

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT FOR CULTURAL RESOURCES
ACTIVITIES, FISCAL YEAR 2002**

**PROJECT TITLE AND ID: RECLAMATION ADMINISTRATION OF
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT (PA) AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT
PROGRAM (AMP) TRIBAL CONSULTATION PROGRAMS**

Status: Ongoing. Originally approved and implemented with Record of Decision and PA in 1995.

General Project Description: Reclamation needs to provide administrative and professional support to complete the three stipulations in the PA and to ensure government-to-government consultation between AMP federal agencies and tribes.

Rationale/Problem Statement:

PA. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) directs federal agencies to take into account effects of their undertakings on historic properties. It also directs agencies to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) an opportunity to comment on such undertakings. The Council's regulations (36 CFR 800) guiding agencies in implementing Section 106 provide for consultation among interested parties aimed at reaching agreement on ways to avoid or reduce adverse effects on historic properties. Where consultation results in agreement on how to reduce or compensate for adverse effects, the mitigating measures are stipulated in an agreement document. The agreement document for Glen Canyon Dam (PA) has 3 stipulations: 1) to identify and evaluate historic properties affected by dam operations; 2) to monitor effects of dam operations on historic properties within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) of dam operations for the purpose of carrying out remedial actions; and 3) to incorporate the results of the first two stipulations into an Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) describing long-term management of the historic properties. Completion of these stipulations constitutes compliance with Section 106 of NHPA for continued operation of Glen Canyon Dam.

Administration of Tribal Agreements. Government-to-government consultation with Indian tribes is required under a variety of laws, regulations, and policies. These mandates for consultation, coupled with the needs for dialog within the AMP, require administrative support. This support includes salary and expenses from both the Grants and Cooperative Agreement Division and Environmental Division to administer cooperative agreements and to consult with the AMP Tribes on specific issues.

PA Stipulations or PEP Recommendations to be Addressed:

PA1. Identification and Evaluation

PA2. Monitoring and Remedial Action

PA3. Management or Historic Preservation Plan.

PEP3. Improve coordination and integration of a complex program.

PEP11. Improve cultural resource contracting procedures.

Project Goals and Objectives:

- Manage programs recommended by PEP as related to compliance or consultation.
- Work on AMP Strategic Plan Goals and PA stipulations.
- Manage tribal participation and cooperative agreements; ensure government-to-government consultation occurs for AMP.
- Improve program integration and efficiency.

Schedule: Ongoing through FY03.

Budget: \$50,000.

BOR Administration

Office	\$900
Council travel	\$1,150
NC:89days@220/day	\$19,580
Benefits @ .24	\$4,699
NC Travel (10*500)	\$5,000
Grants:25 days @200/day	\$5,000
Benefits @ .24	\$1,890
Grant Travel (2@500)	\$1,000
Subtotal	\$39,219
Indirect @ .275	\$10,785
Subtotal	\$50,004

PROJECT TITLE AND ID: NPS MONITORING (GRAND AND GLEN CANYONS)

Status: Ongoing since 1995. Specific programs approved and implemented beginning with Record of Decision and PA in 1995.

General Project Description: NPS monitoring programs were initiated with the completion of the archeological inventory in 1991. Programs were formalized in the Monitoring and Remedial Action Plan stipulated in the PA in 1995. Programs will remain unchanged until a new monitoring plan is in place in FY03.

Rationale/Problem Statement: As stipulated in the PA, the purpose of monitoring was to generate data regarding the effects of dam operations on historic properties, to identify ongoing impacts to historic properties within the area of potential effects (APE), and to develop and implement remedial measures for treating historic properties. The NPS monitoring programs were also designed to identify and evaluate previously unrecorded properties. Mitigating measures included bank stabilization, check dam construction and data recovery.

PA Stipulations or PEP Recommendations:

PA2. Monitoring and Remedial Action

PA3. Management or Historic Preservation Plan.

PEP7. Redefine the cultural resource monitoring programs.

Project Goals and Objectives:

- Continue working on PA stipulations until new monitoring plan is in place in FY03.
- Identify effects of dam operations on historic properties for the HPP.

Expected Products/Deliverables: The deliverable for FY02 will be a final report of adverse effects related to dam operations observed by monitoring.

Recommended Approach/Methods: Modify MRAP following recommendations of PEP, but otherwise continue until the new monitoring plan is in place.

