

**Bureau of Land Management
Preservation Board Report
June 13-15, 2017
Fort Vancouver, WA**

Preservation Board Members

Federal Preservation Officer/Chair (FPO):

Ranel Capron (Washington Office 240)

Deputy Preservation Officers (DPO):

Robert King (Alaska)

Tony Overly (California)

Daniel Haas (Colorado)

Kirk Halford (Idaho)

Gary Smith (Montana)

Bryan Hockett (Nevada)

Cynthia Herhahn (New Mexico)

Kristen Martine (Oregon)

Nathan Thomas (Utah)

Kathy Boden (Wyoming)

Line Officer Representatives:

Steve Nelson (FM, Bishop, CA)

Sarah Schlanger (FM, Taos, NM)

Paul Tigan (FM, Marys Peak, OR)

Field Archaeology Specialists:

Natalie Clark (Grand Junction FO, CO)

Tiffany Arend (California Desert FO, CA)

Field Committee Representative:

Marci Todd (ASD, Nevada)

Other Participants

In person:

Byron Loosle, Division Chief (WO240)

Theresa Hanley (ASD, Oregon/Washington)

Ian Johnson (Oregon State Historic Preservation Office)

Allyson Brooks (Washington State Historic Preservation Officer)

Scott Thomas (Archaeologist, Burns District, BLM OR)

Everett Bassett (Transon Environmental)

By telephone:

Signa Larralde (Archaeologist, BLM National Transmission Support Team)

Jenna Gaston (Archaeologist, BLM National Transmission Support Team)

Anna Rago (Training Coordinator, BLM National Training Center)

Greg Haverstock (Archaeologist, BLM Bishop CA)

Diana Barg (Collections Manager, BLM UT)

Richard Hanes (Applied Earthworks, Inc.)

**Bureau of Land Management
Preservation Board Report
June 13-15, 2017
Fort Vancouver, WA**

June 13

Welcome

Theresa Hanley, Associate State Director for Oregon/Washington welcomed the group and provided some insight from her executive leadership level. She reminded the members that land management is like anthropology in motion and affords us a pathway to our BLM mission and responsibilities to the Indian Tribes we work with and the public.

Updates from Washington

Byron Loosle, Division Chief for WO-240, conveyed concern on the lack of information and movement on the hiring freeze. There is no political appointee identified for BLM yet; concerns have been expressed about the review of sage grouse plans as well as our monuments, unsure whether these reviews will impact our program. The reorganization plan has been compared to a military command or a fire incident command. Washington is expected to have only 3% of the agency's staff with 75% of the staff in the field; this could affect the State Offices. Byron reviewed the Director's five priorities and indicated an interest for developing state protocols for those BLM states that don't currently work under a protocol. All grants and agreements are being reviewed and this could affect our ability to transmit funds to our partner State Historic Preservation Offices.

Oregon State Historic Preservation Office

Ian Johnson and Chrissy Curran from Oregon SHPO spoke to the Board about their organization. The SHPO also serves as the director of State Parks, so has numerous responsibilities. Their Heritage Programs/Commission cover a variety of programs including historic cemeteries, Main Street, Archives, historical societies, Century farm program grants, and a program called Diamonds in the Rough. They have added a lot of programs in the last five years, due to needs expressed by the public. Currently they are under a hiring freeze and expressed sympathy with BLM's similar situation. There are 9 Tribes in the state that they work with. Their review and compliance group typically completes 20 Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) and 4-5 Programmatic Agreements (PA) a year. The public in Oregon has a lot of broad discomfort with change; there is a feeling that a lot of people have moved to OR, creating gentrification; historic neighborhoods and buildings have been lost. Oregon has wind power in the eastern part of the state and the Boardman to Hemingway transmission line is concerning to the public about how it will affect their vistas and the Oregon Trail viewshed. Education is a big part of their job and trying to help the public understand what is important. Zane Grey Cabin on BLM is a big interest point. Pleased to see that listed on the NRHP.

