	nd	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	2	0	n/a	2	1	0	0	0	10
B2 \$ (value of partners' contributions)	\$0	\$650,000	nd	0	unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	0	\$776,000	0	0	0	\$1,426,000
B3 (number of volunteer hours)	n/a	0	nd	0	unknown	0	0	36	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	160	0	0	0	196
C1 (number of area-wide ARPA and NHPA overview or general non-project plans)	0	1	nd	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	4	14
C2 (number of projects for which reviews, etc. were done)	2	105	nd	0	39	2	1	744	13	1	5	0	5	1	0	116	12	26	5	1	84	1,162
C3 (Number of notifications to Indian Tribes of potential harm)	0	5	nd	0	39	0	0	2	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	n/a	n/a	84	142
D1 (number of field studies)	2	97	nd	0	20	2	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	12	0	12	0	32	3	1	84	271
D2 (number of acres inventoried)	16	8,050.34	nd	0	1,036	61	0	0	21.8	111	0	0	0	0	0	1,638	0	1,617	8.5	0	7,800	20,360
D3 (number of new archeological sites identified)	0	48	nd	0	135	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	25	0	0	>200	470
D4 (number of Section 106 actions involving archeological sites completed)	0	13	nd	0	23	2	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	38	90
D5 (number of archeological sites stabilized, rehabilitated, protected)	4	103	nd	0	113	0	1	3	15	0	7	3	0	2	0	46	0	0	0	0	40	337
D8 (number of reports [grey literature, e.g. Section 106 compliance reports] about archeological resources completed)	2	68	nd	0	38	2	0	11	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	48	184
**D9 (cumulative total number of acres inventoried on DOE land)	489	0	4,229	6,800	52,177	2,810	7,375	23,130	37,057	29,318	n/a	300	0	3	2,066	118,972	2,481	81,398	n/a	0		368,605
D10A (number of cumulative survey areas mapped using GIS)	489	n/a	4,229	0	39,800	unknown	7,375	23,130	33,351	0	n/a	300	0	1	2,066	118,972	2,481	61,404	n/a	0		293,598
D10B (number of cumulative survey areas mapped using CAD)		n/a	0	unknown	7,375	n/a	0	n/a	0	0					0					0		7,375
**D11 (cumulative total number of archeological sites on DOE land)	46	1	5	46	2,537	197	28	1,866	2,178	47	n/a	16	1	69	38	1,035	0	1,822	n/a	0		9,932
D12A (number of cumulative total of archeological sites mapped using a GIS)	46	1	5	0	2,050	unknown	28	1,396	1,960	0	n/a	16	1	1	38	1,035	n/a	1,093	n/a	0		7,670
D12B (number of cumulative total of archeological sites mapped using a CAD)		n/a	0	unknown	28	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	0				0					0		28
D13 (number of archeological sites assessed for condition)	4	1	5	0	43	0	1	19	15	0	n/a	3	0	2	0	45	0	32	n/a	0		170
D14 (number of known archeological sites revisited and re-evaluated)	0	1	nd	0	0	1	2	28	15	0	n/a	3	0	2	0	47	0	7	n/a	0		106
E1 (number of archeological data recovery projects in progress)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8	10
E2 (number of archeological sites on which data recovered)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9
E3 (number of undertakings with unexpected discoveries)	0	1	nd	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4
E4 (number of undertakings with unexpected discoveries requiring data recovery)	0	1	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3

