

EIS

From: Susan D. Radzinski [sradz@lanl.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2005 3:39 PM
To: kIRK.W.OWENS@saic.com
Subject: Fwd: Revised SWEIS statement with additional incident for Question 6

Attachments: S-SWEIS data request (12-14-04)1.doc



S-SWEIS data
request (12-14-04...
Kirk,

I thought I had sent this, but here it is now.

Susan

>X-Sieve: CMU Sieve 2.2
>X-Sender: wbmasse@esh-mail.lanl.gov
>X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
>Date: Fri, 04 Mar 2005 17:03:26 -0700
>To: sradz@lanl.gov
>From: "W. Bruce Masse" <wbmasse@lanl.gov>
>Subject: Revised SWEIS statement with additional incident for Question
>6
>Cc: manzk@lanl.gov
>X-PMX-Version: 4.7.0.111621
>
>Susan:
>
>Cheers.
>
>----Bruce
>

Susan D. Radzinski
ENV-ECO NEPA Team Leader
Project Lead Annual SWEIS Yearbook
Los Alamos National Laboratory
P. O. Box 1663, MS M887
Los Alamos, NM 87545

Voice: 505-667-1838
Fax: 505-667-0731
e-mail: sradz@lanl.gov

**DATA REQUEST FOR LANL S-SWEIS
ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES
March 3, 2005**

- C-2. The Information Document (ID) (LA-UL-04-5631, Section 4.8.4) discusses the impacts of the Cerro Grande Fire on cultural resources. However, although the total number of archaeological sites impacted by the fire is provided (page 4-151), the ID does not break the number down by type. Could you provide the number of prehistoric, historic, and Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) impacted by the fire?

Data From LA-UR-02-5713 "Cerro Grande Fire Assessment Project: An Assessment of the Cerro Grande Fire on Cultural Resources at Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico"

Prehistoric and unknown = 248

Homstead = 56

Manhattan Project/Early Cold War buildings and structures = 12

TCP = 0

- C-3. The ID indicates that rehabilitation work was conducted at 107 cultural resource sites affected by the fire (page 4-151). Could you provide the number of prehistoric, historic, and TCPs involved in the rehabilitation work?

Prehistoric = 107; Historic = 0; TCP = 0

- C-4. With respect to the Land Conveyance and Transfer, the ID indicates that there were 16 cultural resource sites excavated in 3 tracts and that they were all prehistoric sites (page 4-151). The ID also notes that there are 31 sites in TA-74 (page 4-152). Is the total number of cultural resource sites present within the land that has been conveyed and transferred to date known? Can this number be provided by category and land tract?

There are a total of 64 sites that have been conveyed and transferred to date.

White Rock Tract: 11 sites: prehistoric = 11, historic = 0, TCP = 0

Airport East Tract: 2 sites: prehistoric = 2, historic = 0, TCP = 0

**TA-74 Tract: 51 sites: prehistoric = 46, historic = 1, recent = 1,
undetermined = 3**

- C-5. The ID notes (page 4-152) that there are 31 archaeological sites within an archaeological protection easement in TA-74, but does not account for all 31 in the rest of the paragraph. Could you provide the number of prehistoric, historic, and TCPs involved in the easement? Are all of these on lands that have been transferred or conveyed or are some yet to be transferred? How many resources have been transferred to date by category?

The 31 sites in the protection easements in TA-74 are as follows:

Prehistoric = 30; Historic = 1; TPCs = 0

None of the land containing the 31 sites within the easements has been transferred to date.

Same as answered in C-4. There are a total of 64 sites that have been conveyed and transferred to date.

White Rock Tract: 11 sites: prehistoric = 11, historic = 0, TCP = 0

Airport East Tract: 2 sites: prehistoric = 2, historic = 0, TCP = 0

TA-74 Tract: 51 sites: prehistoric = 46, historic = 1, recent = 1, undetermined = 3

- C-6. Have there been any other actions (other than the fire and land transfer/conveyance) that have impacted cultural resources in the past 5 years and how many resources (by category) have been affected?

May 2002. **Rendija Canyon Tract** of the Land Conveyance and Transfer Project. Vandalism to a Traditional Cultural Property caused by the presumed burial of a pet dog in an unfenced and unmarked archaeological site. Corrective action in November 2002 included the fencing by LANL of all TCPs in Rendija Canyon Tract (in two parcels) and posting as “environmental sensitive areas.”

May 2002. **TA-33 Remodeling Project:** Manhattan Project building in which original rollup door was removed prior to consultation and documentation as part of scheduled remodeling. Corrective action included photographic documentation of building after the door was removed, along with the creation of archival quality negatives from digital photographs taken prior to door removal.

March 2003. **TA-18 Gun Site:** Manhattan Project complex disturbed by road construction. Ongoing corrective actions scheduled for completion in FY 2005.

May 2003. **Rendija Canyon Tract** of the Land Conveyance and Transfer Project. Cutting or driving over in several locations of the two TCP fences, and driving through one TCP area. No TCP sites were actually disturbed. Corrective action included erection of gated and locked fence into this portion of Rendija Canyon, increased monitoring by police, and notification in the Los Alamos newspaper about the ongoing archaeological excavations in the area and why the area was closed to the public.

November 2003. **Rendija Canyon Tract** of the Land Conveyance and Transfer Project. Vandalism to two archaeological sites caused by driving through the sites during a holiday weekend. Corrective action included documentation of damage, reporting to police, strengthening gates and fences into the Rendija Canyon tract, the placement of surveillance cameras at the gates, and further newspaper coverage of the closure of the Rendija Canyon Tract to the public. Discussions were also held with Santa Fe National Forest archaeologists and recreation specialists to formulate a shared strategy for helping to prevent or limit future vandalism in Rendija Canyon. Also, DOE has contracted the Forest Service to patrol the area on a regular basis.

April 2004. **TA-16**, West Jemez Road Upgrade Project. Secondary contractor drove through a marked archaeological site (Archaic lithic scatter) by lifting up the string and driving their vehicle into the site area. This caused minor surface to the archaeological site. Apparently the primary subcontractor failed to inform the secondary subcontractor what the marked and flagged sites represented, and the secondary contractor failed to ask what the marked and flagged sites represented. This situation happened despite frequent periodic monitoring of the project by the LANL Cultural Resources Team. A set of “lessons learned” documents was produced, including recommendations for contract language to make contractors and subcontractors more aware of restricted locations.