Washington State Historic Preservation Office

Allyson Brooks, Washington State Historic Preservation Officer, conveyed thanks for the invitation to speak, especially since there is little BLM land in Washington and no state protocol to work under. Her agency is an independent state agency, which is rare. They work with 36 Tribes having treaty rights and consider them to be partners in managing the cultural resources of Washington. In fact, the Tribes have asked SHPO not to sign MOAs unless the Tribe(s) sign first. This requires the federal agency to sincerely coordinate with the Tribes. The Governor meets with all the tribal chairs once a year under the Centennial Accord. A discussion about

**Bureau of Land Management
Preservation Board Report
June 13-15, 2017
Fort Vancouver, WA**

cultural resources is part of that conversation. Washington has invested a lot of money into technology, which has allowed their review time to shorten to about 4 days per project. They have 6000 reviews a year. All their site data is online and surveys and sites are behind a firewall. The GLO maps are online, as is the maritime data and a predictive model. A Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) form was developed with the Tribes and that is online. Consultants can also attach audio and video files to forms. They have an electronic Area of Potential Effects (APE) form, so the APE is drawn directly into the system for submission to SHPO as well as Tribes and communities. Although the APE designation is a federal responsibility, WA SHPO took the initiative to help processing go faster.

National Cultural Heritage Solution

Kirk Halford, Idaho Deputy Preservation Officer, provided a presentation on the proposed data standard. He expressed concern that the SHPOs have not implemented a standard that was agreed upon several years ago. There is no consistency across the states, so he asked the Board to decide whether we should move forward with the standard. The Board agreed it was important and the work should continue. The next question was about the type of workflow/maintenance model to be pursued. The Board decided it was very important to continue working with SHPOs and to create workflows that would write scripts pulling SHPO data across into a BLM system. Kirk indicated that SHPOs are also seeing the need to maintain some of these data categories. BLM will need to do quality control; each state data rep will have to conduct the review. Program will be hosted at the BLM National Operations Center (NOC).

BLM Oregon resources

Scott Thomas, archaeologist with the Burns District, provided a briefing on Oregon BLM work including Rimrock Draw rockshelter and Paisley Caves.

Using a Compliance Inspection Contractor

Signa Larralde, National Transmission Support Team archaeologist, presented the topic and Everett Bassett from Transcon, an environmental firm that Signa has worked with. Signa encouraged the use of compliance inspector contractors (CIC), especially when there are multiple states and field offices involved in a large project. Field offices may be understaffed and overwhelmed with existing workload, so CICs can help, especially during the construction phase of a project. They can assist BLM to make informed decisions (often daily) about variances and provide local expertise in resolving ongoing issues. The consultants can act as agency eyes and ears on the ground. They coordinate daily with the construction contractor and ensure that the historic property treatment plan is being followed. Whether we use CIC personnel from an external group, or have a dedicated BLM archaeologist doing similar work, it is highly useful to develop this capability.

**Bureau of Land Management
Preservation Board Report
June 13-15, 2017
Fort Vancouver, WA**

June 14

Tribal Participation in Monitoring

Jenna Gaston, National Transmission Support Team archaeologist, discussed the use of tribal monitors on renewable energy project. Currently there is no specific policy for monitoring other than mentioned in the 1780 manual on Tribal Relations. She sees a need for best management practices. The 1780 manual allows for tribal assistance agreements, payments through proponents or through BLM funding for services rendered such as monitoring. Tribes are requesting and often expecting to conduct their own inventories, being involved in any archaeological testing, and monitoring of construction to ensure tribally sensitive resources are not adversely affected. Discussion included use of ethnographic overview as part of the identification effort; ensuring that BLM gets a product that is useful; tribal participation plans are becoming more common; and sharing examples of what has worked in states.

Training Strategies

Anna Rago, training coordinator at the National Training Center, Zane Fulbright (Lewistown MT FO), and Greg Haverstock (Bishop CA FO) from the Cultural Training team, discussed new training courses. They are currently planning for an update to the 8100 Fundamentals course, in order to be ready for a May 2018 class. Kirk Halford is working on a “GIS for archaeologists” course. Zane encouraged the group to take a Train the Trainer course; it helps you learn how to teach courses. Discussion included a push to get on the managers’ course list, as well as emerging leaders and leadership academy. Currently they have courses in law enforcement, fire, lands, and realty. We need to revisit the foundational courses because we are losing the senior specialists, as well as packaging courses for what new managers need. Finally, when hosting a course in your state, think about inviting your tribal partners to participate.