## DOE SITE RESPONSES TO FY 2008 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

SITES *	ASO	BPA	BNL	Fermi	Idaho	LM	LLNL	LANL	Nevada	ORO	OCRWM	PNSO	PGDP	Pantex	PORTS	Richland	Sandia	SRS	SWPA	SPR	WAPA	TOTAL	
F1 (number archeological sites determined NRHP-eligible)	0	31	nd	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	53
F2 (number archeological sites listed on NRHP)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F3 (Number of archeological sites determined ineligible for NRHP)	0	1	nd	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	43
**F6 (cumulative total number of archeological sites on DOE land determined NRHP-eligible)	4	0	3	1	0	20	5	439	1,121	15	n/a	1	0	0	0	30	0	0	n/a	n/a			1,639
**F7 (cumulative number of archeological sites on DOE land determined not NRHP-eligible)	21	0	153	17	4	177	23	84	1,055	32	n/a	8	0	67	38	156	0	0	n/a	n/a			1,835
**F8 (cumulative total number of NRHP-listed archeological sites on DOE land)	0	1	nd	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	49	0	0	n/a	n/a			51
F9 (number of NRHP-listed archeological sites that passed out of DOE control)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a			0
F10A (number of archeological sites under DOE control that were formerly but are not now NRHP-listed due to natural causes)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a			0
F10B (Number archeological sites under DOE control that were formerly but are not now listed on the National Register due to human induced destruction)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0		0	0		n/a			0
F11 (number archeological districts on DOE land determined NRHP-eligible)	0	0	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	n/a			0
**F12 (cumulative number archeological districts on DOE land determined NRHP-eligible by the Keeper)	0	0	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	n/a			0
F13 (number archeological districts listed on NRHP)	0	0	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	n/a			0
**F14 (cumulative number NRHP-listed archeological districts on DOE land)	0	0	nd	n/a	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	6	n/a	0	0	n/a			6
H1 (number of items curated)	63	unknown	10,962	n/a	10,900	15,516		n/a	414,682	0		0	0	0	0	n/a	0	1,547,580	0	0	0	0	1,999,703
H2 (cubic feet curated)	68.4	unknown		12	n/a	n/a	1.2	418	3,448	0	300	0	0	717	9	197	0		0	0			5,171
H3 (associated records included? yes)	1	unknown	1	1	n/a	1	1	1	1			n/a	n/a	1	1		n/a		n/a	0			9
H3 (associated records included? no)		unknown		0	n/a	0					1					1		1		0			3
H4 (% of H1 and H2 processed for curation)	100%	unknown	100%	100%	99%	100%	90%	99%	100%	0%	100%	n/a	n/a	100%	0%	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	0%			99%
H5 (linear feet of paper archeological records)	3	unknown	9	1	5	unknown	2.5	11	370	0	220	n/a	n/a	2	<1	2	n/a	525	8	0			1,159
H6 (gigabytes of stored archeological records or studies)		unknown		n/a	0.3	n/a	<1	157.3	0.15	0		n/a	n/a		<1	n/a	n/a		10.5	0			170
H7 (number of federal museums/repositories curating DOE collections)	0	unknown	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0			5
H8 (number of non-federal museums/repositories curating DOE collections)	1	unknown	nd	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0			8
H9 (agency policy for managing and preserving archeological collections - yes)	1		nd	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	0			14
H9 (agency policy for managing and preserving archeological collections - no)		1	nd				1						1				1			0			4
H11 (number of times DOE collections utilized for research or exhibits)	0	unknown	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	45	n/a	0			52

## DOE SITE RESPONSES TO FY 2008 FEDERAL ARCHEOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

SITES *	ASO	BPA	BNL	Fermi	Idaho	LM	LLNL	LANL	Nevada	ORO	OCRWM	PNSO	PGDP	Pantex	PORTS	Richland	Sandia	SRS	SWPA	SPR	WAPA	TOTAL	
I1 \$ (appropriated dollars used for archeology)	\$0	\$4,863,500	nd	\$0	\$200,000	\$39,000	\$0	\$471,100	\$0	\$0	\$235,000	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$600,000	\$0	\$416,000	\$94,372	\$0		\$6,933,972	
I2 \$ (non-appropriated dollars used for archeology)	\$0	\$0	nd	\$0	\$40,000	\$0	\$0	\$221,900	\$900,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$360,000	\$0	\$0		\$1,521,900	
K1 (archeological permit applications received)	0	1	nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		2	
K2 (archeological permits issued or in effect)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		2	
L1 (number of incidents document)	0	1	nd	0	1	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0		4	
L2 (number of incidents with arrests)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L3 (number of individuals arrested)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L4 (number of individuals cited)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L5 (number of individuals convicted of misdemeanor under ARPA)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L6 (number of individuals convicted of felony under ARPA)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L7 (number of individuals found liable for civil penalty under ARPA)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L8 (number of individuals found not guilty or not liable under ARPA)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L9 \$ (amount given [not offered] in rewards)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L10 (number of individuals convicted of misdemeanor under other laws)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L11 (number of individuals convicted of felony under other laws)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L12 (number of individuals found not guilty under other laws)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L13 (total number of cases where individuals were found guilty or liable [include ARPA])	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L14 \$ (total value of fines imposed or ordered)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L15 \$ (total value of restitution, including civil penalties)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L16 \$ (estimated costs of restoration and repair in site damage assessments)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L17 \$ (value of property seized)	0	0	nd	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	
L18 \$ (cost of law enforcement to DOE for archeology)	\$0	\$200,000	nd	0	unknown	0	0	\$121,000	n/a	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		\$321,000	
L22 (number of collected LOOT forms)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1	
* all values are for FY 2008 only, except for those marked with ** that are cumulative totals.																							
** = cumulative values that include FY 2008																							
n/a = not applicable																							
nd = no data																							



Enclosure 4

**DOE Site Acronym List**



## DOE SITE ACRONYM LIST

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