PEP PLANNING PROCESS

**December 1999 -**

1. Initial planning group to discuss scope of PEP efforts, PEP issues and project logistics

2. Four PEP subareas identified: Native American Issues, Archaeology, Monitoring and Compliance, and Geomorphology

3. Determined a full river trip with resource specialists was necessary in addition to public meetings and presentations

Initial planning group - Reclamation, Western, National Park Service, The Hopi Tribe, GCMRC

**December - February 2000-**

Solicited suggestions from cultural resource AMP participants for PEP participants
January - February 2000 -

1. Recruitment of PEP members
2. Logistic Planning

January - February 2000-

Mail out of materials to panelists

• March 6 - 12, 2000 PEP river trip

• March 13 - 15, 2000

    PEP public meetings

March - June, 2000

PEP Final Report Preparation
PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

Panel Members By Subgroup

Archaeology

Michael S. Berry, Ph.D Staff Archaeologist, Utah State Trust Lands Administration.


Paul R. Nickens, Ph.D., Senior Research Scientist, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Adjunct Faculty, Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Betsy L. Tipps, M.A., Independent Consultant, archeological and ethnographic research, Salt Lake City.

Geomorphology

Michael Blum, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Geosciences, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Kyle House, Ph.D., Research Geologist, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, University of Nevada, Reno.

Joel Pederson, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Utah State University, Logan.
Monitoring and Compliance

David Cole, Ph.D., Research Biologist, Aldo Leopold Wilderness 'Research Institute, Missoula.

James Collins, Ph.D., Department of Biology, Arizona State University.

Mark Druss, Ph.D., Archaeologist, Environmental Affairs, Idaho Power Company.

Thomas F. King, Ph. D., Independent Consultant, cultural resource policy and practice.

Lynne Sebastian, Ph.D., Independent Consultant,, Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology, University of New Mexico.


Native American Issues

Rebecca Tsosie, J.D., School of Law, Arizona State University.

David Vader, M.A., Native American Coordinator, US Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District.


Joe Watkins, Ph.D., Agency Archeologist, Anadarko Agency of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
PROJECT RESOURCE PERSONNEL

River Trip Participants

Jan Balsom - Grand Canyon National Park

Mary Barger - Western Area Power

Robert Begay - Navajo Nation

Nancy Coulam - Reclamation

Jane Crisler - Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Brenda Drye - Southern Paiute Consortium

Loretta Jackson - Hualapai Tribe

Jen Kunde - Grand Canyon National Park

Ruth Lambert- Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center

Lisa Leap - Grand Canyon National Park

Otto Lucio- The Pueblo of Zuni

Ted Melis- Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center

Kate Thompson - SWCA, Inc.

Mike Yeatts - The Hopi Tribe
PROJECT RESOURCE PERSONNEL
Meeting Presenters

Tim Begay - Navajo Nation
Andres Chama - The Pueblo of Zuni
Ila Bullets - Southern Paiute Consortium
Kurt Dongoske - The Hopi Tribe
Richard Hereford - US Geological Survey
Mark Manone - Northern Arizona University, Geology
Andre Potochnik, SWCA, Inc.
Stephen Wiele - US Geological Survey
Reclamation

Archaeology - Nancy Coulam
Purchasing - Karen Johnson

National Park Service

Archaeology - Lisa Leap, Jen Kunde, Duane Hubbard
Permitting - Bob Winfrey, Della Snyder

GCMRC River Contractor

Humphrey's Summit Staff - Brian Dierker, Kirk Burnett, J.C. and Meg Running

GCMRC Staff

Carol Fritzinger
Barry Gold
Mark Gonzales
Vickie Kieffer
Keith Kohl
Michael Liszewski
Serena Mankiller
Ted Melis
Steve Mietz
Barb Ralston
Jake Tiegs
Bill Vernieu
General Purpose

The purpose of the PEP project is to provide GCMRC and Reclamation with recommendations and suggestions concerning cultural activities that are being conducted or proposed to be conducted in the river corridor.

Specific Questions

Relative to both GCNMC's and Reclamation's programs

1) What are the strengths of these programs?

2) What are the weaknesses of the programs?

3) What management objectives are needed within these programs?

4) What are your recommendations for improvements to the programs and to increase integration between the programs.

Subgroup Issues

1) The role of Native American involvement and the incorporation of Native American perspectives within the programs

2) Coordination of compliance efforts between the program activities relative to the GCPA and NHPA

3) Elements and procedures that comprise a long-term monitoring program based on the needs and requirements of both programs

4) Activities and techniques to identify erosion related to dam operations versus natural process
**Specific Issues for Programmatic Agreement Program**

**Identification, Evaluation, and Compliance:**

Do the monitoring programs fulfill all needs of Reclamation's compliance responsibilities under Section 106 and the Grand Canyon Protection Act?

Given impacts to National Register eligible sites since the inventory, should eligibility be reevaluated and should historic contexts, property types and ranking be prepared?

**Area of Potential Effects (APE) and Effects:**

What is the APE of dam operations? Does it include any area above the maximum historic flow of 90,000 cfs?

Are effects reasonably foreseeable or predictable within some defined area?

Have monitoring programs separated effects of dam operation, dam existence, visitors, and natural processes?

Should identification of effects, treatment recommendations, and treatment actions be made independently or with independent verification?
Treatment:

What measures are recommended for site protection and preservation?

For impacted sites, what is the best course of action? What is the scale of data recovery at impacted sites, features, structures, artifacts?

At what threshold should sites or features be recommended for treatment?

In treatment decisions, what compromises should be made between informational value and the value of sites to living communities?

Public Outreach and Accountability:

How do we meet the spirit of law regarding public outreach and information dissemination?

Under government accountability acts, how do we evaluate whether program costs are reasonable and in the public interest?
SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Core Recommendations

• Complete and adopt a Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) as a top

• Expand Native American involvement at multiple levels

• Improve coordination and integration of a complex program

Supporting Recommendations

Refine the definition of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the PA program

• Prepare a systematic evaluation of historic properties for the PA program

• Reassess geomorphology research priorities

• Redefine the cultural resource monitoring programs

• Develop an integrated historic properties treatment plan for the PA program

• Develop a cultural resource database plan

• Expand public outreach and education activities

• Improve cultural resource contracting procedures
NEXT STEPS

1) Cultural resource Meeting July 18 and 19, 2000

* Discussion of PEP recommendations

* Implementation planning for PEP recommendations

* Project Activities

* Project phasing for FY 2002 and FY 2003

2) Preparation of Scopes of Work for Projects

3) Prepare RFPs for Work Projects