Metal Detecting Policy and Brochure

This topic was introduced by Dan Haas, Colorado Deputy Preservation Officer. This effort began in 2006 with a brochure. Then in 2010, we tried to get policy consolidated in 1050, but recreation and minerals wanted to have policy in their manuals. So, we went back to a brochure idea. Most recent work has been by our contractor to incorporate language in the new 8130 manual. IM language got bogged down in NLCS; it’s hard to get a single policy out, expect it will need coordination and buy-off from other programs, which can be hard to get. There is some overlap in this with meteorite collection; would like to see both. Try to work on a brochure again. Dan, Matt, and Nate were identified as a team to see about working a brochure through the Respect & Protect program.

Cerberus Collection Update

Nate Thomas, Utah DPO and Diana Barg, Cerberus Museum Collection Manager, briefed the Board on the current situation regarding collection and disposition. Artifacts have been identified from five states apart from Utah. Nate proposed that the other states initiate government-to-government consultation and implement NAGPRA; identify the appropriate curation facility to house these collections; develop repository agreements, contracts, or assistance agreements if those do not yet exist. Concern was expressed about splitting the collection. Unfortunately, collections facilities are not interested in housing the collection due to the lack of provenience of

**Bureau of Land Management
Preservation Board Report
June 13-15, 2017
Fort Vancouver, WA**

the artifacts. The Board asked Utah to go through the State Directors for decisions about this collection.

Manual Revisions

Richard Hanes, Applied EarthWorks, Inc. (AE), spoke to the group about the manual revisions. He and Stephen Fosberg are under contract with WO-240 to assist in writing and editing documents.

There is an increased focus on FLPMA and NEPA, looking at sacred sites through the lens of Section 106. And a greater emphasis on heritage resources that may not be historic properties. The last touch-up that AE did was in mid-May, so the set (8100-8150) is fairly clean. Have purged the Planning 2.0 nomenclature and revised words such as landscape and climate change; though it doesn't read as smoothly, so a review would be good.

The 8110 has a new emphasis aside from Section 106; proactive activities that also have legal mandates; strong addition to the set; compliance with FLPMA and NEPA. No issues with the Handbook tied to that manual. Nate suggested a restructure of the 8120, a step-by-step guide may be better suited to an appendix; Byron mentioned that if the process gets flipped by planning using terms like AMS could be problematic. Nate suggested a flow chart. Cynthia said to describe what an AMS is supposed to do, just don't call it out. 8130 has no lingering issues. Just received some comments on 8140 from Gary Smith and Kristen Martine; have not fully incorporated / addressed those.

Largest number of issues is with 8150, such as curation agreements. Should they be required for all permits or just those for testing/excavation. One camp wants them for all permits, especially to cover maps, photos, diagnostic artifacts; other camp is no curation agreement required for survey. Text currently aligns with the first position. Kirk indicated Idaho Tribes do not allow collection of artifacts. In 7 years, no collection has been made. CA is the same. A requirement of curation agreements will be up to the State Director. There are financial considerations; BLM will not agree to annual curation fees.

Tony suggested we change altogether and start not allowing any collections. Anti-deficiency standard – can't make commitments for future when we don't know if we'll get the appropriations. Sarah said if we are truly renting space in curation facilities, then just do that. Kathy was asked to send out Lynn's template letter of violation. 8160 – Kirk won't get to it for a few months.

**Bureau of Land Management
Preservation Board Report
June 13-15, 2017
Fort Vancouver, WA**

June 15

Oil Spill Training and Disaster Response

Ranel Capron briefed the Board on recent training and opportunities for field participation, as well as goals for the disaster recovery program.

Charter Discussion

The Board reviewed the new draft charter and voted to recommend it to the Director.

New Business/Closeout

The Board reviewed action items and discussed future meeting locations. Next June meeting will be held in Salt Lake City, UT.

The rest of the day consisted of a tour of the Fort Vancouver collections and the Cathlapotle Plankhouse.