Schedule: The project is ongoing until the new monitoring plan is completed at the end of FY02.

Budget: \$248,500 total (\$201,000 for Grand Canyon NP plus \$27,500 for Glen Canyon NRA)

PROJECT TITLE AND ID: HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN (HPP)

Status: Initiated in 1995, expected completion date is the end of FY03.

General Project Description: An Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) is stipulated in the PA. The HPP will consist of multiple subsidiary plans and will describe the process by which adverse effects of dam operations will be resolved. Reclamation is responsible for compiling the HPP in consultation with PA signatories and with input from the AMP.

Rationale/Problem Statement: Completion of an HPP is necessary to complete Section 106 compliance for dam operations.

PA Stipulations or PEP Recommendations:

PA3. Management or Historic Preservation Plan.

PEP1. Complete and adopt a Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) as a top priority.

Project Goals and Objectives: The purpose of the HPP is to resolve adverse effects of Reclamation's continuing operation of Glen Canyon Dam on eligible downstream properties in compliance with the NHPA.

Expected Products/Deliverables: An historic preservation plan (HPP).

Recommended Approach/Methods:

1. Plan for the HPP.
 - A. Clarify purpose and objectives of the HPP.
 - B. Identify elements that must be in the HPP
 - C. Identify who will do what in the writing and contracting process.
 - D. Decide work schedule.
2. Organize the HPP.
 - A. Identify main themes or sections.
 - B. Decide order of topics.
 - C. Collect information.
3. Contract for writer of HPP Introductory Chapter
 - A. BOR write scope-of-work.
 - B. Have PA signatories review scope-of-work.
 - C. Advertise in Commerce Business Daily.
 - D. Convene Technical Evaluation Committee for review of proposals.

E. Get best and final offers.

F. Award contract.

4. Write HPP.

A. Resolve area of potential effects definition (APE).

B. Contractor given written identification of differing authorities, responsibilities and interests from parties provided by parties, as they overlap within the APE.

C. Contractor given other government furnished property, references.

D. Contractor writes HPP as introductory document to subsidiary plans.

D. Incorporate flowcharts, subsidiary plans, into HPP structure.

E. Parties review draft, make comments which contractor incorporates in final.

5. Distribute HPP and implement.

Principles for the HPP.

1. Reclamation will compile the Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) for purposes of Section 106 compliance for operation of Glen Canyon Dam.
2. Reclamation shall ensure that the HPP is developed in consultation with PA signatories and with input by the TWG or AMWG.
3. The HPP will include subsidiary plans and may include a description of the GCMRC's Section 106 compliance responsibilities.
4. The HPP shall be prepared by or under the direct supervision of an individual who meets, at a minimum, the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for one or more of the cultural resource professions [48 FR 44738-9]. In addition, the HPP contractor will have demonstrated experience completing HPPs, or Historic Properties Management Plans, Historic Resources Management Plans, Cultural Resource Management Plans, and having them accepted by agencies, tribes, SHPO/THPOs, the Council, and the public.
5. The HPP shall be prepared with reference to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Preservation Planning [48 FR 44716-20]; the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archeological Documentation [48 FR 44716-20]; the Section 110 Guidelines [53 FR 4727-46]; 36 CFR 800; NPS Director's Order 28, Arizona SHPO and Navajo and Hualapai THPO standards and guidelines; the Society for American Archeology Principles of Archaeological Ethics, and other relevant documents provided by the PA signatories.
6. Disagreements about the draft HPP will be resolved through consultation. If agreement cannot be reached among PA signatories, the dispute will be forwarded to the TWG and AMWG for resolution.

7. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and a centralized, georeferenced database shall be a primary means of providing integration among PA signatories and across disciplines.
8. Results of the HPP will be integrated into the AMP and disseminated to various public and professional audiences, as appropriate.

Draft Outline for the HPP and Schedule: The project duration will be until the end of FY03. The draft outline is as follows:

1. Introduction. The introduction shall explain the organization and use of the various sections of the HPP.
2. Background. The purpose, scope, boundaries and limits of the HPP will be defined. The parties involved in the HPP shall be defined, along with their authorities, responsibilities, and relationships. A flowchart to map the HPP processes and relationships may be included. The introduction and background shall be prepared by PA signatories and contractors in FY02.
3. The Area of Potential Effects (APE) shall be defined. (This will depend upon the results of information gathering among geomorphologists during FY01, and possibly FY02 and FY03. The current APE cannot be mapped using the GCMRC's GIS for one year, i.e. end of FY01 or mid 02.
4. Effects will be described and projected within the APE.
5. Subsidiary Plans:
 - A. Research Design, including property types and comparisons of National Register eligibility and values (Criteria A-D). Contract award anticipated in Feb. 2001.
 - B. Treatment Plan. Plan depends on research design; contract anticipated in FY03.
 - C. Data Management Plan. Reclamation initiated in FY01, will coordinate and transfer data to GCMRC in FY02.
 - D. Monitoring Plan. Contracted by GCMRC and Reclamation in FY02.
 - E. Public Outreach and Involvement Plan. Contracted by GCMRC and Reclamation in FY03.
 - F. Tribal Consultation Plan. Tribes taking lead in FY01 along with AMP Strategic Planning effort.
 - G. Curation Plan and NAGPRA Plan of Action. Written by PA signatories during FY03.

Budget: Direct costs are roughly estimated at \$550,000. Costs will change as contracts are awarded. HPP costs are estimated as follows:

FY01 research design (GCMRC + BOR), ca. \$110,000

FY01 consultation plan, \$20,000.

FY01, database plan, \$40,000

FY02, database plan, \$50,000 (evenly split between GCMRC and Reclamation)
FY02, HPP introduction, \$40,000
FY02, monitoring plan, \$50,000 (evenly split between GCMRC and Reclamation)
FY03, treatment plan, \$200,000
FY03, public involvement plan, \$30,000 (\$20,000 Reclamation, \$10,000 GCMRC)
FY03, curation, NAGPRA plan \$25,000

PROJECT TITLE AND ID: *MODEL AND MAP EFFECTS OF DAM OPERATIONS WITHIN AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS*

Status: Uncertain. This project depends upon the results of a FY01 project namely, consulting with geomorphologists to determine whether the geomorphological effects of dam operations can be separated from dam existence and natural processes.

General Project Description: The PEP's recommendation to adopt a new definition of area of potential effects (APE) does not resolve whether dam operations can be separated from dam existence or natural processes affecting historic properties. Therefore, in FY01, Reclamation is seeking additional information from geomorphologists. If they determine it is feasible and cost effective, then a modeling and mapping study of dam operational effects might occur.

Rationale/Problem Statement: The exact questions to be asked by this study have not been formulated, however, the basic questions are as follows. If the geomorphological effects of dam operations can be separated from dam existence and natural processes both theoretically and specifically downstream of Glen Canyon Dam, where are these effects observed today, and where are they predicted to occur in the future? What is the theoretical model linking dam operations with these predicted effects? What is the probability that observed erosional effects on historic properties located downstream of Glen Canyon Dam are related to dam operations and not to dam existence or natural processes including climatic change?

PA Stipulations or PEP Recommendations:

PEP4. Refine the definition of the area of potential effects (APE) for the PA program.

PEP6. Reassess geomorphology research priorities.

Project Goals and Objectives: Reclamation needs information about the specific locations within the APE where adverse effects of dam operations occur or are predicted to occur. The goal of this study, if determined feasible and effective during FY01, is to identify those locations.

Expected Products/Deliverables: The expected deliverable is both a theoretical model and a georeferenced map of where adverse effects of dam operations occur within the APE.

Recommended Approach/Methods: Unknown at this time.

Schedule: The project duration is expected to be one to two years, if the study is conducted.

Budget: The costs cannot be estimated at this time, nor has it been determined to go forward with this project. Therefore, funds are placed in FY02 as a very rough guess that the model and map will be recommended by geomorphologists during FY01.

PROJECT TITLE AND ID: DATABASE PLAN

Status: New in FY01. Will continue jointly by Reclamation and GCMRC in FY02. See GCMRC plan for more information.

Budget: Reclamation is planning to contribute \$25,000 to the joint effort with GCMRC in FY02. Costs are rough estimates at this time.

PROJECT TITLE AND ID: CULTURAL MONITORING PLAN

Status: New for FY02 as joint project of Reclamation and GCMRC. See GCMRC plan for more information.

Budget: The costs are only roughly estimated at this time. Reclamation is planning to contribute \$25,000 to the joint effort in FY02.